

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 16 August 1988

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

DEATH OF Mr J.A. HEASLIP

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

That this House express its regret at the recent death of Mr J.A. Heaslip, a former member of the House of Assembly, and place on record its appreciation of his meritorious service, and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

We have just been advised of the death of a former member of this Parliament, Mr James Alexander Heaslip (Jim Heaslip as he was known), at Kadina, aged 87 years. Mr Heaslip's parliamentary career spanned almost 20 years. He was member for Rocky River from 1949 to 1968 and during that period he served on a number of committees, including the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, of which he was Chairman for three years. Mr Heaslip was also a member of the Public Works Standing Committee at the time of his retirement from Parliament. As a retired member, he continued his membership of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association from 1968 onwards.

Mr Heaslip was educated at Appila Primary School and later at Prince Alfred College. The son of farming parents, he became a farmer and grazier. In 1968, Mr Howard Venning, who succeeded Mr Heaslip as member for Rocky River, paid a tribute to his predecessor, referring to Mr Heaslip's sound knowledge of rural industry. However, Mr Heaslip's business interests were broader: they included an involvement in a number of companies. The best known of these was the Grosvenor Hotel of which he was a director, and that hotel was the subject discussed by Mr Heaslip and me on one of the few occasions on which I met and talked with him.

From 1959 until 1961, Mr Heaslip was a member of the University of Adelaide Council. On retiring from Parliament, he became a member of the Primary Producers Assistance Committee.

Mr Heaslip's interest in sport was well known amongst his parliamentary colleagues. He was a founding member of the South Australian Parliamentary Bowling Club and a life member of the South Australian Rifle Association. He was also President of the Great Northern Athletic and Cycling Club, which held popular meetings in Mr Heaslip's home town of Appila. Those meetings attracted the top professional cyclists and sprinters throughout the State. Indeed, the present coach of the Australian Olympic cycling team (Charlie Walsh) was a regular and outstanding competitor at those annual meetings and I imagine that other members, including my colleague the member for Price, would know about and have attended those events.

Appila has always been a small town, but it was always home to Jim Heaslip, and yesterday his funeral was held there. He is survived by his son Ian, and his three daughters, Nan, Pam and Jill, and to them and their families I extend sincere condolences on behalf of the people of South Australia.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I am pleased to second the motion to express the condolences of the House at the passing of Jim Heaslip. As Jim was a predecessor of mine in the seat of Rocky River, my remarks today have

added meaning. As the Premier has indicated, Jim Heaslip represented Rocky River from February 1949 until 1968—a period of 19 years and a time of extraordinary development for the State of South Australia. As a member of the Playford Government, he was at the very coalface of the State's changing fortunes. A farmer and grazier, Jim Heaslip was born at Carrieton in 1900.

He was educated at the Appila Primary School and Prince Alfred College, and later in life had a direct link with North Terrace as a director of the Grosvenor Hotel, prior to his parliamentary career. Jim Heaslip brought with him to the Parliament the experience of a primary producer, a proud link that he maintained throughout his parliamentary career. Indeed, he was involved in light industry pursuits, particularly in the development of agricultural machinery. He was very much involved with legislation to establish the grower-controlled South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling which is now regarded as the best and most cost-effective grain handling system in Australia.

In representing his constituents, Jim Heaslip did much to ensure that reticulated water and ETSA power went to country areas—to ensure that people living in the country regions of South Australia obtained the same deal as people living in the metropolitan area. During his time in Parliament he served as a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement (which he chaired between 1960 and 1963), the Public Works Standing Committee and, together with Lyell McEwin, was one of the founding members of the Parliamentary Bowling Club. He continued as a playing member well after his retirement in 1968 and for his interest and involvement was made a life member last year.

Following his parliamentary career, he served as a member of the Primary Producers Assistance Committee from 1968 to 1971 and also during his time as a member of Parliament he served on the University of Adelaide Council as a nominee. It is interesting to note that his work as a member of Parliament saw him in contact with many people from varied walks of life, but he never forgot those to whom he was primarily responsible: his constituents. In fact, his maiden speech to Parliament in July 1949 made mention of a number of issues of concern to his electorate. These included reforestation and soil erosion—issues that are as topical today in country areas of this State as they were when he first raised them in Parliament.

Two things that Jim Heaslip pursued for 19 years while he was a member of this House were the sealing of country roads within his electorate, in particular, the Murray Town to Booleroo Centre link and the building of a new high school at Gladstone. Although both these projects did not see fulfilment until after his retirement from the Parliament, they were achieved as a direct result of his untiring efforts.

As a person Jim Heaslip was a quiet and retiring man. His gentlemanly nature made him a very popular member, and all who came in contact with him acknowledged his approachability. He had a strong social sensitivity, which was reflected in his work both as a member of Parliament and in the wider community. He and his family maintained a strong belief in the philosophical direction of the Liberal Party: he was proud to be a member and the Party was proud to have him as a member. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion before the House, and ask that the condolences of the Opposition and Liberal Party be passed on to Jim Heaslip's family.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I feel obliged briefly to support the remarks made by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon in their com-

ments of respect to the Heaslip family following the passing of a former member of this House, Mr J.A. (Jim) Heaslip. I feel obliged to, and desire to do so, on the basis that I had a personal affiliation with this man and his family: the late Nell Heaslip, his wife; the late James Heaslip, his son; Nan, Ian, Jill and Pam.

It was Jim Heaslip, then a member of Parliament in the years 1952-54, who employed me as a sheepshearer for the first time on mainland South Australia. I would like to put on record my respect for this man as a primary producer, a sheep and wool producer, in particular, and say that his property 'Willow Park' on the Wirrabara-Appila Road is a place of pride in the north and, indeed, one of pride in South Australia. His application to the rural industry in so many ways—as has been already referred to—is something that I think his survivors can be proud of for generations. I say also that, as a member of this Parliament and a man of the land—and having worked for him—he might fairly be described as a tough but very fair employer.

The SPEAKER: I will ensure that a copy of *Hansard* containing members' contributions is conveyed to the family of our late colleague.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.11 to 2.25 p.m.]

PETITION: ARID LANDS BOTANIC GARDEN

A petition signed by 234 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish an Australian arid lands botanic garden at Port Augusta was presented by Mr Goldsworthy.

Petition received.

PETITION: NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

A petition signed by 343 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish a Neighbourhood Watch scheme for the Lockleys area was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: NETTING

A petition signed by 21 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to allow the use of larger mesh nets for fishing in the Coorong was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to question No. 25 on the Notice Paper be distributed and printed in *Hansard*; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

ASER PROJECT

25. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:
1. How much has the ASER project cost?

2. What was the original estimated cost of the project?

3. How will the difference between the estimated and the actual cost of the project be met?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This question has been asked on a number of occasions, both in this House and elsewhere. I will answer it the same way as I and my colleagues have previously answered it.

The ASER project is being carried out by the ASER Property Trust, which is a joint venture between SASFIT, the statutory body with the responsibility to invest and manage the superannuation fund, and Kumagai Gumi of Tokyo. Whilst the South Australian Government has provided support to the project in various ways, ASER is essentially a private development and the ASER Property Trust is entitled to the confidentiality enjoyed by any other commercial organisation.

Under the original agreement the Government undertook to provide a guarantee of the repayment of Kumagai's loans to ASER, and this could be said to give the Government a right to inquire about the costs of commercial elements. However, as Kumagai has indicated that it no longer requires the guarantee (and I have previously reported this to Parliament), the developer cannot reasonably be expected to make such information public, other than through the normal reporting mechanisms required by law.

LABOR POLITICIAN

In reply to **Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (11 August).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Commissioner of Police has advised:

There is no evidence to indicate that a senior South Australian Labour [sic] politician has been investigated for several years.

That there is no evidence to suggest that any such documents have been shredded.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ANTI-CORRUPTION STRATEGY

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: During 1986 and 1987 the National Crime Authority (NCA) as part of one of its general references, carried out certain investigations in South Australia. This resulted in certain charges being laid which have now been dealt with by the courts. In particular, a senior South Australian police officer, Mr Barry Moyse, has pleaded guilty to serious drug offences. In the course of the NCA investigations, certain other matters came to light, many of which were referred to the authority by the Police Commissioner. Those matters are now the subject of a report prepared by the National Crime Authority and referred to the South Australian Government on 29 July 1988.

The NCA report can be broadly divided into two parts. The first suggests procedures and mechanisms for identifying and dealing with police corruption and raises concerns about the inadequacy of previous investigations and existing measures to identify corrupt practices and to investigate allegations of corruption within the South Australian Police Force. The second identifies a number of operational matters and specific allegations relating to certain individuals. The NCA has indicated in the report, that:

... the report contains material, the disclosure of which to members of the public could prejudice the safety or reputation of persons or the operations of law enforcement agencies.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated by the NCA, it is not, in the Government's view, desirable to release all of the NCA report publicly and in particular those parts of the report which deal with operational matters and specific individuals. However, it is necessary for the Parliament and the public to be informed on the general recommendations made by the NCA. With the approval of the NCA I now table chapter 12 of its report dealing with its general recommendations.

At this point I quote directly from these general recommendations:

It is the authority's view that the allegations canvassed in this report, if true—

and I emphasise to the House those words, 'if true'—demonstrate that an unacceptable level of unethical practice has been in existence in the South Australian police for a considerable time and that without the authority's investigations, these allegations might not have come to light. It seems to the authority there has also been a lack of resolve and perhaps even a reluctance to take effective measures to enable these types of allegations to be brought to the attention of a permanent and independent investigatory unit.

The report further finds:

The authority, as noted in this report, is aware of past investigations into allegations of improper conduct by South Australian police officers. Those investigations did not create a positive environment to ensure that the risk of unethical practices was minimised and those responsible for corrupt activities were identified and properly dealt with.

However, despite the findings, the NCA concludes that an independent inquiry into the South Australian Police Force is not needed. The authority's conclusions state:

The authority however does not recommend an independent inquiry into the South Australian police such as or similar to a royal commission.

The authority does, however, recommend the establishment of an Anti-Corruption Unit to identify and investigate corruption within the South Australian Police Force.

With respect to the second category of recommendations identifying a number of specific operational matters and individual allegations, these will be the subject of thorough further investigation. The NCA report has been referred to the Commissioner of Police. He will examine, in conjunction with the authority, how the outstanding matters and allegations will be dealt with. Those which should be dealt with urgently will be attended to immediately by the Commissioner of Police and others will be the subject of consideration by the Anti-Corruption Unit when established. This course of action has the support of the National Crime Authority.

In response to the report, the Government has decided to establish a ministerial committee comprising myself and the Attorney-General, Mr Sumner, who, together with the Police Commissioner, Mr Hunt, will formulate recommendations on an anti-corruption strategy for South Australia incorporating recommendations on an Anti-Corruption Unit for consideration by State Cabinet as soon as possible. This committee will be serviced by a committee of officers headed by Mr Kym Kelly, Deputy Crown Solicitor, Attorney-General's Department, a representative of the Police Department and an officer from my own office.

In developing its proposals, the ministerial committee is expected to hold further discussions with the NCA, examine all available reports and evidence obtained during recent criminal cases and consult with the Fitzgerald inquiry in Queensland. The committee will also consider a paper, 'A Proposal for an Anti-Corruption Strategy', prepared for the Police Commissioner, Mr Hunt, prior to the receipt of the NCA report.

I now table this paper, but indicate that as it was prepared before the availability of the NCA report it provides only

one of a number of matters to be considered by the ministerial committee.

The Government believes that this proposal contains a number of valuable suggestions to deal with corruption; however, there are some issues which need further consideration and refinement. While the Government accepts that any general anti-corruption strategy must deal with corruption and the potential for it in the community generally, the Government does not have before it evidence to indicate any widespread organised corruption within the South Australian Public Service or local government authorities.

It should be noted that the paper prepared for the Commissioner of Police outlines anti-corruption initiatives already taken by the Police Department. Further anti-corruption initiatives have been implemented in consultation with the NCA during the inquiries in this State. I now table a document outlining these further anti-corruption initiatives.

In summary, key measures already taken to deal with corruption include:

- New measures for dealing with informants, including witness protection measures;
- Increased security for handling drug exhibits and drug disposal; and
- A reorganisation of Crime Command.

The Government accepts the recommendations of the NCA that an Anti-Corruption Unit be established. The formation of such a body had already been canvassed in discussion papers prepared for the Commissioner of Police (and forming part of his paper, 'A Proposal for an Anti-Corruption Strategy').

The ministerial committee will be charged with the task of preparing recommendations for the consideration of State Cabinet concerning the composition and structure of the unit, its relationship to the police and Government, how it will operate and its terms of reference. The Government will seek through the committee's recommendations practical and effective strategies for dealing with corruption.

At this point I would like to reaffirm the Government's support for the operations of the National Crime Authority. The Government has already announced that legislation will be introduced to ensure the Act under which the authority operates in this State is extended beyond 30 June 1989. It is vital that the NCA obtain Government and community support if it is to be effective in attacking organised crime.

There has been some criticism of the NCA and its operations from some quarters; however, the Government believes that these criticisms are largely unwarranted. It is important for the community to understand how the NCA operates and how it is organised. The National Crime Authority was established by the National Crime Authority Act 1984. It consists of a chairman (who must be a judge or a legal practitioner enrolled for not less than five years) and two other members. The members are not eligible for reappointment.

Section 11 of the Act in essence confers on the authority four functions:

- (i) to collect and analyse criminal information and intelligence relating to 'relevant criminal activities' (that is, serious organised crime) and to disseminate that information and intelligence to law enforcement agencies;
- (ii) to investigate, otherwise than pursuant to a reference granted by a Commonwealth or State Minister, matters relating to 'relevant criminal activities';

- (iii) to arrange for the establishment of task forces for the purpose of investigating matters relating to 'relevant criminal activities'; and
- (iv) to investigate a matter relating to a 'relevant criminal activity' in respect of which there is in force a reference granted by the Commonwealth Minister (in so far as the relevant offence is an offence against Commonwealth law) or a State Minister (in so far as the relevant offence is an offence against a law of the State concerned). [When a formal reference has been given special investigatory powers may apply.]

Currently, the authority is headed by Mr Justice Stewart, a former judge of the New South Wales Supreme Court, who has the equivalent status to a judge of the Supreme Court of the ACT. He is assisted by Mr Peter Clark (of the Victorian bar) and Mr Lionel Robberds, QC (of the New South Wales bar). On references they are usually assisted by senior counsel. For example, in relation to one South Australian investigation, the NCA was assisted by Mr Graham Morrish, QC, also of the Victorian bar. Clearly, its members are highly qualified.

The authority is also overseen by the Federal Attorney-General (Mr Bowen), and an intergovernmental committee comprising Ministers representing all participating jurisdictions, that is, by representatives of the Governments of the Commonwealth, all States and the Northern Territory. In addition, an all-Party Joint Committee of the Federal Parliament has been established to oversee its operations. Earlier this year the Joint Parliamentary Committee handed down a report—'The National Crime Authority—An Initial Evaluation'—and I would commend it to members who require more detail of the authority's operations. In its report the committee recommended that the authority be retained and a sunset clause which would otherwise have terminated the authority's life be lifted. I have already indicated that this will be done in South Australia. The report concluded, in part:

Looking back on the debate leading up to the establishment of the National Crime Authority, the committee considers that there was a clear expectation that the authority would get results. The primary objective for which the authority was established was, the committee believes, to put significant criminals behind bars. In those terms the authority is beginning to demonstrate success. It has put the Cornwell/Bull drug trafficking syndicate out of business, and it has obtained convictions of significant figures under two of its other references. The terms of imprisonment imposed on Cornwell and Bull—23 years and 18 years respectively—indicate the gravity with which the courts viewed their activities. Terms of imprisonment of 24 years and 20 years have been imposed on principals under another reference, and the maximum term of imprisonment available for the offence concerned, three years, has been imposed on the principal under a third reference. Numerous other matters are before the courts at the moment . . . the committee believes that Mr Justice Stewart, the members and senior staff of the authority deserve credit for having turned this experiment into a successful working reality.

Further, the effectiveness of the authority has been demonstrated most recently in the successful prosecution of former senior police officer, Barry Moyses. The very fact that Moyses was identified, charged and convicted should raise public confidence in the operations of both the authority and the South Australian police. There is a good and effective working relationship between the authority and the Police Commissioner.

I might add that earlier this year when the Joint Parliamentary Committee report was tabled there were some who demanded a full Royal Commission into corruption in South Australia, claiming that corruption was widespread both within the Police Force and, indeed, in the public sector. At that time the Government indicated that there was insufficient evidence to justify such a commission—a decision

supported by the recent report of the NCA—but offered to listen to any person who came forward with any evidence of corruption so that it could be examined thoroughly. In fact, both the Police Commissioner and the Attorney-General wrote in these terms to several persons, including the Hon. Ian Gilfillan and Senators McGauran and Hill.

Indeed, in the letters, both the Police Commissioner and the Attorney-General offered to meet with those making the allegations. It was also indicated that the Crown Prosecutor would be available should they feel reluctant to come forward. And, if this were still unsatisfactory, the Government indicated that it would agree, in principle, to pay the reasonable legal costs of any person who wished to come forward to enable him or her to consult private legal practitioners so as to determine the best way to put his or her allegations before the appropriate authorities. Yet despite these offers no new evidence has been brought forward.

While it is obvious from the Moyses matter and from information contained in the NCA report that there has been some corruption in the South Australian Police Force, no evidence has been produced of corruption in the public sector generally. The Government and the Police Commissioner are more than willing, however, to reaffirm the offers already made, to ensure that those who may have some information are able to come forward. When the work of the ministerial committee which has been established is completed, an announcement will be made to the Parliament on the structure of the anti-corruption unit and the nature of the additional anti-corruption measures that will be taken. In conclusion, let me make it perfectly clear that the Government will not shirk its duty to the community to fight organised crime and to attack corruption wherever it may be.

Today, the Government will also introduce a significant measure to attack the drug trade and organised crime, namely, the Telecommunications (Interception) Bill. This Bill will allow State police to seek Federal judicial warrants for phone taps and will ensure that warrants for taps to be conducted by authorised Federal police will be issued in relation to serious offences such as drug trafficking, murder and kidnapping. Telecommunications interception is a most important means of combating serious crime, and it is crucial to have strict safeguards that cover the use of this investigative tool which will be outlined in the legislation. We will continue to cooperate fully with the Federal Government in fighting organised crime and, in particular, fighting drug trafficking.

Before concluding, I would like to place on record the Government's confidence that, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Police, these matters will be resolved in the public interest. I would also like to affirm the Government's confidence in the Commissioner of Police and the men and women of the South Australian Police Force who, incidentally, command the highest level of community respect of any mainland Police Force. The statement I have given the House today provides the initial key step in the development of an anti-corruption strategy for South Australia. With the assistance of the National Crime Authority, the various reports already available, and other inquiries such as the Fitzgerald inquiry, this strategy will be developed as soon as possible. When completed, a full announcement of the Government's intentions will be made.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education
(Hon. Lynn Arnold):

Technical and Further Education, Director-General of—
Report, 1987.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally):
Highways Act 1926—Regulations—Goolwa-Hindmarsh
Island Ferry.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter):
Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935—Regulations—
Abortion Prescribed Hospitals.
Worker's Liens Act 1893—Regulations—Fees and Forms.
Schedules of Alterations made by the Commissioner of
Statute Revision—
National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.
Shop Trading Hours Act 1977.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HIGHER EDUCATION

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I seek leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Last month I indicated my intention to appoint a ministerial working party to examine the future of higher education in this State. I can now announce the membership and terms of reference for the working party. The 12-member committee will have until the end of October to provide a report to me for consideration of further action by the Government.

Before I name the members of the working party, I point out that it includes representatives of all higher education institutions, students, TAFE, the Chamber of Commerce, unions and Government. The working party will be chaired by Mr Andrew Strickland, the Commissioner of Public Employment. Other committee members are:

Organisation	Representative
South Australian Institute of Technology	Dr Alan Mead (Director)
South Australian College of Advanced Education.	Dr Robert Segall (Principal)
Roseworthy College	Dr Barrie Thistlethwayte (Director)
Adelaide University	Professor Kevin Marjoribanks (Vice Chancellor)
Flinders University	Professor John Lovering (Vice Chancellor)
TAFE	Mr Barry Grear (Deputy Director-General)
Office of Tertiary Education	Dr Fred Ebbeck (Director)
UTLC	Mr Paul Acfield (South Australian College Academic Staff Association (SACASA))
Chamber of Commerce	Mr John Menz
Students	Ms Arna Evers-White (National Union of Students)
Ministerial nominee	Ms Eleanor Ramsay (Equal Opportunities Officer, Education Department).

Many of the organisations have appointed deputies as well. I have received approaches from other organisations wishing to be represented on the working party, but I am not acting on those requests at this stage. All such requests are being referred to the working party to consider, given that it was established with the current structure on the recommendation of the Advisory Council on Tertiary Education. The following are the terms of reference and matters for consideration by the working party:

A. Terms of Reference

1. In relation to the matters for consideration to develop by September 1988 for consideration by the Minister a comprehensive program of review.
2. After consultation with the Minister to develop by October 1988 an agreed plan of action within clear timelines to implement the program of review.

3. To develop from November 1988 and by February 1989 submissions to the Minister on proposals for change in relation to each matter for consideration.
- B. Matters for Consideration
1. An inter-institutional program for credit transfer between higher education institutions to achieve improvement from 1989.
 2. The establishment of joint institutional/TAFE arrangements for:
 - program articulation on entry
 - the establishment of rural and metropolitan transfer programs
 - the establishment of joint centres outside metropolitan Adelaide
 - the establishment of relationships between South Australia and out-of-State institutions
 - outreach activities and external studies
 3. The development of a joint access and equity program for South Australia including support systems and targeting of particular groups and paying particular attention to the need for the student body to be more representative of society on a field by field basis.
 4. The establishment of an inter-institutional study on productivity, attrition, administrative and graduate costs to review the existing situation and to produce information and recommendations on the effects of various kinds of structural change on economic efficiency.
 5. An inter-institutional strategy for disciplinary rationalisation in the higher education system.
 6. Strategies for the accommodation of growth in the higher education system, such as envisaged in the discussion paper—Higher Education in South Australia: Future Directions and Organisation, without commensurate growth in resources from government sources.
 7. Other matters raised in the discussion paper not specifically identified in the above.
 8. Such other matters as are suggested by the working party and agreed to by the Minister.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER: I have received the following letter from the Hon. R.J. Gregory:

I hereby tender my resignation as member and Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee effective from the close of business on 11 August 1988.

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

That Mr Groom, the member for Hartley, be appointed to the Public Accounts Committee in place of the Hon. R.J. Gregory who has resigned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members' approbation of a resolution should await the seconding of the motion.

Motion carried.

QUESTIONS

DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF EDUCATION

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Education accept full responsibility for the actions of the Director-General of Education, who, according to the Institute of Teachers, has tried to intimidate at least two school principals for calling a meeting of parents to discuss the effects of the department's staffing formula for 1989, and will the Minister give a guarantee to principals, parents, and the public that the Government will not proceed with legislation to gag principals and teachers?

Last Thursday night a meeting of parents was held at a suburban primary school to discuss school staffing issues. The Director-General of Education, Dr Boston, was offered the opportunity to address the meeting for 20 minutes. He insisted that he should be able to speak for an hour.

Mr Hamilton: That is a lie.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader to resume his seat. I ask the honourable member for Albert Park to withdraw the unparliamentary language that he used in his unparliamentary interjection.

Mr HAMILTON: Reluctantly, I withdraw.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: Because the condition was unacceptable to the organisers, Dr Boston did not address the meeting, but the Opposition has been informed that, while two principals were addressing parents, Dr Boston continually interjected, audibly disagreeing with points being made by the principals. At eight-thirty the next morning, the two principals were instructed to report immediately to Dr Boston's office. At this meeting, he was strongly critical of their actions at the parents meeting, and he indicated that their future career prospects would be in some jeopardy if they did not toe the line.

The principals were then sent to another room and instructed to draft an appropriate letter to parents clarifying the effects of the average enrolment staffing formula—a letter which had to be satisfactory to the Director-General before it was sent out.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order; the Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Mr OLSEN: The Opposition has received approaches from a number of principals and teachers who are concerned that the Director-General's actions in this particular matter and the Government's intention to legislate to prevent teachers and principals commenting publicly on educational issues represent an attempt to censor communications between schools and parents about the impact of the Government's education decisions and policies.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter so that I can clarify it. It is interesting to note that the Leader hedged all his allegations by saying that he had received hearsay information from sources outside the Education Department.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: It is interesting that, in his opening remarks, he said that he had been advised by the Institute of Teachers, so now the Leader is obtaining his information from the Institute of Teachers.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat. The Chair endeavoured to provide adequate protection to the Leader of the Opposition so that he could ask his question and be greeted with a reasonable amount of courtesy. I ask the same courtesy be extended to the Minister when it is required.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. First, I am very pleased to give an undertaking to the teachers, parents and those interested in education in this State that there will most certainly be no gagging of statements of principals and others in our education system that are lawfully made about issues affecting education in this State.

An honourable member: What does that mean?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: What it has always meant. I want to clarify what has occurred with respect to the furphy that is being promoted by the Opposition about amendments to the Act. In 1987 the Education Department began a process, as it does, of periodic review of the Education Act and, indeed, other Acts under its control. One of the matters that was raised internally within the Education Department was acceptance of employment or other busi-

ness activity by persons employed under the provisions of the Education Act, that is, people who accept jobs for payment in addition to their paid employment under the Education Act.

In 1980, under the previous Government, the then Premier asked the Public Service Board about the differing provisions which then existed as between the Public Service Act (as it affected public servants) and the Education Act (as it affected teachers). Subsequently, and following detailed discussions with the Public Service Association, along with other organisations, the Government Management and Employment Act 1985 was brought into effect.

Mr S.J. Baker: Excluding the Education Department.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: That is right. This made amendments to the previous disciplinary provisions which applied. Earlier this year the former Director-General of Education approached the Commissioner for Public Employment about the variations which existed between the GME Act and Education Act disciplinary provisions, and sought an opinion as to whether the disciplinary provisions in the Education Act should be aligned with those in the GME Act. The Commissioner supported this move and, as a result, this measure was incorporated with other proposed amendments.

The set of proposed amendments was forwarded by the new Director-General to the South Australian Institute of Teachers, various principals associations, and parent organisations seeking comment and requesting a response by 29 July 1988. In fact, as I have explained, that process was set in train well before the new Director-General was appointed. Following receipt and consideration of those comments, the department intends to make recommendations to me, and then I will make recommendations to the Government. The following points need to be made.

Mr Olsen: Answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: No decision has been taken by me or by Cabinet for any amendments to the Education Act to be made: in fact, no recommendation has yet been forwarded by the Director-General. It is interesting that only one of the organisations contacted has responded to that request, and that response was from Mr Talbot.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in view of your ruling last week as to the prolixity and the relevance of answers to questions, I ask you to rule that the Minister's response bears little resemblance, if any, to the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think I recognised the voice of the Minister of Health at that particular point. No—correct nationality, wrong Minister. The Minister of Public Works is called to order. In relation to the point about prolixity raised by the honourable Deputy Leader, the Chair noted that the Leader of the Opposition commenced his question when the clock read 60 minutes and resumed his seat, without having been interrupted at any great length, when the clock read 57 minutes.

The Minister rose shortly after the clock read 57 minutes and was sat down, on this point of order, after having been interrupted several times by members opposite, at the 53 minute mark. I do not believe that the Minister has been indulging in prolixity. The Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The main point I sought to raise was the relevance of the answer. I made the point—I think quite clearly—that the Minister's answer bore little or no relevance at all to the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot give a definitive ruling without a copy of the question in front of me. Like most

members, my memory is not so perfect that I can remember word for word a question delivered to the House. However, I understand that the general thrust of the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition was about the introduction of a particular Act regarding teachers. That is the question on which the Minister has been replying and I understand that, at the very point that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition took his point of order, the Minister was specifically referring to one of the principals in the chronology outlined to us by the Leader. The member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The question was about intimidation of teachers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is not of the view that the Minister is not attempting to answer the question. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am outlining the sequence of events that have been raised in the question by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the amendments to the Education Act. I will continue because it is important that not only honourable members but also the public know the facts about this matter. Secondly, as I have explained, this matter was put in train well before the appointment of the present Director-General of Education, that is, the consultation on the matters to which I have referred. The issue was not in any sense brought about nor has it any relation to the matter of school staffing changes intended to be implemented in 1989. Consultation with a wide range of organisations is taking place, as is reasonable, and the views of those bodies would have been taken into account in that normal process.

The furphy raised should be clearly put in its proper context and put to rest. This matter has been flamed by a reply from the President of the South Australian Primary Principals Association, Mr Talbot, to the Director-General of Education on 9 August—indeed, before the meeting to which the Leader has referred—and in so doing indicated that he sent a copy of those proposals, quite improperly, to all and sundry in the community. His pre-emptive action was uncalled for and is unnecessarily disruptive. It has led to the misuse of that information for mischievous reasons. The Leader has chosen to attack in this Parliament the character and reputation of the newly appointed Director-General of Education.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Leader does not want to hear this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I was about to name the Leader of the Opposition for being out of order, and in the process of so doing I had the member for Coles continuing to interject, which is even more disorderly than the Leader's interjection.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I also caution the Minister of Housing and Construction. The Minister of Education.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I believe that such an attack, without one being in full possession of the facts, is most unparliamentary of the Leader in these circumstances. He was not at the meeting. My colleague, the member for Albert Park, was at the meeting and in interjecting would know, and I know, that what the Leader has said is simply not the truth.

The Leader might like to know the details of a telephone call that the member for Albert Park received from Mr Talbot the day after that meeting, saying, 'Kevin, we have nothing against you, we are out to get the Director-General

and we will get him.' That is an unfortunate sequence of events. I want to say this about Mr Talbot, whom the Leader parades as being one of his close advisers on education. The Leader invited him to speak on his recent radio program, as his obviously highly regarded adviser. Mr Talbot is the man who circulated a document last year scurrilously defaming my colleague the Minister of Employment and Further Education on the basis of his religious beliefs. He did not have the courage of his convictions to sign that document, but later, under investigation, he admitted that he was the author of that document. He further used public property to disseminate that scurrilous information throughout the community—to honourable members and to others in the community. This is not simply a teacher or a principal—it is a person who has set himself up to be the leader of teachers and principals in this State.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I would ask you to rule on the relevance of what the Minister is now divulging to the House.

The SPEAKER: One of the difficulties that the Chair has with this particular question is that so much material was covered in the course of the question and its explanation by the Leader.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Two points.

The SPEAKER: Order! There was a whole chronology of events and a mention of several individuals—all of which it would appear to me to be relevant to the reply from the Minister. However, in view of the amount of time that the House has taken on this question I ask the Minister whether he could just go only a little further before winding up his remarks.

Mr Olsen: Perhaps he could answer the question—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition. I have pointed out on previous occasions why I do not take it upon myself to rise when addressing the House. Were I to do so perhaps it might be clearer to members, particularly those with the stature of the Leader of the Opposition, what it means to interject and interrupt when the Chair is on his feet addressing the House. I repeat: I warn the Leader of the Opposition—and what that means is that any further intrusion by the Leader could lead to his being named. I ask the Minister to wind up his remarks.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a further point of order, Mr Speaker, one of the largest time intrusions into Question Time is the lengthy rulings given from the Chair. Could I ask you, Sir, on behalf of all Opposition members, if you could perhaps cut back the length of these very long explanations which we get day in and day out in justifying to the House your actions.

The SPEAKER: I will take that in good spirit and not as a reflection on the Chair, but I would point out in giving rulings at length I do so to try to make sure that the situation is absolutely clear and that members on both sides understand that the Chair is trying to ensure that justice is done. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: With respect to the statements, the allegations, that the Leader has made against the Director-General, I want to say this: more than ever before the community of this State demands of its managers responsible management, particularly those in the very large areas that deliver important services to the State, such as education. I stand by the managers in the Education Department who demand of their managers responsible behaviour in the commission of their duties. I believe that we are very fortunate in this State to have secured the services of Dr Boston and, indeed, he deserves the support of members—not their condemnation—for ensuring that those people

who are paid very large salaries in our education system, in fact to be responsible managers, are doing their job.

In this matter, there is no question at all about gagging debate or restricting opinion. What we want is to have our responsible leaders in the Education Department base their public statements on fact, and doing that responsibly, informing, not misinforming the community.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Premier, as Minister for the Arts, tell the House what response if any has been made to the South Australian Film Corporation following delivery of the Milliken report on the corporation? It has been put to me by some of my constituents that the report, which was commissioned by the Minister, contains recommendations for wide ranging changes to the corporation's structure.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is one of a fairly long series of questions on the Film Corporation, in which the honourable member has a particular interest. It is an important corporation: it is also a very important industry, and this was why a report was commissioned into the future of the corporation and its directions. The report was undertaken by Ms Sue Milliken, who came from outside the State with a wealth of experience in the film industry.

Her report was direct and hard-hitting. She consulted with a wide range of groups and made certain recommendations to the Government. I am pleased to say that we have been able to respond positively to that report. I am not just talking about the Government: I am talking about those involved in the Film Corporation and in the film industry in South Australia. One of the chief areas identified by the Milliken report was a perceived lack of communication between the corporation and local film industry practitioners, quite a considerable breakdown—even a stand-off situation—in relation to particular individuals and their attitudes.

That is something that really needed addressing as a matter of urgency, and I am pleased to say that the Milliken report, and the debate which surrounded it, has acted as the catalyst to bring a number of people together, perhaps for the first time. In doing that, of course, we have responded to recommendations in relation to the structure of the Film Corporation and its relations with the local film industry practitioners. I have advised the SAFC Chairman that, on the occasion of the next vacancy on the Film Corporation board, a local film maker will be appointed and that, therefore, there will be direct input. However, in the interim the corporation has proposed, and I have certainly agreed, that such an individual should immediately commence attending board meetings as an observer, so that he or she can be involved prior to being added. The Milliken report recommended a change of legislation in a number of respects, one of which was to increase the size of the board, and we are considering that at the moment. In the interim, because the matter is not high on our legislative priorities at this stage, this method will be adopted.

Secondly, one of the Milliken recommendations related to funding the corporation's 1988-89 budget for the appointment of a person to assist local producers with project development and coordination of a training program. This has been agreed. The establishment of a committee to assist the board to implement these proposals has been endorsed, and the chair of that committee will be appointed from the local industry. I believe that that committee can play a valuable role in recommending to the board guidelines for

coproduction, for joint ventures and for the use of Hendon Studios.

The Film Corporation in its response to the Milliken report proposed a much more radical solution of severing its activities as a production house from its facilities. I do not believe that that is desirable. Indeed, I think that that might even exacerbate some of the tensions which have existed in the past. These proposals, together with others which look at incentive funding for training and various other aspects that Ms Milliken identified, can, I think, improve relations substantially and rapidly and will see people in our industry working in unison rather than, as seems to have been the case in the past, against each other. I think it promises much for the future of film in South Australia.

TAPE RECORDING OF SCHOOL MEETING

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Did the Minister of Education have any prior knowledge of the intention of a Government member of this House to tape record the meeting of school principals and parents referred to in the Leader's question?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: At least one member is amused.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Has that Government member offered to provide the Minister with information about the meeting from the tape recording that he made? Will the Minister give a guarantee that this tape recording will not be used to further intimidate the two principals who addressed the meeting and that he will ask Government members not to tape record any future meetings between principals and parents?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: First, the honourable member referred to advised me, I think on the day of the meeting, that he would be attending the meeting and that the Director-General would be attending. I have asked the honourable member for a copy of the information that he has about that meeting. I understood that the meeting gave permission for proceedings to be tape recorded and that there was no objection to that being done. I reject the assertion by the Deputy Leader that there has been intimidation of teachers. If the manager and his staff cannot discuss these matters rationally and sensibly, as I understand they were discussed, and without fear of intimidation, that says little for the management structure of any organisation. I should have believed that only good could come from such frank discussions, particularly where there was obviously a lack of factual information being used as a basis for much of the discussion that took place at that meeting.

DEVELOPMENT SUMMIT

Mr GROOM: Will the Premier explain what benefits, if any, might flow from a development summit comprising representatives of the Government, unions, developers, environmentalists, investors and media executives, which has been suggested by the General Manager of the State Bank, Mr Marcus Clark?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question. This topic has been one of considerable debate over the past few days, a debate in which I have been glad to take part because it really has articulated concerns felt in this community for which all of us must

take some responsibility. In his speech Mr Marcus Clark referred to a number of people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will come to that. In this context, Mr Marcus Clark in his speech referred at base to attitudes in the city. I was interested to see an article in this morning's *Advertiser* referring to a consultant's view which said much the same sort of thing. However, there is no question but that we must be careful that this debate does not get off the rails and out of hand. Much substantial development and investment is taking place in this city—infinitely more than there was six years ago. It is also true that in many areas, if it were not for the resolution shown by this Government, many things would not have proceeded.

May I refer for the benefit of members opposite to the fact that, when the ASER development was proposed and required legislation in this House, it was those members opposite who wiggled, carped, opposed, and tried to amend. Indeed, from the time when that indenture was in place, an indenture that required us to be resolute in the sense of ensuring that the development could go ahead unimpeded by other restrictions, who criticised us for that! Who said that it was unacceptable and an outrageous abuse of power? It was the Opposition, and so it goes on with a number of other projects. In the case of Roxby Downs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—from the time the indenture passed, it was this Government which changed policy at the national level, and that made the Roxby Downs project possible. The indenture passed by this State Government would have been null and void because of the policy of the Federal Government which would have refused the export licences for the project to go ahead. On a number of occasions I have had full—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Premier resume his seat.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, standing Order 159 clearly provides that no member shall interrupt another member while that member is speaking. The Premier is on his feet trying to answer a question asked by the member for Hartley and I am having great difficulty in hearing the reply. It is time that the Opposition started to show some commonsense, if that is possible.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on both sides should not try to make political speeches under the guise of points of order. However, the Chair has been concerned over the past minute or two over the amount of noise coming from the members on my left, apparently in an attempt to deliberately drown out the Minister in replying to the question. I ask that it cease forthwith. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can understand it, because the Opposition does not like what it is hearing and refuses to accept that this issue—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition. His interjecting at that point was a clear flouting of the Chair's instruction, given about 30 seconds previously. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Opposition is trying to drown us out, because it does not like what it is hearing, nor does it like the fact that, were it not for the way we tackled, at a national level, policy changes that made the Roxby Downs development possible, that project would not be going ahead today. The Opposition does not like our

proposition; everything that we have proposed or tried to do it has opposed outright or, even more dishonestly, tried to sabotage or undermine.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: For the member for Coles to dare to even raise her voice in the context of the projects outlined by Mr Clark about which he feels there have been problems or unwarranted delays, when just about every one of them has been opposed by that honourable member! I suggest that it is time the Leader of the Opposition asserted what little authority he has and removed that honourable member from the front bench or declare that he supported her. If he supports her, let him declare it clearly indeed. Be that as it may, I doubt that that will happen. The Leader of the Opposition is immobile in terms of his front bench. Look at them! They have been sitting there for years and they will be sitting there for a good long time in the future, because the Leader has not got the guts, the resolution, or indeed the policy direction to do something about it.

On the question of the summit, this is the man who claims in the national newspapers that the State's fortunes are slipping. He is happy to go around bad mouthing the State here, in other States or anywhere else. That is how much credibility he has. The idea of the summit is interesting, but I must say two things. First, there is no point in our having a summit that cannot produce some kind of outcome. Indeed, I remember the Deputy Leader of the Opposition constantly attacking us for holding what he called 'powwows'. He said, 'You find a situation and you have a powwow about it.' I remember his eloquently going on in that way in the past. However, to use his words, I am not interested in having powwows for the sake of having them.

My second point is that we must ensure that those taking part in a summit are prepared to take part on an open and constructive basis. I am prepared to give that matter full examination. However, I might say that meetings of this kind are constantly going on. I meet with industry leaders once a month to discuss various issues, and these discussions are communicated to members. The Minister of State Development, the Minister of Labour and I sit on the Manufacturing Advisory Council and discuss matters with the industry. There are various other consultative mechanisms. Indeed, this may be a new or different approach—and it may be a useful one—but, as Mr Clark himself said in his address (and he repeated this to me when I discussed the matter with him): the summit meeting needs to be a private non-publicised event. I suggest that in the current circumstances that is a little hard to achieve, but if it can work we will have it.

I conclude by saying that, while it is true that the Government—or any Government—must take on itself some responsibility for particular perceptions and attitudes, I simply point to what has been happening in and around this city and this State to show that just about every major tangible development has had this Government's hand in it in some way or another. That is not good enough: I would like to see our private sector doing a lot more. Mr Clark's own organisation, the State Bank of South Australia, the most successful financial institution in this country at present, has been developing and expanding, and is a credit to Adelaide, to Mr Tim Marcus Clark, his board and all his staff. It is a great tribute, and that bank and its charter came about through legislation introduced by this Government.

I remind members that when that legislation came before the House those opposite, while not opposing the merger, spent their time trying to constrain and reduce the powers

of that bank by pettifogging amendments and other things that would ensure that it could not properly carry out a commercial charter: they are the facts. We gave it a commercial charter, and the challenge has been magnificently picked up. I repeat: it should not have to all rely on Government: I would like to see the private sector and private entrepreneurs doing a lot more.

Mr Rann interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I call the honourable member for Briggs to order. The honourable member for Light.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES REGULATIONS

The **Hon. B.C. EASTICK**: Will the Minister of Correctional Services initiate changes to correctional services regulations to remove the impasse between his department and the police which is one of the major reasons for overcrowding and people being accommodated in disgraceful conditions at the City Watch House? With the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Minister of Correctional Services, I visited the Watch House this morning. We saw conditions which justify statements by the Police Association that detainees are being accommodated in squalor. Our inspection has also revealed that current regulations, under which correctional services institutions refuse to take back remandees and prisoners after 4.30 p.m., are adding significantly to problems at the Watch House. They force the police to admit to the Watch House remandees and prisoners whose court cases do not finish until later in the afternoon. As a result, while the Watch House accommodated more than its capacity of 59 people last weekend, there were six vacant places at the Remand Centre.

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: I thank the honourable member for his question. At 3.30 p.m. today the Director of the Department of Correctional Services is meeting with his opposite number in the Department of Emergency Services. The problem of opening the Remand Centre after 4.30 p.m. is purely a cost problem, involving overtime. It may well be that at certain times that will help in a very small way, but that is not the basis of the problem. The problem is that in this State, for reasons about which we can only speculate, the number of people who are charged and remanded in custody is higher than any other State. I have not been able to work out what it is about the people charged in South Australia that makes it more necessary for them to be remanded in custody than in any other State in Australia. I understand that it is also very high by world standards.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: I beg your pardon?

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The interjection was out of order and the honourable Minister should not ask the member for Morphett to repeat it.

Mr Hamilton: He's only a parrot, anyhow.

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

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: That is the problem that we have. If from time to time we have to bring people back on overtime—if we have one or two spare beds in the Remand Centre to take one or two people out of the City Watch House—perhaps an arrangement can be made between the two departmental heads today.

An honourable member: It's been consistently denied.

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: It has been consistently denied on a policy basis that the Remand Centre is not opened after 4.30 p.m., or that prisoners are not accepted after that time, because it would mean putting on another

shift—it is as simple as that, and the Government makes no apology for it. The problems at the City Watch House are cyclical: they are not constant problems but happen from time to time. There are certain times in the court calendar when there are a lot of arraignments, for instance, and it is at those peak periods that this happens. It may well be that if we do have six beds—and that is a lot for the Remand Centre; it is usually only one or two—and if people need to be brought back on overtime or another shift is put on so that one or two people can spend the night in the Remand Centre rather than in the Watch House—as I have said, we will try to do that.

While I am on my feet I point out one thing: since the Government came into office in late 1982 it has spent almost \$100 million on capital works alone within the prison system.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: Indeed: five years ago we had almost an entire prison population living in squalor. Over the past five years we have been able to ensure that 95 per cent of them do not live in squalor.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: I will pause here for a moment, because the member for Bragg—although I did not know that he knew anything about this topic—seems to want to constantly interject. As he appears to be so knowledgeable I will pause while I listen to him. What is your problem?

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Chair cannot permit that on the part of the honourable Minister and the honourable member for Bragg. If the honourable Minister wishes to write a dorothy dix question for the honourable member for Bragg, that can be delivered later by the member for Bragg.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I ask the Minister to restrict himself to the question he has been asked.

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: The member for Bragg was speaking with such authority and knowledge, and at such a high pitch, that I assumed he knew something about the matter, but evidently not. At present about 95 per cent of the population incarcerated for one reason or another in this State are living in reasonable conditions, and I think that over a period of five years that is a significant achievement. There is another 5 per cent of prisoners—we do not deny that—who from time to time do not live in ideal conditions. The Government will do something about that situation—there is no question. I would have thought that the population of South Australia would give us credit for achieving a 95 per cent rate of decent accommodation for prisoners and that it would have a little patience with us while we make it 100 per cent.

The present system of accommodation for prisoners of any status in this State is the highest in Australia and it is to the credit of this Government that that has occurred. It brings absolutely no credit to previous Governments—Liberal or Labor—that we had that huge problem five years ago. If the only problem we now have in prisons in this State is that from time to time in the City Watch House about 40 people have to stay for a couple of nights in quite deplorable conditions, then I would say that without a doubt this Government's record is excellent and its prisons program over the past five years can be judged as a success.

ADELAIDE GAOL

Mr DUIGAN: Can the Minister of Housing and Construction tell the House how many people visited the old

Adelaide Gaol during the two open days over the weekend? Does he consider the exercise to have been a success, and are there any grounds for repeating it?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the member for Adelaide for that totally unexpected question. The open days at the old Adelaide Gaol last Saturday and Sunday were a complete success. Both the Department of Housing and Construction and the Heritage Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning, which proposed this idea in the first place, expected about 2 000 people to attend and all our costings were based on that figure. Because of magnificent support that we received from the media (and I thank the media for supporting that function), 4 100 people attended. I think that indicates what I have said in the past and that is that there is a place for the Adelaide Gaol on the tourist circuit in this State.

Evaluations are taking place at this stage but, as a consequence of the number of people who wanted to volunteer and give their time over the weekend, we have been able to ascertain that there is a public interest and a fair degree of enthusiasm for this project. In fact, 10 volunteers were Department of Correctional Services officers, who used to work in the Adelaide Gaol. They gave their time so that they could show the visitors around. I congratulate all officers of SACON and the Heritage Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning for the time that they gave over the weekend.

As to the question of any future visits, the Government will consider whether or not last weekend was just a one-off situation, with no more interest likely to be shown in the project. However, I think that there is an underlying interest in the community. The option is available to open the gaol during the Royal Show and Grand Prix weeks and during all those events when visitors are attracted to Adelaide. Visitors completed 2 500 questionnaires and, when they have been evaluated, I, as the Minister responsible for the Adelaide Gaol, will have a better indication as to what use we can make of this attraction. I will pass those recommendations on to Cabinet.

ANTI-CORRUPTION STRATEGY

Mr S.J. BAKER: My question is to the Deputy Premier. By what time will the ministerial committee formulate the recommendations on an anti-corruption strategy for South Australia and, in relation to his ministerial statement that the NCA has identified a number of operational matters and specific allegations relating to certain individuals, will he say who will investigate these allegations, how long he expects those investigations to continue; and, if it is possible, without prejudicing the safety or reputation of persons or the operations of law enforcement agencies, can he indicate the areas of current police operations which are to be investigated as a result of the NCA report?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As to question 1, as soon as possible. As to question 2 (a), the Police Department; 2 (b) (in relation to those matters that are more properly addressed to the new unit) the new unit; and, as to question 3, for reasons indicated in the ministerial statement, I cannot give any information.

DISABLED PERSONS PARKING

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Transport ask the Motor Registration Division to investigate whether information can be included in licence and motor registration renewals

pointing out to people their responsibilities, both morally and legally, in ensuring that disabled parking bays are not used by able-bodied motorists? I have been approached several times by one of my constituents who, having a disability, is often frustrated in his attempts to use local facilities, such as shopping centres and sporting facilities, by the thoughtlessness of other drivers. For instance, parking spaces reserved for disabled motorists are often used by motorists who are not authorised to do so. My constituent feels that many motorists may not be aware that these reserved spaces are designed specifically to allow easier manoeuvrability of wheelchairs and other special equipment. The parking bays in question are also wider and more conveniently located.

My constituent suggested that pamphlets, explaining the special needs of disabled drivers, could be inserted with registration papers and licence renewals. He has asked the Minister to consider his suggestion, or perhaps even to investigate other means which may be employed to increase motorists' awareness of the needs of disabled drivers.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. Frankly, I do not think that I could adequately express my disgust at the selfish and ignorant behaviour of some South Australian able-bodied motorists who use parking bays that are provided expressly for the purpose of accommodating disabled people. It is quite clear that some people do this consistently, and I think that that deserves the condemnation of everybody. I am not sure that the suggested remedy of the Motor Registration Division's sending out a notice stating the obligations of able-bodied drivers in relation to disabled parking bays would be the most appropriate way of dealing with the problem.

This law has been established under the Private Parking Areas Act and, as members would recall, over many years my colleague the member for Hayward sought the implementation of such a measure. I am not sure that such a measure would be very effective, but I will look at it. I will also talk to the Minister in charge of the Act (the Minister of Local Government), and also to the Disability Adviser to the Premier, to ascertain whether the three bodies concerned can suggest a scheme which will ensure that these parking bays provided for disabled people are reserved for them, and to bring the reality of their actions to the attention of those motorists who flout the law.

ISLAND SEAWAY

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Transport confirm advice given to me prior to my sailing last week on the *Island Seaway* that the cost to the public of that vessel has now reached \$28.3 million?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No, I will not give that assurance, because it is not true.

NORTH EAST ROAD

Ms GAYLER: My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. What scope is there for the Highways Department to change the traffic signal sequence on North East Road to improve the flow of morning peak traffic between Sudholz Road and Grand Junction Road? I have written to the Minister highlighting the bank-up of traffic which takes place on this stretch of North East Road. I understand that the Minister saw the problem on a recent trip to Tea Tree Gully. This traffic congestion affects about 150 000 drivers.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for her question. It is correct that recently in wet weather I was able to see the build-up in traffic between Grand Junction Road and Sudholz Road and it was extensive. I have taken up the matter with the Highways Department and the Planning Department. It is clear that the build-up of traffic on those northern arterials is heavy, although not as heavy as on some of the southern arterials. That is not to say that the build-up is not increasing. However, traffic delays in Adelaide are still quite minimal compared with other cities in Australia, even cities of similar size. We are not happy with the build-up of traffic occurring and we are monitoring it to ensure that if it reaches a stage where action needs to be taken we can take such action.

Capital works programs are not necessarily the only, although they are certainly the most expensive, way of addressing traffic build-up. There have been examples of grade separation throughout the city, and it is incredibly expensive. Recently publicity was given to the tidal flow concept, which is to be tried on Flagstaff Hill Road. There is also the possibility of reducing access to some of our major arterials. These options are all available to the authorities to introduce if the need arises. The Highways Department has advised me of options to assist with peak period traffic flow. These problems exist mainly in the peaks, and our peaks are shorter than elsewhere, although it is not to say that motorists are not inconvenienced. To assist with peak traffic flow on this section of North East Road, in the short term the Highways Department is planning to convert existing bus lanes to clearways when the northeast busway is extended to Tea Tree Plaza in 1989.

I earlier heard an interjection and I am sure that my colleague the member for Newland would agree with it, namely, that we should encourage more people to use the O-Bahn. At least \$100 million of capital investment is going into that rapid transit system to accommodate the needs of people in the north-east travelling to Adelaide. I encourage motorists, particularly when the system is extended to Tea Tree Plaza, to park their cars at Tea Tree Plaza, or two other locations on the O-Bahn, and come into the city on the first-class rapid transit system, thereby reducing the number of vehicles on the roads. That is not to say that we should not be monitoring what is happening on our roads, and action will be taken when appropriate. I am prepared to concede that there are occasions when traffic delays are building up and will require the attention of the Highways Department.

DEREGULATION OF GRAIN INDUSTRY

Mr BLACKER: Will the Minister of Agriculture advise whether the South Australian Government has a firm position on the proposed deregulation of the grain industry and does he intend to support the Minister of Agriculture in Victoria and the majority of grain growers in this State in their quest to retain the orderly marketing of grain?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question, even though he may be related to me! In regard to the review of grain handling, Agricultural Council had the issue before it quite recently and the Federal Minister indicated that the Federal Government was considering a review of the grain marketing programs. It is important to divide the area of grain marketing into two categories—the domestic and export markets. The Commonwealth indicated to the States that it would continue its support for regular and regulated marketing through the Wheat Board as a basis of operating on an international level. I support

that view as State Minister. I qualify my comment by stating that I have not yet been back to Cabinet to get endorsement of a review of the existing system, on either the export or domestic level.

In regard to the whole marketing program of regulation and export, I wish to see the existing system continue and maintained because it is the strongest base on which our grains are marketed. The success of the Wheat Board, although there have been obvious criticisms from various sectors in Australia, is overwhelmingly in favour of continuing the current marketing program. With regard to the domestic market, I reserved my right and did not speak with the endorsement of Cabinet and have not been back to it concerning a review. I intend to bring that matter before full Cabinet providing the opportunity to review the system.

A number of options are available with regard to domestic marketing. I wish to see what the Federal Government will propose in the final wash-up of how domestic wheat will be marketed. A view exists that the Federal Government will extend the permit system for domestic grains and then move to phase out that system. Another alternative is available which will mean that they will continue the permit system but relax it somewhat to allow more freely for the sale of grain on the domestic market between various industry groups. I am personally attracted to the view that there be an extension or loosening up of the permit system. However, I have not yet been to Cabinet with it. It is important for us to know exactly what the Federal Government intends to do before we can finalise anything.

HALLETT COVE KINDERGARTEN

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the Minister of Children's Services outline details to the House on the timetable for the construction of the new Hallett Cove kindergarten to be constructed on Zwerner Drive, Hallett Cove?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in children's services. Planning for the construction of a new kindergarten at Karrara is well under way and will be located in the Zwerner Drive/Ramrod Avenue precinct at Hallett Cove, adjacent to the Hallett Cove Child-Care Centre. We are able to provide that cooperation and aggregation of children's services in the one area for the benefit of families with younger children. The estimated cost of construction of the facility is \$300 000 and it is hoped that the kindergarten will be completed by the beginning of the 1989 school year. It will have a sessional capacity of 45 children.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move: That the select committee have leave to sit during the sittings of the House today.

Leave granted.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for:

- (a) completion of the Address in Reply;
- (b) all stages of the—

Supply Bill (No. 2) and the Radiation Protection and Control Act Amendment Bill
be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 11 August. Page 177.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. This debate traditionally is a response to the program for the new parliamentary session which the Government puts before the House. However, on this occasion, the Government has presented nothing of substance or significance to respond to. It has foreshadowed only 10 pieces of legislation, and there is nothing from the Government in the way of innovative, imaginative or creative responses to the problems and challenges South Australia faces.

Usually, the speech to open a parliamentary session contains something new, something fresh, for the media to report, but there was hardly a newspaper line or a radio mention of this one, because, simply, the Government is tired. It is consumed by internal bickering and division, despite the attempts at the convention last weekend to give an impression of unity. For example, the public heard the new Health Minister accelerate his bid for movement up the bench when Cabinet is reshuffled later this year. His calls for higher taxes on higher income earners were typical Left wing appeals to greed and envy. Yet he took the convention with him, and he rolled the Premier.

As a result, Labor in South Australia has said yet again that it wants to penalise the entrepreneur, the risk-taker, the profit-maker, without whose work and effort our economy can only slide further. The political focus of this Government is not on the future of our State, where it ought to be, but on the division and disintegration, within its own ranks. It is divided over policy direction. One has only to consider the graduate tax debate at the recent ALP convention. The Government is stumbling because of its own appalling standards of ministerial propriety.

On this latter count let me give some recent examples. I refer first to the abuse of the planning legislation in a bid to stop a perfectly legitimate development in a street in which the Minister of Agriculture lives, in relation to a property for which the Minister was an unsuccessful bidder at auction. To compound this Minister's irresponsibility, there was the spectacle of his press secretary attempting to blacken in the media the name of the small church group which lawfully bought this property and which lawfully obtained local government consent to develop it. Then, the recently departed Minister of Marine was shown to have required his ministerial driver to leave the scene of an accident in which his ministerial car badly damaged a private vehicle.

Most recently, there is the case of the former Minister of Health. What has compounded the attitude of the public to this latest episode of arrogance and abuse of high public office is the fact that it was not the first time that the former Minister had failed to hold his tongue, and that he had embarked on a public and vicious vilification of an innocent individual. While the Premier tried to pass this off as just a single incident, let me remind the House of some other celebrated public incidents involving the former Minister.

In 1982, the Hon. John Cornwall alleged that the Mayor of Port Pirie, Mr Jones, had a 'conflict of interest' which prevented him giving proper consideration to the health of

children in Port Pirie. The *Advertiser* of 15 May 1982 reported Dr Cornwall as saying that Mr Jones was not doing his job properly because of his involvement as publicity manager for BHAS Pty Ltd. The report continued:

Dr Cornwall said he was very unhappy about the role played by Mr Jones in the controversy surrounding the lead content in the blood of children in the area.

In other words, the former Minister was alleging that Mr Jones put his loyalty to his employer before his concern for the health of children in Port Pirie. Such an allegation was, of course, as untrue as it was unworthy of any fair-minded person.

That the Hon. Dr Cornwall was anything but fair-minded became plainly evident to all South Australians soon afterwards. He had not been a Minister for a year when, in a very public outpouring of bile, he confronted a doctor at the Adelaide Children's Hospital who had dared to raise some concerns about standards of care at the hospital. In front of the television cameras—which incidentally were advised to be there to catch the spectacle—the Minister labelled the doctor as 'an unhappy malcontent' and 'a maverick who had acted irresponsibly'. Afterwards, the only excuse that he could offer was that he had a 'short fuse'. At the same time, he equated with chook raffles the Children's Hospital's magnificent fundraising efforts. In the same year he attacked the Chairman of the Hillcrest Hospital Board, in front of patients and staff.

In 1984, the administrators of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital came within the former Minister's sights: he accused them of 'incompetence, connivance, or both'. Also in 1984 I had my own personal experience of the former Minister's bitter and twisted attitude towards the conduct of public debate when I questioned the Health Commission's use of taxpayers' money to undertake a public opinion poll which, amongst other things, asked questions about the approval rating of the Premier and the Minister. One might want to know why the Minister wanted to ascertain his own approval rating. I have a pretty fair idea what it might be like right now. However, at that time I instantly received a lawyer's letter from the former Minister saying that he would sue if I did not desist. To that challenge I said, 'Fine, I will see you in court with all the departmental files,' but to this day I have not heard another word.

Writs were threatened all around town by the former Minister of Health. He even marched personally into the office of the Chief-of-Staff of one of our newspapers to demand that certain stories in print be withdrawn. That was a typical tactic of a Minister who believed that he could use his office to bully, to intimidate, to insult, and to impugn.

Mr Gunn: A real bully boy.

Mr OLSEN: He is a real bully boy, but now his just desserts have come home to him. The House must recognise that that judgment awarded against the former Minister a fortnight ago related not only to his defamation of Dr Humble on a single occasion. There was a serious criticism from the Bench of a course of conduct by the former Minister over a period of four years, leading right up to and during his trial. In short, he was a Minister who refused to learn by experience to hold his tongue.

Had the Premier acted on any of the previous occasions that I have recounted, it is possible that taxpayers might have avoided most of the bill of more than \$200 000 that they now face for the insults, indiscretions and incredible irresponsibility of this former Minister with the mega-buck mouth. Had the Premier insisted that all his Ministers uphold the highest standards of ministerial propriety and responsibility, the former Minister would have been out of

Cabinet long ago, without the financial support of taxpayers to meet his legal bills.

All of us in public life need to set an example. The Premier has failed to do so, just as much as the former Minister of Health. This goes back to 1984, when the Premier admitted that the former Deputy Premier, Mr Wright, had misled Parliament, but he still refused to take any action. The Premier also failed to act against the Minister of Agriculture and the former Minister of Marine over their more recent indiscretions.

Even now, the Premier has left the way open for the former Minister of Health to return to Cabinet within the next four or five months. This just further demonstrates the Premier's stunning disregard for even minimum standards of ministerial behaviour. The public is saying that if the Premier wanted the Minister of Health out of Cabinet he must have done something wrong—and of course he did: he acted recklessly and irresponsibly. So, why did the Premier sanction the payment of his legal costs and damages by taxpayers? Further, why did he second the motion of support for the former Minister at last Saturday's ALP convention?

Mr Lewis: Because he is a wimp.

Mr OLSEN: We know he is a wimp. Talk about the development debate in this State! If ever anyone has walked away from standing up and being counted in relation to development in this State it is the Premier. We saw that today when he said in this House, 'Well, we all share the responsibility for this.'

Mr Robertson interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I can understand why the member for Bright is a little anxious and concerned about the truth coming out about the behaviour of this Government. Some of the small business people that I contacted in his electorate a week or two ago were well and truly going to drop a note, I think it was, in his letterbox about the \$200 000 that has been coughed up by the Government to pay Dr Cornwall's costs. I have no doubt that that little bushfire is going to run solidly and for a long time in his electorate.

The motion of support moved at last Saturday's ALP convention was a slap in the face for our system of justice. We know that this Government believes in a slap on the wrist approach for hardened criminals. Now it applies the same leniency to Ministers who step out of line. Here was a Government condoning public behaviour by a Minister that has seen an innocent individual viciously slandered and a court trial used for political purposes. If all that happens is that Dr Cornwall has five months in backbench exile it will be a monstrous sham. If the Premier supports the early return to Cabinet of the former Health Minister, he would be abdicating, again, his responsibility to ensure that Ministers behave properly, and that those who do not are properly punished for their failures. The Premier takes this heavy responsibility very lightly.

When there are difficult decisions to be taken, he ducks for cover; he runs away from them. When the heat is on, Bannon has gone. He has not been prepared to enforce basic ethical standards of public behaviour. I have no doubt that public respect for our political institutions is on the slide in South Australia. The Ministers who have been indiscreet share some of the blame. Ultimately, the chief responsibility rests with the Premier, who has let them get away with it. It is time we had a comprehensive code of conduct for Ministers of the Crown so that they cannot go on showing contempt and disregard for their public responsibilities. The Premier talks about guidelines for handling defamation cases in which Ministers are involved. But this addresses the issue

only after the event—after innocent South Australians have had their reputations attacked publicly by Ministers.

Under the precedent the Premier has now set, a Minister can have a vicious defamation broadcast into every home in South Australia, safe in the knowledge that taxpayers will be forced to pay the legal costs of their irresponsible behaviour. What we need is a code of conduct which also stipulates that Ministers cannot behave like fanatical fans on the mound who abuse the umpire; they cannot use court trials for political purposes and have taxpayers pay for this behaviour as well; if they want Cabinet to stop a development in the street in which they live, they must withdraw their chair during the Cabinet discussion, not indicate that the Cabinet table is too long and they did not hear one another anyway, so it was okay, he did not have to withdraw the chair; or if their ministerial car is involved in an accident, they cannot leave the scene.

No member of the public can get away with behaviour like that: why should Ministers of this Government? Yet Ministers in this Government, who should be setting the example, have been able to do so, in just the past six months and, because the Premier has refused to take them to task, we need a code of ministerial conduct so that the Cabinet, the Parliament, and the public know exactly how far Ministers are permitted to go in a reasonable and responsible exercise of their duties—and that if they go any further, they as individuals must pay the consequences.

The next Liberal Government will have a ministerial code of conduct. It will stipulate what is expected of a Minister in the exercise of his or her public and Cabinet duties, but on past performance, this is not an initiative the Premier will follow. In my Address-in-Reply speech last year, I raised some major challenges facing South Australia.

I said that we needed to identify the extent of poverty in our community, and offer practical solutions. South Australia has the highest rate of poverty of any State. The Premier has spoken in vague terms about a social justice strategy. No doubt this will form the basis of an election package of promises, but it cannot make up for the years of Labor neglect.

I said last year that all South Australians needed to be encouraged to accept that we have some fundamental responsibilities as well as rights. I also called during the last Address in Reply debate for the creation of a spirit of concerned and enlightened enterprise; for the establishment of firmer links between school and work; for upholding business and work ethics which encourage cooperation rather than confrontation; for maintaining South Australia's quality of life; for ensuring we have a respected Public Service; and for putting Government in its place so that it becomes more relevant and efficient. These aims are guiding our policy development at present. The Liberal response will become evident in the months ahead.

I said last year that these had to be our aims because, under Labor, South Australia has been slipping behind. Over the past 12 months there has been further evidence to show that we are being outperformed by the other States. Our share of the nation's population is now 8.55 per cent and can only decline further considering that over the past 12 months we had only 7.1 per cent of total births in Australia, and 4.9 per cent of the nation's intake of migrants.

The major economic indicators lag behind what they should be on a *per capita* basis. Over the past 12 months our share of Australia's exports was 6 per cent; building approvals, 6.9 per cent; car registrations, 7.6 per cent; and retail sales, 8.1 per cent. Alarmingly, South Australia accounted for 17.7 per cent of bankruptcies in Australia last financial year. They are currently occurring at the rate of

four a day—almost twice the rate as when this Government came to office.

With indicators like these, it is inevitable that unemployment has remained above the national average. Indeed, since this Government came to office, the average monthly rate of unemployment has been 9.3 per cent, compared with 7.8 per cent during the term of the former Liberal Government. For 39 of the 69 months this Government has occupied the Treasury benches, the rate has been above 9 per cent. The rate had remained below 9 per cent during the entire life of the former Liberal Government.

This Government also has presided over a period of slack employment growth. Since 1982, South Australia's share of employment growth has been 6 per cent—more than 2 per cent below what it should have been on a *per capita* basis. The evidence is overwhelming that, under Labor, South Australia is falling significantly behind the other States. Again, the Premier must accept direct responsibility, because he won office with a totally negative campaign centred around the State's economic performance. He promised he had the solutions, although he did not define them at the time. Now, he has failed to deliver.

There is virtually no group in the community that has been spared the cost of the Premier's failed promises. Family budgets struggle to keep up with rising Government taxes and charges and higher prices for basics like food, housing, electricity, and transport. More and more families are being forced on to the Housing Trust waiting list, unable to afford interest rates which have gone to record levels, and remained there, since Labor came to office.

The rising cost of living consumes the savings and superannuation of older members of the community, while the young continue to be confronted with bleak employment prospects, in increasing numbers they turn to crime, to drug abuse, to delinquency. More and more families are being torn apart under the continuing pressure of declining living standards. More and more people are being forced into Government dependency, only to find that Government programs for the genuinely needy are often inefficient and wasteful.

Labor measures social security in terms of Government activity of the amount of taxpayers' money spent, rather than on the efficiency and benefits of the spending. Labor also deliberately flouts the imperative to help one's neighbour, which is the responsibility of everybody, not the bureaucracy. Not everything has a Government solution. Yet, more and more, Labor is directly discouraging self-help, self-reliance, volunteerism. We have seen it most recently in the CFS and the ambulance service.

Many Labor policies have also eroded the role of the family as the foundation—the first building brick of society. Compassion means much more than spending taxpayers' money in the name of caring. It is time some of the traditional values I have referred to were brought to bear again on Government priorities and on Government decisions. In the name of greater social freedom, Labor has eroded these basic values which created a caring and creative society in the first place.

At the same time, Labor has undermined economic freedom. The Premier parades as the cautious fiscal manager. Behind the facade, however, he rides on the biggest political lie ever told in this State. I refer to his 1982 promises not to increase taxes. Under his Government, revenue from taxes and charges has galloped ahead at twice the rate of inflation, meaning the economic freedom of individuals and of businesses to spend the money they earn in the way they choose has been sharply eroded.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: We took taxation levels in South Australia to the lowest tax State *per capita* in Australia at 30 June 1982, and it is a record that you might not like but it is a statement of fact. We took South Australia to the lowest tax State *per capita* in Australia, and it is an enviable record, a good record and a record I am proud of, as a Liberal member of this House. I am proud to have been involved in the Government that delivered this to South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: If members opposite will contain themselves for a minute, we will give them a few facts and figures about their track record since 1982. I am more than happy to go out there on the hustings, side by side with Labor members, and compare the record of the last Liberal Administration with that of this Labor Administration. We were streets in front. Just wait: we will develop a theme that will clearly demonstrate that. I know that the member for Hartley has just had a new lease of life, because they brought him in out of the cold. They ran down the beaches—they did not have anyone else to go to, I am sorry Terry, but at least you got the call.

We will have to wait for the budget to find out the final figure for tax collections last financial year. If some estimates are correct, the increase over 1986-87 will be more than 18 per cent, or almost 12 per cent in real terms. Such a blow-out would be the equivalent of \$118 per head of population. The Premier's capacity to increase State charges has been equally capable. Since his Government came to office, public transport fares have risen by more in Adelaide than in any other capital city. Our rise has been twice Melbourne's in this period, while we have run second in electricity tariffs and Housing Trust rentals.

Taking all State charges, rises in Adelaide over the past six years have exceeded the all capital cities average to the tune of 13 per cent. The Government collects this money primarily to deliver essential services. The main services for which a State is responsible are health, education, road construction and maintenance, police, prisons, and the administration of justice. Financing these services takes the greater part of expenditure approved in the annual budget presented to Parliament. The other major essential services provided by the State Government are electricity, water and sewerage, public transport, and public housing.

These services can be considered separately from the first category I mentioned in the sense that charges directly levied on those who use them in the form of electricity tariffs, water rates, bus and train fares, and Housing Trust rents meet in part or in whole the cost of providing the services. There are, of course, many other activities in which the South Australian Government is involved. While there is no dispute about the need for the Government to ensure community safety through the police, the prisons, and the courts; to provide decent education and health services; to fund the building and maintenance of roads; and to keep water and electricity flowing, the efficiency of these important services and the range of other less essential activities in which the Government is involved determines how much the community has to pay in the form of taxes and other Government imposts.

If the income the Government receives does not meet the amount the Government spends on all the services, essential and non-essential, in which it is involved, money must be borrowed each year to cover the difference. A major failure of the present Government is that it has not operated essential services as efficiently as it should have or could have, while there are other activities in which the Government has no business being involved in at all. As a result,

the Government's spending has been running well in excess of its income. Accordingly, while taxes and charges have been increased by record amounts, borrowings have also escalated.

In turn, this means more of the Government's annual income has to be set aside just to pay interest on these borrowings. The rate at which this Government has increased spending through taxing, charging, and borrowing, coupled with a serious deterioration in the standards of essential services, will be key factors on which this Government will be judged at the next election. Put simply, under this Government, South Australia is living beyond its means. The Government has been spending much more than the State economy can afford.

Taxes, charges, and borrowings have risen much more than necessary because the Government has failed to ensure the efficiency of those services which it must provide, while it also has refused to rationalise or reduce many non-essential services or transfer them to the private sector where they could be undertaken at a lower cost to users. Measured on a *per capita* basis, the budgeted spending of the Government last financial year was above the six State average. On a *per capita* basis, the figure was \$2 810 for every man, woman, and child in South Australia. When this Government came to office, State spending per head was less than in Victoria and Western Australia, whereas now we are spending more *per capita* than those two States.

Since 1982, the rate of spending increase also has been much greater than inflation during a period when the Government has urged average families to accept wage restraint and to modify their own spending habits. Real State Government expenditure has gone up every year. To fund this spending, South Australians have endured a rate of increase in State taxation 17 per cent above the average of all States. With widespread concern and dissatisfaction over declining living standards, it is now obvious that the average family would rather keep more money in its own pockets to spend in the way it chooses, rather than pay more in tax to feed bigger government. In addition to its tax grab, it is estimated by the Australian Bureau of Statistics that the South Australian Government added more than \$550 million to the State's net debt last financial year. That is more than \$1.5 million a day. This difference between the amount the Government is spending and the amount of revenue it collects is estimated by the ABS to have been 44 per cent more than in the previous year. This was by far the biggest increase in public sector borrowing requirement of any State.

In 1984-85, South Australia's public sector borrowing requirement was the equivalent of \$64 per head of population. It is now \$400, compared with the all States average of \$350. Indeed, according to ABS estimates, South Australia added almost a billion dollars to its net debt over the past two financial years.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: We are living beyond our means and mortgaging the future of our kids. That is all that this Administration is doing. It is not only spending and taxing more: it is borrowing more and thus limiting the flexibility of future Governments to provide essential services. South Australia's economic base is far too narrow to support a trend like this. The higher interest repayments required to repay our mounting debt mean less spending on schools, on hospitals, on roads, on being able to employ more police.

I have referred to the declining standard of basic State services. This is an issue the Opposition will pursue during this session but, as a prelude, I will briefly mention two areas—electricity and public transport. An analysis of the performance of the Electricity Trust over the past five years

reveals that sales of electricity per employee have fallen; the number of ETSA customers per employee has fallen; and the price of electricity has risen by 16 per cent in real terms.

Mr Tyler: You did that in only one year.

Mr OLSEN: The honourable member does not even understand the meaning of 'real terms'. That is how financially illiterate he is.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Hamilton): Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition will take his seat. The Acting Chair will not permit such an interchange across the floor. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. The trust's costs have blown out in the administrative and debt servicing areas: these expenses are 2½ times what they were in 1982. The trust has put on another 600 employees since 1982, while sales of electricity have increased by only 10 per cent. Power generating capacity is now well in excess of peak demand. Unnecessary operating capacity is adding to cost increases.

Turning to the State Transport Authority, the following trends emerge: while fares have increased by more in Adelaide than in any other capital since 1982, at twice the rate of inflation, STA losses also have doubled, from just over \$60 million to \$120 million. A simultaneous doubling of fares and doubling of losses reflects gross management problems for which the Government is directly responsible. At the same time, with services becoming increasingly less attractive, patronage has sharply declined.

The standard of living of ordinary South Australians depends very much on the cost and efficiency of basic services such as power and public transport. Under Labor, going back to the mid-1960s, poor management practices have been allowed to develop in too many Government agencies in South Australia. Union power rather than public interest too often has dictated important management decisions. As well, questionable accounting practices now are proliferating. So, not only are our major Government agencies spending too much and borrowing too much to provide a declining standard of service: they are also concealing too much.

As a Parliament, we should look at means to ensure much greater accountability including: a comprehensive audit of all the State's assets; exposure of the true level of debt, and full disclosure of the extent of unfunded liabilities in areas like public sector superannuation and workers compensation. These will be high priorities of the next Liberal Government for they are key ingredients to boosting South Australia's relative economic performance.

An honourable member: Don't hold your breath.

Mr OLSEN: Whilst members opposite show their arrogance, let them remain in that state of misguided certainty because, come the next 12 or 18 months, the true reality will sink in through the ballot box, as it did in Adelaide and Port Adelaide.

Another responsibility is the need for Government leadership in attracting further development in South Australia. This is another responsibility that the Premier has run away from. The Government can play an important role in securing the balance between a much needed development orientated business environment and the much cherished quality of life in South Australia. These objectives are not contradictory for, without a continually growing economy, there will only be fewer jobs, more poverty, more crime, more drug abuse and, consequently, a deteriorating quality of life.

In the 1950s and 1960s South Australia did have a growing economy because it had a Government which demonstrated strength, consistency and, above all, leadership. It

had a Government which did not allow the majority public interest to be hijacked by a selfish special interest. But under Labor, union officials and other power elites have made the overall public good subservient to their demands. Without a Liberal Government prepared to put the public good first, the Premier would not now be relishing the prospect of opening the Roxby Downs development in November; he still would be committed to a belief in mirages in the desert. Against his Party's opposition, and against the opposition of groups within the community egged on by him, the Liberal Party pressed ahead with that project.

Through patient presentation and promotion of our case, we cut through the mischief and misrepresentations of the Premier and his Party. When we came to Government in 1979, two-thirds of the community were against uranium mining. At the time we put the Roxby Downs Indenture before Parliament in 1982, a majority supported uranium mining. We achieved this result because we acted consistently from a firmly held set of principles, and we were not prepared to be sidetracked by the lying of the Labor Party.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I object to the Leader of the Opposition saying 'the lying of the Labor Party'. I object to that statement and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I understand that the member for Mitchell finds the words 'the lying of the Labor Party' offensive. I ask the Leader whether he is prepared to withdraw those words.

Mr OLSEN: If the member for Mitchell finds them offensive I will merely say that the Labor Party is prepared—and was prepared during that period of time—to tell a number of deliberate untruths.

In the *Advertiser* yesterday, the Premier tried to blame the Opposition for a lack of development in South Australia. The public will make up their own minds at the next election. When they do, when they come to judge the sincerity and honesty of the Premier, I am confident they will take into account the fact that the same Premier, who fought tooth and nail to stop the Roxby Downs project only six years ago, will officially open the mine in November. This will be akin to an undertaker conducting a christening. The public will recognise the Premier as being not what he seems; it will recognise that if he was honest, if he was sincere, he would have insisted that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and Mr Norm Foster should open the project in November. Let the House recall that it was the Premier who helped hound Mr Foster out of the Labor Party because Mr Foster supported development in South Australia. At the same time, he silently welcomed Mr Foster's decision to vote with the Liberal Party for the Roxby Downs project. It got the Premier off the hook. It was perhaps the most significant factor in the 1982 election result.

This is how the Labor Party has continued to deal with the issues of uranium mining, in particular, and economic development, more generally. There is no principle or consistency to what the Premier and Labor have done. To prove that, we need look no further than the absurdities of Labor's three-mine policy, and the continuing ban on enrichment. Its decisions have been taken only to balance its own Party's internal factional fighting with electoral implications—rather than seek a community consensus about the importance to South Australia of continuing economic development.

So, let the Premier stop his whingeing and whining about where the blame lies for a lack of development in South Australia. The blame rests fairly and squarely with him and his Party. His Party, right through the seventies, cultivated

groups like the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy, which have also encouraged anti-development attitudes within the community. Labor destroyed the consensus which had been developed during the 1950s and 1960s about the need to encourage investment compatible with the desire of South Australians to retain their superior quality of life.

It is no accident that this was the State's period of greatest economic development. It is no accident that the State had, at that time, strong and consistent political leadership, able to fairly balance competing interests. It was leadership that did not ignore the environmental implications of development, for we would not be debating now how to maintain our quality of life if it had been destroyed during the period of our most rapid expansion. It was also leadership which recognised the reality of the challenge South Australia faces. We have disadvantages in attracting investment dollars. We are remote from the large centres of population in Australia. We have always lacked ready accessibility to essential resources like water and high quality coal which can help keep the costs of development down. So, attracting investment to South Australia has always been more difficult than for the other States.

The former Liberal Government restored the momentum of investment—listened to environmental concerns—but when they were unrealistic or unreasonable, we did not allow them to stand in the way of development, to add to the disadvantages we already have. Without the last Liberal Government, there would be no Roxby Downs mine for the Premier to open in November, there would have been no O-Bahn for him to open—because Labor also opposed O-Bahn while it was in Opposition, if you recall—there would be no Torrens Linear Park; no Technology Park; and the Stony Point project would not have developed at the rate it has, and the benefits to the State would not have materialised as quickly.

The last Liberal Government achieved much more in terms of environmentally compatible investment and development in just three years than this Government has achieved in six years. It will take the next Liberal Government to break the log jam again for this Government listens too much to groups which have no bargaining position, which are simply intent on holding South Australia back, which say 'No' to each and every development rather than sit down and discuss what could be appropriate development. This does not bode well for our future development or for our growth possibilities. Instead of running away at the first sign of opposition, as this Government did with, for example, the Jubilee Point project—

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Yes, I said so publicly, and it has been on the record consistently for two years. The member for Fisher can go back to sleep.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Will the member for Fisher come to order. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: I was referring to Jubilee Point. The Government walked away from that project after two and a bit years of encouraging the developers through feasibility and viability studies to spend some \$2.25 million. It encouraged them right up to the barrier and, at the first sign of opposition, the Government just walked away. More priority should be given to considering the best way to accomplish something, to considering what the long-term problems are that a given procedure may generate, and to choosing the route that will generate the least impact.

One thing is for certain; we will not find solutions that generate no effects. What we have to decide is an acceptable price for development. This is a challenge this Government has too often refused to address because it is too hard. This

is just one reason why, under Labor, South Australia has been slipping behind.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Exactly, before the EIS has even been processed. I have provided figures to prove the Government is consuming more and more of the State's productive resources and capacity, at the expense of long-term employment and investment. We need to have three basic economic goals: to lift investment in South Australia; to lift our export performance, and to lift competitiveness, productivity, and the quality of production of our local industries.

If we can do these things, we will be well on our way to a better, more secure future for all South Australians, with more jobs and less crime and other anti-social behaviour. We will be able to take advantage of export opportunities, particularly in the growing economies of the neighbouring Western Pacific Basin; to maximise South Australia's share of the services sector of the Australian economy and make our own service industries more export oriented; to lift prospects for the agricultural sector; to increase our manufactured exports by pursuing niche market strategies; and to attract more tourist and recreational activity.

South Australia may not be the biggest, but we can be the best. We need to emphasise quality in absolutely everything we do—in our schools, in our health system, in public transport, and in power generation, as well as in our manufacturing, agricultural and service industries and major tourist, recreational and other developments. We must excel in everything we do compared with the other States, for only in this way will we retain the quality of life which has in the past made South Australia the envy of the other States.

But quality of life means much more than retaining a pleasant, uncluttered urban environment and plenty of green spaces and national parks. It also means a quality education system, a quality health system, a quality transport system, a safe neighbourhood, and satisfying jobs. This is what the so-called Adelaide attitude should be—a quality city in a quality State, with quality services provided by a quality Government committed to quality development. In all these things, Labor has let down South Australia. It has taken the quality out of our basic public services. It has taken quality out of governing itself. South Australians deserve much better.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I support the motion and I thank His Excellency the Governor for the speech with which he opened this session of State Parliament. I join my colleagues in expressing my sympathy at the passing of Sir Douglas Nicholls, who was an honourable man and a great ambassador for his people. His football feats were also well known. I pass my condolences to the Nicholls' family. I also offer my condolences to the family of the late Arnold Noack, the former Head Attendant of this House.

I congratulate my three colleagues who have been elevated to the Ministry, the Hon. Susan Lenehan, the Hon. John Klunder, and the Hon. Bob Gregory. I am confident that each Minister will fill their respective portfolios ably and successfully fulfil their responsibilities to the people of this State. I also place on record my respect for the Ministers who have returned to the back bench. Each has served the Labor Party and South Australia extremely well. I also convey my best wishes to Murray Hill, who retired from the Legislative Council. I wish Murray and Mrs Hill a very enjoyable retirement. My main involvement with Murray was through our representation on the Public Works Standing Committee.

In June I had the opportunity of visiting Brisbane and thus to tour Expo 1988. The South Australian exhibition was housed in the same pavilion as the exhibitions from the Northern Territory and Tasmania. On speaking with South Australian representatives at the pavilion, I was told that the only complaints were received from South Australians after reading the media criticism raised by the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore MP and the Hon. Legh Davis MLC. I fully agree with the Premier's stance that South Australia should not go to excessive expense with a display. In my opinion, the South Australian display was just right and appropriately portrayed our State.

In his speech the Governor spoke about changing enrolments in schools. I understand that over the past 10 years, because of changes in population patterns, there has been a decrease of about 45 000 students. This pattern is certainly reflected in the electorate of Peake and in the nearby western suburbs generally. If members look at a portion of the western suburbs between South Road and the sea, bounded to the south by Burbridge Road, and to the north by Grange Road, Crittenden Road and Trimmer Parade, that takes in nearly all my electorate of Peake as well as the District of Henley Beach and part of the District of Hanson. There are 18 schools in that area—14 primary schools and four secondary schools. In 1981 the total enrolment in these schools was 8 330 students and by 1984 that figure had dropped to 7 461 students. This year, 5 542 students are spread over those same schools. Between 1981 and 1984 the decline was 10.4 per cent and between 1984 and 1988 it was 25.7 per cent. Over the whole period from 1981 to 1988 there were 2 788 fewer students, which represented a decrease of 33.4 per cent.

What this boils down to is that there are just not enough students to go around. Some high schools that were built to hold 1 000 students or so are half empty. There are several examples of this problem in my electorate of Peake. In February 1981 Thebarton High School had 463 students and in February this year it had 313 students.

Primary schools in the western suburbs are suffering the same fate. In February 1981 Thebarton Primary School had 386 students and in February 1988 it had 125 students. In February 1981 Torrensville Primary School had 203 students and in 1988 it had 145. In February 1981 Flinders Park Primary School had 500 students and in 1988 it had 260 students. Findon Primary School, which is on the border of my electorate, had 330 students in February 1981 and 198 students in February 1988. In 1981 the Cowandilla Primary School had 574 students and in February 1988 it had 293 students. It is pleasing to note the promotion of multiculturalism at this school. The principal, Dennis Vance, is to be commended for his efforts. The school campus includes a primary school, the multicultural learning centre, a kindergarten and a pre-school.

I have a great deal of respect for the teachers in the schools in my electorate. And while there are a few advantages in these schools having plenty of room to spread out a bit, there are also some disadvantages. As the number of students in a school drops below a certain threshold, so the cost per student begins to increase dramatically. At the nearby Hindmarsh Primary School, for example, last July only 34 students were enrolled, and the cost per student was about \$8 600 a year. That is nearly three times the cost of educating a student at one of the neighbouring primary schools. At that school it costs an extra \$5 000 to provide each child with an education similar to that which children in other schools are getting for about a third of that cost. And all those lots of \$5 000 add up to a lot of money,

which could be better used for improving educational services for children.

The teachers at Hindmarsh Primary School have been doing a fine job; nobody is disputing that. But there is a growing risk that children in schools facing such a drop in numbers may be missing out in some things. Because there are so few students, such a school has only a small staff. With the best will in the world, the teachers cannot cover every aspect of the curriculum; they are stretched too thinly. It may be, for example, that through no fault of its own, and in spite of a dedicated and hard-working staff, a school suddenly finds itself unable to provide sporting or recreational programs or music, art or drama lessons.

The situation is repeated at high schools with shrinking numbers. For example, if a high school wants to maintain a wide range of subjects in the senior school, there will be only a handful of students in each class. If a school chooses to go down that path, the effect will be larger classes in the junior years because of the uneconomical use of teachers in the senior school. Such schools are in a dilemma. If they decide to use their teachers more economically and maintain reasonable class sizes, they are unable to offer such a wide range of subjects, each catering for only a small number of students.

Many schools are already taking steps to solve their problems. Nearby schools can share subjects instead of each school trying to do everything and stretching its resources too thinly. Clusters of schools and networks are popping up everywhere, with several schools in the same area rationalising their courses and cutting out some of the doubling up that has occurred. The Education Department has been promoting this kind of cooperation in areas such as the south-west corner of the metropolitan area and in the northern suburbs.

There are worries. There comes a time when school communities have to face up to the possibility of their local school being amalgamated or closed. This is an extremely difficult decision for teachers, parents and students to come to grips with. A school is part of the fabric of the local community. There are often family connections with particular schools going back for years, with all the affection and loyalty that that means. Local communities feel threatened by moves which could involve changes to nearby schools and they fear that they and their children might be, at the best, inconvenienced or, at the worst, disadvantaged.

In the short term, such changes may be unsettling and upsetting, but in the long term, such changes will be for the benefit of students. I ask that the local community continue to be consulted adequately if any changes are proposed to schools in its area, and that the Education Department keep the local community informed and deal sensitively with any changes that have to be made. I have a copy of a graph and seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*. It is a purely statistical table.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member seeks leave to have a table incorporated in *Hansard*. Is leave granted?

Mr Lewis: No.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

Mr Plunkett: It is purely statistical.

Mr LEWIS: As I understand it, Mr Acting Speaker, the honourable member asked you and you asked the House whether he could have leave to incorporate a graph in *Hansard*. If that is what he is asking, I draw your attention to Speaker Trainer's ruling on the question of graphs. No indication has been given by the honourable member as to what the statistics or graphical material relates, so it is not

possible for me to make any other judgment. It is for that reason that I refused leave.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I understand that the member for Peake is seeking to incorporate a statistical table in *Hansard*—is that correct?

Mr PLUNKETT: Yes. I apologise to the honourable member. It is a table showing school enrolment figures for the western suburbs.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Does the member for Murray-Mallee still deny leave?

Mr LEWIS: I withdraw my refusal to grant leave.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

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

Leave granted.

ENROLMENTS

	1981	February 1984	1988
Thebarton Primary School	386	250	125
Torrensville Primary School	203	225	145
Cowandilla	574	374	293
Lockleys North	337	240	227
Lockleys	156	176	191
Fulham	214	153	64
Fulham North	406	375	364
Fulham Gardens	522	384	199
Kidman Park	617	520	279
Henley Beach	147	111	112
Grange	606	633	657
Findon	330	308	198
Seaton Park	524	440	217
Flinders Park	500	358	260
Sub-total	5 522	4 547	3 331
Thebarton High School	463	409	313
Underdale High School	676	859	769
Kidman Park High School	790	661	369
Henley High School	879	985	760
Sub-total	2 808	2 914	2 211
Total	8 330	7 461	5 542

Mr PLUNKETT: The Governor's speech referred to water supply. Only in May 1988 the Public Works Standing Committee recommended a revised proposal for the Happy Valley water filtration plant. Over a number of years the committee has been actively engaged in investigating water filtration plants for the State and for the metropolitan area in particular. On these occasions the committee satisfied itself as to the safety of the Adelaide water supply, but it had to concede that, on the grounds of colour, turbidity, odour and taste, water supplies fell far short of established standards for a public water supply. In more recent months there has been increasing concern that due to the presence of suspended matter a guaranteed disinfection standard from chlorination was becoming more and more difficult. It was on this basis that the committee satisfied itself that, whilst water filtration was expensive, water treatment plants were necessary to safeguard the whole of the metropolitan water supply.

When the Happy Valley water filtration plant is completed it will be by far the largest filtration plant in South Australia with a design capacity of 850 megalitres a day. The next largest is the plant built at Anstey Hill which has a capacity of 313 megalitres a day, and the other four plants in the metropolitan area and at Morgan are somewhat smaller. The colossal size of the plant at Happy Valley led to major construction problems, but these were ably solved by the Engineering and Water Supply Department engineers who achieved major cost savings with innovative ideas.

Thus, whilst the total cost of water filtration is somewhat disturbing it is a necessary expenditure and it would have been substantially greater if the innovative engineering applications had not been introduced during the construction period.

When the Happy Valley water filtration plant project was before the committee, it was scheduled for commissioning in mid-1991, and it is noted that His Excellency has stated that it is now scheduled for completion in November 1989. It is most gratifying that this most essential work is to be achieved about two years ahead of schedule.

I now refer to the reference in the Governor's speech to hospitals. Unfortunately, owing to illness I was unable to attend the official opening of the redevelopment works undertaken at the Modbury Hospital. In the initial forward planning of Modbury Hospital it was envisaged that due to further demand eventually the hospital would expand to the north in order to meet additional accommodation requirements. Because of changed approaches to hospital treatment, the increased demand for in-patient accommodation did not increase as much as expected but, nevertheless, there was a major growth in emergency and accident treatment. It is most pleasing that the redevelopment work carried out at Modbury Hospital has been directed towards meeting these changed needs.

His Excellency also mentioned that the major restructuring at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and the complete rebuilding of the Lyell McEwin Hospital and Health Services are proceeding. These are further examples of where the Government is directing its energies towards improving the quality of health services in this State.

On Thursday 4 August, the Public Works Standing Committee recommended the construction of the Riverland Regional Hospital at Berri. This is a further example of forward planning by the present Government directed towards providing the same resident specialist health services to people in the Riverland as are enjoyed by residents in the metropolitan area. There is overwhelming evidence that those areas with better regional hospital facilities are more successful in attracting resident specialists. As a consequence, there is a much greater opportunity for improved patient welfare as well as for the more efficient allocation of scarce resources.

Also, the Governor dealt with prisons. The erection of Mobilong Prison is a further example of the forward planning of the present Government. The Government has encouraged a series of plans and initiatives by the Department of Correctional Services for modern development of its prison system. Mobilong Medium Security Prison, for 160 male prisoners, is an integral part of these plans. The prison will provide facilities and programs which are consistent with its medium security status within a graduated Statewide prison system in South Australia. The system is based on a number of rules, including length of sentence, nature of offence and behaviour while in prison. Three levels of security exist within this security system, namely, high security, medium security and low security. It is anticipated that during the course of a sentence most prisoners would move through the security ratings.

The Public Works Standing Committee is currently examining a proposal to provide an additional 32-cell accommodation wing and various building alterations at Port Lincoln Prison. It is an institution of medium/low security classification for male prisoners and a short-term holding area for female prisoners. During the past few years the prison capital works program, as well as providing approved accommodation, has been directed towards providing single cell accommodation for all inmates. I am pleased to say

that the approach from the Department of Correctional Services is that the deprivation of freedom is a prisoner's punishment. It does not see the use of a harsh physical environment as a method of further punishment. The Public Works Standing Committee has examined this project as a matter of urgency, and the committee hopes to be in Port Lincoln for a public hearing and inspection on Thursday 18 August. There are many other things in the Governor's speech with which I could deal but I am aware that other members want to speak and so I will now conclude my remarks.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I support the motion. I add my condolences to those of other members to the families of former members who have passed away since the occasion of the last Address in Reply. I also add my concurrence to the congratulations extended by other members in relation to the distinguished contribution made by the Hon. Murray Hill to this Parliament and the State of South Australia during the great length of service that he gave. His contribution was outstanding in many ways. He was always a courteous and considerate man, capable not only of listening to another's view but of understanding it and taking it into account in the determination of the position that he would ultimately advocate. In political style I found him to be more a conciliator than a confrontationist—perhaps an example that more of us might do well to follow. I recognise, of course, that were we to do so the print and electronic media these days would pay no attention to anything we said or did, because they simply look for sensation in deciding what they shall or shall not report.

In the course of my remarks in the time at my disposal I shall simply place before this Chamber some facts about the problems created by Government policy for the people whom I represent. It is unfortunate that in the circumstances, apart from the Address in Reply, there is little opportunity for someone like me to make much contribution during the other forms and procedures of the House. It is important therefore for members to recognise that, in the course of putting before this House their own concerns and grievances about the constituencies that they represent, they should understand exactly what is happening in other places. I have listened with interest to the sorts of remarks that other members have made, and I trust that they will consider the way in which decisions that are made in this place—which, of course, are made by the Government because it has the numbers—have continuously impacted adversely on the people that I represent. Let us take a look at some of them.

I have heard members opposite boast proudly about what the Government is doing for the people whom they represent in the communities from which they come and in which they live. Let them consider, though, that it has been at the expense of the people in the communities in the Murray-Mallee. If they honestly reviewed the provision and operation of kindergarten or pre-school services in their areas, for instance, how many members here would have to report to the House on a closure or indeed a degradation of services available in their communities? Yet, in this regard I have to so report.

There has been a reduction in the availability of preschool facilities and services in Keith, Coonapyn, Geranium and Lameroo, and it involves not just reducing those services in keeping with the necessity to do so in order to ensure that parity is maintained with the services provided in communities elsewhere: it involves a reduction in those services below that point to lower than they are in electorates such as those represented by the Minister at the bench

and, say, the members for Fisher, Hartley or Gilles. Moreover, it has been done in spite of the honest, honourable, well-reasoned protests put on behalf of those preschool centres by the parents whose children are involved and by the staff from those preschools.

Let us look at some of the other things that have been cut mercilessly. The School Dental Service, which all members here would take for granted for children attending schools in the electorates that they represent, has not simply been cut but completely removed from the schools in Keith, Tintinara and Coonalpyn. The children from those schools will now have to travel, in the case of Keith, 33 miles to Bordertown and, in the case of Tintinara, the additional distance of 26 miles, the all up figure being in the order of 90 kilometres to Bordertown. Coonalpyn is over 100 kilometres away, and the Government representatives, in discussion with me and with other people about the consequences for those children and about the inequity of it, have simply said, 'We must reduce our expenses involved.' The amount that they are going to save, when one adds up the additional costs which will be incurred at Bordertown and the loss that has to be borne in Naracoorte, is a mere \$6 000 per year.

If that is not stingy, bloody-minded, mean and miserable I do not know what is. That makes me mad! Members in this place may sometimes wonder what motivates me to get angry when I see the way in which they carry on. It is because I have little opportunity to put those points before this Chamber, since it will not change the votes of any one person in any marginal seat anywhere in the metropolitan area. I think it behoves them all to consider that these things do happen and are continuing to happen.

I will give yet another illustration of this kind of thing. I refer to the administration of the Police Force, which is based on regional boundaries in this State. In the region that I represent (Murray-Mallee), we have *per capita* fewer policemen than any other region in the State, yet we are being told that we must reduce that number still further. That is in spite of the fact that there is an increase in the amount of larceny of livestock, that is, cattle duffing and sheep stealing. We have heard reports that I have brought to this Chamber in anger and disgust over the past couple of years about the way in which crime escalated in Murray Bridge and the steps that were taken by the local population, in concert with me at public meetings that I organised, to identify the root cause of the problem and take community action to stop it.

We had not only to beg the Government to give us a Neighbourhood Watch scheme but also to undertake some of the expense of that ourselves. It is not in as big an area of the town as we would want it. That has made a significant contribution to the reduction of crime, but I do not see why we should have to pay our taxes like everyone else and put up with fewer police as part of our resources, and then suffer some further cuts. I will illustrate those cuts.

An honourable member: It's because you're more law abiding.

Mr LEWIS: Because we are more law abiding does not mean that we are not entitled to protection from those itinerants who move through our community from time to time exploiting what we have. My concern is that the police station at Narrung is to be closed, and the reason given is simply that it will cost too much to renovate the dwelling in which the policeman lives. Can members imagine anything more ridiculous as a reason? Do members opposite really believe that I should in all equity accept that as legitimate and fair on behalf of the people whom I represent? In all sincerity can members expect me and the com-

munities I represent to accept that, without saying 'Whoa—sufficient is enough. You are expanding the number of people to be accommodated at Point McLeay. You will increase the number of itinerants who visit Point McLeay through Narrung and you will increase the problems which they bring with them, yet you take away the policeman. That is not fair. That is just because you are too bloody-minded to renovate the policeman's dwelling'?

Let us take a look at another problem with which I am confronted. It is not sufficient that the Government reduces the amount of available preschool facilities; it is now going to downgrade the Geranium Area School. It will not be an area school if the Government has its way.

Mr Gunn: They've taken the school buses away from people west of Ceduna.

Mr LEWIS: That doesn't surprise me. They have done it on almost all school bus routes throughout Murray-Mallee. From five years ago most schools have had a reduction in the total number of kilometres that their buses can travel in one year, and further reductions are contemplated. God help us if there is a further amendment to the formula. That is in spite of the fact—and all members should take note of this—that school buses have been introduced into the metropolitan area to carry children in places like Hallett Cove who would otherwise be able to get to school if they would take the trouble to ride a bike or go on public transport. I used to walk five miles to school and back every day—

Mr Gunn: And you're better for it.

Mr LEWIS: I think I am. I have certainly been healthier than most other people who did not have to do that. I do not see why it is impossible for children in the metropolitan area to walk two or three miles to school or take public transport. Why must they have special dedicated buses that come out of the school bus line? Also, why must that be done at the expense of school bus routes somewhere in the rural parts of South Australia—Murray-Mallee or anywhere else?

Mr Gunn: Eyre.

Mr LEWIS: And Eyre. One could name any one of a number of electorates in which that is happening, I am sure. In my judgment, that is just not legitimate. The people at Geranium cannot hop on public transport and go to another high school a few kilometres away. They do not have a high school, anyway: they rely on an area school. The nearest area school is well over 20 kilometres away, and there is no public transport. The children must therefore accept a downgrading of their education or somehow or other miraculously increase their numbers.

I commend the school council—and I will be saying something further about that in a subsequent grievance debate—for the initiative that it has taken, again in concert with me after all other attempts at consultation and conciliation of the proposition of closure have apparently come to an *impasse*. All the Minister of Education has to do is allocate a few dollars to keep that school going. It would be fair and just. It is otherwise unfair and unjust, because the people whom I represent, contrary to popular opinion, are not wealthy.

In the main they have lower *per capita* incomes than the people in electorates in the south-western corner or the north-eastern corner of the metropolitan area, where more and more public money is being spent on providing services and facilities, because they are in localities where electorates are marginal and sensitive. As if that were not enough (and it is not, it seems to me), the Government in its wisdom has decided to tell all the people from places like Peake, Netherton, Coonalpyn, Coomandook, Malinong, Tailern

Bend, Wellington or any of the areas in the immediate vicinity of Tailem Bend that acute care will no longer be available in the hospital which they all strove to build, for which they all worked to raise the funds to buy the bricks and cement, and which they then in working bees put together in the form of a hospital. These kinds of decisions being taken by Government really represent the kinds of propositions that I will now put to the House.

Let us say that we simply close down all the high schools between Willunga and Brighton and that all the children in between simply go to either of those schools, travelling on one bus in the morning and one in the evening and, if they miss the bus, their parents will have to transport them. Let us close down the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Lyell McEwin Hospital, and Flinders Medical Centre and require people to travel from places such as Tonsley Park, Henley Beach, Burnside and Elizabeth to the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Better still, let us leave open the Lyell McEwin Hospital and tell the people at Tonsley Park and Brighton that, if they want to go to hospital, they can go there. That is the sort of logic being used at present in addressing the petitions of people living in or near Tailem Bend, and when I say 'near' I mean that in country terms. It is more than a country mile from Tailem Bend to Murray Bridge and a damn site more than double that from places such as Peake that are farther afield. There is no question that in all fairness and equity that is not just. Some people in Tailem Bend who have spent their youth and adult years when they were strong and healthy building that hospital in the belief that they would have its services there to support them in their latter years now find that those services are no longer there.

That would not be so bad if the analogy between that situation and the one to which I have referred in the metropolitan area, with the closing down of hospitals there and telling the people to go 25 km to 70 km away to the nearest hospital, allowed for public transport in the Murray Mallee, near Tailem Bend, because all the people in the metropolitan area can catch a bus, tram or train to get to hospital. Indeed, all their families can catch a bus, tram or train to see their sick relatives in hospital. However, can the people in the Murray Mallee, from Peake, Coonalpyn or Wellington, catch a bus to see their sick relatives in hospital at Murray Bridge? No. Can they catch a tram? No. Can they take a train? No. Then what must they do? They simply have to thumb a lift because there is no other way that they can get there.

If members opposite sincerely believe that what the former Minister of Health was trying to do in this regard is just and fair, they should examine their consciences and the criteria on which they acquiesce on these matters. They are neither just nor fair, and it is not as if the people whom I represent are wealthy: they are not wealthy at all. In fact, the average annual income of households in places in and near Tailem Bend is substantially lower than that in the western suburbs of Adelaide, not just by a few dollars but by several hundred dollars. Those people in Tailem Bend who have relied on the hospital and who have a chronic medical condition, such as diabetes or chronic or acute asthma, need to have a hospital close at hand, only a matter of minutes away.

Now, if those acute care facilities are closed and cannot be funded from the private financial resources of that hospital and from the trust funds administered by its trustees, those people must leave Tailem Bend where they have lived all their lives and live somewhere else such as Murray Bridge. In Tailem Bend (and this is the rub) one can buy a

good three bedroom cottage for between \$26 000 and \$28 000, certainly no more than \$32 000, and one can buy a good two bedroom home for between \$17 000 and \$25 000. That means that, if these people go to sell their homes in order to find accommodation near the medical facilities that they need to support them they must find an additional \$12 000 to \$20 000 because the price of a home in Murray Bridge next door to a hospital with acute care facilities is at least that much dearer. Do members honestly believe that in their twilight years these retired people can find that money or borrow it from a bank and service the loan? Of course, members know that that is not possible.

What we therefore have to do is accept that, in the process of closing down the acute care facilities at Tailem Bend, we must fork out of the public purse, for public housing, an amount equivalent to or greater than the amount that we are saving in public health, and we have to dislocate people, who were otherwise happily settled in close proximity to their lifetime friends and relatives in Tailem Bend, and resettle them in Murray Bridge or somewhere else with all the attendant problems that that brings to their personal health and their feelings of self esteem and wellbeing.

Do members call that fair or reasonable? Is that the way to treat people who have worked and relied on themselves all their lives, asking nothing from anybody—people who have done their bit towards building their own hospital, something that most people living in the metropolitan area know nothing about. Indeed, city people say 'Gimme' and, if they are in a marginal seat, they get it.

That is just not reasonable or fair. The other thing that acts as a gross disincentive—and it is unfair to the people in the communities that I represent—is that when they seek these facilities they must travel at their own expense from Tailem Bend to hospital and back again. It is not only that there is no public transport but that the cost of their own transport will be much greater. They still pay their taxes like anyone else in this State and, in addition, they must subsidise the losses incurred by the public transport system in the metropolitan area, and that runs to over \$100 million a year. These people must find their own private transport to get to and from hospital if they cannot find the capital to relocate themselves. That does not strike me as being in any way fair, just and equitable. This policy is not something that I thought the Labor Party—at least in rhetoric—said it stood for.

Life for these people has not been made any easier by the abysmal performance of the Bannon Government since it came to office. The Government's economic record with respect to this State is one of terrible mismanagement. The Premier has said that he is prepared to be held to account in comparison with the previous Liberal Administration, yet he has gone down the tube on all economic indicators. He has not improved in any area—apart from unemployment. When you compare South Australia's performance between 1982 and 1987 with the performance of other States for the same period—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: We are way in front.

Mr LEWIS: We are way behind, and I will tell the member for Gilles exactly in what ways and by how much. There has been no population growth between 30 June 1982 and 30 June 1987 (the most recent figures available). In fact, we were second worst on both counts—1982 and 1987. However, with respect to employment growth, in 1982 we were second best nationally, but in January 1988 we were the worst State, and that means that our employment growth was the worst for any State.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Selective figures.

Mr LEWIS: They are not. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a purely statistical table which sets out the key indicators for South Australia compared with other States. It indicates the percentage change between 30 June 1982 and 30 June 1987 or 31 January 1988, whichever is the more recent figure.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do I have the honourable member's assurance that it is purely statistical?

Mr LEWIS: Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker.
Leave granted.

KEY INDICATORS—SOUTH AUSTRALIA COMPARED WITH OTHER STATES
PERCENTAGE CHANGE

	N.S.W.	Vic.	Qld.	S.A.	W.A.	Tas.	Aust.
<i>Population Growth for year to 30 June 1982</i>	1.3	0.9	2.9	0.9	3.0	0.6	1.7
Points Score	4	2	5	2	6	1	—
for year to 30 June 1987	1.3	1.1	1.9	0.8	2.5	0.6	1.4
Points Score	4	3	5	2	6	1	—
<i>Employment Growth for year to 31 January 1982</i>	1.6	0.6	4.4	2.2	0.7	-0.2	-1.7
Points Score	4	2	6	5	3	1	—
for year to 31 January 1988	5.8	2.9	1.6	1.1	5.4	4.5	3.3
Points Score	6	3	2	1	5	4	—
<i>Unemployment rate as at 31 January 1982</i>	5.6	5.6	5.9	7.5	7.0	8.1	6.0
Points Score	6	6	4	2	3	1	—
as at 31 January 1988	7.5	6.2	9.6	8.7	7.9	9.1	7.8
Points Score	5	6	1	3	4	2	—
<i>Building approvals: Number of dwelling units approved increase in year to 31 December 1982</i>	-31.4	-4.9	-26.9	0	-22.6	-21.0	-15.6
Points Score	1	5	2	6	3	4	—
Increase in year to 31 December 1987	7.6	-6.3	23.8	-17.0	-11.6	-12.0	8.8
Points Score	5	4	6	1	3	2	—
<i>Retail Sales Growth: Increase in year to September 1982 compared with previous corresponding period</i>	9.7	11.1	13.7	10.7	10.4	8.8	11.3
Points Score	2	5	6	4	3	1	—
<i>Retail Sales Growth: Increase in year to September 1987 compared with previous corresponding period</i>	8.7	9.0	6.6	3.9	9.3	7.2	8.1
Points Score	4	5	2	1	6	3	—
<i>New Motor Vehicle Registrations: Increase in year to December 31 1982 compared with previous corresponding period</i>	4.0	6.0	4.9	10.0	0.9	-11.8	3.9
Points Score	3	5	4	6	2	1	—
Increase in year to 31 December 1987 compared with previous corresponding period	-15.5	-12.2	-13.1	-19.7	-8.4	-21.8	-16.1
Points Score	3	5	4	2	6	1	—
<i>Bankruptcies: Increase in year to 30 June 1982 compared with previous corresponding period</i>	-18.0	1.2	-20.5	-15.5	-12.2	1.7	-11.3
Points Score	5	2	6	4	3	1	—
Increase in year to 30 June 1987 compared with previous corresponding period	26.3	38.3	34.1	46.6	40.5	19.8	34.3
Points Score	5	3	4	1	2	6	—
<i>Industrial Disputes: Working days lost per 1 000 employees 12 months to September 1982</i>	481	260	672	102	352	432	396
Points Score	2	5	1	6	4	3	—
12 months to September 1987	322	253	97	93	252	169	235
Points Score	1	2	5	6	3	4	—
<i>Inflation: Increase in the consumer price index (capital cities) December quarter 1982 compared with previous corresponding period per cent</i>	-1.0	-1.9	-0.6	-1.3	-1.7	-0.3	1.2
Points Score	3	6	2	4	5	1	—
December quarter 1987 compared with previous corresponding period	-1.1	-1.3	-0.9	-0.6	-1.5	-1.8	-1.2
Points Score	3	4	2	1	5	6	—
<i>Private New Capital Expenditure: Increase in year to 30 June 1982 compared with previous corresponding period</i>	23.9	21.0	45.7	23.0	34.9	-10.9	25.9
Points Score	4	2	6	3	5	1	—
Increase in year to 30 June 1987 compared with previous corresponding period	17.5	23.4	6.5	13.4	32.3	15.7	17.5
Points Score	4	5	1	2	6	3	—
<i>Overtime Worked: Average weekly hours worked per employee working overtime as at August 1982</i>	6.55	6.75	6.16	6.05	7.68	6.02	6.60
Points Score	4	5	3	2	6	1	—
as at August 1987	6.34	7.38	6.27	6.06	6.62	6.69	6.66
Points Score	3	6	2	1	4	5	—

Mr LEWIS: All members, including the member for Gilles, will be able to see that what I have described is correct, according to the ABS. It is not a figment of my imagination. These figures are not selective: the same yardstick is used for both periods in all States. There was a marginal deterioration in our unemployment rate: in 1982 South Australia was the second worst and in January 1988 we were the third worst. The table shows that in 1982 this State had the best record with respect to building approvals,

but in December 1987 it had the worst. In retail sales growth we were third best in 1982, but under the Bannon Government we are now the worst. In 1982, at the conclusion of the Tonkin Administration, South Australia had the best record for new motor vehicle registrations, but as at 31 December 1987 it had the second worst.

With respect to bankruptcies, we were at about the median in 1982 at the conclusion of the Tonkin Administration, but as at 30 June 1987 South Australia's record was the

worst of all States. This State has the best record with respect to industrial disputes, but not because of any great ability displayed on the part of the current Labor Administration to ameliorate strikes, as its only strategy is to cave in. However, as a result, costs rise and that is exactly why this Government has had to increase not only taxes to a record level but also borrowings to finance that additional cost in order to meet the demands, bit by bit, of an unreasonable labour sector in the Public Service.

At the end of the Tonkin Administration, inflation in this State was at about the median but, as at December 1987, we had the worst level in Australia. In relation to private new capital expenditure, which is an indicator of economic vibrance and growth, we were at about the median in 1982, but in 1987 we had slipped back. With respect to overtime worked, in August 1982 this State had the second worst record. Lo and behold, the Government could not even make an improvement in that area because, as at August 1987, this State had the worst record.

So, on any of those indicators it can be seen that the Bannon Government has not delivered what it said it would deliver; it has delivered quite the opposite. The Premier stood in this place today bemoaning the fact that the manager of a leading bank in this State has claimed that there is a problem in development. Small wonder there is a problem: it has been caused by the mismanagement of the Bannon Government over the past five years. The Bannon Government and indeed the Premier himself has happily claimed credit for all the cranes seen on the Adelaide skyline over the past three or four years.

Mr Duigan: Hear, hear!

Mr LEWIS: I hear the member for Adelaide joining in the chorus with respect to that claim. What a foolish thing to do because as he would know, if he had ever been involved in the development of feasibility studies to determine viable projects and get them through the planning process and into the construction phase, from concept to near completion of building work is a period of five to six years. Most of the projects for which the member for Adelaide claims credit on behalf of the Government were conceived—from concept to the feasibility studies and analyses on paper before a pencil was put to a draftsman's board to design the project—over five years ago, which is well before the member for Adelaide arrived and well before Mr Bannon became Premier. In fact, those decisions were made as a consequence of the direct improvement in the South Australian economy brought about during the Tonkin Administration.

The Liberal Government was successful in providing greater incentives for the South Australian business environment to create jobs and investment in projects by making this the lowest taxed State in the Commonwealth. However, as it now stands, South Australia is the highest taxed State anywhere in mainland Australia. That is the record, and that is why there are no further projects in the pipeline. Everything that was conceived in the minds of entrepreneurs is now reaching completion and they can see that the environment in which they contemplated investment under this Government is totally unsatisfactory.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity of speaking in the Address in Reply. I am not sure whether it is 18 or 19 times that I have had this privilege. This afternoon I will address a number of matters but, before doing so, I commend His Excellency the Governor on his speech to open this session of Parliament, the manner in

which he delivered it and for the excellent job he is doing on behalf of the people of this State. I am pleased to say that at this time he is touring in my electorate. I hope that he is enjoying himself in the north of South Australia.

Like other members, I was saddened to learn of the untimely death of Sir Douglas Nicholls. He brought great credit to the Aboriginal community; he was a man of compassion and obviously someone whom the Aboriginal community could look up to. I hope that his brief time as Governor of this State brought great enjoyment to him and gave support to that community. I also place on record my appreciation of the excellent service that the late Arnold Noack gave to members of this House. I always found him to be helpful, considerate and ready to provide assistance whenever requested. I would like to record my condolences to his family.

There were some interesting comments in the Governor's speech. Paragraph 6 states:

The largest development in South Australia for at least a decade, the \$850 million Roxby Downs project, will progressively come into production providing more than 1 200 jobs . . .

Following those comments, the member for Mitchell gave us the benefit of his knowledge as a former Minister of Mines and Energy. The first thing that I want to do for the member for Mitchell, the Premier and other people is to refresh their memories of that notable occasion on 8 June 1982 on the third reading of the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill.

We had an interesting scenario when a division was called by the member for Mitchell at the third reading. There were 21 Ayes and 18 Noes. The Noes included the following people: Mr Abbott, Mr Lynn Arnold, Premier Bannon, M.J. Brown, Mr Crafter, Mr Duncan, Mr Hemmings, Mr Hopgood, Mr Keneally, Mr Langley, Mr McRae, Mr Payne (teller), Mr Plunkett, Mr Slater, Mrs Southcott, Mr Trainer, Mr Whitten, and Mr Wright. Let them stand up in Parliament and let them go to Roxby Downs and try and justify their hypocritical stand. They set out to torpedo this proposal.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The honourable member was not here and many of his colleagues will not be here after the next election. They torpedoed the project.

The Hon. T.M. McRae: We were wrong, not hypocritical.

Mr GUNN: And now you are claiming credit for the project. The Government runs around the country patting itself on the back. We will have a situation where the Premier, like Robin Hood, will go up to Roxby Downs and open the project.

Mr Duigan interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I want to refresh the member for Adelaide's memory, because he will have only a short time in this House. He will have to learn as much as he possibly can, because before long he will join the unemployment queues. A few days ago I decided to research this subject and I found some interesting quotes. Before this session of Parliament has been completed, we will find a few more interesting quotes for the benefit of members opposite. I remember visiting Roxby Downs with the select committee and the member for Mitchell and the Deputy Premier refused to get out of the bus to look at the site. They stayed in the bus and would not look.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: They had made up their minds.

Mr GUNN: They had made up their minds. They went into the canteen to have a drink, but they soon left because the workers present made their views clear about the member for Mitchell and the Deputy Premier. One worker, who had been a member of the Labor Party executive in Western

Australia, stood on the table and told us what he thought of the policy and of the two members. There was silence from those two members.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Mr Foster is still regarded very highly at Roxby Downs.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is rather painful. The honourable member will not get away with it that easily. We have had to listen to these hypocritical comments and I want to refresh the honourable member's mind as to what the then Leader of the Opposition had to say.

Mr Lewis: The present Premier.

Mr GUNN: The present Premier, yes. The then Leader of the Opposition spoke about the committee at page 4268 of *Hansard* as follows:

That is totally irresponsible and cannot be accepted by any responsible member of our community. I would like to hear from the Minister. I would like him to point to those clauses in the indenture which guarantee that production mining will start. He cannot, and the report of the select committee makes that quite clear, just as an examination of the indenture itself makes it quite clear.

The then Leader of the Opposition (Mr Bannon) was trying to goad the then Deputy Premier into saying that the proposal would never get off the ground, but he went even further than that. In the *Advertiser* of 10 November 1981 the Premier berated the Opposition. An article under the heading of 'Libs and Labor still duelling on Roxby Downs' states:

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, countered by saying the Government should be chasing 'here and now' ventures such as Stony Point rather than 'pies in the sky' such as Roxby Downs. He called Roxby Downs 'pie in the sky'—some pie in the sky! I suggest that he should undertake a familiarisation trip. Then, on 31 May, under the heading 'Roxby won't be mined—senator', an article about Senator Bolkus, that erstwhile Minister, stated:

Roxby Downs would never be mined, SA Labor Senator Bolkus told an anti-uranium mining rally in Elder Park at the weekend.

About 2 000 people marched from Victoria Square on Saturday to hear speakers at the rally.

Senator Bolkus said there was no sign of the Olympic Dam site being mined.

'The economics of Roxby are too risky,' he said.

Senator Bolkus said the SA Liberal Government was pinning its hopes on the 'Roxby Horror Show' and the Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr Goldsworthy, the Minister for mining, milling and mutation, was making uranium lobbyists look like amateurs.

Mr Don Dunstan told the rally his fact-finding mission on uranium shortly before he resigned as Premier had discovered that a relatively safe Swedish uranium waste disposal method depended on rock and soil formations not found in most uranium customer countries.

On 5 March, under the heading 'Roxby doomed: Labor vetoes U-mining', the *News* stated:

SA's \$1 000 million Roxby Downs multi-mineral mine appears doomed.

Defeat of the Roxby Downs Indenture Bill is certain following statements by the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, and the Australian Democrat Leader, Mr Millhouse.

Both have made it clear their Parties cannot accept uranium mining.

And Western Mining Corporation and BP Oil, the joint venturers in the potentially giant resource development in the Far North of the State, have said defeat of the Bill will put an indefinite 'hold' on the project.

Let the Premier explain his position now. He claims credit for 1 200 jobs, for the income which will be generated and the great benefit for the people of this State.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is a pity that the honourable member did not have a reasonable understanding of economics. He has been here a long time. The facts are clear and anyone who

knows anything about that project knows very well that, if the indenture had not passed, the project would not be up and running as it is today. That fact cannot be disputed. BP would have withdrawn from its involvement in the project and that excellent facility that has operated for the benefit of all South Australians would not be there today. All those people who have faced such difficulties in the agricultural area and who have been able to go up there and obtain jobs would have then joined the ever increasing unemployment queues of this State. The honourable member and his colleagues should be thoroughly ashamed of themselves and the situation as it applies to unemployment in this State.

I wanted to bring those few points to the attention of the House because the Premier has tried to get away with the fact that he did everything in his power to veto that project, aided and abetted by his colleagues and Ministers. There are a number of other matters that I want to say one or two things about today. The first concerns the agricultural situation in South Australia and the difficulties faced by certain people in the west of the State. It is not only unfortunate but highly irresponsible of the Government not to show a little compassion in this matter. Last year we witnessed the spectacle of the Premier visiting the West Coast with a great media entourage. It was stage-managed and the Premier made a number of significant noises of concern. It was followed up by a number of media visits but, unfortunately, nothing of tangible benefit has come to these people.

The Government steamrolled the proposal to extend the waterline west of Ceduna, and other people are still trying to get justice from the Vegetation Clearance Authority. They have been treated in a most outrageous fashion. If people in a marginal seat had a similar problem, it would have been fixed, no worries at all. They would not have been evicted from offices. Women and little children were not even given a seat to sit on after being told to come hundreds of kilometres to appear before this wretched tribunal. They were treated without any courtesy. That should not be tolerated by members in this place.

Many of these people appear to be facing financial ruin. When I approached the Minister of Agriculture about getting a little justice for these people, to provide the bare minimum of assistance for agistment of stock and to buy fodder, my appeal was rejected out of hand. I have made two approaches.

The previous Tonkin Government was a little more compassionate and provided some assistance. If these people are to have any chance of surviving, they must be able to agist their stock to other parts of the State having more favourable seasons. If that does not occur, these people will be placed in an even more difficult situation.

The Government has set up a far western advisory committee to help people on Eyre Peninsula. I was interested to read a letter to the editor, which appeared in the 10 August edition of the *West Coast Sentinel*, from a group of concerned citizens who have been involved in making representations. Under the heading 'Double Standards', the letter reads:

It is with concern for the future viability and living standards of Far West Coast farmers and residents, that important questions must be answered by the present State Government.

Mr Bannon, how can you flatly refuse pleas for help in the way of agistment and fodder for drought stricken sheep, when in the same breath award a massive amount of money for damages incurred by a Minister who cannot control his tongue?

How can you say 'No' to a reticulated water supply west from Ceduna, after an independent feasibility study showed the scheme to be profitable, and then turn around and just happen to find at least \$5 million to upgrade filtration in the southern suburbs?

How can you deny help to an area that has incurred seven droughts in the past nine years, which is completely abnormal, and then subsidise the STA each year to the tune of \$100 million?

To an area which produces at least \$15 million in gross export income from farming alone in an average season, it is appalling that these issues do not have a higher priority.

If the State Government decides it does want the export income produced from an average season then it must support the area urgently. If it does not, then it cannot expect us to support its debts through indirect taxation. It will be at least January 1990 before we as farmers have any hope of receiving income, given an above average season in 1989. We do not want to keep on borrowing more money but instead desperately need lower input costs.

Ross Borlase, Jon Hoffrichter, Philip Trowbridge, Paul Brown, together with other concerned farmers, Far Western Eyre Peninsula.

That sums up the difficulty that these people are having. It also illustrates the treatment that they have received from the State Government. The new Minister of Lands should be interested in a comparison with the assistance that has been provided to the farming community in the United States.

An article in the *Weekly Times* of 3 August, headed 'Drought relief bill may hit \$10 billion', stated:

Drought relief for thousands of suffering farmers across the nation attracted a rare bipartisan wealth of support in mid-July but it will be weeks before the necessary administrative moves are completed to implement the emergency legislation.

Basically, the Bill will offer farmers nearly half of the cash they would have earned if the crops had gone to harvest. The assistance will be given to all farmers, both those participating in subsidy programs and non-participants.

The Government price tag for the drought assistance could be \$US5 to \$10 billion. Much of that money up to \$10 billion could be recouped from the lowering of subsidies when commodity prices started to jump due to the drought.

Let us compare that sort of outlay with the attitude that is being displayed. One could compare the difficulties that the agricultural sector in this country is facing with the sort of support that is provided in EEC countries. In Japan each farmer is subsidised upwards of \$2 000 per annum, in the EEC it is \$3 000 and in the United States \$8 000. In the United States public expenditure on agriculture is comparable with that in Europe, but there are fewer than half as many farms. In Germany there is a subsidy of 1 400 deutschmarks in relation to every dairy cow in that country and about 5 000 deutschmarks for every farm. It is costing the taxpayers in that country about 17 billion deutschmarks per year. There is little assistance for agriculture in this country.

The Premier and others are demanding investment. Agriculture requires a very high capital input, large amounts of money, before we see any return. The percentage of investment over the past few years is interesting. I have been advised that the average investment in farms is as follows: 40 per cent in land; 25 per cent in livestock; 25 per cent in plant and equipment; and 10 per cent in fixed structures. That is a very high percentage indeed. In this country there must be a return to sensible investment policies so that people can afford to invest. We have had a period of low incomes and there is now considerable improvement. People will need to replace their stock and equipment.

Agriculture has been successful in this country because of two factors so that we have the most efficient farmers in the world: first, a sensible taxation policy that has allowed our agricultural producers to be efficient in keeping up with the latest technology and equipment, which is terribly important; secondly, a system of orderly marketing of primary products through a number of statutory marketing boards, which have operated successfully. They have been able to compete on an international basis and sell the Australian product successfully in a very fierce, competitive market.

I was appalled this afternoon to hear the Minister of Agriculture's reply to a question whereby he was not prepared to support the continued operation of the Australian Wheat Board and the sole receivership rights of the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company. It would be an act of gross irresponsibility if we in this Parliament supported any propositions emanating from the Federal Parliament which in any way weakened the domestic market arrangement unless those suggestions had the overwhelming support of the wheatgrowers of this State.

I have had the opportunity to attend a number of meetings recently, and the farming community has made very clear that it does not support any rearrangement of the wheat marketing facilities unless new evidence can be provided. It is totally opposed to any alterations to the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company.

I believe that there are a few people who understand that South Australia has probably the best grain handling authority in the world. It does not cost the taxpayers one dollar, unlike the situation in New South Wales, which is some \$300 million in the red. In the 1986-87 season, the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company in this State had revenue of \$62 million and an operating surplus of \$24 million. It spent \$7 million on fixed assets and has assets worth about \$1 100 million, while the grain handled was worth about \$530 million. It has a permanent storage capacity of about 4.3 million tonnes. They are significant statistics, which the Government, the Parliament and the people of this State ought to appreciate. They help us to understand what a valuable organisation that is in terms of the economy of this State.

Let me place on record that I intend to vigorously oppose any proposal to interfere with the sole receivership of the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company and any attempt to unreasonably interfere with the domestic market arrangements of the Australian Wheat Board unless the proposal has the overwhelming support of the grain growing industry in this State. Any such action, in my view, would be quite irresponsible. I have conveyed my views to many people over the past few weeks and have received little opposition to them.

Unfortunately, the Government has again decided that it wishes to attack agricultural research in this State. It has set out on a most unwise and ill-considered course of action to destroy the Northfield concept. In this State a large number of people have been doing valuable work on behalf of agriculture and the people of South Australia, but this Government, in an attempt to balance its budget and only thinking of tomorrow with no idea of looking to the future, has decided that it will dispense with Northfield, that there are a few dollars to be made there. But it has no regard for those valuable ongoing research facilities which are worth millions of dollars and which will be bulldozed. The matter has attracted a considerable amount of discussion. An article which appeared in the *Public Service Review* of 12 July this year states:

Northfield relocation

Following the shock announcement by the Minister of Agriculture on 5 May 1988 that Northfield Research Centre was to close, the association took immediate steps to gather additional information and solicit member views on this issue in preparation for talks with the Government. The association was quick to vigorously protest at the lack of consultation prior to the announcement.

Two mass meetings.

Members from Northfield and other worksites have attended two mass meetings at the Gilles Plains TAFE college. A number of resolutions and actions were determined at those meetings. Members were unanimous in their belief that Northfield should be retained by the Department of Agriculture and that if operations were relocated this would be a backward step for the depart-

ment and for the rural industry generally. Both meetings called upon the Government to reconsider its decision.

Mitchell report.

Following a request from members, the association commissioned an evaluation of the Government's proposal [by] Dr B. Mitchell, an economist at Flinders University. Dr Mitchell found that the replacement costs of the demolished Northfield facilities would total at least \$23 million, and yet sale of the parcel of land on which the research centre's facilities stood would realise only \$17.8 million. The Mitchell report also concluded that the Government could save nearly \$6 million by dropping plans to relocate Northfield operations to Roseworthy and develop residential land around the existing facility.

Dr Mitchell found that the proposal to bulldoze Northfield was not only a significant waste of taxpayers' money but also seriously jeopardises the future of the State's agricultural research capacity due to possible wholesale resignations of research staff. Copies of the Mitchell report have been forwarded directly to the Premier, the media, rural industry groups, and widely circulated within the Department of Agriculture.

Delegation to Premier.

The association has made arrangements to meet with the Premier to fully discuss the Northfield situation, and is seeking a delay in any further action until a full review of all available options has been considered.

Unfortunately, to this day the Public Service Association, the employees at Northfield and the agricultural sector have had no response from the Government in relation to the findings of the Mitchell report. It is quite deplorable that the Government is proceeding on its merry way. It will completely disrupt the arrangements at Northfield and research generally in South Australia, but it has not yet had the courtesy to even respond. Therefore, I call on the Minister to give to the House and to the community of South Australia a clear response to the matter of Dr Mitchell's costings in relation to the relocation of the Northfield facilities.

The Opposition is opposed to the Government's proposal. We believe that a considerable amount of the land involved should be maintained for agricultural purposes and for open space. We do not believe that every acre in Adelaide should be built on. I received an interesting letter from Northfield High School, which is keen to see another agricultural school similar to Urrbrae established in the area. As to the land that Peter Waite dedicated for the people of South Australia, I think we should all greatly appreciate the wisdom and foresight that he had. I believe that a similar concept ought to be considered for the north-eastern suburbs. I believe that future generations would greatly appreciate the Government and the Parliament taking action to ensure that a considerable amount of the land at Northfield is maintained for open space and agricultural purposes. It is the only opportunity that many children have in those areas to see any agricultural production whatsoever.

I am concerned about a number of other matters. For instance, what has the Minister of Agriculture decided in regard to the future of the saleyards at Gepps Cross? They are going to go, he has told us, but what alternative arrangements will apply? Where will the new yards be located? Last year the Government made about \$500 000 in the operation of the saleyard, and so I believe we are entitled to a response from the Minister.

I am concerned that the Government intends to continue on its merry way and take away more services from country people. The member for Murray-Mallee has quite rightly referred to the attack on the Tailem Bend Hospital. I want to say that I am most concerned about the Government's decision to alter the facilities currently available at the Laura and Blyth hospitals. There is no logical reason for that decision. It is obvious that people comprising the bureaucracy in the Health Commission are so keen on saving their own skins that they are prepared to do anything to maintain that large and unnecessary bureaucracy. The first area that

should be trimmed is the Health Commission itself. I look forward to the new Minister reversing former Minister Cornwall's decisions because they do not stand up to adequate or proper scrutiny.

I, like other members, am of course aware of the difficulties facing local government bodies and the Highways Department through lack of funds for road construction in South Australia. As I drive around the countryside I am continually appalled at the deterioration of the road system. I have again been approached about the poor condition of the unsealed section of road between Orroroo and Hawker. With the Government's promoting the Wilpena development, which will be not only substantial but of an international standard, many people will want to go to Wilpena via Orroroo and Hawker. Yet, I would think that the surest way to deter tourist operators and bus companies would be to let them use that road, particularly after there has been a bit of rain. I sincerely hope that this year the Government will supply the Highways Department with sufficient funds to continue the construction program. It is not only long overdue but absolutely essential.

I conclude by saying that, in relation to those matters, I find it amazing that the Government can find money for its own pet projects, such as the State Opera, but not for agisting stock, for assisting people in drought affected areas, or for the provision of adequate roads. It really is only a matter of priorities.

At the time of the last State election there was debate about privatisation and housing policy. Yet, a few months ago, I read in my local newspaper that the Eyre Peninsula branch of the Housing Trust had houses for sale. The Government is putting into effect the very policies that the Leader of the Opposition was promoting at the time of the last election. I hope the new Minister of Lands looks very closely at any proposals to alter the Crown Lands Act before she brings them into the Parliament.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I support the motion and pass on my condolences to the relatives of the late Sir Douglas Nicholls. Before addressing some of the items that I believe need attention, I will congratulate a number of people. Obviously, Murray Hill belongs at the top of my list. He gave a great deal to the Parliament of this State and to the ethnic community. He had great integrity and considerable foresight. We will continue to see the legacies of his contributions—not the least of which is the Festival Centre—for the next 20 to 30 years.

There are many human monuments to Murray Hill and his wife Eunice. Every member of this House is aware of the dedication with which he approached his parliamentary duties, the listening ear that he provided to all members of Parliament irrespective of their political persuasion, and the depth of humour he often displayed. I well remember the day that he was pictured on the Torrens with a flower in his mouth and a boater doing his Venetian bit. I think that at the time he had just returned from Italy—

An honourable member: The gondolier!

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is right. Murray Hill injected into this Parliament a great deal of humanity, humour and expertise. He will be missed by members on both sides of the Parliament. I have a special word about former Ministers Payne and Abbott. Whilst Roy Abbott's Ministry of Marine and Forests would not exactly be classed as glorious, he was probably the most approachable Minister that I have found in the Bannon Government. He was always willing to take up legitimate complaints if they were raised in the right fashion. If a good case was put he was also willing to test

his officers and make them prove that they and not the local member had the right solutions.

Indeed, we reached some very good solutions during the time that Roy Abbott was Minister in relation to a number of areas where departmental officers had put up propositions that were not in the best interests of the people concerned. My thanks to Roy Abbott for his help when he was a Minister. At least in the transport area he was good, but in the other areas he was not so good. As a human being I have a lot of time for him.

I believe that the member for Mitchell, Ron Payne, had a very good grasp of his Mines and Energy portfolio. He certainly applied himself to it with a great deal of diligence. I came to respect a number of his judgments in that portfolio because it was obvious that he had done his homework. He was trying to grapple with some very difficult competing interests and, on most occasions, I believe that he did it well. Those two former Ministers will in due course be retiring from the Parliament. The major area of my address follows the contribution made by the Leader of the Opposition, and was going to be on the topic of morality in Government. However, on checking the various references, I find that morality involves a very changing attitude.

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

Mr S.J. BAKER: Before the dinner adjournment I was talking about morality and standards of conduct. I refer the House to a contribution made by one Charles Churchill in the nineteenth century which goes something like, 'Morality was held as a standing jest and faith a necessary fraud at best.' Reflecting on that statement, I suspect it was appropriate for the times. Unfortunately, it also seems to be appropriate to the Government we have today. There is no doubt that there must be standards of accountability in Government. We have seen many examples of the Bannan Labor Government's failings in this area, and I believe that if we are to have good Government in this State we have to solve the moral dilemma or induce the highest possible standards of conduct.

I refer in particular to the member for Unley—the Minister of Agriculture—who is now embarking on another course to extract money from my colleague the member for Coles. Members will recall the efforts made by the Minister to prevent the development in his street of the New Age Spiritualist Mission. The fact that he was outbid at the auction had no relevance, of course, to the Minister, who believed that there was no conflict of interest. We must question the actions of both the Minister of Agriculture and the Government in this case. There is no doubt that the Minister used his electorate secretary to go and beat up the situation in the neighbourhood and spread scurrilous untruths. He did this on a number of bases. One was that all the residents would be subjected to the *Hallelujah Chorus* every night of the week; another was that the streets would be clogged with cars and people would not be able to get into their residences; and yet another was that the people concerned would set up an office block which was quite illegal. So on all those counts the Minister either failed to do his homework or was deliberately spreading untruths.

He thought that he had achieved his final aim when the Government invoked section 50 of the Planning Act, which section relates to major developments such as petrochemical plants, allowing Governments to exercise some form of control when the planning rules fail. In this situation, there is no doubt that the planning rules were applied as they should have been. Indeed, there was no conflict with the council's decision. Yet to compound the error of his ways

the Minister sought to malign the church concerned in a most unseemly fashion. Members no doubt recall the accusations which the Minister's Press Secretary (Mr D'Sylva) attempted to spread on that occasion. The accusations were that this church in Unley was somehow part of a sex cult and was going to debase human values in the area.

It amazes me that the Minister now attempts to use the member for Coles to increase his income. He must be relying on the good graces of the church not to sue him and his Press Secretary for some of the things that were said at the time. I know that the people of that church are very gentle people. They had a right to sue the Minister and his Press Secretary, but they did not proceed: all they wanted was peace and quiet, which was being denied by the Minister. It is a very small church: the largest number normally attending a service is about 25 people. They did not want to go through another court case or incur anyone's wrath. In the process the Minister has maligned and libelled members of that church. When it was discovered that he had the story wrong he did not have the decency to apologise to this House, despite the fact that he has accused the member for Bragg of not apologising on a previous occasion.

That must be the ultimate in double standards. The Government did not meet the legal fees of the church. The church thought it was in the right and that it had done everything according to the Planning Act. The Government did not compensate it for the cost of the legal advice, nor for the delays that were experienced. It is apparent that the Minister of Agriculture, with the concurrence of his colleagues, decided to use the power of Government to stop this application, knowing full well that what was being said was quite untrue.

I suppose we should go back to the statement by Charles Churchill, 'Morality was held as a standing jest and faith a necessary fraud at best.' We may well have to dismiss another Minister in the future—the Minister of Agriculture. He has certainly taken over from the former Minister of Health with respect to his activities. I would like to know whether there is justice in this system. I put a question to the Ombudsman about what advice Cabinet had received. The Ombudsman replied, 'I cannot investigate the matter further, because the information is contained in Cabinet documents.' The shredding machine must have been working overtime. There must have been some briefing notes that were not part of the Cabinet documents or part of the Cabinet submission. Therefore, the Government can only be accused of suppressing information to the Ombudsman, and that raises some very serious questions.

On what basis did the Government use section 50 of the Planning Act? On what basis did it stop the church carrying out its activities in the way that it had in the past with no interruption and no disruption to the people around it? Indeed, it was probably one of the quietest congregations that Adelaide has ever seen. What untruths were placed in that Cabinet document by the Minister of Agriculture? Why did the State Planning Commission, on the advice of the Minister, invoke section 50? On the evidence available, there is no possible justification for the action taken by the Government. Therefore the Minister has obviously told some incredible untruths and maligned this church to such an extent that it made it impossible for the application to be accepted as it should have been in the first place.

I submit also that, when this church is operating, the neighbourhood will be very pleased that it has a neighbour that is as feeling as this church. When we talk about morality, we must always remember that Governments should never use power for evil, which is indeed what the Minister did in this case.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the conduct of the former Minister of Health and he described many of his indiscretions. We go back to the question of standards of conduct and standards of performance in Government. Unless those standards are of the highest order, we cannot expect a Government to perform properly. This is one of the reasons why the State is moribund and why it is not going ahead—because there is always some dirty deal being done somewhere and because there is no standard of conduct. The Government should be honest in its approach and not simply take the easy way out.

I will describe what the Government has done to this State over the past five years when I debate the motion that was put on the Notice Paper today. As well as questioning all the activities of the former Minister of Health, who now suffers from a grand case of foot and mouth disease, one must question what he has done to this State. We know that the health budget is completely out of control and sucking up more and more of the State budget. We know that he produced nearly 300 reports at extraordinary cost to the taxpayer, most of which will never see the light of day and some of which will be acted upon only in areas in which the former Minister actually had an interest.

We know that he closed one of the great institutions of this State, namely Kalyra, where a caring hospice service was provided for people in need. We know that he was associated with The Second Story, which is an absolute debacle. It was supposed to be a meeting place for young people but it has been a monumental failure. We know that he was the prime mover behind the closing of country hospitals. My colleagues will say much more about that during debate on other occasions. The fact that he has denied country people emergency care is disgraceful. I believe the fact that he is willing to close down hospitals, saying that country people are of a nature which does not bear consideration, is also disgraceful. We know that the waiting list for elective surgery blew out of all proportion under the former Minister. There are some 7 600 persons on the current waiting list for elective surgery. When will we catch up? At the same time, the former Minister closed beds in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre. How will we cope with these waiting lists?

The former Minister failed as a Minister and as a person. I note that the ALP conference supported the former Minister of Health. This was to be expected because he has always found a heartland with the union movement and has always done those things which most unions crave to do. He has taken on the tall poppies, as the union movement would see them, and he has kicked them in the head or somewhere else. He has made a farce of Government in this State and the union movement would be very pleased with that outcome. We understand why the former Minister enjoyed support, but why, with his record and his policy of denigration and intimidation, was he allowed to continue in the ministry? The things that we see printed in the paper are but the tip of the iceberg. Constituents in my electorate were subject to this intimidation behind closed doors. They were told that their jobs were on the line unless they fell into line with the former Minister of Health.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Of course I cannot name them. You know that we cannot name them, simply because we know that the ALP mafia is alive and well. I am not blaming Dr Cornwall, because obviously the man has a psychiatric or behavioural disorder.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has given far more tolerance to the honourable member for Mitcham than it

should have. He has reflected seriously on at least two members in the past 10 minutes. I remind him of Standing Order 154 which says that all imputations of improper motives and all personal reflections on members shall be considered highly disorderly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Mitcham to withdraw the last unparliamentary remark that he made concerning the former Minister of Health.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Sir, I withdraw. I go back to the point that is the key to this contribution. Who has been the captain of the ship throughout this debacle? This Government determined that we would have a new Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act in this State and the provisions of that Act stated that all employers were responsible for their employees.

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, I refer to Standing Order 151 which provides:

No member shall use offensive words against either House of Parliament, or, unless moving for its repeal, against any statute. Standing Order 153 provides:

No member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House.

I suggest that the line of the debate that is being taken by the member for Mitcham offends Standing Order 153. I ask you, Sir, to rule that he frame his words in such a way that they do not offend Standing Order 153.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order, because the Chair has already ruled exactly that.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already ruled that the honourable member for Mitcham should cease using language which reflects on members of this House or on members of the other place.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I presume that those members on the other side who are awake would know that I actually withdrew when I was asked to do so. An Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act was promulgated in this State and it provided that employers are responsible for the actions and safety of their employees and, when an employee, for whatever reason, injures another person, the employer is responsible. If that provision is contravened the employer or manager can be fined \$50 000 or imprisoned for two years. During the debate on this legislation we asked who was responsible and, clearly, the person responsible is the Premier. I cannot understand how time and again the press avoids the Premier when the heat is on. When we have these travesties of justice, morality, standard of conduct, or whatever you like to call them, the Premier escapes the notice of the press when the Premier is responsible. The Premier first and foremost is the captain of the ship or the Chief Executive Officer. The Premier is culpable for failure to show leadership and has been negligent in his duty.

If we are to have standards of conduct in this State, I think it is important that, when there is some problem with government, the Premier be asked questions about the conduct of his Ministers. Unless those standards are applied to the Premier (who will know that the press will watch over his shoulder to see that he acts correctly), we cannot exist for much longer in this State.

One area that has concerned me for some considerable time relates to the Australian submarines. It has become evident that again the Premier failed to show leadership when it counted. Members may well remember that I made at least two or three speeches on the need to get it right from day one; that our reputation was on the line; and that the rest of the world was watching us because we had a contract of international standing. South Australia had the

unique opportunity to show that it could perform. However, from the first day sections of the union movement attempted to scuttle the project, or to obtain some largesse from the project.

Whilst it is now all quiet on the submarine site, the damage that was done at the time is irreparable. If there had not been any damage or hold-ups, South Australia would be building or contracting to build the bow and midship sections of the submarines.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr S.J. BAKER: South Australia put its inadequacies fully on display. We said to the rest of the world—to the Swedes and to the other people involved in submarine construction around the world, and they were watching us—we cannot manage our own affairs. We know that that message got back to Sweden and we also know that, as a result, part of that contract went back to Sweden.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It was part of the original Swedish submission to the Federal Government before it was allocated to South Australia. That is true. Don't misrepresent the facts.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister of State Development and Technology has misrepresented the facts. I have read the submission. It is in my office if he wants to re-read it.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Why aren't you quoting chapter and verse?

Mr S.J. BAKER: I suggest that the Minister re-reads the submission because he will find that it was not part of the original deal. They were going to be built on this site here in Adelaide. The Premier did not want to intervene because he would have had difficulties with sections of his union movement. If he had intervened and shown leadership, South Australia would not have lost part of the submarine contract.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: How much of the submarine contract did we finish up with?

Mr S.J. BAKER: We simply do not know how much the State will benefit from the submarine project because the contracts are still being let. Weekly releases are suggesting that parts of the contract are going elsewhere outside this State. The bow and the midship section have gone. We also know that certain parts of the inner systems have gone. I can only stress that my interest is primarily in the future of this State and when I see—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister of State Development and Technology says, 'Talk about it and then shoot it in the foot.' I remind the Minister that I did not start the debacle on the submarine construction site. I did not notice the Minister rushing down to solve the problems that were pretty evident at the time. We know, and everybody in this House—

Ms Gayler: There were no days lost on that site.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the member for Newland get it right!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the floor. If the honourable Minister wishes to have himself added to the speaking list for the Address in Reply, he can do so. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Thank you, Sir. When the Minister of State Development and Technology participates in the Address in Reply debate, I will listen with a great deal of interest because I have the documents on the submarine contract and they show quite clearly that what he is saying

is false. How many days were lost? We know that the contract was on hold and we know that, because of the problems down there, the contracts were not being let. For the Minister to say that there were no hold-ups is an interesting misuse of information. We know that there were overlaps in those contracts and, indeed, parts of those contracts would have started earlier had there not been that disruption.

The bottom line is that this Government and parts of the union movement failed this State. South Australia will have to pay the bills for that because the State will get less of the contract than it should have. Various estimates have been made which suggest that 25 per cent of the contract will go to South Australian manufacturers and suppliers.

The original estimate was some 33 per cent of the contract, but again no-one really knew the answers. We will not know the answers because, even if the Government knows them, it will say that they are commercially confidential, as it normally does when asked a question. This Government has managed over a period of time, whether it be in relation to ASER contracts, SAFA, or the South Australian Timber Corporation, to hide from the public of South Australia the truth about financial arrangements in this State. If this Government wants to be re-elected at the next election, that attitude and performance will have to change radically.

I intended to address such matters as occupational safety, WorkCover and compulsory unionism tonight. It has not been possible because of the assistance I have received from members opposite and I will use another opportunity to address those issues.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): That was, with the greatest respect for the honourable member opposite, one of the poorest contributions I have heard in an Address in Reply debate. The honourable member's yellow power tie did him a great injustice. In fact, his speech displayed the reverse. His yellow power tie failed to hide his ineffectiveness. The personal reflections he made in respect of other members of this Parliament were appalling, but an indication of the standard one could expect of a Liberal Government in office. It is a sad day when members of Parliament get up and say the things that the honourable member said, thereby reflecting personally on members in another place. I congratulate the new Ministers who have been elected to the Government benches and I pay tribute to the two retiring Ministers, Ron Payne and Roy Abbott. I also formally express my condolences on the death of Sir Douglas Nicholls.

I have agreed to limit my time in this debate, so I will not be very long. South Australia is fortunate in that it is well governed by a responsible and decisive Government that has a fine fiscal record in office. That is indicated by the Governor's speech in which he stated:

My Government continues with the proper management of the State's economy as its prime commitment, but in the knowledge that South Australia is now able to consolidate advantages made possible by earlier fiscal responsibility.

It is the type of fiscal responsibility that members opposite opposed time and again for no other purpose than short-term political gain.

I heard the Leader of the Opposition purporting to boast about the record of the Liberal Government. He claimed that this was the lowest taxed State and that the Liberal Government had a proud record. Members opposite have very short memories, because when in office they inherited a \$1 million surplus from the outgoing Corcoran Government in 1979 but within three short years they turned it into a \$63 million deficit, whilst at the same time transferring and using capital works money to the tune of \$100

million, because they failed to impose fiscal responsibility. That is why we had a recession in this State and why our building and service industries collapsed. Money was taken out of capital works and used to prop up recurring expenditure. Any Government can do that; any Government can display that type of financial irresponsibility to hold down taxes, but it promotes a collapse of the economy by so doing. That is the sort of record about which the Leader of the Opposition got up and boasted in this Chamber this afternoon.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Yes, as the member for Fisher says, the Leader is proud of it. Not only the State Government but also the Federal Government has displayed economic responsibility. I note from material put out in July that Australia's balance of payments deficit fell to \$11.5 billion in the previous financial year, on target with the Government's budget prediction. One has to remember that, when the Federal Government came to office, the budgetary deficit was in the vicinity of \$9 billion, and that has now been converted, after five relatively short years in office, into a \$3 billion surplus for next year. That is the type of responsibility that Australia needs, because what is occurring is that both Federal and State Governments are displaying the needed financial commitment, the needed financial responsibility, to enable Australia's economy to grow and expand.

I note that in July the creation of jobs increased and unemployment reduced. More than 35 000 new jobs were created during the month of June, which is further evidence of the strength of the labour market and the Federal Government's good management of the economy. Employment rose by something like 35 600 in June and the labour participation rate rose by .2 percentage points to 62.5 per cent. Unemployment fell by 7 700 to 584 800 and the unemployment rate fell by .1 of a percentage point to 7.4 per cent. Last financial year something like 200 000 jobs were created in Australia. That is the type of fiscal responsibility that the Leader of the Opposition decries.

During 1987-88, unemployment fell by 24 600 to 610 000. The average unemployment rate last financial year was 7.8 per cent and that compares with 8.3 per cent for 1986-87. Since the Hawke Government came to office, employment has risen by over 1 million or 16.7 per cent. The unemployment rate has fallen about 2.6 percentage points. That is a remarkable achievement.

Another issue that concerns the community from time to time, because members opposite in the role of the Opposition want to pump out material to electors, is taxation. The Labor Government looks after what could loosely be termed its traditional voters, as indeed it looks after the whole community. Concerning taxation, we increased sales tax on luxury cars from the standard 20 per cent to 30 per cent because those people in the community who can afford a luxury car have to contribute more. The Federal Government rejected a consumption tax of the type once proposed by Mr Howard and the Liberals.

A capital gains tax was introduced, but an exemption on the family home was provided. A capital gains tax is an important component of the way in which our taxation system functions. Entertainment expenses have been disallowed. That action was opposed by members opposite, but the net result was that about \$300 million in expense account lunches annually for the well to do are no longer paid for by the average taxpayer, as occurred previously. As a consequence, those members of the community who can afford to go out to lunch to expensive restaurants are now not subsidised by the average taxpayer.

We know that fringe benefits were being used as a rort to reduce one's overall income. With a \$50 000 income, a person could work out something with the employer and effectively pay tax on only \$25 000, which meant that other members of the community had to subsidise someone in that position. That has now gone. The tax free threshold of the amount for tax exempt income has been raised from \$4 595 to \$5 100, and the bottom tax rate has been cut from 30c under the Liberals to about 24c. At the same time, personal income tax has come down from 60c in the dollar to 49c in the dollar, and will come down even further.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: We hope!

Mr GROOM: Well, we do hope. These sorts of changes have been very important for what we could call the ordinary person in the street. I have already mentioned the changes that have taken place regarding the number of jobs in the community. The increase in the CPI under a Liberal Government in 1983 was 11.5 per cent; it is now about 6.9 per cent. Universal health cover against hospital and medical expenses is provided through Medicare, saving the average family about \$21 per week on health insurance.

There have been reductions in schedule fees paid to doctors for a range of services, including after hours consultations. In housing there was the introduction of the First Home Owners Scheme, to assist low and moderate income earners to buy their homes by making grants of up to \$6 000. In social welfare, there has been the \$500 million family package for low income workers. Further, there is the family allowance supplement of \$22 per week per child. We have raised the standard age pension to nearly 25 per cent of average weekly earnings, equal to an increase of 8.3 per cent—more than the cost of living rises. There has been an increase in adult single unemployment benefits. We have raised from \$10 to \$30 per week the limit on extra income for unemployment and sickness beneficiaries before part benefits are payable. These very substantial reforms over a number of years have benefited the ordinary person in the street.

There has been a remarkable transformation in South Australia under the present Labor Government. Only this afternoon the Premier outlined a number of benefits that have taken place. Indeed, in his speech the Governor mentioned the Roxby Downs project. It was this Government which implemented the Roxby Downs project and which has seen it come to fruition.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The honourable member cannot deny that. South Australia has the submarine project, which represents an enormous development for Port Adelaide and the State and which will create hundreds of jobs. Further, the ASER project is a very important development that has come to fruition as a result of the activities of this Government. One has only to walk around the town to see how the skyline has changed over the past six years. There have been dramatic changes in the South Australian economy, all as a consequence of fiscal responsibility on the part of a Labor Government. Indeed, only a couple of weeks ago Mr Marcus Clark, the Managing Director of the State Bank, was reported in the press (I am not sure whether it was the *Advertiser* or the *News*) as follows:

The South Australian economy has recovered dramatically during the past six months, one of the State's most influential business leaders said today.

State Bank Managing Director, Mr Tim Marcus Clark, said the boom was mainly through the housing, property development and manufacturing sectors.

He said the State Bank had provided more than \$150 million to small business last financial year—100 per cent above predictions.

And Mr Clark said statistics released last week showed council approvals for new homes were the highest in more than 18 months and that State Bank had approved a record 989 home loans during July . . .

'In another indication of our faith in the strengthening of the South Australian economy, the State Bank will increase funding available for home buyers by \$150 million to at least \$500 million during this financial year,' Mr Clark said.

That is a remarkable record on the part of the State Bank. As the Premier said this afternoon, when the legislation to amalgamate the State Bank and the Savings Bank was before this Chamber the Opposition sought to frustrate that legislation and to tie the State Bank down as much as it could. It is a remarkable institution for South Australia and replaces the Bank of Adelaide, following its demise. It is true that Marcus Clark last week made reference to some criticism and called for a development summit, as the Premier outlined this afternoon.

From my own observations and experience over the years I think that we do have entrepreneurs in South Australia. What I find is a tendency in the bureaucracy to be somewhat inflexible. It is much easier for the people in the bureaucracy to say 'No' to entrepreneurs, because very little responsibility is attached to saying 'No', while a great deal of responsibility is attached to saying 'Yes'. Some people, I have observed, do shy clear of saying 'Yes' to entrepreneurs.

I think that is the sort of resistance that Marcus Clark was talking about in the context of a criticism of lack of entrepreneurs in South Australia—because people do get discouraged. There is no question that the bureaucracy takes much longer to arrive at decisions. There is a much more exhaustive process before people are required to take ultimate responsibility. We need far greater flexibility on the part of our bureaucracies in South Australia and elsewhere. South Australia is doing very well; I do not think that there is any doubt about that, and that is underpinned by the Governor's speech.

Can the Liberals do a better job? What we have to judge them on is their record when they were in government. When they had their opportunity in government they frittered it away. It is no good standing here crying about Roxby Downs; that is ancient history. The fact of the matter is that that indenture was passed by this Parliament and effectively was ratified by the people of South Australia at an election. But, it was this Government that the people elected; they did not elect the Liberals. The people did not have confidence in the way in which a Liberal Government could manage South Australia's economy. They placed their trust in this Government and it has been a very good, decisive Government which has been prepared to tackle the fiscal needs of South Australia; and it has done very well indeed.

Apart from the Liberal Party's record between 1979 and 1982 we now have the Greiner Government to compare with. One only has to go across the border to see what Mr Greiner and the Liberal Government are doing. When in Opposition he ran a campaign which argued that no charge increases should exceed inflation. What did he do within a month of his election? Public transport rose by 12.8 per cent, electricity rose by 9.8 per cent, hospital bed charges rose by 15 per cent and parking fines rose by 50 per cent, against an inflation rate of about 7 per cent. There is no doubt that more is to come.

We know that the New South Wales education system is now in complete disarray and that people are remonstrating against the changes. There is no doubt that a Liberal Government will go back to its old philosophies. Any Government through a sleight of hand can do what the Liberal Party did in this State between 1979 and 1982—that is, reduce or do not raise taxes and use capital works moneys

to fund recurring expenditure and to prop up receipts. That is not fiscal responsibility; that is how one induces a depression. This Labor Government has got on top of a \$63 million deficit and is slowly bringing it down and, at the same time, maintaining growth in the economy. Most of the contributions of members opposite have been negative; they have been a carping form of criticism. As I said, the Leader of the Opposition—

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr GROOM: We have not heard anything about policy—not one policy comes from members opposite, except the one Australia policy which was floated by their Federal Leader and from which they want to distance themselves because they know the voting problems that that will cause in the ethnic communities. Because the Federal Opposition is so desperate it is prepared to clutch at prejudice. A multicultural policy—a policy which we thought all Parties in Australia adhered to and which has served Australia well—is being overthrown for some perceived short-term political gain, and it will raise a racial debate.

Ethnic communities can expect that because that seed is sown in the Liberal Party. It has always been there and it only takes a few people to bring it out. The one Australia policy is promoted by the Liberals and by the National Party. Senator Stone has got into the act. However, that racial policy is not in Australia's best interests.

How can one effectively trade with South-East Asian countries—our Asian neighbours—and at the same time maintain a racist immigration policy. One cannot do it. Australia is a multicultural nation. We have a basis on which to judge what we can expect from a Liberal Government and we would have more of what happened during 1979 to 1982—more of the racist policies being enunciated by the Federal Opposition, both the Liberal Party and the National Party. One only has to go across the border into New South Wales to see what Greiner is doing. South Australia is a well governed State, and it will continue to be governed by a Labor Government for many years to come.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's speech, and I commend His Excellency for the manner in which he presented his address on opening this Parliament. I share with him the sad loss of Sir Douglas Nicholls, and I am sure that all members recognise the contribution Sir Douglas has made not only to South Australian lifestyles but also in the many other areas with which he was associated.

I wish to congratulate the new Ministers who have been appointed, and I note the retirement from their portfolios of the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Mines and Energy and commend them for the service they have given to the community. On many occasions I have had reason to differ with them, while on many other occasions I have had good reason to work with them, and I can only thank them for the services they have provided to the State.

His Excellency referred to reponsible constraint across the community in terms of fiscal matters. That is a concern which I share. I may not share it in exactly the same way as that portrayed in His Excellency's speech, but there is no doubt that our community is looking for responsible attitudes in relation to fiscal policies, and I believe that every Government should be responsible for bringing down a balanced budget and not have deficit budgeting as governments of various persuasions, both State and Federal, have tended to adopt in recent times.

If we go down that path we are only saddling future generations with debt which they will not be able to service. I do not believe that the Government of the day should be allowed to create debts for oncoming generations. I suggest to the House that if a Government creates a debt during one financial year it should be mandatory for that Government to rectify this position by either cutting its expenditure or increasing taxation. In other words, it should wear the consequences of its own actions.

His Excellency referred to the Roxby Downs project. I applaud that project for what it is and will be doing for South Australia. There is no doubt that it is a project involving immense wealth. I am not sure that the size of the deposit has yet been defined, but the project itself has provided considerable employment. I believe that between 2 300 and 2 400 people are employed there at the moment, and that number could further escalate. Many people forced off the land in my electorate have been able to find employment at Roxby Downs and, to that end, it has indeed been a lifesaver for members of some families who have had to leave the land and seek employment elsewhere.

The work ethic of Eyre Peninsula people has been recognised by the Roxby Downs management, who have done much of their canvassing for employees on Eyre Peninsula. That is a feather in the cap of West Coast workers. The project has proved very useful in alleviating some of the crises these people have experienced. I was a member of the Public Works Standing Committee when the Roxby Downs project was first mooted.

I think something like 100 test bores were put down at that time. There were four or five transportable Atco buildings on site. Basically, it was very rough—something like explorers or developers huts or shanties. From that came a massive development of which we are all proud. I notice that both the Government and the Opposition are now singing the praise for it.

I would like to make a comment regarding the inspection of this site by the Public Works Committee. When a Roxby Downs officer asked when the project would proceed, a member of the committee who is now a Government member said in reply, 'If the project proceeds'. That word 'if' could have been interpreted as a stunning blow. Certainly, it was a clear indication of that person's attitude towards the Roxby Downs project continuing.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Is he still a member today?

Mr BLACKER: Yes. I make the point that the Roxby Downs officer made the comment that regardless of the politics and regardless of the Government of the day that project would go ahead, whether it be next year, in 10 years, 30 years or 50 years in advance. So the project team was so confident of the find that it knew that the project would go ahead at some time in the future. It was really a matter of political persuasion at the time and the political pressures then being applied whether it would continue.

I am pleased that there was no real hiccup in the development of that project. Once it started under the Tonkin

Government and got under way there was progression all the way down the line, and we are now seeing the project up and running and some tangible benefits accruing to the State.

Mention was made of the Australian submarine replacement program. I, too, applaud that, as I have done in the past. I question whether it is quite the panacea that many people believe it to be. We are now finding that many components which many of us thought would be produced here will now be produced elsewhere and, if we are not careful, it could become just an assembly site and little more.

The main issue to which I wish to refer is that of the primary producing sector and, in particular, the area of Eyre Peninsula. I note in His Excellency's speech that he made reference to the rural sector when he stated:

Primary production has enjoyed favourable seasonal conditions, with good to excellent rains in most parts of the State. Many farmers are enjoying benefits which have flowed from the continuing recovery in world commodity prices, with a forecast 7 per cent increase in the gross value of rural production in this State during this financial year.

Whilst one might be able to make that generalisation, I have to inform the House that that is far from the truth on Eyre Peninsula. In fact parts of Eyre Peninsula are experiencing their worst year ever. I refer in particular to some of those areas in the northern part of Eyre Peninsula which extend into the electorate of the member for Eyre. Many people there tried to plant a crop, but in the main they kept most of the seed home in the shed, because the crop that they had planted had not progressed enough to enable it to be reaped. So, the traumas for those people are snowballing day by day.

I might add that on the weekend I attended a CFS competition which took me along the western roads, and I am concerned that there, too, we are facing a crisis situation. If we do not get good rains within 10 days to a fortnight, a large percentage of the northern areas will become very seriously affected. Some areas now are almost beyond recovery. However, if we do not get rain for a month at least one-third, and possibly as much as half, of Eyre Peninsula will be totally wiped out as far as cropping prospects go. That is a fact that I think the Government should recognise, because we have a very productive area on the peninsula, to which I will refer in a moment.

Unless the Government recognises the plight of those people and at least gives them the opportunity to work their way out, there will be serious disruption to the economy of this State. In talking about the economy of this State, I refer to the most recent statistical figures for the Eyre region. I refer to the Eyre region because that is the way in which the Australian Bureau of Census and Statistics classifies that area, but it is basically the Eyre Peninsula. I seek leave to have a table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Agriculture

Selected Agricultural Statistics, Eyre and South Australia, 1987-88p

Particulars	Unit	Eyre	South Australia	Per cent
Persons employed in Agriculture (1986)				
Males	number	2 949	24 946	11.8
Females	number	1 389	12 630	11.0
Rural establishments (1986-87)	number	1 779	15 369	11.6
Area of Establishments (1986-87)	hectares	5 826 158	59 470 735	9.8
Barley, total area	hectares	243 488	922 721	26.4
Oats, total area	hectares	87 758	237 434	37.0

Particulars	Unit	Eyre	South Australia	Per cent
Wheat, total area	hectares	819 901	1 592 525	51.5
Field peas, total area	hectares	5 247	125 804	4.2
Sheep	number	2 543 304	17 633 543	14.4
Ewes mated	number	1 003 634	7 738 761	13.0
Lambs marked	number	788 965	6 558 954	12.0
Lambing percentage	per cent	78.6	84.7	—
Cattle	number	24 661	957 619	2.6
Pigs	number	36 385	448 446	8.1
Gross value of agricultural commodities produced	\$000	284 900	1 984 600	14.3

Mr BLACKER: In the main, Eyre Peninsula has about 11 per cent of the population of this State which, I suppose, would be par for the course. In relation to the area of establishments, it has 9.8 per cent of the total for South Australia; barley, 26.4 per cent; oats, 37 per cent; wheat, 51.5 per cent; field peas, 4.2 per cent; sheep, 14.4 per cent; ewes, 13 per cent; lambs, 12 per cent, and so on. The point that I wish to make is that Eyre Peninsula plays a very valuable part in the agricultural production of the State and therefore its economy. In fact, the total for that area during the past year is some \$284.9 million. For the previous year, which was slightly better in agricultural terms, it was some \$296 million. On top of that there is the fishing industry, a small shipbuilding industry and machinery, service and tourist industries.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: As I mentioned, for the benefit of the member for Alexandra, I referred to the Eyre statistical region, which would be a line slightly north of Goyder's Line as it crosses Eyre Peninsula. There would be some agricultural areas further north to which the honourable member might be referring, but it would be only a very small percentage.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: No, certainly not. The honourable member would know that the value of wool production for that area is immense as far as the overall economy of the nation is concerned, particularly when we have wool clips which average \$1 000 a bale or better depending on the density.

I turn to a few other issues. Reference has been made to country hospitals. It is a very vexed question and people in my area in particular are very concerned about what could happen if a Government chose to reduce the number of acute beds at any hospital on Eyre Peninsula. I say that because of the concern that has been experienced in other areas of the State. Whilst those hospitals so affected have been, in relative terms, much closer to other hospitals, that same concern extends to Eyre Peninsula.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: To do a Blyth, a Tailem Bend or a Laura on Eyre Peninsula is an impossibility because our hospitals are more than double the distance apart, but the principle that applies and the time limit to get from one hospital to another could be interpreted by some as being a risk for Eyre Peninsula hospitals.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not Question Time and, in any case, the member for Flinders does not have ministerial responsibility.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: He is the Leader of the National Party, with respect.

The SPEAKER: That is not his responsibility towards the House. The honourable member for Flinders has the floor and he should ignore interjections which are out of order.

Mr BLACKER: The Address in Reply is one of the few opportunities that a member has in this House to refer,

quite exclusively if he wishes, to his own electorate. To that end I am very proud of my electorate and I will defend it to the very end. I wish to remind members, including the member for Alexandra, that my electorate plays a very important part in the State's economy and I will defend that to the nth degree. I do not wish to be diverted very much—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member for Alexandra follows me and I may be able to recall what he has said during my contribution. His Excellency made reference to the standard of water and the need for improvement in the metropolitan area. Whilst I do not downgrade the concept of improving the quality of water in the metropolitan area, I point out that many people in this State do not have a reticulated water supply and that is a very serious omission on the part of past Governments, one that is not being addressed now. The Government is not making any real effort to extend reticulated water services in this State. That matter must be addressed.

The problem is further compounded, because there does not seem to be any real long-term plan for replacing some of our ageing water schemes, some of which are 50 or 60 years old and almost at the end of their economic life. Therefore, some provision must be made for the gradual replacement of those services. I have not been able to ascertain any policy or long-term planning for the provision of expenditure to replace these services. Eventually, a Government of the day will be faced with that very real problem, or will they allow the situation to deteriorate to a stage where there will no longer be a serviceable line? It would then be closed down and the people who are presently being serviced by those lines would be left to their own devices.

I do not think that any Government of recent years has seriously contemplated what it would do about the replacement of those lines, let alone an increase of services which many people believe should be the right of every individual within this State. The last time an uneconomic water service was provided in this State it was in my own electorate, and that was at Coffin Bay. I hope that, when the Public Works Standing Committee visits my electorate next Friday, it will inspect that project to see the benefits that have been gained. I thank the then Minister of Water Resources who facilitated that development. Since that time an uneconomic service has not been provided in the State.

In His Excellency's speech mention was made of telecommunication interception for combating serious crime. When one begins to discuss phone tapping, one learns that there is always the fear that privacy may be invaded and therefore many people question how far we should go in this regard. If there is good reason to suspect that a serious crime is contemplated, I would have no real objections to the use of phone tapping. However, it must be used advisedly, on very rare occasions, and for the right purposes. I fear that, if it is not used in such a controlled manner, it could be abused and the individual liberties of many people could be infringed.

Some members have mentioned the effect on our State of a 'Yes' vote to the four questions of the referendum. Some aspects of this referendum relate to the State Government and therefore could be seen to have some impact on the budgetary measures before the House. I refer specifically to the fourth question in the referendum relating to fair compensation for compulsory acquisition of a property by a Federal or State Government, or local government. I wonder whether the Government has actually looked at that question to see how the Native Vegetation Management Authority Act would be affected if a 'Yes' vote were returned for that question.

There has been a lot of controversy about fair compensation under the Native Vegetation Management Authority. Many people believe that they have not been given fair compensation, that they have been coerced into taking on heritage agreements.

Mr Tyler: So you are supporting a 'Yes' vote?

Mr BLACKER: I am certainly not supporting a 'Yes' vote. I wonder whether the Government has considered the consequences of a 'Yes' vote being returned. If some members of the community think that they would get better compensation, they might be tempted to support a 'Yes' vote. I have been around Parliament and Governments long enough to know that one's expectations are not always reached in cases such as this. However, it is a very real risk to the budgetary planning of this and every other State Government. It could well be perceived that State Government authorities, in this case the Native Vegetation Management Authority, which affect individuals at a local level, could be totally overruled by the Federal Government which could decide that the State must pick up the tab. I do not think that the Government has considered this proposal properly or thoroughly.

Another aspect of the referendum that worries me is the question of religious freedom. I have reason to believe that, if this proposal passes, it will be similar to that which applies presently in the United States, where a confirmed atheist disputed the teaching of Christianity in schools. He took the case to the highest court and was successful. As a result, neither Christianity nor any other religion can be taught in any form in any school. Religious instruction players such as the Covenant Players, who travel all over the world, will no longer be allowed in schools. Indeed, Australia is one of the few places where they are still allowed.

Mr Tyler: That's nonsense.

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member says that it is nonsense, but I am informed that the wording of the Australian referendum question is almost if not identical to the American provision. It was challenged in the High Court, which brought down its decision. Obviously, somebody would have to challenge the Australian provision in the High Court, so it does not matter a darn what any member of Parliament, from the Prime Minister down, says about this. The High Court will interpret the legislation and the referendum proposals. Furthermore—

An honourable member: So what! That's the High Court's function.

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member is trying to convince members of the public that his Party knows what it is talking about, yet he now says that it is not his role to do it, it is the High Court's decision.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Rann): Order! The member for Fisher will come to order.

Mr BLACKER: I could refer to a number of other issues relating to the referendum proposals. For every one I can find good arguments against—

Mr Tyler: What about for?

Mr BLACKER: —and very few, if any, arguments in favour because, without doubt, it is a power grab for Canberra. We are not being asked just four questions; we are being asked 33 questions, which, if they are passed, will be 12 pages of fine print for the Constitution.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member can say that it is rubbish, but he need not take my word for it. I have sought advice and that is what I am told. I have copies of the Bills that have gone through Parliament and I am endeavouring to put them together. I am prepared to fight on this issue. It is a power grab for Canberra which will diminish the rights of the States and it will lead to a gradual undermining of all other stages of government. I will say no more on that.

I was rather perturbed at an article in the *Stock Journal* of last week in which reference was made to the National Party's stand on orderly marketing. That article was totally wrong. The article is being corrected and I am hoping that a retraction will appear.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: What is your policy in relation to orderly marketing?

Mr BLACKER: The reference of the article—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: No, yours?

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member will have his time shortly. Reference was made to the deregulation proposal that is presently being debated in the wider community. It was raised in the shadow Cabinet of the Federal Opposition and at that time when a vote was taken every member of the National Party plus one Liberal member voted to retain orderly marketing and voted against the deregulation of the grain industry.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: That is exactly right. It was reported very much to the reverse. However, I put on record that every member of the National Party and one member of the Liberal Party, Mr Wal Fife, voted against it. Every other member of the Liberal Party voted for deregulation. I will leave that point now and take it up later because many side issues relate to it. I will explain that to the House in a week or so. Another factor of grave concern to the rural community is the single receivership of grain. I support the South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling being the single receiver of grain.

The South Australian Grain Handling Authority has, to a degree, been victimised by the royal commission because the anomalies that applied in the grain handling systems in the eastern States were the ones being targetted. It was not really necessary to bring South Australia into that because it has a very efficient grain handling system and transport system. Had all other States been up to the standard of South Australia, the need for the royal commission would never have existed.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: This is the reverse of the other situation, since all the Liberals support—

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member is being facetious.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: That is good. I am hoping that the whole State agrees on that issue.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Will the Labor Party agree with you?

Mr BLACKER: We have had an indication today that possibly it will. If we can get the whole State, including the Government of the day, to do just that we will be better off. I thank His Excellency for his delivery of the address. I look forward to the legislation to be introduced. I was at

Country Fire Services competitions at Streaky Bay recently and the enthusiasm was quite high among the 172 participants in the competitions. However, many questions were asked about when the new Country Fire Service Bill was coming into State Parliament. There is an air of expectation and anticipation amongst the volunteer fire fighters who are actively involved and I await that legislation coming into the House. I do not see reference to it in His Excellency's speech. However, I am hoping that the Government—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: We particularly want to know about the funding of it, too.

Mr BLACKER: The whisper I heard was that the funding aspect would not be in the Bill coming before the Parliament. It will contain management, procedural and hierarchy aspects, but the funding side will be further down the track. I support the motion.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the speech by His Excellency the Governor. I also congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion, the members for Fisher and Price respectively, for their contributions to this debate. I have no doubt that both of my colleagues will be around for many years and will outstay me in this Parliament. I join all members in expressing my condolences to the family of the late Sir Douglas Nicholls. Sir Douglas was not only a great and tireless worker for the Aboriginal community but also a great representative of his people in all capacities in which he became involved in his life.

I also express my condolences to the family of the late Arnold Noack who for many years assisted me as a raw and young recruit in this Parliament. He assisted me, as did many others, in advising on where I could go to get assistance in this place. The messengers, indeed all the staff, have ably assisted not only me but many other members of the Parliament over the years, and Arnold was one such terrific person who gave me advice freely and assisted me during my early time in this place.

I wish the member for Mitchell and the member for Spence well during the rest of their term in this Parliament. As one would expect, being a member of a Cabinet requires long hours of work under stressful circumstances. I remember when I first came into this place and stood on the other side, in the place now occupied by the member for Murray-Mallee. When I delivered my maiden speech my knees were knocking and I had great difficulty keeping still, but it was Ron Payne, the member for Mitchell, who assisted me greatly. He encouraged me by saying, 'Get in there, Kevin, and show them what it is all about. Don't be frightened of that bunch opposite.'

I recall the great law and order debate, in which I made one of my best contributions, and I will never forget the encouragement that the Hon. Ron Payne gave me. I believe that from that time on I had a greater ability to stand in this House and speak off the cuff more so than previously. The member for Spence was invaluable in assisting me with the program for the extension of West Lakes Boulevard. It is those people who have made members on this side such a worthwhile and cohesive force.

I wish to go on record as saying that I believe very strongly that John Cornwall was by far the most competent and reformist Minister of Health in this State. He is a man who has the intestinal fortitude and the ability to take on those pillars that needed knocking down and those establishments that needed to be shaken up. I believe that he did all those things in his time as Minister of Health in this State. I will come back to that point later because, despite the fact that I have had some differences with my colleague,

I believe that he felt very strongly about many issues, and I admire any man or woman who feels very strongly about issues and is prepared to take on not only the establishment of this State but perhaps colleagues.

The new Ministers are the member for Florey and the member for Mawson, the mouth from the South—and I say that most affectionately. She will be around for many years to come. She is not very tall, but by hell, has she got guts. Similarly the member for Florey, who came from the trade union movement and understands it, unlike some members opposite. I believe that the ability of those two new Ministers will assist us tremendously in the years to come.

As for the member for Todd, I can only speak about him with the greatest admiration, having worked with him on the Public Accounts Committee. He is a man with incredible perceptiveness, intelligence and understanding, one who knows how the bureaucracy works and is prepared not only to get in there and find out what the problems are but to impart a great deal of information about the manner in which the Public Accounts Committee should operate.

For the reasons stated I am indeed grateful to all of those colleagues. I am prepared to go even further and state that the contribution of those three members will not only enhance the electoral popularity of the Bannon Government but increase the perceptiveness of members on this side. There is tremendous talent on the backbench on this side, and that is recognised by the media. This is one of the best Governments that the State has seen in a long, long time. There is a lot of youth and a lot of dynamism amongst Government members; they have the ability to understand what is happening in the electorate and relate it to policies.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I look forward with a great deal of interest to the contribution that my colleague behind me will make to the Public Accounts Committee, given his expert ability in the legal profession. There is no doubt that he will go on to bigger and better things. There is no question about that.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I would never question the integrity of my colleague. I agree with His Excellency's following comment:

My Government continues with the proper management of the State's economy as its prime commitment, but in the knowledge that South Australia is now able to consolidate advantages made possible by earlier fiscal responsibility.

This fiscal responsibility continues, despite the fact that again this year South Australia must structure its programs around a further reduction in Commonwealth money of some \$100 million. Coupled with that fact, the Government has promoted and encouraged the restructuring and consolidation of our technical and industrial base in South Australia.

In his speech the Governor referred to developments in the Iron Duke ore mine near Whyalla, the construction of a major natural gas pipeline from Port Pirie to Port Bonython and Whyalla, and the defence and aerospace industry capabilities, including the Australian submarine program at Port Adelaide. This will not only be a major program to promote defence and civil offsets opportunities to local industry but also will provide many thousands of jobs in this State. We all know that for each dollar spent there is a multiplier effect of at least three to one.

I look forward to the future with a great deal of optimism, particularly when the first submarine comes on-stream. There is no question that the western suburbs will benefit tremendously from the submarine contract which, indeed, will be the catalyst for many other technological advances and

contributions by industry in this State. It is my view, and I believe that of the Government, that it will encourage many other industries to set up a base in this State.

The Bannon Government's recognition of the need for additional shipping services was given further emphasis with the Premier leading a party of over 100 people, including some of South Australia's leading business people, to Japan in April this year. I think it is worth putting on record the contribution that the Premier made. The 10-day mission was centred around the Okayama Expo which more than 3 million people were expected to attend.

I think it is worth reminding the House that South Australia was the only Australian State to be invited to this Expo and to participate. The South Australian display at that Expo included a wide range of goods on exhibition to the Japanese people. The Premier addressed investment seminars in Okayama, Tokyo and Nagoya and he was involved with numerous meetings with representatives of leading business and financial institutions. The promotion of South Australian tourist destinations, food and wine was also part of the Premier's contribution while on this trip to Japan in April.

It is also worth noting that Japan is one of this State's major trading partners, each year buying about \$250 million worth of goods from us. As has been mentioned by the Premier, there is still plenty of room for expansion. In terms of the automotive industry, Mitsubishi is now selling Australian made cars to Japan, and a number of component suppliers have won big export orders to Japan. We also supply foodstuffs such as fruit, vegetables and fish to the Japanese market. The setting up of the new base down by the International Airport will further facilitate the export of South Australian fruit and vegetables to Asia.

On the question of Asia, I find it extremely disappointing to note the racist statements and overtones from the Federal Leader of the Opposition. I say that not from a political perspective but in terms of the need to sell our products and to encourage Asians to come to, invest in and trade with this country. There is no question that statements made by Liberal Party and National Party members in the past few months have caused tremendous damage to trade between our countries. If I was an Asian I would feel extremely disappointed about this racist attack. We all hurt and bleed and do not like to be ridiculed by others. I think that the Liberal Party has done a grave disservice not only for the next few years but for 10, 20 or 30 years down the track—into the next century. People do not forget racist attacks on themselves, their families and their children. The quickest way to hurt someone is to attack their family.

The upgrading of shipping services between Port Adelaide and Japan will increase significantly export opportunities for many South Australian companies. The Premier encouraged more shipping not only from Japan but also from other Asian countries to use the Port Adelaide facilities. As the Premier has pointed out in many of his press releases, this will reinforce South Australia's position as a central distribution point to the rest of the country.

We hope that, as a consequence of the Premier's overseas visit, exports from South Australia can be expected to grow at an even faster rate than predicted, particularly now that the shipping service has been approved. It is worth reminding the House that General Motors-Holden's has reached a decision to concentrate its activities in South Australia through a \$500 million expansion program at its Elizabeth plant. This augurs well for the future of the South Australian economy. It is also worth reminding the House about the 250 megawatt unit to be set up at the Northern Power

Station which will cost \$450 million in present day prices and which will generate additional power for this State.

It is particularly noteworthy that more and more tourists are coming to this State. An *Advertiser* report of 13 August entitled 'South Australia grabs more tourists: report', in part, states:

Figures released this week shows South Australia guest arrivals for the three months to March this year totalled 403 544—a rise of almost 20 000 over the same period last year. The average stay rose from 1.9 days to 2 days, with only Queensland and Western Australia scoring longer average stays, 2.4 and 2.5 days respectively.

The need to encourage more people to visit South Australia and to understand what South Australia has to offer in terms of tourism is patently obvious. I was greatly disappointed to read the comments of the member for Coles and her attack upon the Expo stand in Brisbane.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I agree with the member for Fisher: she probably would criticise anything. However, having noted the comments of the member for Coles, I was encouraged to go to Brisbane, with assistance from the office of the Minister of Tourism and the Commissioner for South Australia at Expo (Ralph Maloney). I would like to mention specifically the wonderful response I received from the staff of the South Australian pavilion. It was delightful to see South Australian people who could not do enough to assist those who came to the stand, and provide them with information. I know that at first hand because over a period of three days I spoke to a number of visitors to our stand, and they had nothing but praise for our South Australians manning that stand. With the assistance of my good wife, I was able to give them a few small gifts in appreciation of the fantastic job they had done—

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: As my colleague says, I have a fantastic wife, and I concur in that. Getting back to the issue, since my return from Expo I have had occasion to ring the people in our pavilion to ask them to assist a number of South Australians, and they were only too happy to do so and to facilitate access to a number of pavilions. Also, it would be remiss of me not to mention the fantastic assistance provided to my friends by the Victorian people. Having looked around a number of those pavilions at Expo over a period of eight days, I must say that the \$400 000 spent by the South Australian Government was worthwhile. It was value for money, and the only people who criticised the stand were South Australians who, I am informed (and noted), stood outside the pavilion with hands on hips with preconceived ideas about that pavilion.

As I said, the people to whom I spoke were quite happy with what was provided in terms of selling holiday packages, Grand Prix tickets and our wines. Once again, I state that they were quite happy with the staff. I hope that when the staff come back to South Australia a number of members on this side of the House will show their appreciation by inviting them up here for a luncheon. When they come back I will put my name forward to take them into the Parliament and show my appreciation for the wonderful assistance that they gave to me.

I have noted over many years that when the Liberal Party thinks it is getting close to an election its members rip out the hoary old chestnut of law and order and intimates that the Labor Party is not particularly concerned about law and order. I challenge Opposition members to examine my comments and the amount of work that the Government has done in terms of assisting the community to reduce crime in this State. The other night in this House I said that, when we look at statistics, it should not be forgotten that

this Government has encouraged South Australian people to report incidents of crime. It is a recognised fact that, the more encouragement that is given to the community to report crime, the higher the incidence of reported crime will be. As a consequence, this Government has taken the appropriate measures, given its financial constraints—

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, and I will come to what the member for Fisher has said. I suggest that this Government has done more than anyone else in terms of a reduction in crime in this State, and I challenge the Opposition to dispute that. From the number of questions I put on the Notice Paper between 1979 and 1982, I know what I am talking about in relation to the reduction of crime in this State. The figures quite clearly reveal the contributions that this Government has made. The Minister of Correctional Services today in this House highlighted the contribution that this Labor Bannon Government has made in terms of correctional services; in terms of the Neighbourhood Watch schemes; in terms of reducing juvenile crime; in terms of increased sentences; and particularly in terms of the fight against drugs. Right across the board, this Govt has addressed head on those particular issues that the community quite correctly are demanding that we, as a Government, address.

During the years I have been in this place, I have constantly addressed the question of road safety probably, I must confess, to the dismay of the officers of the Minister of Transport. I can recall, under the Liberal regime, comments to the effect, 'This Hamilton, I wish he would shut up or stop writing letters to us.'

Mr S.J. Baker: And you still haven't.

Mr HAMILTON: No, as the member for Mitcham says, I have not slackened in this regard, and I do believe very strongly in my commitment to try to extract as many dollars as I can out of any Government for my electorate's benefit.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: You're a tireless worker.

Mr HAMILTON: I appreciate the sentiments from my colleague. According to the member for Morphett, the Premier has not made a great contribution on the question of law and order. That was probably one of the most disgraceful contributions by the member for Morphett. He, and every other member of this House, knows that the Premier is not the Minister of Correctional Services; he is not the Minister of Police; he is not the Minister of Emergency Services. There are 13 Ministers in this Parliament. Despite his ability to run marathon races and work marathon hours, the Premier is not Superman.

So the member for Morphett is grossly dishonest. I do not mind him getting down into the slime but when he gets down into the sewer that is when I say that enough is enough. That is the sort of nonsense he wants to peddle in this place when he starts talking about law and order.

Let us have a look at what this Government has done in terms of the Licensing Act; in terms of trying to reduce the incidence of road accidents in South Australia; in terms of under age drinking; in terms of dangerous articles; in terms of assisting the police particularly in connection with Neighbourhood Watch. Where was the Liberal Party between 1979 and 1982 in relation to community policing? What did they do? Sweet FA—sweet Fanny Adams! That is all they did—nothing—all mouth and no action. But when it came to us, when we got back into office in November 1983, this Government implemented the suggestion that I put to this House of a Neighbourhood Watch scheme in this State.

In Semaphore, for instance, there has been a 77 per cent reduction in crime. There are over 100 Neighbourhood Watch operations in South Australia, each one involving

something like 600 people. There is now a tremendous ongoing reduction in the crime rate in this State.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Despite the mouthing of the member for Morphett, he will not drown me out in this place. It is typical of him to try to shout people down, but I assure him that he has met his match in this regard. What have we done in terms of the Neighbourhood Watch? Only last Sunday, if the member for Morphett had the intelligence to understand what was said on television, he would have learnt that this State Government made a further contribution of \$100 000 towards the Neighbourhood Watch program. We have more police in this State per head of population than in any other State in Australia, despite the utterances and the garbage peddled by the member for Morphett. He does very little work and is bone lazy. He stands up and mouths off but is very short in terms of fact.

Mr Tyler: And substance.

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, indeed. We have addressed the question of graffiti. We have picked up the question of community service orders and assisted the community through that program. I wish I had another hour to speak on these matters.

I now want to talk about other very positive things that have been put in train by this Government. The multi-million dollar Happy Valley water filtration program will come on stream in November next year. This Government puts its money where its mouth is, unlike the Opposition: a lot of rhetoric but very little action. Here we have another illustration of what this Government is prepared to do to assist the community. I know, as one whose household has received dirty water, like many other households in this State, that this plant will be very welcome and well received by the community at large.

I also refer to the encroachment of sand-dunes in my electorate—a matter of which the Minister is well aware; access around the West Lakes waterway; the further need to upgrade the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works; and the question that was raised today in this House about the number of teachers in schools. I believe that this Government is properly addressing those issues, and I must say that I was a little saddened by what took place at the recent school meeting the other night.

I look forward to the progress that this Government will make over the forthcoming 12 months. I have no doubt that this Government will be returned despite the utterances of those non-thinking people on the other side of this House. I look forward to the return of the Bannon Government in 1989 because the Opposition, to put it bluntly, is very much devoid of people with the intelligence and capacity to assist this State.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I support the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech to this Parliament during the opening of the current session. In doing so, I agree with a number of members who extended congratulations to those people promoted to the Government's Cabinet. In particular, I refer to Sue Lenehan, John Klunder and Bob Gregory who all came into this Parliament after me. I have watched their progress and wish them well in their respective appointments.

I record my recognition of those recently retired Ministers, Ron Payne and Roy Abbott. I also place on record my condolences to the family of Arnold Noack, who passed away during the recent recess. He was one of the gentleman officers who have serviced this Parliament since I joined the ranks in March 1973. Nothing was too much trouble

for Arnold Noack. He assisted members in their various duties and also extended courtesies to members' families, including their children. I noted on a number of occasions, during his time as Head Attendant, the tolerance and patience he extended to those little children who tend to scamper around the place and, by their capers, run some risk of upsetting the delicate furnishings of this place. In that respect, Arnold Noack was a very sensitive and kindly person.

I mention also another officer of the staff who passed away last weekend. Laurie Mayne was a security officer in this Parliament a few years ago for about a year, or perhaps a little longer. Like Arnold Noack, he was a gentleman who was ever ready to assist members of all political persuasions in their duties. Laurie Mayne died as a result of quite tragic circumstances. On behalf of those who knew and respected him, I extend condolences to his family. Laurie was a former police officer. Later, in retirement, he became a councillor for the district of Willunga and contributed significantly to community affairs, including in his capacity as Treasurer to the Fleurieu Tourist Association. I know that his contribution in that respect will be sadly missed by his colleagues.

For some years now this Address in Reply debate in which we participate at the commencement of each session of Parliament has become an occasion for chest thumping by Government members and of identification of the shortcomings of the Government by the Opposition. I have noticed that very little attention has been directed to State or district parochial affairs. It really has become a head-on issue, with the Government seeking to defend its activities and to promote its members and policies as they apply to the Party political line that is represented. I want to raise a matter that has been with us now for about nine months.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Yes, the member for Mitcham has got it right again. I want to put a few things on the record relating to the *Island Seaway* vessel. I will not go into the historic detail as to who was right and who was wrong with respect to its design or whether it was put together correctly. Nor, for that matter, will I refer tonight to its many alleged shortcomings. I will place on record my concern for Government's lack of sensitivity during this much publicised saga when those responsible for operating the ship have failed to communicate effectively and appropriately with the Government, in the form of briefing the respective Ministers, and with members of the Opposition, particularly with me as local member for the district that the vessel services.

For example, Sydney-based representatives of Howard Smith have remained very remote, almost to the point at which it appears that they have been hiding from the media each time an incident or the rumour of an incident has arisen in relation to the vessel. So, too, have the officers of R. W. Miller been conspicuous by their absence in attending to public inquiry as those incidents have occurred. I refer in particular to those occasions when the ship has failed to depart port, late berthings, mechanical, technical and other associated problems, and major incidents that have occurred at sea as a result of engine stoppage or breakdown of one kind or another.

On those occasions one would have thought that these people would be straight out front to talk openly and frankly to the media about the problems. Invariably they have been in hiding and this reluctance to communicate has caused a lot of speculation to develop or fester in relation to the vessel. The practice that I have mentioned has caused much ill-feeling and disturbance with respect to the operation of the vessel. Certainly its saleability to the community at large has been damaged. Faith in the vessel is at a dramatically

low level and it will take an awful lot of publicity, careful planning, communication and attention in order to redevelop and recapture public and crew confidence in the vessel.

The people of Kangaroo Island have no alternative but to use the vessel for their cargo movements. Unlike any mainland-based community, the Islanders are absolutely reliant on the Government's sea link service with mainland South Australia in order to survive. As far as the tourist side of the operation is concerned, the Minister of Tourism and her Director (Graham Inns) have shown little or no interest in promoting the vessel. That shortcoming is squarely in the lap of the Government and it should be addressed as a matter of urgency. A number of premises on Kangaroo Island have suffered as a result of lack of patronage by the tourist industry via that particular form of transport.

Mr Oswald: What happened to the Ozone Hotel?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: My colleague asks what happened to particular premises on Kangaroo Island. That is a sad situation that I would rather not discuss in this debate. What I really want to do is emphasise to the Government, its agents and all those associated with this public utility, as the *Island Seaway* is, that they have a responsibility to communicate to Parliament about the public expense incurred in the capital outlay and the operational expense of the particular facility.

They have a responsibility to report to the Parliament regularly with regard to anything else that may occur in that service. I suggest, with respect to the Minister who happens to be present at the moment, that the sooner those communications are made the less likely the subject will fester, get out of hand and be publicly damaging, as has been the case in relation to our ship so far. You cannot hide your head in the sand or run away from the media. Immediately that practice is adopted the media understandably will recognise or believe that something is being hidden and assume that the Government is ashamed of the project, subject, article, facility or whatever is the case.

Certainly as far as the *Island Seaway* is concerned, nobody in authority has been open and frank about the facts. As a result the media has kept the subject alive and it has been of damage to all concerned. What will be the future of that vessel I do not know. Hopefully a report due at the end of this month or early next month will reveal more information. Maybe then we will be in a better position to determine whether we are stuck with that vessel, whether it can be modified or improved to enable the service to be carried out appropriately or whether positive action to replace the vessel will be necessary. I hope that the former can be achieved, especially in light of the enormous amount of expenditure incurred so far and in the light of the need for a safe, regular service to be provided for that community.

It is parochial and the subject has been addressed on many occasions in this place before, but clearly the time has come when the Government should climb out of the woodwork. The Minister, before retiring, should be open and frank with the community and this Parliament in particular and at least disclose the public costs incurred so far. He denied today, for example, that the figure of \$28.3 million has been expended on initial and correction costs from public funds to date. Whether it is \$28.2 million or \$28.4 million or a lesser or a greater figure than the two, I do not know, but I have been informed by a reliable source that that is about the mark and it is appropriate that we be kept informed and the public at large informed of that factor.

I had the pleasure last Friday of travelling on that vessel. I say 'pleasure' quite deliberately because it was a trip from Kingscote to Port Adelaide in flat calm conditions. It was

in the company of senior officers from the operating firms and they went out of their way to make my trip comfortable and to inform me as far as they were able *en route*. Information is still around from professional sources that there are a number of major shortcomings on the vessel yet not addressed. Safety equipment, and firefighting equipment reportedly still needs attention, but it is not appropriate to pursue those matters at the moment. If we are to be saddled with this plagued service, as it has been so far, we ought to be having those problems openly and frankly identified, addressing them swiftly and getting on with the job of ensuring a service of at least the standard to which that community has become accustomed.

It has been said to me that Kangaroo Island has been spoilt with public services. The situation is that we do not have any public transport whatsoever on Kangaroo Island. We are reliant, and have been for many years now, on a public assisted transport system by sea, and that system under the service of the MV *Troubridge* was absolutely ideal. In that context, I suppose it is fair to say that we were spoilt, but to date, since the commissioning of the current vessel, we have not enjoyed that regular service, nor have we enjoyed a climate around the ship from day one of confidence that we had in her predecessor for some 26 years.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Modern technology taking you backwards.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: My colleague refers to the fact that, although we are in a period of modern technology, we have indeed gone backwards. I noted in a report dated December 1976 on 'Transport to Kangaroo Island', and prepared by the then Director-General of Transport, the type of ship proposed some 12 years ago to replace the *Troubridge* was another roll-on roll-off ship of a similar vehicular capacity.

If possible, the design and construction of the ship was to be undertaken at Whyalla. The Government of the day was being urged to use the island community to prop up the ailing Whyalla shipyards. As it turned out, the ailing Whyalla shipyards in 1976 fell over in 1977, and the Government closed down the shipping operations before a replacement of the *Troubridge* could be put into effect. Some eight or nine years later, the Government, as a matter of convenience, again sought to use the island community and hasten the new modular design plans for a replacement of the MV *Troubridge*.

It was not by demand of the community that a vessel of the modular design that we have, be built. It was not by demand of the island community that the vessel that we have, be built with such haste, and it was not demanded by that community that it be built at Port Adelaide. All of those major decisions were taken by the Government on the advice of the then Director John Jenkin of the then Department of Marine and Harbors. To talk about the consultation that took place in that period is really a joke, because I was around then and so, too, were our local representatives on the island, and they recall as vividly as I do the hustling that was adopted by the Government in order to demonstrate that we, as the State of South Australia, had the capacity to build a modular design vessel and so qualify as a tenderer for the submarine contract. So, again, the island community became a victim of the State, rather than serviced by it.

What we have been landed with now is an acute embarrassment—or it has been to date—and as a result I sought to go on the ship to try to find out a bit more about it generally but, more particularly, to repair this gap in the communication link between those who are operating the

vessel and those who are responsible to answer to the public on its performance. I do believe with respect to the officers who accompanied me last Friday that in fact we achieved a basis on which a better communication arrangement can be established. It is of paramount importance that someone in the Opposition—and indeed, likewise, the Government representative for transport—is informed promptly and properly as to the facts that relate to incidents as they occur and that those facts not be hidden in the face of rumour or rumour mongering and hence unduly disturb the community at large.

One of the other factors that one might question about all this is why the South Australian Travel Centre—formerly the Tourist Bureau—has not sought to promote the vessel as a passenger or tourist carrier. In recent months the Government Travel Centre has produced some brochure material of quite professional quality. Indeed, it has subscribed a substantial amount of a \$100 000 campaign to promote the island. The Travel Centre has provided a significant amount to the Regional Tourist Association on Fleurieu Peninsula, also. These brochures have been produced for the purpose of promoting Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island, both of which are in my electorate. Added to that, these brochures have referred to many other State facilities and many other State Government achievements under the Bannon regime, etc.

I have been through those brochures from cover to cover and, surprisingly, there is only one out of all the productions in the South Australian Travel Centre that refers to the *Island Seaway*. It was drawn to my attention by an officer of that department earlier this week. In the brochure 'How to be the one that got away to Kangaroo Island', there is one line '*Island Seaway—Port Adelaide/Kingscote*'. Under that are given the adult and children passenger fares, plus the vehicle and caravan fares. Other than that there is absolutely no mention of the *Island Seaway* in any of the other State promotion material put out by the Government.

Mr Lewis: What is the fare?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The fare is that which applied before the last half-yearly adjustment, so it is already out of date although the brochure is only a few months old. It is absolutely incredible how these people have dodged from the real subject, how they have lacked pride in the greatest single public investment in a transport item in this State's history.

Mr Lewis: Are you sure it is not confidence that they lack?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I think they are fearful to be associated with their own investment. I really believe that they are ashamed of being linked up with the ship. As I indicated to the House the other day, apart from my trip on the *Island Seaway* last week not one Federal, State, interstate or former member of Parliament had ever been to sea on that ship.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Is it that they are not game?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I do not know what the reason is. I am curious. Since the ship was commissioned in October or early November last year I have been either in a wheelchair, on a walking frame or on walking sticks or physically handicapped. The week before last week I shed my last walking stick and I immediately booked on the *Island Seaway*. However, I understand that Ministers and indeed other members of the Government have been invited, urged or encouraged (and certainly I have challenged them on a number of occasions) to go on the ship, but they have refrained from doing so, month in and month out. One would have thought that even if the Minister responsible for building the ship was too busy he might have nominated

another member of his Party to go on the ship or he might have even thought about nominating his Director of the department to go on it, but not even he has been to sea on the ship. It is absolutely incredible. They have been on the ship when she has been tied up at Port Adelaide; they have had a party on the ship but they have not been to sea on it—that is the difference.

One would have thought that the Minister of Transport, with all the flack that has been flying around, might have found time to go to Kingscote on the vessel. If he did not like it or whatever, he could have returned by air. One would have thought that the Commissioner of Highways, who is primarily responsible for the operation of this vessel, might have gone to sea on her or nominated an officer of his department. But, I am informed that that has not been the case either.

One would have thought that, given the \$28.2 million, \$28.3 million or \$28.4 million (whatever the actual cost) of public money involved in this project, the Premier as Treasurer, being responsible for the money, would have gone on the ship. But as far as I can ascertain he has not even stepped on board, even when she is tied up at Port Adelaide. I do not know whether or not the Premier has actually seen it, but the people on board tell me that he has certainly never been to sea on it, and neither has his Director-General or a Treasury official.

One would have thought that the Minister of Tourism in another place would consider it a good idea to go on this vessel. One would have thought that Graham Inns, that high flying Director of her department, would think it a reasonable part of his duty to go on board that ship. He flies off to Japan, to parts of Europe and around the world to promote tourism in South Australia.

I have been making inquiries, and I cannot identify any Minister, any nominee of a Minister or a senior officer of their respective departments who has been on the vessel. I can only assume that they have no confidence in it. I plead with them to lift their game, get down to Port Adelaide, get on the ship and go for a run to Kangaroo Island. It really is a delightful place. This action will show the Parliament and the people of South Australia that those people have a little bit of pride in a multi million dollar public investment and a little bit of confidence in the decisions to build that ship locally and to incur an enormous amount of extra capital and correctional expense in promoting the submarine contract in isolation from the desires of the Kangaroo Island community.

I feel a bit poorly tonight; in fact I feel as though I am a candidate for the flu, and I have talked a little longer on this matter than I intended. However, in conclusion I urge members from both sides of the House to take a trip on that vessel. In fine weather it is a glorious ship to travel on, but I warn them to be careful and listen to the forecast. This vessel has proved to be a real problem in rough weather so far but, hopefully, the shortcomings can ultimately be addressed so she may then sail in all weather.

Motion carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: LEADER'S REMARKS

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I refer to the Leader's speech today in which he attacked me along with other Ministers of the Bannon Government. I want to refer in particular to the article on page 8 of today's *News* which, incidentally,

was published before the Leader delivered his speech and in which the Leader said that the former Minister of Marine (Mr Abbott) instructed his driver to leave the scene of an accident because he was running late for an appointment. That is simply not true and has been the subject of a previous public explanation by me. I ask the Leader to apologise for and withdraw that comment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Last week I spoke about the referendum on 3 September, and particularly about question 3, which relates to the recognition of local government. In this debate I intend to address the referendum again by making some general comments. Earlier tonight we heard a speech by the member for Flinders, who made some comments about the referendum. I am afraid that those comments were ill-informed and typical of the scaremongering about the referendum questions which has been conducted by Opposition Parties in this State and federally. It is particularly sad that we find ourselves in a situation of having what should be a bipartisan approach to constitutional reform turned into a political football. On 3 September Australians will be asked to vote 'Yes' for fewer elections, fairer elections, recognition of local government and more clearly defined rights for people.

They are the only questions to which Australians are being asked to say 'Yes'. The member for Flinders this afternoon said that 33 changes will occur as a result of the four referendum questions. There are some consequential changes and some grammatical changes but, essentially, the questions are quite clearly spelt out for fewer elections, fairer elections, recognition of local government and more clearly defined rights for people—nothing more, nothing less. It is true to say that Australians have been wary of attempts to change the constitution, and one reason for this has been that often in the past the changes were seen as increasing the powers of Governments and politicians.

That is not the case at this referendum, because the four questions are quite different and really do not seek any powers for politicians or Governments. They offer more rights and guarantees for ordinary Australians. The proposals to which Australians are asked to say 'Yes' are all sensible, modest and practical and are the result of an extensive process of consultation that has been conducted by an independent constitutional commission. They reflect the concerns of ordinary Australians. The commission was chaired by Sir Maurice Byers QC, the former Commonwealth Solicitor-General, and the other members were Dame Enid Campbell, Professor of Law at Monash University; Professor Leslie Zines from the Australian National University; former Labor Prime Minister, Gough Whitlam QC AO; and the former Liberal Premier of Victoria, Sir Rupert Hamer. The commission was supported by five advisory committees whose membership was drawn from a cross-section of the community.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr TYLER: The member for Murray-Mallee can have his say on the constitutional question at some later stage. I am trying to point out to him that the advisory committees were drawn from very prominent Australians from a broad cross-section of the community. They range from people like Peter Garrett, the wellknown lead singer from Midnight

Oil, to former Governors-General and to very prominent Australian authors such as Donald Horne and Thomas Keneally.

So, they were broad ranging people with impeccable qualifications to draw responses from Australians. The commission was charged with the role of seeking the views of people as to the adequacy of the existing provisions of the Constitution and the need to update the Constitution and to make it more relevant to our nation in this bicentennial year and, more importantly, a Constitution that would take us into the next century.

This process acknowledged that our Constitution is a living document and that, while it has served our nation well in the past, it is not immutable. The terms of reference of the commission acknowledge that Australia is a democratic federation in which the Federal, State and local governments each play a complementary role in the administration of our society. The commission was required to seek the views of the public, business, trade union and financial institutions, to stimulate public discussion and awareness of constitutional issues, to hold public meetings and to consider submissions to ascertain Australia's views on constitutional reform. It is these features, the composition and that focus on ascertaining the public's views that sets the commission apart from earlier attempts to review and update the Constitution.

Australians have had too many elections. Since 1945 there have been 22 Federal elections. By voting 'Yes' to question 1, that is, the four-year maximum term for Federal Parliament, Australians can stop this practice. All State Parliaments except Queensland have four year terms, and most democratic countries around the world operate under four or five year terms. It will mean that the Senate will have the same four year term as the House of Representatives. A 'Yes' vote will also mean that all future elections for the House of Representatives and the Senate will be held on the same day. This will create an environment for more responsible long term Government planning which will assist both the private and the public sectors.

Mr Lewis: Piffle!

Mr TYLER: The member for Murray-Mallee says 'piffle'. I would ask him to go and consult some of his colleagues in industry and see what they say about this very question, because it was their strong recommendation that four year terms for Federal Parliament ought to come about. They strongly support it; they advocated it; and they have pleaded with your Federal Leader, Mr John Howard, to change his view on this very important question.

A four year term offers Australia and Australians many benefits. However, there is one thing that it does not do. A 'Yes' vote does not touch the powers or independence of the Senate, despite the utterances of the Federal Opposition and, obviously, of members opposite in this Chamber. The Federal Opposition has said that it would support a four year term for the Lower House (which is quite interesting) but only if Senate terms were increased to eight years, so that defeats the argument put forward this evening by the honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr TYLER: No, the Federal Opposition has said that it would support a four year term for the House of Representatives as long as the Senate could go to an eight year term. It argues that the fixed Senate term has been a stabilising factor that has reinforced the three year electoral cycle and discouraged more frequent elections.

Ms Gayler: That's rubbish.

Mr TYLER: The facts do not weigh up. This is utter nonsense and, as my colleague the member for Newland

said, is absolute rubbish. As I indicated earlier, history proves that this does not work. Australia has had 22 Federal elections since 1945 and a good percentage of these have been brought about directly by the Senate.

On many occasions Australians have indicated that they want to retain the role and power of the Senate. The proposal for four year terms was very carefully drawn up to ensure that the Senate retains all its powers. A 'Yes' vote will not weaken the Senate's power in any way. The Senate will have the same four year term as the House of Representatives under this proposal. The whole Senate will be elected at the same time as the House of Representatives and it will be more accountable. Eight year terms for the Senate would be too long, and such a long term for any elected representative, in my view, would isolate them from the people whom they represent.

As I said at the beginning, the proposals to which Australians are being asked to say 'Yes' are sensible, modest and practical. They are the result of an extensive process of consultation and reflect the concerns of ordinary Australians. They can best be summed up as meaning fewer and fairer elections, in addition to recognising local government, clearly defining basic principles of trial by jury, and providing fair compensation and religious freedom. I believe that we owe it to Australia and Australians to support this referendum, and I will be out and about in the next two weeks encouraging my constituents to support democracy and these changes for the long-term benefit of this country.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I rise to address several matters this evening, the first of which—and it is my good fortune to have the new Minister in the Chamber—is the shonky information given out by WorkCover staff to employers who make inquiries about their reasonable and legal obligations to WorkCover, or to injured employees as to what they can expect of WorkCover.

At present the clerical staff, when contacted about such matters, state that the employer should continue to pay the wages of the employee and collect same from WorkCover. Whenever that has happened since the establishment of WorkCover, employers have waited for 10 to 16 weeks and still not received repayment of the funds owed to them by WorkCover for wages paid to their employees. That is crook.

On the other hand, where employers have quite rightly pointed out to their employees that after the first week of wages they should obtain further payment from WorkCover, that organisation has not paid those employees the wages to which they are entitled, nor has it provided any explanation of what amount of wages it will ultimately pay to those employees, or when. Indeed, the people concerned have been guilty of acting under a direction from their political masters that they should not admit the truth of the matter to members of the general public, be they workers or bosses. They have been told to tell the general public that the employer—the boss—should continue to pay their wages, even in circumstances where they were employed on a casual basis for only two, three or four days during which they injured themselves. I think that is crook, it is shonky, rotten and stinks, and the previous Minister stands condemned. I am quite sure that this Minister will not let that situation go on any longer.

The next matter I want to discuss, totally unrelated to WorkCover, is the futility of the present approach to the fisheries policy adopted by the Minister, who seems to know nothing more about it than having his cartoon likeness published in the daily newspaper frightening people off from trying to catch sharks. What a ridiculous and stupid attitude.

I criticise and condemn the political direction taken in the Fisheries Department on the basis that the present policy of imposing stiffer and steeper penalties for people who breach the law may be a deterrent. I do not deny that that is the case, but it will do nothing to solve the problem of the destruction of the ecology upon which the commercial species depend. The problem is a direct consequence of the inability of successive Governments to manage the ecosystem upon which the species depend: the same species that we depend upon for economic exploitation.

We have done nothing about managing the proper balance of marine flora and fauna in order to maintain those species that we commercially exploit. Putting more and heavier penalties on people who break laws relating to the catching of fish that are too long, too short, too young or too old, the wrong sex or something else, will not solve the problem. We must manage that marine ecosystem.

Over the time I have been in this place I have been heartened when the Government has taken the view that we need to spend more money on developing aquaculture and mariculture technology and to substitute hunting in the wild (that is, catching the fish we need to supply consumer demand) with producing those fish in scientifically valid and relevant farming situations. That is the real way to the future. We ought to leave fish in the wild where they generate the greatest possible value through tourist or recreational fishermen. The amount of money that those fishermen spend on catching those fish is of far greater benefit to the growth of the economy than the amount of money that a commercial fisherman contributes when he hunts. There is no difference between hunting a wild animal and selling the carcass and hide and going out in boats, catching fish and selling them.

I refer to the comments made by the member for Chaffey in relation to establishing artificial reefs which will restore and enhance the kind of environment in which the species of fish upon which we rely, commercially and in the recreational sense, can be improved. I am talking not only about the number of species available but also the diversity. That kind of policy costs very little. Service clubs could be encouraged to participate in such a project. We could get rid of used car bodies and so on in the course of establishing those artificial reefs. I do not want them to be seen as just physical structures at the bottom of St Vincent Gulf or Spencer Gulf. A number of other measures can be taken to enhance that kind of environment such as melting down glass and dumping it in locations where it will increase the numbers of prawns and abalone.

I do not very often have the opportunity, nor am I given the privilege, to speak during an adjournment debate and therefore I need to address a number of matters. I refer to the possibility of a country school's increasing the number of students attending that school to the point where it can ensure its own survival. How many people, perhaps including you, Mr Speaker, would regard it as rather more idyllic than possible these days that one could be absolutely sure that there were no drugs on a secondary school campus or drug users in the school environment? How grateful would you be if you knew that your children or friends' children had a very good student/teacher ratio of about six to one in a secondary school?

Would it not be wonderful if you could place students in an environment in which all the adults in the community cared about who they were, what their skills were and what their aptitude was for not only academic achievement but also for sporting and recreational activities so that they could develop a sense of self esteem, purpose and relevance to the community in which they lived? They could then

relate to younger and older people. That would be an ideal environment, would it not? I do not think that any honourable member would disagree with that statement.

The people at Geranium are now offering that kind of environment to anyone in South Australia or perhaps nationally. If for some reason children have to be sent to schools in other than their own communities, it is no longer necessary to contemplate putting them into private schools and paying as much as \$10 000 or \$12 000 a year. The community at Geranium are now prepared to offer board for the children and to provide them with supervision appropriate to the needs of the individual, from midnight on Sunday through to the following Sunday at midnight and to look after those children in a caring environment.

An advertisement to that effect, although misplaced, appeared on page 179 of the *Sunday Mail*. More will be heard about this in other publications throughout the rest of the week. The people of Geranium who have taken this creative step to ensure the survival of the numbers in their secondary school and, thereby, the completeness of the area school, are to be commended for doing so. It will be a benefit to the children who go there and to the parents who send them there because they will know that the children are in a good environment. It will also be a benefit to the remaining members of the community at Geranium in that they will retain their area school which, at present, is under threat because of this Government's stingy policies.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Until recently, the figure of 77 per cent and percentages in the low eighties in polling terms were associated with John Bannon's personal approval rating. Lately that figure has been attached to the number of people in this community who have avowed themselves opposed to Asian immigration, and it is to that topic that I will refer tonight. As I understand it, 77 per cent was the commonly held figure for the number of Australians who disapproved of Asian immigration and wanted to see it reduced. Last night, the debate hit new lows in Sydney with the performance of one Ron Casey and others. The figures in tonight's *News* indicate that the Australian average is somewhat in excess of 80 per cent. I am heartened to see that, in Adelaide, only 74 per cent of people are against increased Asian immigration while 26 per cent support it.

Mr Duigan: It was only a telephone poll.

Mr ROBERTSON: Yes, it was obviously a self-selecting poll. The important thing from Adelaide's point of view is that it has a significantly better, more tolerant and more humane attitude than that expressed in the other State capitals. I take this opportunity to place on record my commitment to multiculturalism. For the past three or four years I have attended citizenship ceremonies at local councils in the south-western suburbs. In the City of Marion, every six weeks or thereabouts a ceremony takes place and about 60 people take citizenship. In Noarlunga, which is a council of about the same size, fewer people, perhaps surprisingly, take citizenship. In any event, it has a ceremony every three months at which about 50 people undertake Australian citizenship. The third council in my electorate is Brighton, which holds smaller and rather more infrequent ceremonies at which about 20 people a year take out citizenship.

At every ceremony I have advocated and lauded Australia's multicultural policy. I have been supported in that call by the braver Liberals in the local community. Senator Baden Teague has been courageous in his opposition to his Party's Federal policy but every time I have stood on the podium and talked about this, the members for Heysen and Davenport and the Federal members for Mayo and Boothby

have never opposed what I have said and have given me to understand, at least tacitly, that they favour multiculturalism and our present policy.

My commitment to the policy is longstanding. I taught for 17 years in the education system both here and in New South Wales. During that time I taught Iranian Bahai students who escaped from Iran and walked overland to Baluchistan in Pakistan. They spent months and years of privation in refugee camps to make a country like Australia their home. I taught Vietnamese boat people who had escaped from South Vietnam by water. I talked to people who had come out on boats on which half the occupants had been killed. I talked to people whose mothers, sisters and relatives had been raped and others whose relatives had been killed by pirates in the Gulf of Thailand. I taught Cambodian children who do not like to be called Kampuchians and who, during Pol Pot's years, had seen their parents and relatives killed.

I talked with children whose pregnant mothers had been bayoneted. I talked to children whose younger brothers and sisters had been bashed against telephone posts and kerbs. I have talked to others, such as the young accountant with whom I taught at Daws Road High School, who, when the Khmer Rouge came to power in Phnom Penh, took off his wristwatch and threw it into the sea to avoid being identified as literate enough to be able to read the time.

He was smart enough to apply sandpaper to his hands and rub sand into them so that he could pretend to be a farm worker. He spoke French, English and several other foreign languages, but he rapidly made an effort to forget them. He headed as far from Phnom Penh as possible and took refuge with relatives in the country. Because he did that he was able to survive. He did what I suspect a number of quick-thinking people in Phnom Penh did—he got the hell out of the place. As part of my teaching career I also taught Laotian students who escaped from that country. I taught one young person who is now, I understand, an engineer in Adelaide and who, at the age of 14, swam the Mekong River in flood at night. Laotian troops in gun boats with searchlights fired machine guns at him in the water. He made it to Australia and he took this country as his home. He took refuge here and brought his mother, brother and several other relatives to this country.

They are the reasons why I have a commitment to multiculturalism. I must affirm tonight that, if that topic at council citizenship ceremonies is now to be taboo because somebody on the other side of this continent has decided to make political running on it, to cash in at the polls, to use it as an easy ride and pick up the wave while it is there, I have no intention whatever of muting my support for multiculturalism and for a multicultural Australia. I believe

that the people of this country have been conned with respect to this issue because it is easy pickings. Any society that is undergoing a degree of economic insecurity and any people who are subjected to physical insecurity of the kind that some communities experience in this country are ripe for that kind of exploitation. They are ripe for the racists and ripe for the plunder by political Parties that wish to cash in on that sort of cheap sentimentality.

It is worth recording that Australians in this have been better than some of our neighbours. It has been pointed out to me by those who oppose Asian immigration that many of the countries that contribute migrants to Australia have not treated their own migrants and minority populations so well. I do not want to dwell on that at any length, but I make the point that Australia is a relatively tolerant society. The Japanese in their own way have not been kind to their indigenous people, the Ainu, and they have not been particularly kind to their Korean minorities. They have traded consistently with South Africa which Australia, under both conservative and Labor Governments, has not done.

The Malaysians have not been particularly kind to their own indigenous population—the Orang Asli. They have not been particularly kind to Chinese. The Vietnamese have not given the Chinese minorities a good time and the Chinese have tended to practice a degree of Han Chinese imperialism. The Fijians have not been kind to the Indian population. The Indonesians have not been kind to the Irian Jayas or the East Timorese, and similarly the Burmese have given the Shan and the Karen on their borders rather less than a good time.

I think, though, that that can be excused for many of the reasons I have outlined. It can be excused because those people are hungry and desperate and, because in that climate, racism is a natural recourse for those people. Until recently, Australians have perhaps been spared that and, for that reason, I believe that Australians have been rather kinder and rather more well adjusted and generous in their attitude to others.

My conclusion, notwithstanding the results of the survey on the front page of tonight's *News*, is that Australians are a good and generous people. They have, in the main, welcomed outsiders. I believe that they are capable of being and forming a multicultural society. I also believe, though, because of present economic stringencies, that they are capable of being duped, and that is what has happened. The poisonous rhetoric being pumped out by Liberals in Canberra is inflaming our society, and the sooner Australians wise up to that and take an honest political line, the better.

Motion carried.

At 10.16 the House adjourned until Wednesday 17 August at 2 p.m.