

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 13 February 1990

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

**RATES AND LAND TAX REMISSION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purpose mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: WINE GRAPE PRICES

A petition signed by 260 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to legislate to protect wine grape prices was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: MURRAY RIVER REGULATIONS

A petition signed by 1 326 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to review the Murray River fishery regulations and implement a river fishery management plan was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: DRUG OFFENCES

A petition signed by 269 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to amend bail provisions for drug trafficking offences was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: VIRGINIA WATER SUPPLY

A petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide a reticulated water supply north of Virginia was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

PETITION: WALLAROO JETTY

A petition signed by 443 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to ban public use of the Wallaroo jetty while vessels are berthed was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
Declared Drugs of Dependence—Fenetylline.
Declared Prohibited Substances—Fenetylline.

Declared Poisons—Fenetylline.
Declared Prescription Drugs—Fenetylline.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Commissioner for Consumer Affairs and Standards—
Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Motor Vehicles Act, 1959—Regulations—Disabled Per-
sons Parking Permits.
Road Traffic Act, 1961—Regulations—Keith District
Hospital.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Real Property Act, 1886—Regulations—Solicitors and
Land Brokers Changes.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education
(Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Local Government Finance Authority Act, 1983—Reg-
ulation—Riverton District Hospital.

District Council By-laws—

Onkaparinga—

No. 1 —Permits and Penalties.
No. 5 —Caravans and Camping.
No. 6 —Animals and Birds.
No. 7 —Dogs.
No. 10—Repeal of By-laws.

Willunga—

No. 1 —Repeal of By-laws.
No. 2 —Petrol Pumps.
No. 3 —Bees.
No. 4 —Cattle and Horses.
No. 5 —Garbage Bins.
No. 7 —Nuisances.
No. 8 —Tents.
No. 9 —Height of Fences.
No. 10—Caves.
No. 11—Camping.
No. 12—Caravans.
No. 13—Vehicles for Hire.
No. 18—Parklands.

QUESTION TIME

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I direct a question to the Premier. Has the South Australian Government at all times had confidence in the manner in which Mr Faris discharged his responsibilities as head of the NCA? In particular, does the South Australian Government endorse the actions of Mr Faris in relation to the first report on the Operation Ark investigation, completed by Mr Justice Stewart, and endorse his criticisms of the Stewart report?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The South Australian Government took the view that it must deal with the National Crime Authority as constituted at any one time. The Chairman and members of the authority are not appointed by the South Australian Government. Such appointments are made by the Federal Government and are subject to some scrutiny—

Mr D.S. Baker: Do you pay them?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No. The South Australian Government pays for the office of the National Crime Authority here in Adelaide. The manager or director of that office is appointed in consultation with the South Australian Government. As far as the National Crime Authority and its Chairman are concerned—Mr Justice Stewart and then Mr Faris—those appointments are entirely in the hands of the Federal Government.

I put to the House the situation in which the Government finds itself in relation to any matter with which the National Crime Authority is dealing. We can make references to the authority and it is up to the authority how it carries out those references, conducts its inquiries and develops its

findings. Ultimately it reports to the South Australian Government.

We cannot second guess the authority on either its methodology or the means by which it arrives at a particular recommendation or, indeed, on a particular test of any report. That was well illustrated in the case of Operation Ark. It now appears that the authority, chaired by Mr Justice Stewart, had reached a stage of completion of a report and had it in readiness to forward to the South Australian Government. Prior to taking that action the new authority came into office. The new authority reviewed that report and, for reasons set out in the letter from Mr Faris (tabled by my colleague the Attorney-General), decided that it was not appropriate to adopt that as its official report or forward it as such. It forwarded a shorter report.

Incidentally, in talking about the two reports it must be always pointed out that they agree on the fundamental issue that corruption was not involved in this case. The reports are critical in different ways about police operations and the follow-up of certain complaints—no question of that. In that fundamental finding they do not differ. It is not a case of Mr Justice Stewart finding corruption and Mr Faris saying that there was none. There is no such argument between the two authorities. However, an argument exists about methodology on the two matters, as a comparison shows.

We were in a situation where the authority, as constituted at the time the report was forwarded, was headed by Mr Faris and we received his report. That is the report of the authority. Subsequently we asked for and received the report prepared by Mr Justice Stewart. It is not for us to judge which is the correct or proper report—we had to deal with the report we had. However, as the Attorney-General pointed out, some of the recommendations contained in the Stewart report were not endorsed by the Faris report. Nonetheless, action will take place. We are looking at the two reports.

In relation to any matters before the NCA at the moment, we can only receive the reports as they become available and take action in accordance with recommendations made. Whether the Chairman be Mr Faris or someone else, that is the situation. A change of Chairman of the authority, as has just occurred in the past day, does not affect the operations of the Adelaide reference or the Adelaide office. That work is continuing. I hope that it is brought to a conclusion and that we receive a report as soon as possible.

SENATE VACANCY

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Premier advise the House of what procedures will be adopted for filling a casual Senate vacancy where such a vacancy arises immediately prior to a general Federal election? It has been widely reported that South Australian Liberal Senator Tony Messner intends to resign his seat in the Senate, leaving a casual vacancy for the unexpired portion of his term, that is, about three years. The timing of the Senator's resignation is, as yet, unclear. Under our Federal Constitution the vacancy would ordinarily be filled at a joint sitting of the two Houses of this Parliament.

However, as a general Federal election is imminent, it has been put to me that under the Constitution the vacancy could be filled at that election. Under such an arrangement seven Senate vacancies would be decided at the election rather than the usual six. This procedure would mean that the vacancy could be decided by the people of South Australia directly rather than by 69 elected representatives forming an electoral college.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is relevant because, whilst it is probably true that in practice the Senate can no longer be seen as a true State's House, the State has a lively interest in the activities of its Senators and, under the Constitution, where a casual vacancy occurs, the relevant State Parliament makes the recommendation for the filling of that vacancy. So, when one reads that a casual vacancy is to be created, clearly that triggers the interests of this Parliament as to when and how such a vacancy should be filled.

Of course, in asking the question the honourable member will probably recall that he was a member of this House, as was I, the last time I can remember this situation arising. I refer to the vacancy that arose when the then Senator Hall retired or resigned from the Senate in order to stand for the seat of Hawker in the Federal election that was taking place at that time. Senator Hall, as it turned out, remained out of Parliament because he was not able to win that seat from Mr Jacobi.

Be that as it may, the vacancy was created and the South Australian Parliament—the two Houses jointly—were called on to fill the vacancy. The dispute that arose at that time was who was the most appropriate person to fill the vacancy to accord with the convention that we have always abided by in this State—a convention which was breached quite scandalously in New South Wales and Queensland in the 1970s—to replace a retiring Senator by one nominated by the Party from which the Senator came.

The conclusion reached on that occasion was that, although Mr Hall had in fact withdrawn from the Australian Democrats-LM group and was obviously preselected to stand for the Liberal Party, it was appropriate to reflect the wishes of the electors at the time that he was elected (he did not stand as a Liberal candidate) and, accordingly, the now Senator Haines was appointed to fill that vacancy. As it happened, she stood in the subsequent election and was not re-elected, so her period in the Senate was very short.

There was another occasion in the late 1960s when the Hon. Martin Cameron, in similar circumstances, was nominated to fill a casual vacancy which had been created by the death of a sitting Liberal senator. But, in this instance—and this bears very much on the case we have before us—there was a Federal election due shortly after that and the procedure was that, while the Hon. Martin Cameron, representing the Liberal Party, was appointed to fill that casual vacancy at the next election, that vacancy was put up to the electors and Senator Don Cameron, who was nominated by the Labor Party, took the seat.

A lot has happened since that time, but I believe that the situation is somewhat similar in this case. If as originally declared Senator Messner was to step down just before the Federal election or even while it was in progress, one would say that there is probably a reason to fill that vacancy at that election; in other words, add to the number of senators who are available for election and let the people decide that overall.

If, however, Senator Messner does not resign until after the Federal election, that hypothetical situation could not arise: one is simply talking about filling the Senator's residual term. Of course, amendments have been made to the Constitution, but I am not sure of their detail. I know that this convention of replacing a senator with a member of the Party from which the retiring senator belonged is now entrenched in the Constitution, and so it should be. I make it quite clear that there is absolutely no question that, if a vacancy is available because of Senator Messner's retirement, my Party will support the nominee of the Liberal Party for that position, and that nominee happens to be the

member for Custance. He will be supported in those circumstances. However, I am not sure about what happens if an election occurs around that time. I will refer that question to my colleague the Attorney-General for a considered reply.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I address my question to the Premier. When was the South Australian Government informed of the decision by Mr Faris to resign as head of the NCA? Was the Government or the Attorney-General consulted about any aspect of that resignation? Has the Government been made aware of any reason, other than ill-health, for that resignation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We were informed of the resignation some time Monday afternoon. We were advised of that cryptically, and I am not quite sure from where the message came, but I think it was phoned through to my office or the Attorney-General's office. We were advised that Mr Faris had tendered his resignation on the ground of ill-health. There was no further detail at that time.

Secondly, we were not consulted in any way, and nor should we have been consulted because, as I pointed out in my answer to the Leader, the appointment of the Chairman of the NCA is entirely a matter for the Federal Government and not a matter for us.

SEAT OF CUSTANCE

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Can the Minister of Finance advise the House of the estimated cost of, and whether provision has been made in the current budget for, conducting a by-election for the seat of Custance, which must be held when the current member carries out his publicly stated intention of resigning?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Walsh for his question. Of course, as I have assumed the portfolio and responsibilities of the Minister of Finance, this is a question that interests me. Members would know that all Ministers of Finance are pretty careful with the dollar. That was the first thing that struck me: I was not interested in the politics; I was not interested in the controversy; I was not interested in the backbiting; I was interested only in how much it would cost.

I was quite alarmed when I found out that the cost was about \$75 000. So, I immediately asked whether any provision had been made for this in this financial year. Obviously, the answer was, 'No, no provision has been made.' That immediately poses a problem. Upon reflection, it does not look as though we need to spend the money anyway; it appears that it is moving further and further into the future. I had made some arrangements to include it in next year's estimates, but I believe it will probably extend even further. It is quite—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Minister has answered the question. I call on the member for Bragg.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): In view of the serious conflict between Mr Justice Stewart and Mr Faris over conclusions to be reached from the Operation Ark investigation, will the Government request the responsible Federal Minister to invite Mr Faris to appear before the Federal Parliament's

NCA watchdog committee, notwithstanding his resignation as Chairman of the authority, so that Mr Faris can account to that committee for his actions over the Operation Ark investigation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Surely, that is the prerogative of the committee. It has its rights under the Act; it has its responsibility. If the committee believes that is an appropriate action to take, I am sure it will take it. So, I do not understand the burden of the honourable member's question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

KIDMAN PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Education inform the House whether the Education Department has made a decision on what will happen to the Kidman Park High School building and the surrounding areas? Constituents in the Kidman Park area have been inquiring as to what the future of the Kidman Park High School building and its surrounding areas might be. Many rumours have circulated as to what may or may not happen to this valuable piece of real estate.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I can advise him that the Education Department is currently assessing the long-term future of the Kidman Park High School site. It is a substantial property holding that is no longer required for use as a suburban secondary school. The Education Department has entered into a short-term rental agreement with units of the Department of Recreation and Sport so that the buildings are used in the community interest and in the interests of the Government, achieving the most efficient use of property. The Education Department is providing a caretaker service to help ensure that the grounds and buildings are maintained and, of course, secure. The Woodville council has been advised of these current arrangements. I have been advised that facilities, such as the gymnasium, have continued to be made available to community groups who have used them under previous arrangements with the school.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Following the Attorney-General's statement to another place last Thursday that the Government was considering a number of reports following the first 12 months operation of the NCA in South Australia, will the Premier reveal precisely how many reports the Government has received; without jeopardising any ongoing investigations, say what matters those reports deal with; say whether, in view of the reports it now has, the Government has any reason to change the view put to this House in a Ministerial Statement by the Deputy Premier on 16 August 1988 that while 'there has been some corruption in the South Australian Police Force, no evidence has been produced of corruption in the public sector generally'; and, finally, indicate when the Government will make a public statement on its response to these NCA reports?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Attorney-General was referring to his intention effectively to give a progress report on the stages of the inquiries reached by the NCA on a number of matters. He is currently awaiting information so that he can finalise an appropriate statement to Parliament as a kind of 12-month review of the activities that have taken place. In that statement any of the references under

consideration will be referred to in whatever is the appropriate way so that there will be some understanding of the work that the NCA is doing. I am not aware that any of those matters have as yet reached a conclusion in the sense of the NCA's having forwarded a final report and closed its file on the matter. It may be that, by the time the Attorney-General makes his statement, which will be within the next couple of weeks, that is the case. As I understand it at present, the Attorney intends to make a kind of progress report on matters under consideration by the NCA.

FOREIGN STUDENTS

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education explain why the Government wants to increase the number of fee-paying foreign students studying at South Australia's tertiary education institutions over the next three years? I noticed a newspaper report attributed to the Minister saying that the Bannan Government and South Australia's tertiary institutions are successfully exporting South Australia's tertiary education sector to South-East Asia and that the benefits are expected to flow both ways.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in further education, which does not seem to be shared by members opposite. I have informed the chief executive officers of the various tertiary institutions in South Australia that the State Government is keen to treble the number of fee-paying foreign students studying in South Australia's universities and other tertiary institutions over the next three years. Last year there were 600 full fee-paying foreign students in South Australia's universities and colleges who paid \$4.5 million in fees. The honourable member is correct when he says that the Government and South Australia's tertiary institutions are already successfully exporting our tertiary education sector to South-East Asia, with the benefits flowing both ways.

Members opposite might be pleased to know that students from neighbouring countries, such as Malaysia, Hong Kong and Indonesia, gain access to quality education and in return South Australia enjoys an economic boost and also additional educational opportunities are created for our own community. The presence of all types of overseas students will enhance our education system and generate demand for additional local accommodation, goods and services, which contributes to the well-being of local businesses.

Overseas fee-paying students do not take local student places. They are additional students who pay their own education costs. Over time the South Australian institutions will use many profits to enhance the quality of their educational offerings or their local student intake, and that is already happening in TAFE colleges. If we succeed in trebling the number of students to 2 000 in 1992, revenue will be in excess of \$20 million.

ADELAIDE CASINO

Mr BECKER (Hanson): My question is directed to the Premier. As the operator of the Adelaide Casino has recently written off \$1.2 million in bad debts, is the Government considering any amendments to the Casino Act to ensure that the spirit and intent of the Act is followed to prevent any gambling by credit? The latest annual report of the Casino Supervisory Authority, tabled last Thursday, has revealed the extent of the casino's potential losses due to bad debts. The report further reveals a dispute which began

in September 1988 and continued until May last year between the authority and the holder of the casino licence (the Lotteries Commission) over payment for gambling chips by cheque.

Without advising the authority, the Lotteries Commission had given the casino operator permission to change the management agreement to allow the casino to hold cheques tendered for payment of chips for a period of up to 30 days before presentation to a bank. The Casino Supervisory Authority took the view that this action was 'contrary to and inconsistent with' section 17 of the Casino Act which prohibits gambling chips being sold on credit. However, it was only under the threat of a direction being issued by the authority that the Lotteries Commission finally accepted the decision of the authority. In the meantime, losses incurred by the casino due to dishonoured cheques increased steeply.

In May 1988 cheques totalling just over \$222 000 had not been met on presentation, but by the close of the latest reporting period the authority revealed that 'the practice of accepting and holding cheques from junket players resulted in \$1.2 million being written off as bad debts with little prospect of recovery'—a loss which reduced the amount of casino revenue payable to the Government.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will not make the mistake of answering the question in my first sentence. I thank the honourable member for his question. The annual report of the Casino Supervisory Authority was tabled last week by the Treasurer.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will tell the honourable member in a moment. There are lots of things to be revealed.

The SPEAKER: The Minister will address his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was being addressed by the member for Hanson.

The SPEAKER: The Minister will address his remarks to the Chair. Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The report of the authority was tabled by the Treasurer on Thursday. The explanation to the question is an extract from that report, so there has obviously been no attempt to hide anything nor has there been any suggestion of anything untoward. The reason I am answering the question is that at about 4 o'clock yesterday this Act was kindly donated to me by the Treasurer.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I should be pleased—

The SPEAKER: The Minister will address his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As the report indicates, a difference of opinion between the Lotteries Commission and the authority was resolved in favour of the authority. It is always difficult, in relation to casinos, to decide how to handle credit—what is considered to be credit—and whether holding cheques for five days is considered to be credit is arguable. I believe there are legal opinions which say that that is not contrary to the spirit of the Act. Nevertheless, the authority said that it was and, according to the report, the practice has had to cease. In the long term, that may be detrimental to the profits of the casino and, consequently, to consolidated revenue.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not saying that I support it but, according to the argument, if some form of accommodation is not made towards big players in this area, the turnover and profit will not be obtained.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Adelaide Casino is operating in a market place and it is a world market place for all casinos. As the person who actually drew up the Act and put it through, I can say that it seemed perfectly clear to me and, subsequently, the authority came to the same view. I am not sure that that is in the interests of consolidated revenue, and that is my primary concern. If a lot of those big players are eliminated, a lot of profit for the State is also eliminated, and that would be a pity.

If the casino operators feel that their operations are unnecessarily inhibited by the Act, they should make representations to the Government to have the Act amended. I am sure that all members in this House would consider that matter fairly because we all want the casino and other businesses to operate in this State as profitably as possible and on a level playing field. I have no doubt that the Government would seriously consider any request, but they must make that request.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: They certainly have not. I have been responsible for that area only since 4 o'clock yesterday, so the operators would have to be quick. Nevertheless, I will be having some discussions about it later this afternoon.

KATNOOK 3 GAS FLOW

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with details of the recent major gas flow from the Katnook 3 well in the South-East and say what it will mean in development terms for South Australia?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The short answer is that the development outcome from the Katnook discoveries will become very much clearer in the near future. While the test flows from the Katnook 2 and 3 wells have been outstanding, and very large by Australian standards, the important thing from a development point of view is not the rate of flow of gas but the amount of gas in the reservoir: in other words, are the reservoirs large enough to support a commercial project?

At the moment, there is a reasonable degree of optimism that the reserves will be sufficient to establish a local project, and the process of formally establishing that is currently under way. A wireline crew is due to start at Katnook 3 today on a period of production testing that is expected to last about two weeks. At the same time, the Department of Mines and Energy has begun the task of calculating the reserves available from the Katnook structure on the basis of the information that has just been gained from Katnook 3. I am informed by the department that those calculations are expected to be completed some time next week. If the reserves are sufficient, the various parties will be in a position to finalise contracts and plans for commercial development.

Members will also be interested in the fact that seismic surveys are currently being carried out in the two petroleum exploration licences which adjoin PEL 32 in which the Katnook discoveries have been made. The surveys will define future drilling targets in petroleum exploration licences 39 and 40. In addition, the consortium involved in the Katnook discoveries will carry out a further seismic survey in March. Members will also be interested in a progress report from Spencer Gulf, where the semi-submersible rig *Southern Cross* is drilling the offshore wildcat well Anna 1. At last report, that well was at a depth of 256 metres.

ADELAIDE CASINO

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Will the Premier say what management standards and practices at the Adelaide Casino have been found to be so unsatisfactory that they have resulted in major senior staff changes? I seek this information in view of the revelation in the 1988-89 annual report of the Casino Supervisory Authority that the authority, the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and the Lotteries Commission shared concerns about a 'lessening of standards' of management at the casino. According to the report, some actual examples of this were provided and, subsequently, the authority was advised that there had been 'some major changes in senior staff'.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I do not have that information. In fact, I do not have any information other than that which was made available in the annual report. I had to smile at the word 'revelation' as though it was something made available quite spectacularly. The annual report is quite open and was laid on the table of Parliament. The word 'revelation' was a little bit of hype. However, there are some important issues in the question and I will obtain a detailed answer for the member for Light and let him have it as soon as possible.

WEST LAKES BOULEVARD

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Following the State Government's announcement that it intends to bid for the 1998 Commonwealth Games, will the Minister of Transport ensure that the remainder of West Lakes Boulevard is widened by 1998 to cater for the anticipated increase in traffic for sporting events at Football Park and/or the West Lakes waterways and surrounds?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I assure the member for Albert Park that the State Government's bid for the Commonwealth Games is not merely an elaborate ploy to pork barrel the honourable member's electorate. I assure the member for Albert Park that, if indeed we are successful in securing the Commonwealth Games for Adelaide, a number of changes and improvements will have to be made. That is one of the benefits of having the games here. Whilst it enhances our prestige, gives us world exposure, and so on, there are real benefits in respect of employment, improved infrastructure, and so on.

I am sure that a wonderful facility such as West Lakes will see improvements in and around the stadium for the member for Albert Park. I am sure that West Lakes Boulevard, whether triggered by the Commonwealth Games or otherwise, will eventually be widened when traffic volumes on that road warrant it. However, it is competing with many other projects as requested by members.

EURILLA

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning confirm that the Government is attempting to stop a development of the Eurilla site at Crafers because it will compete with the proposed Mount Lofty project, in which the Government is a joint venturer, and will she immediately reconsider the Government's actions?

In November last year, the Stirling council approved development applications for the Eurilla site at Crafers, acting, it believed, consistently with previous planning determinations on similar developments at Mount Lofty

House, which included Crown Law opinion and advice from the Department of Environment and Planning on how to treat such projects. In considering applications for the Eurilla site, the council consulted extensively with the Department of Environment and Planning before making its final decision on 14 November. However, no comment was received from the department until 19 December when the Crown Solicitor wrote to the council indicating he had been instructed by the Minister for Environment and Planning to consider whether there should be a judicial review of the council decision on the grounds that it was unlawful.

In his letter the Crown Solicitor indicated a willingness to talk further to the council prior to taking such action but, just two days later, on 21 December, the council was advised, without any further consultation, that a judicial review would be sought as soon as possible. I have been contacted by people involved in this matter who are concerned that the Government's decision to seek a judicial review is an attempt to delay and frustrate a development at Eurilla because, in the Government's view, it will compete with its proposed joint venture development on the nearby Mount Lofty summit. There is also serious concern amongst Stirling ratepayers that legal action over the Eurilla project will expose the council to further significant legal costs on top of those already being incurred in the continuing Ash Wednesday saga.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question and, as someone suggested, it was more like a grievance debate than a question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, it would seem that the natives are a little restless today. In relation to the question, which I think was trying to impugn motives to me and my department with respect to whether certain actions were being taken to ensure the protection or otherwise of a proposal in which the Government certainly does have an interest, I categorically state that the answer is 'No'. In terms of clearly debating and discussing in my answer each and every point, including the dates referred to—14 November and 19 December—I will call for a report from my department, and I will be happy to provide the honourable member with an answer.

VIDEO-CONFERENCING

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of details of TAFE's new high technology teaching method called video-conferencing? Last Friday the Minister launched a series of TAFE trials of a new teaching method which involves linking a lecturer at one college with student groups at one or more location through the use of Codec, a new technology which provides instant transmission to television monitors through established Telecom lines.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am pleased at the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's interest in further education; I will be quite happy to give him a briefing on it some time. Last Friday I was very pleased to open a new high technology facility at the Adelaide College which links that college with the Light colleges of the Barossa and Clare. Basically, it is a first in Australian further education. It uses the latest in high technology and is attracting enormous interest from universities interstate and in South Australia. It gives the South Australian Department of TAFE the leading edge in high technology in Australia.

Video-conferencing has obvious advantages in terms of flexibility where teaching resources are scarce or where there

is heavy demand for a subject. As the honourable member said, TAFE can use the Codec system to link one of its major metropolitan colleges and all its courses to a smaller country college and deliver the teaching skills of a single lecturer simultaneously to students at various locations. That is why the Opposition's negative attitude to this system is so puzzling, because what we are doing is a major initiative to assist rural students.

I am sure that constituents in rural constituencies, if they ever visit these colleges, would be very pleased to know that the State Government is making this commitment to rural TAFE students in this State. Video-conferencing reduces the need for lecturers to spend unproductive time travelling between campuses. I believe that video-conferencing, supported by appropriate study materials and local teaching guidance, will become as popular as face-to-face classroom contact.

Satellite transmission is also possible with Codec, giving video-conferencing great potential for improving educational services to outback areas, particularly Aboriginal communities. I am sure that video-conferencing will be stretched out to private industry because, as we know, on-the-job training is as important as off the job training and there will be direct links from TAFE into the workplace for skill training or management improvement tuition.

AL MUKAIRISH AUSTRALIA PTY LTD

Mr MEIER (Goyder): What action has the Minister of Agriculture taken to ensure the Al Mukairish Australia Pty Ltd sheep exporting company does not leave South Australia following the recent suspension of that company's export licence by the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation? Al Mukairish Australia contributes over \$30 million annually to South Australia's economy. Local farmers have an outlet for millions of their wethers and young slaughter sheep through this company, and last year farmers received \$600 000 for hay used in the feedlot.

Since the export licence suspension some three weeks ago Al Mukairish has gone offshore for its sheep. New Zealand is benefiting enormously at our cost. Many people stand to lose their jobs in South Australia and the company's 450 acre feedlot at Dublin is up for sale. It has been put to me that the company's future in South Australia looks 'pretty gloomy'. At the same time, I am given to understand that the Government could be a negotiator between Al Mukairish and the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation and stop a \$30 million plus industry leaving South Australia's shores.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The situation with respect to the live sheep export trade is that one needs a number of players in the game. First, we need people producing the sheep for export, and then we need people to herd them together ready for shipping and to transport them through a shipping company which has an export licence and which can take them to the overseas market. The situation in respect of Al Mukairish is that previously it had an export licence, in other words, the capacity for shipping sheep as well as the capacity to collect herds within South Australia.

As the member for Goyder quite rightly identified, that capacity is presently up for sale. From the State Government's point of view, we are concerned that there are companies with export licences serving the industry in South Australia and that there is capacity within South Australia for the collecting of herds ready for the export market. We maintain an active interest in that area, dealing not just with one particular company but with any of the companies

that have an interest in this area. It would be improper for me to suggest that the withdrawal by the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation of the export licence for Al Mukairish was not appropriate.

Clearly, the corporation deemed that that let down the interests of others who had export licences within Australia at a time when the industry was vulnerable and when it was important from the AMLC's point of view that there be a united approach in regard to the Saudi market so that Australia could force the Saudis back into our market place. As I understand the situation with Al Mukairish, it went into a situation where prices for sheep had exploded in Saudi Arabia. Members may recall that I predicted that that might be an outcome when I answered a question on the live sheep export trade last year. In fact, there was a price explosion and this one company broke rank and attempted to take advantage of the situation.

When one company broke rank, we were faced with a vulnerable industry trying to compete in this very difficult market. We will continue to liaise with the industry at large. We will ensure that we are liaising with the Federal Minister for Agriculture and the AMLC to make sure that the best approach is available for South Australian producers, so that they can get the maximum market potential. I am not prepared to say that there is a one-off which we should be doing for one company but which may jeopardise the interests of producers in this State.

CHELTENHAM RACECOURSE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport tell the House how the redevelopment of Cheltenham racecourse is progressing? Cheltenham racecourse has been closed for months because it is being reconstructed. I believe that the aim of the reconstruction is to bring Cheltenham up to the standard of Morphettville and Victoria Park racecourses and to secure Cheltenham's future in South Australian racing. My local bookie and several of my fellow punters are eager to know when the 'sport of kings' will resume in the north-western suburbs.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Spence for his question. Obviously, he is keen to see this facility re-established in his electorate, and I am sure most South Australian supporters of the racing industry, particularly the gallops, would endorse his views. The redevelopment of Cheltenham racecourse is proceeding well and is on target. There has been some expansion in the cost of the proposed grandstand and related facilities. The cost of the grandstand is estimated at \$8.78 million, which is above the \$7.63 million originally budgeted.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am sure that the member for Hanson will be interested to know that the redevelopment of the facility includes extension of the stand to allow for upgraded catering facilities, with about \$200 000 being allocated for that; and an additional \$250 000 has been provided for the upgrading of the communications system. The honourable member referred to his bookmaking friends, for whom these changes will be of direct benefit. Every bookmaker working on course will have a television screen for odds information and that will be available for his or her personal use.

An amount of \$137 000 has been spent on upgrading the sprinkler system, and I am sure that members who visited the old Cheltenham course would have been concerned about the fire risk. Indeed, a fire occurred just before it was closed for redevelopment. I am sure the fire brigade regarded

it as a severe risk in terms of fire potential. Overall, I believe that at Cheltenham we will see one of the most modern of all Australian racecourse facilities, certainly with other expenditure with regard to the track and surrounding facilities for the benefit of the public. I am sure that the honourable member, his constituents and other members of the South Australian community will have many hours enjoying the facilities.

The stand is to be named the Wyndham Hill Smith Stand after Mr Hill Smith, who is the former Chairman of the Port Adelaide Racing Club and who has been a leading owner for many years. Windy is delighted about that. I am sure that the opening will be enjoyed by all. Certainly, the racecourse will be one of the pre-eminent facilities in South Australia. I am delighted to say that it is on track, and racing will recommence in March 1990.

1998 COMMONWEALTH GAMES

Mr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): In planning Adelaide's bid for the 1998 Commonwealth Games, can the Premier give a guarantee that there will be no need for further encroachment on the parklands for sporting or car parking facilities?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would have thought that if there was one area to which one could point where this Government has done more than any other Government in the history of the State, it is in terms of what is commonly referred to as 'freeing the parklands'. If we look at just about everything—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, indeed: good point. I thank the member for Custance for reminding me that a substantial area of the Hackney bus depot has been returned to public use through the erection of the tropical conservatory in the surrounding area. In fact, we have a timetable whereby that will go. That depot was established in 1908. This Government is the first to have taken tangible steps to ensure the return of a considerable acreage of that area, and we will see it finally cleared. However, that is not the only area that one can point to. In just about every area of the parklands one can point to something, such as the railway yards and surrounds along the Torrens bank, the closure of the Adelaide Gaol, the Post-Tel area on West Terrace, and a range of other areas.

This is part of a systematic attempt to ensure that as much of the original parkland area as possible is returned—and indeed more, because some of that area was stipulated for public purposes, and even some of that has been returned to public access. In the future, there will be a number of other projects relating particularly to the area off Frome Road; we will see that area returned over time. All I can say to the honourable member is that, if that has been the consistent policy of this Government, if that is something on which we have spent a considerable amount of time, money and energy, we will not suddenly reverse that policy because we have a massive one-off event in Adelaide. On the contrary, one of the strongest reasons we can attract something like the Commonwealth Games is because of the amenity of the parklands. They will not be jeopardised or alienated for an event.

COMMONWEALTH CORPORATIONS ACT

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs in another

place. Has the Minister determined South Australia's position in view of the High Court's rejection of certain aspects of the Commonwealth corporations legislation? What are the likely consequences for the future regulation of company and security law in Australia following that decision?

As honourable members would know, last Thursday the High Court rejected the validity of the incorporation provisions of the Commonwealth Corporations Act in favour of the challenge by South Australia and its successful co-plaintiffs, New South Wales and Western Australia. Without future agreement between the Commonwealth and the States there is the risk of a Commonwealth parallel regulatory company and security system to that operated now by the States as part of a cooperative scheme. As the Commonwealth scheme was due to operate fully from 1 July, the States clearly had indicated a legitimate and continuing interest in the development of company law in Australia.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his most important question. The Attorney-General is looking most carefully at the judgment brought down by the High Court in this matter before bringing the issue to Cabinet for the development of a Government position prior to the next meeting of the Ministerial Council, of which the Attorney-General in this State is the Chairperson. At that stage a response will be developed among all the States with respect to the dilemma in which we now find ourselves.

INTEREST RATE RELIEF SCHEME

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): My question is directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction. When did Cabinet approve the interest rate relief scheme announced by the Premier in his election policy speech on 13 November; had the scheme been costed by the Treasury before the Premier's announcement; is the Minister prepared to release documents to verify the dates of the Cabinet approval and the Treasury costings; and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The detail of the home interest relief mortgage scheme, which was announced by the Premier during the election campaign, was part of a strategy which was considered by the Government. In terms of the program of the election which was announced by the Premier in the process of a policy speech—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Members opposite are not interested in the answer. The situation was that it was included as part of the discussions that the Government undertook in looking at the assistance that the Government could offer the South Australian community.

As I said last week, our scheme offered something past January 1990: we offered a scheme which looked at continued relief to those who were suffering disadvantage and social and financial distress, not just in a cynical process as outlined by the then Leader of the Opposition in endeavouring to win a few votes at the point of the election.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is the Minister's debate of the material irrelevant to the question but maybe in some way related to it legitimate in the circumstances?

The SPEAKER: The Chair considers it legitimate. The question was fairly broad in its approach and I considered it legitimate. I call the Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I have finished my answer.

CONTRACT TEACHERS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Education inform the House about the progress made in reducing the number of contract teachers in schools at Port Augusta and Port Pirie?

Members will recall that last year concern was expressed by residents in Spencer Gulf towns about the number of contract teachers employed in local high schools. I understand that one of the objectives of the curriculum guarantee was to reduce the number of contract teachers in the education system. Is that happening?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in education. A reduction in the number of contract teachers employed by the Education Department was one of the important issues addressed in the curriculum guarantee package, which was successfully negotiated last year. Honourable members will know that contract teachers are employed by the Education Department to fill vacancies caused by permanent officers who are absent for one reason or another—long service leave, accouchement leave, extended sick leave, or the like.

So, it is not simply a matter of converting contract positions to permanent positions: there is the problem of management of personnel, as well as enormous expenditure problems. So, the reduction of contract positions, which is a desirable outcome, needs to occur over a number of years.

As I have said, this was an interrelated aspect of the curriculum guarantee package which had two main facets: first, providing better educational opportunities for students in our schools; and, secondly, and very importantly, improving career structures for teachers and other staff. Those two aspects of the guarantee are interrelated in numerous ways, and the result is a much better deal for teachers and students.

The major gain for teachers was the establishment of the skills related career path with better opportunities to perform a broader range of roles and, indeed, to be rewarded for remaining in schools rather than moving out of schools to obtain those career path opportunities and the greater rewards for those additional duties.

In the area of contract teachers, an undertaking was given to reduce the proportion to 4 per cent of the total employment of the teacher component of the department by the end of 1991 and thereafter reduce the proportion further to a steady level of no more than 2 per cent by 1995. This reduction is dependent upon the continued cooperation of the South Australian Institute of Teachers for the balancing of the taking of leave evenly over the school year.

I am pleased to inform the honourable member—and indeed all members—that the Education Department is on course in this matter. For example, I am advised that last year high schools in Port Augusta had 23 contract teachers and this year they have nine. Last year in Port Pirie high schools had 33 contract teachers and this year they have five. To complete the picture, I inform members that, in the Spencer Gulf region, high schools in Whyalla had 39 contract teachers in 1989 and this year that number has been reduced to eight.

So, this matter, when considered with the abolition of country service for teachers, has reduced the need to appoint contract teachers to temporary vacancies created in the past in country schools. At the same time, a better country teaching incentive scheme will help ensure that country students have access to experienced teachers.

NORWOOD FIRE STATION

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. In view of the statement by the Minister of Education in the *Advertiser* of 24 November last year—the day before the election—denying a statement by his opponent for the seat of Norwood, Mr Bob Jackson, that the Norwood fire station would be closed after the election, will the Minister immediately review the decision now made to close that station without any consultation with the Kensington-Norwood council and the local community; and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The decision to rationalise fire stations throughout the metropolitan area is several years old and has been carried out in a normal sequence of events. The latest part of that program has been the closure of the Norwood fire station. Members may be aware that one cannot get modern fire appliances into that station, that its accommodation is substandard, and that its closure was considered not only desirable but necessary. The quality and level of service to the people of Norwood has not been changed markedly.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Playford I remind the House that this is the honourable member's maiden speech and I ask that the usual courtesy be extended.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I move:

That the following Address in Reply to His Excellency's opening speech be adopted:

May it please Your Excellency—

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

In so moving, let me first congratulate you on your election, Mr Speaker, and express my sincere and wholehearted best wishes for your term in the Chair. I am sure that all members will strive to make your task a memorable and, I hope, an easy one. I am sure that you will make an historic contribution to this Parliament.

I would like to acknowledge the work of my predecessor, the former member for Playford, Mr Terry McRae. He was first elected in May 1970 and represented the seat of Playford until the recent election on 25 November last. Terry McRae never rose to ministerial rank although he occupied the Chair of this House from 1982 to 1985 with considerable distinction. In that period of 19½ years Terry McRae was known as a marvellous representative of the constituents of Playford. He presented to the Government many different viewpoints, solved many local problems and was particularly adaptable—as, in fact, he had to be—because the seat of Playford was moved through a number of redistributions from its original geographic centre, which was in the south of Elizabeth, to the axis that it now occupies in the area comprising Ingle Farm, Para Hills and Pooraka.

I would like to acknowledge many others today, but unfortunately I do not have the time to mention them all. Obviously, for her support, I owe a great debt to my wife,

Davina, to whom I have been married since last August. She has been a tower of strength and I want to acknowledge her contribution because all too often the sacrifices of others, particularly those close to us, go unrecorded and are not recognised. I would also like to make special mention of my former employer and friend, Senator Dominic Foreman, to whom I am greatly indebted for gaining a wealth of experience and knowledge over a fairly turbulent period of 4½ years.

I would like to make special mention of one other key person and that is the State Secretary of the South Australian Labor Party, Mr Terry Cameron. It has been a great pleasure to work with a man as fine, intelligent and diligent as he, and I put on record that I—and I am sure others on this side of the Chamber—acknowledge the key work that he did to help the re-election of the Bannon Government. The fact that I am speaking from this side of the Chamber, rather than the other, is in no small part due to his tireless efforts. Many names spring to mind immediately, and no doubt I will forget others.

I would like the record to show my appreciation of the advice, help and support over the years received from many great men and women in the Labor Party. I will mention a few. The Hon. Trevor Crothers, former Senators Reg Bishop, Jim Toohey and Don Cameron, and my good friend Don Farrell, have all been strong influences on my political life and a tower of strength.

As it is constituted today, the seat of Playford has a large migrant population base. In many respects, those people represent the waves of migration into this State since 1945. The Para Hills area has many British migrants who made Australia their home in the 1960s. In the 1970s, other migrants, largely of British nationality, but also Italians and Greeks, came to live in the Ingle Farm and Gepps Cross areas. In the 1980s, Vietnamese people, who I understand number around 10 000 in South Australia, have also moved to the electorate of Playford. Approximately 1 000 Vietnamese live in my electorate, most of whom live in the older settled area of Pooraka.

With such a large ethnic population or with such ethnic diversity, Government policies are crucial to the well-being of the community. Education needs to be singled out as the most important ingredient in creating a harmonious community. The Bannon Government has come to grips with the issues of cultural diversity and multiculturalism, and in education, particularly in the primary schools in Playford, is this nowhere more apparent. On visiting the schools, as I have done, one sees children of all races happily getting along together, learning cooperatively and pursuing learning strategies which are devised not only to enhance the cultural diversity that is present but to make one culture aware of another. The benefits of our policies are self-evident. This is one of the great success stories of the 1980s; it is one of those policies that in many respects go unsung and are increasingly taken for granted. That, in itself, is a measure of its success. The careful blending of cultures and the cooperative approach in schools is underpinning a community that has matured and accepted diversity.

The seat of Playford has 19 260 electors and it is almost on a par with what is considered to be the electoral norm for the 47 seats in South Australia. It has a limited industrial base with the exception of the Samcor operation at Pooraka which, today, employs a fraction of the people it employed many years ago. Playford is largely a residential area with the usual mix of small businesses. However, important industries provide employment for the residents of Playford in surrounding areas. The question of South Australian economic development is crucial to the residents of Playford

and to all South Australians. It comes as no surprise that this Government has always held that economic development is the cornerstone of our future and that of our children. That is why I wished to join the Government.

Since 1982, the Bannon Government has come to grips with unemployment figures that were almost double what they are today. Some singular successes have been achieved and, rightly, they have had a great deal of media exposure. The submarine project is generating much employment in South Australia, giving us the opportunity of becoming world leaders in technology. It is one of the great achievements of John Bannon and his Government. The contribution that the State will make to the Anzac frigate project and a lot of the work to be done at Technology Park, which is next to my electorate, must be recognised. It will mean that world-class skills will develop in South Australia. It will mean that technology will be moulded, changed and enhanced. It is hoped that the development of weapons systems of this type will lead South Australia to develop projects that will bring more joy to humankind than the presence of weapons systems which I am sure all members would like to see obliterated from the planet.

The development of our industries is crucial to the economic well-being and welfare of the citizens of this State. The employment base of South Australia must be at the top of our agenda. It was with this in mind that, in a recent, much publicised trip, I decided to make myself aware of some of the more rapidly developing economies to the north. I must say from the outset that, as I made clear to the media, my intention was to become aware of and try to come to grips with some of the key points in respect of economic development in those countries.

When I made the decision, I believed it appropriate to go before Parliament commenced so that I would be forearmed and aware of lots of the issues which would arise during this session. With hindsight, I feel that it was foolish to have entered into the project so early in the term. I am of the opinion that, while the trip was of great personal benefit to me, its timing was in error. I make that clear to the House. Having said that, I would still like to share with other members some of the observations that I made during that trip. The official report will be placed in the Library for members to peruse as soon as production and binding has taken place. Although under parliamentary guidelines the report should be completed and presented in up to 90 days, it is my intention to have it available for perusal in the week commencing 6 March, or earlier, depending on its final production.

The basis of my report is that South Australia can gain more from taking positive steps now to encourage and develop trade with north-east Asia and, in particular, with Korea and Japan. We need to plug into the world's most rapidly growing economies to stimulate and develop our own industrial base. In a report that I will present to Parliament, I will include an overview of our current trading position and the likely directions for change in the near future. The report will also deal with visits and observations obtained in banks, factories, distribution centres and Aus-trade centres in Japan and Korea.

I make clear that, whilst I had the pleasure of visiting a number of car plants in Korea and Japan, it was not specifically my intention at all to be so narrow, and comments in the media to that effect should not be attributed to me. In the final section of my report I will make recommendations that I hope will be picked up by Government. Today, I will precis this process and outline the main tenets in the report. Australia is currently enjoying a period of growth that has seen a reduction in unemployment to about

half the level that it was in the early 1980s. In South Australia, a strong trend towards less unemployment and to projects such as the submarine venture at Port Adelaide has led to greater confidence in our future than was the case 10 years ago. This is borne out in surveys measuring consumer demand and consumer expectation. Is there some justification for this? On the other side of the ledger, Australia is facing a ballooning overseas debt that has risen well past \$110 billion and is currently rising at a rate of \$17 billion more for the financial year 1988-89 and, most probably, for 1989-90.

Interest rates have been used to dampen demand, rising to the highest level in the developed world, resulting in considerable hardship. They have also been used to steady a volatile exchange rate that is particularly sensitive to adverse economic indices. On the one hand, Australia appears to be a country of hope, in which employment has never been as widespread as it is now. On the other hand, Australia has clouds over its trading performance and over its ability to continue to deliver the lifestyle that we expect. We do not know whether our children will have the same opportunities that we have had and want for them.

South Australia has always depended on the eastern States for the majority of our sales. When the eastern States have boomed, South Australia has done well. When the eastern markets experience a downturn, it always appears more severe in South Australia. When Sydney sneezes, we have caught a cold. A severe downturn in sales in the eastern States has always meant a corresponding downturn, usually more dramatic for South Australia. A number of economic indices clearly show that South Australia has followed but lagged well behind the growth in the eastern States.

Some of the tables presented in the December 1989 quarterly report of the State Bank of South Australia illustrate the case. The graphic material presented in that document shows in instance after instance the economic nexus that binds us to our eastern States neighbours. Unfortunately, the material also shows that, in general, we have performed below the national average. In terms of employment, our figures per capita are less than the national average. Our population growth has been less and, in the provision of new housing, we have fallen behind the level set by the eastern States. The *Quarterly Economic Report* (page 24) illustrates the case I am making. It states:

While we believe the South Australian economy is well placed to cope with any moderate and short-lived downturn of the national economy, it would cope less well in the event of a more pronounced or longer lasting downturn.

Further in the State Bank report the question is posed: what are the economic challenges of 1990? A profound question indeed, in which we, particularly those on this side of the Chamber, have more than a passing interest. The report continues:

South Australia is still vulnerable to a pronounced downturn in national economic growth. The State's economic performance, notwithstanding the strong growth of 1988 and 1989, can still be improved. In particular, the possibility of employment growth again falling to the very low levels seen prior to 1988, unless the momentum of economic development is maintained, cannot be ignored. Such a slowdown in employment growth would mean, *inter alia*, a renewed exodus of our young and most talented people interstate in search of suitable employment. The prime economic challenge facing South Australia is to maintain an environment which is conducive to business and investment. Government, the bureaucracy, unions, business and the community in general all have a role to play.

We must focus on such things as keeping business and living costs as low as possible; on facilitating the development of business activities in South Australia; on improving productivity and competitiveness; and on promoting the efficiency of our public sector. These things are essential if we are to maintain the standard of living and economic services which we enjoy in South Australia.

South Australia is already well placed to attract new economic development with lower land costs, a more stable industrial relations environment, good transport systems, and generally lower Government taxes and charges. This is backed by a generally high standard of living. The issue for the 1990s is to ensure the further development of this environment, which is often as much about perception as reality, is disrupted as little as possible by short-term political or single interest group considerations.

The problem is that South Australia with only 8 per cent of national population is vulnerable to, and a victim of, national economic trends rather than being a prime initiator.

The production of goods in South Australia for eastern States' markets requires us to keep a competitive cost advantage to overcome problems of transportation. Many goods are assembled in South Australia from eastern States componentary. Further shipment to a point of sale means that a burden of cost is already placed on these goods, and over the years numerous examples of abound companies that have found it easier and necessary to move east.

Full tribute must be given to Governments in South Australia that have grappled with this problem, and many have had notable successes. To the extent that we have two of the principal motor vehicle manufacturers present in South Australia—and, overseas, Adelaide was described to me as 'Australia's Detroit'—shows that long-term manufacturing for primarily a domestic market has been possible. The point remains that the cost of manufacture must be cheaper in South Australia to offset transportation disadvantages.

The fact that the Submarine Corporation decided that Adelaide was a good point for final submarine assembly, and that the cost of manufacture would be less in South Australia, was one of the chief reasons we obtained this most important project. I understand that both tenderers had a preference for Adelaide, although, should politics have intervened, final assembly could have been in at least three other States.

Much credit must be given to the Bannon Government for picking up and running with this project, and for the professional approach adopted to sell the advantages of South Australia. The skills and technology, as well as the employment, will have wider implications than submarines. The Anzac frigate project will see other essential spin-offs and, together, both the frigates and submarines will generate technology and skill.

However, at the end of the day South Australia is a small State at the end of the eastern seaboard, and is dominated by factors largely beyond its control. It is the realisation by government that to be able to play in a wider field might buffer South Australia against national downturns and in turn lift the level of growth.

One principal aim of the South Australian Government should be to lift growth to at least that of the national average by the turn of the century. Should the gap widen further than in an economic scenario not too hard to paint, mass defection of industry from South Australia could occur. The resultant drain of youth, talent, wealth and employment would take decades to overcome. Let me make it clear that I am not advocating development for the sake of development, and I shall deal with the question of too rapid development later. However, unless we live by our wits, snare useful projects (such as the submarine project) and expand our growth, we run the danger of becoming a much poorer State.

The problem for Australia is that even in times of slow rates of growth, we have not been able to match the figures of the Asia/Pacific rim. Australia has not kept pace with North-East Asia, Europe or the United States. Currently, North-East Asia leads the world in growth. One must

remember that South Australia has fallen behind the Australian average, which makes it worse for us.

Currently, the five North-East Asian economies of China, Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Korea contribute 25 per cent of world product. Collectively, they have a population of about 1.3 billion people, or 25 per cent of the world's total population. The disequilibrium, however, becomes apparent when the much poorer performing China is removed from the equation. China contributes only 3 per cent to world product and has 22 per cent of world population.

When I visited the Samsung Electrical plant in Korea I was impressed by its sheer size. The plant outside of Seoul was on 250 hectares of land and employed some 35 000 people. Two other Samsung plants, which are also worth visiting, employed collectively about the same number of people and produced computer, electronic and other componentary such as silicon chips. The whole company employed 70 000 people, housed about half of these in accommodation provided and had medical schemes which I gathered covered all of the workers and their families.

Samsung is the biggest company in Korea and one of the largest producers of such items as microwave ovens and television sets. Currently, Samsung produces 20 per cent of the world's microwave ovens which appear under many different badges. Toshiba was the label that was being put on those produced the day I visited the plant. Samsung only started in 1968 and has reached a point in which it has a large share of the world, and particularly the Japanese market. Whilst I shall have more to say about its corporate strategy later, the point here is that Samsung is also, in essence, the story of Korea, going from nowhere to one of the leading and most rapidly developing economies in 20 years.

This year Korea has, by its terms, a depressed economy. It believes that growth will reach only 8.5 per cent, which I hasten to point out is twice the value of our best figure in the past two decades. The trade commissioners in Seoul made the point to me that dramatic changes are now taking place in Korea which we will be well placed to exploit.

The growth of real wages in Korea is staggering. For the past three consecutive years, as Korean products have continued to move into overseas markets, sustainable wage rises of 20 per cent have been achieved. According to Austrade officials at the coal face, wage differentials between Australia and Korea have converged to the point that only marginal differences now occur in some industries. The present average wage in Korea is about 800 000 won per month, or about \$400 Australian per week. The Korean economic performance has been based so far on what are described as the three basic lows: the low costs of production; the low value of currency; and the low value of wages.

The first and third of these lows is no longer the case. The value of the currency is still controlled by Government but much pressure is now placed on Korea to lift the value of its currency. Since 1985 Korea has had a surplus on its overseas trading account, and in the past year that was measured Korea had a surplus of 4.5 per cent of gross domestic product. I point out that Korea has the same percentage of surplus as Australia has as deficit.

The presence of Australian product is not too hard to find, although the volume and diversity of those products could grow. To Australia, according to Austrade in Seoul, Korea is worth two Chinas. We currently trade with Korea, in dollar terms, more than with any other country except Japan, the United States and New Zealand. According to Austrade projections, and early figures confirm this, Korea

during this financial year will replace New Zealand as our third most important trading partner.

There is another angle to this question on which I will not spend much time, although it is a matter that needs redressing: our trade is currently in surplus with Korea by a factor of better than two to one. To expand trade further will, no doubt, require a redress of this imbalance or, at least, the implementation of a measure to not allow any further divergence.

Samsung currently exports \$US3.2 billion worth of product and sells on the domestic market a further \$US1.1 billion worth of goods. Gold Star, its chief competitor, exports about 80 per cent of that value of goods in roughly the same proportions; that is, for every \$4 worth of product \$3 are sold internationally. The growth in domestic economy has the executives of Samsung tuned in to the prospect of expanding its role on the domestic level. This year Austrade noted changes by the month rather than by the year.

The two car manufacturers in Korea are Hyundai and Daewoo. We have had some experience in recent times with Hyundai but Daewoo, which does not export product to Australia, manufactures a range of products, through joint ventures with Isuzu and General Motors which look familiar to Australians and involve some South Australian components. As recently as 1988 these companies exported more than 60 per cent of their production; by the middle of 1989 that had dropped to 55 per cent; and by late 1989 it was on a 50/50 basis. The demand on the domestic market was outstripping supply when I was in that country.

South Australia sells manufactured automotive products to South Korea. We supply various primary products and other raw materials. Australia, in general, has become one of the chief suppliers of raw materials to Korea. It has had some success with manufactured product and sells other services as well. With the growth in the Korean domestic economy we are well placed to put other products on this market.

There are a few areas in which we could greatly expand our present level of activity. First, we could increase our share of the current beef quota. Secondly, we can encourage South Australian automotive component manufacturers to move more aggressively into the Korean market because of the evidence that Taiwan is trying to edge us out. We are at present a player in this field and we should immediately expand to meet projected increases in demand.

Thirdly, we can sell educational services. South Australian educational services are much in demand in many parts of the world, but the creation of full fee paying places could have other benefits as well. The average Korean, whilst friendly towards Australians, has little knowledge about us. This ignorance is understandable and is matched by our own of Korea. One of the chief recommendations of my report will be the creation of a chair and centre for Korean studies at either the Flinders or Adelaide university. For those who see such a step as a waste of taxpayer's funds, I would simply state what our experience was in Japan. At a time, some 20 years ago, when Japan was at a similar stage of growth as Korea is today, Australia failed to capitalise on what could have been an entree for Australian and South Australian products.

The lack of Japanese language skills and lack of knowledge of domestic packaging and marketing meant that products from other countries edged us out of these lucrative Japanese markets many years ago. And, despite all our efforts since, it seems that has edged us out of that market in the medium term future. South Australia is well placed to not make the same mistake in Korea.

Fourthly, we need to do some market research on our current technology which can be sold to Korea. Traffic jams, poor road infrastructure, lack of emission control on vehicles and associated pollution problems are some of the features of Seoul today. Elements of these problems lead me to think that we can help solve some of them.

Before I turn to Japan, I would like to venture a few other observations about Korea which illustrate the potential we could have in this market. The cost of living by our standards is enormous. I think that this fact is surprising to all members who believe Korea to be one of the Asian countries where the standard and cost of living are traditionally low. Korea is much more like Japan than its other Asian neighbours.

In Seoul beef is sold for between \$30 and \$290 a kilogram. Wines sell at about \$90 to \$100 per bottle, spirits at about \$70 to \$150 per bottle and a range of grocery items roughly average about twice the price of the same product in Australia. So that members do not get the wrong idea, I point out that my knowledge of the sale of alcoholic product was gleaned purely from research as I do not imbibe.

Food is particularly dear in Korea and Japan because agriculture is heavily protected. About half of the Korean population is still heavily involved in agriculture and, by using tariffs and quarantine provisions, the Korean Government has blocked the further penetration of agricultural products into that country. In the past five years the Korean Government has tried to build a domestic beef and dairy industry. It has failed and now admits this fact. In the past six months the Korean Government has realised that it is better to curb living costs to dampen further wage demand by allowing the import of agricultural products. Milk is currently \$2.60 a litre in Korea. Products such as this can be shipped from Australia and South Australia.

On the political side, Korea appears to be developing towards a multi Party entity. Whilst the question of human rights in Korea is a vexed one, and the past record appalling, some progress is being made. The right to organise and enter into legitimate trade union activity has not been allowed to date. However, the shortage of labour has meant that, increasingly, labour has had better weapons to bargain with.

Whilst I was in Seoul the President managed to create a union of political groupings to consolidate into a broad, conservative formation. On the other side of the fence, political groupings in Korea appear to be coalescing around a more left alternative. It is hoped that in the future elections with more realistic objectives take place. Certainly, there is an anticipation that only by going down this road will Koreans be able to create the political stability necessary to enjoy the benefits to their rapid growth.

The concentration of wealth is disturbing and has militated against reform. The top 200 companies in Korea generate 90 per cent of the economy, and the top five generate 30 per cent of gross domestic product. Despite this, and largely because of the shortage of labour, money is thrown around much more widely in Korea than the above figure would indicate. Although the presence of poverty is at each street corner and sleeping in a Korean street is an even more unpleasant experience than in many other countries, I point out that in January this year the warmest day was minus 2 degrees and the coldest, when corrected for wind chill factor, was minus 35.

Japan is a different experience. Japan has developed to a point where its per capita gross national product is well beyond our own. It is now beyond that of the United States and the rest of the developed world. Japan is bracing itself for the expectation that it will be the single most powerful economy in the world in the late 1990s.

There would seem little doubt that it will reach that point within the near to medium term future. The Australian banks to which I spoke confirmed what the Mazda and Toyota corporations have based their future strategies on. The consensus is that the Japanese currency will continue to rise in respect to our own and that of the United States. Twenty years ago 378 Japanese yen bought one Australian dollar, and now it takes 110 yen. The current price of a United States dollar is 147 yen. The Toyota Corporation and the head of its Oceania division put the following worst case scenario forward. He stated that the yen could rise to a point in which 60 yen would buy one Australia dollar in two to three years, and the American dollar could slip to a point where 90 yen would be the equivalent of one American dollar. Toyota believes that even at that point this is the surprise—it would still be competitive—and that if the adjustment took place within two years, the company could adapt to it. Now 40 per cent of the Japanese domestic car market is held by Toyota, which is in a battle to expand its share to 50 per cent as quickly as possible.

I point out that that is 50 per cent of a market that is growing annually by more than 10 per cent. Such a move will insulate the company from loss of overseas sales. Toyota said that such a move could mean the need to implement more new technology in its plants. I was very impressed with the robots and their role in the plants that I visited. I outline the position in greater detail in my report, which is worthy of scrutiny by members.

Toyota is preparing to implement some, if not most, of its robot technology into its plants in Victoria. Should currency movement be as rapid as I outlined a moment ago, their plans might be abandoned. Hopefully, this scenario will not materialise.

The Mazda Corporation's head of the Australian division would not be drawn on what he believed currency figures would resemble in the middle 1990s. However, he believed that revaluation of the yen was inevitable. To Mazda it would mean increasingly moving offshore, and it announced, whilst I was in Japan, that it would be setting up a plant in West Germany.

Such a placement would put Mazda in a position to compete in Europe and possibly pioneer market penetration into Eastern Europe. The price to Mazda would be to relinquish a part of its current domestic Japanese market. In my report I go into much more detail about the Japanese workers and some of the myths that surround them. They are at present paid much more than their Australian counterparts, although the purchasing power is much lower there, as the whole cost regime in Australia is much lower than that in Japan. Australia delivers the same products and services to our market at costings much lower than those available in Japan.

The sheer pressure of population makes housing a real problem and ownership in Tokyo is beyond the range of even the most affluent wage and salary earners. This is despite mortgage rates around 5 per cent. I venture more recommendations in my report and I would like to look at just a few broad groupings. First, we need to have a broad aim to achieve Australian levels of growth by the year 2000. If we accept that as a goal for our South Australian community, we need to broaden our economic horizon to a point at which we can insulate ourselves from economic downturns in the Eastern States.

We need to internationalise the South Australian economy much more than is the case presently. To do this we need to make some decisions about emphasis, and I believe that we need to 'plug' into the rapid growth areas to our north and, in particular, Japan and Korea. The role of South Australian Government then is:

1. To foster and promote the penetration of our products in these markets.
2. To step up our on-site representation in places such as Korea so that we can get a first hand picture of market potential and realisation.
3. To foster the creation of a centre for Korean studies.
4. To investigate and encourage joint ventures which will give us a foothold on important overseas markets. This was one of the key mistakes we made 20 years ago on the Japanese market: we were too slow and opportunities were lost.

The broadest area of recommendation involves national considerations which we have in South Australia and which we must convince our Federal colleagues in Canberra to act upon. They include:

1. The continuance and stepping up of micro-economic reform, so that we are able to trade from South Australia as easily as people can trade from the Eastern States.
2. Reappraisal of saving rates. The level of domestic saving in Australia is the lowest in the developed world, and one of the key advantages North-East Asia has is a pool of domestic saving which can be used for new plant and technology at low rates.

I realise that saving rates is always a controversial topic. However, I think that we need to look again at strategies for fostering a greater level of domestic saving. In 1989 controversy was raised when suggestions were made about tax sheltering of saving, and that certainly is one road that could be followed. There are others, which may be much fairer. They need to be investigated and a primary goal has to be a dramatic lift in the level of domestic saving. The convergence of many economic policies will have to be looked at so that such a savings strategy can be put in place.

That brings me to the role of the State Government and what I believe to be the role that I as a backbencher can play in these important processes. Over the years there has been some ambivalence in the Australian Labor Party about the independent separate roles of State Parliaments. In the early days the Labor movement took the view that State Parliaments and, in particular, their Houses of Review, were vestiges of colonial wealth that stood in the way of progress. The view was that separate State Parliaments and Governments needed to be overcome so that greater equity amongst all Australians could be achieved.

Since the turn of the century, much progress has been made in creating a fairer Australia. Much progress has also been achieved in creating more democratic and representative Parliaments in the States. Much more must be done in several States in which conservative elements have consistently stood their ground, trying to block the waves of electoral change. In South Australia we have achieved much since 1968. It is for this reason that I got some amusement from the Opposition's cries of 'foul' after the recent South Australian poll where a finely balanced Parliament was elected on what is claimed as a 52 per cent to 48 per cent split.

I am pleased to see that the Liberal Party has discovered that electoral reform is an ongoing process. I wonder, though, whether it is the same Party that:

1. Wanted country loadings.

2. Wanted a different franchise for the Legislative Council which effectively disenfranchised large sections of the population.
3. Never forgave the Millhouses and Steele Halls for the implementation of electoral reform to abandon what was determined at the time as the Playmander.
4. Was made up of the same people who talked about all the hidden agendas in the 1988 referendum that would have seen a redistribution, and that might have seen members opposite now in Government and on this side of the House.

I believe that the Government will pursue this matter with vigor, and has made a commitment to bring into effect electoral reform during the term of this Parliament. The born again electoral reformers will have their day in helping in this process. I raise the question of electoral reform now because only by making State Governments more representative and responsive has the question of their relevance been overcome.

There is no doubt that a great many issues are rightly the purview of national Government in Canberra. We are one State in a Commonwealth involving people of our own kind with expectations and views just like our own. Historically, since 1901, the role of the Federal Government has grown and issues such as further education policy, Aboriginal affairs, industrial relations and the environment demand a national approach. They also demand a State perspective.

State responsibilities have sharpened over the years. State Governments legitimately place on the agenda issues with which we in the community here in South Australia must come to grips. There are many examples of quality of life considerations which we in South Australia need to make. Such decisions as the Sellicks marina or developments along our immediate foreshore such as Jubilee Point might not have the national implications of a Franklin Dam. However, government is a crucible into which may different converging and diverging views are poured and, in a democratic process of consultation, we shape and develop the type of community that we wish to build in the future.

State Governments have traditionally assumed the role of guardians or watchdogs for State interests. The transfer of powers to Canberra in many areas has been welcomed, and there are issues to which a national perspective can be applied. Since the 1940's Federal government has had greater resources, and as well as an assured tax base and the responsibility for setting the national economic parameters.

There is a view that, since then, State Governments have become relevant only as good housekeepers, and that the transfer of powers to Canberra has left in the States Governments that are responsible for day-to-day running of only essential services. There is some truth in the proposition that the primary responsibility of State government is good management and the day-to-day running of those essential services. However, it is a narrow view, which does not take into account the broader perspectives so essential to our community.

The type of society that we wish to create is indeed in the melting pot; whilst Federal government has come more and more to determine the parameters and boundaries, the qualitative questions are still determined on the State level. The type of world we wish for our children in the provision of education, welfare, services, the environment and employment opportunity is still largely determined here in South Australia. Decisions made by government today here in South Australia will greatly influence the world of tomorrow. The view that I hold is that State government has a wide ranging responsibility to build the South Australia of

tomorrow that maximises the opportunities for all South Australians.

The question that must always enter into a debate of this type revolves around the role of State government and the limit of government intervention. One of the sharp differences of emphasis in this House is in respect of government intervention in the economy and the establishment of suitable policy settings on the State level. The difference of emphasis relates not to the extent of intervention but to whether intervention is necessary at all. We on this side of the House hold the view that government intervention is not of itself intrinsically bad. Whilst there are areas of human endeavour that do not require intervention or regulation, the operation of a truly free market will not necessarily produce the social outcomes or goals required by the community.

In the conservative years of the early 1980s many calls were heard for the role of government to be severely limited and restricted. It was as if government by its nature was seen as malevolent, getting in the way of progress, limiting or destroying opportunity and conflicting with an ideal world in which community aspirations could reach their zenith only without government.

Government, as we have seen it in many parts of the world—and in particular those fearful apparatuses of state that are now being dismantled in Eastern Europe—can be malevolent. Government can limit or even postpone community aspiration. However, this is not always the case. The democratic and consultative approach of government can foster and develop true community consensus. The election of members to this House is testimony to the democratic and representative process. Our role needs to be multifaceted. We must ensure that government is of the people and for the people. We must ensure that the legitimate rights of the minority are not stamped upon by those of the majority. We must also ensure that small vocal and probably wealthy minorities cannot hold up or destroy necessary change.

Finally, we must ensure that the processes or mechanisms we put in place to facilitate democratic government do not evolve into laws unto themselves. The struggle to make government lean and efficient, effective and representative means a struggle to ensure that bureaucratic structures cannot frustrate the democratic will. I would like to finish my remarks today by talking about our own role in this House as custodians of the democratic process. Parliament and its various committees must function as a watchdog upon government and, at the same time, strive to develop the potential of our State. In a broad sense, the vision that the Australian Labor Party has in its platform for a fairer, more just and more equal society is the one that members on this side of the House and I stand fairly and squarely behind it. That society will see progress and development consistent with rather than conflicting with the environment.

We on this side of the House were elected to implement that platform. We are to ensure that we build a better and fairer society that opens opportunities for all South Australians and does not protect small, sectional vested interests. The vision of the Labor movement is to initiate as well as to sharpen the focus of the process of reform so that good government can build community consensus and a better world. State Government has a vital and essential role to play in building that future. We have been elected to ensure that this historic mission is fulfilled.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call on the member for Peake, I remind the House that this is the honourable member's maiden speech, and I ask that the usual courtesies be given.

Mr HERON (Peake): In seconding the motion moved by the member for Playford, I am pleased to support the immediate legislative program for our State set out in the opening speech by His Excellency, the Governor. As the newly elected member for Peake, I would like to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your election to that honoured position. I also congratulate the Premier on his re-election, the Government Ministers and all new members of the House, particularly my colleagues here on the backbench.

It is a great honour to have been elected to this House and I thank the electors of Peake for placing their trust in me as their representative in this the Forty-Seventh Parliament. The people of Peake can be assured that I will do my utmost to assist and represent them at any level. My electorate office doors will always be open. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my predecessor, Keith Plunkett. Keith has served the electorate of Peake well since 1979. He has also represented the State ably as Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee. My thanks go to the Australian Labor Party for having confidence in me by preselecting me as the candidate for Peake. Special thanks must also go to my campaign director and committee and to other members and supporters of the Australian Labor Party who worked tirelessly for my success in Peake.

As most members would be aware, I have spent the past 15 years of my working life as an official of the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union. During that time I have witnessed many and varied changes in the industrial relations wage fixation system. Indeed, I can recall the time before the current centralised wage fixation system whereby collective bargaining and the industrial laws of the jungle prevailed. It will come as no surprise to members—certainly, on this side of the House—that I have supported the centralised wage fixation system, which, among other things, assists those groups of members in the work force who are industrially weak. A brief thumb nail sketch of the current industrial relations scene is as follows.

On 11 March 1989 the Federal Labor Government introduced a new Industrial Relations Act replacing the old Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. The alterations to the Act contain measures which assist the process of award restructuring. These measures include: giving the Industrial Commission wider powers to prevent and settle industrial disputes; rationalising the number of trade unions; and making it easier for trade unions to amalgamate, as well as allowing for better cooperation between Federal and State industrial tribunals.

The Federal Government must be congratulated for taking these important initiatives. These alterations assisted the Australian Industrial Relations Commission in August last year to hand down a new and unique pay decision for the Australian work force. The new system is called award restructuring. The necessary background information for the setting of the current wage fixation principles can be traced back to the March 1987 national wage case decision where the key principle in the system was 'the restructuring and efficiency principle'. As I understand or recall, the proper application of the restructuring and efficiency principle called for a positive approach by trade unions, their members and individual workers, and by employer organisations, their members and individual employers.

The national wage case decision of August 1988 provided for a structural efficiency principle. Its purpose was to facilitate the type of fundamental review essential to ensure that existing award structures are relevant to modern competitive requirements of industry, and are in the best interests of both management and workers.

In February 1989 a review of the current wages system (as it then was) was conducted and allowed for the further development and refinement now embodied in the current wage fixation principles of August 1989. The principles of the national wage decision, including the structural efficiency principle, have been determined by the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and endorsed by the South Australian Industrial Commission. The aim is to provide a clear framework under which all concerned—employers, workers and their unions, Governments and tribunals—can cooperate to ensure that labour costs are monitored, and that measures to meet the competitive requirements of industry are undertaken to provide workers with access to more varied, fulfilling and better paid jobs, while ensuring that lower paid workers are protected.

Award restructuring stemmed from a delegation of ACTU officials who visited Sweden, Norway, West Germany, Austria and the United Kingdom. The delegation found a range of national economic policies had been adopted in those countries, with different approaches by the United Kingdom and West Germany compared to Sweden and Austria. Sweden and Austria achieved low unemployment, low inflation, reasonable growth and improved balance of payments because they used the consensus approach—that is, by Governments, unions and employers negotiating over economic policy to achieve lower inflation and lower unemployment.

Australia faced problems similar to those of other countries, and the hard fact is that Australian industry needs to be restructured. The fairest and most efficient way of managing such change is by unions being involved in the decision-making process of restructuring.

One reason for the decline of Australia's position in the international standard of living level is the failure to develop adequate skills to meet the changing nature of industry and technology. Immigration can still be viewed by many employers, public servants and politicians alike as the cure for Australia's skills shortage—a view I do not necessarily share. This attitude only allows Australian employers to escape their training obligations and responsibilities.

Interests in skills in Australian industry have normally been restricted to traditional trade skills, university developed technical skills and managerial and marketing skills. In relative terms, little interest has been taken in skill formation for the high-technology process worker.

A barrier that must be torn down to assist the work force to become better educated and to develop additional skills is the outmoded and outdated concept, such as the status between manual and non-manual workers, blue collar and white collar workers, and between wages and staff employees.

There are a number of features of the changing labour market in Australia that have had a negative effect on workers acquiring skills. One is the decline in the proportion of the work force employed in the manufacturing industry. This is the area that traditionally provided the majority of apprenticeship opportunities. There has also been a dramatic increase in part-time and contract employment which has reduced the opportunity for systematic skilling. Youth, working part-time, cannot be apprenticed, and tradespersons working under casual bodyhire arrangements are not available for developing apprentices.

The only opportunity that most wage employees have to increase their income is for their union to achieve an across-the-board wage increase. Consequently, for many there is little monetary incentive for improving their skills. Rewards for higher levels of skills acquired need to be become an accepted part of wage determination in Australia. Unless active policies are developed to counteract these negative

trends and barriers, there will be a continuing and significant decline in the balance and level of skills in the Australian work force. Such a decline will further exacerbate industrial relations as employers compete for the declining number of skilled people.

The need to provide new skills and training to use new technology effectively provides the opportunity to develop career structures for both the trade and non-trade areas. There is also growing pressure from workers for wage movements to compensate for new skills and the increased productivity that flows from new technology. Traditionally, career paths have been a concept restricted to so-called professionals or semi-professionals. These employees have been offered opportunities to increase their earning capacity as their skills develop. Unions are now seeking to extend this concept to workers in all industries.

The basic thrust of the trade union movement's commitment to award restructuring is to provide a career path that allows a semi-skilled worker to progress through a skills program, over time, to the highest possible level (upward movement will be restricted only by one's ability, ambition and the availability of positions); to create award wages which encourage skills acquisition and reward length of service and experience; to increase the flexibility of workers to undertake a wider scope of work through higher level training; to reduce the need for supervision through the training and payment of employees to take increasing responsibility for quality and delivery of their work; and to develop a national training system which will provide accreditation for in-house training so that accredited courses can receive universal recognition by other employers.

For award restructuring to succeed, effective communication between all involved is essential, and that goes for Governments, board members, managers, supervisors, employees and trade unions alike. The major importance of award restructuring is that it gives the opportunity for Australian industry to become more productive and competitive, at the same time giving workers better security in their employment and job satisfaction. Employees will gain from learning new skills, and will have improved training, better consultation, and better and more fulfilling jobs with varied skills, enabling mobility of employment, as well as a career path. Employers will enjoy productivity gains, with better quality, a more skilled work force and fewer demarcation problems, at the same time increasing their ability to retain trained workers. Award restructuring means more efficient industries for the benefit of the Australian economy as well as the Australian community.

Accreditation is one of the most important issues in the restructuring of skills, training and classifications. Simply stated, accreditation is the process of determining the educational worth of a training course. The lack of accreditation or formal recognition of training done in a factory, or by equipment suppliers, particularly the training undertaken by non-trade workers, is one of the major disadvantages of the current system. Process workers can do hundreds of hours of in-house training, and may even receive a company certificate, but it is useless to them for furthering their formal education or changing jobs as it is not recognised outside the factory.

A system of accreditation ensures that all training undertaken by a worker has a value that is recognised on a national basis. Technical and further education colleges should be the main centres for training. Their system provides the most secure method for delivering training and qualifying workers. TAFE qualifications are recognised nationally, and this is important for the mobility of workers. It is imperative that a cooperative learning arrangement is

developed between educational institutions, industrial and commercial organisations.

The conservative Parties and some employer groups are pushing for enterprise bargaining in the work place, which would, among other things, exclude trade unions and undermine award conditions determined by the Arbitration Commission. Enterprise agreements are designed to weaken the trade union movement, pay workers less for the same work being performed elsewhere, and hence line the pockets of the bosses with ill-gotten gains.

Let me now say what apparently happened in Queensland in relation to enterprise agreements. Approximately 12 months ago, legislation was passed by the National Party in Queensland allowing for what they called voluntary employment agreements. These agreements allowed employers to set wages and conditions of employment outside and below what had been determined by the Arbitration Commission.

The National Party claimed that voluntary employment agreements (VEAs) would provide greater flexibility and create more jobs. By way of illustration here is but one example. In August last year a Queensland security company (Sylvia Holdings Pty Ltd trading as Securaguard International) put into operation a voluntary employment agreement providing for the following:

- wages of \$303.60 base rate before tax;
- no weekend penalties for permanent employees or casuals;
- 10-hour shifts, at a flat rate, with no overtime;
- if an employee volunteered for overtime then time plus 20 per cent was the overtime rate payable;
- time off in lieu of overtime at time for time and not at the appropriate penalty rate; and
- no shift allowance for casuals.

The security industry is an extremely competitive one, and it is not surprising that Securaguard, since the voluntary employment agreement came into operation, has secured a number of contracts that were previously held by other major contract security companies. While most reputable companies pay wage rates and apply conditions under the appropriate award, Securaguard was able to undercut its competitors when quoting for various contracts.

As can be seen, under these arrangements it allowed the employer to reduce, not increase, the number of permanent employees in the work force. So much for the National Party's claim that it will create more jobs with voluntary employment agreements. The only flexibility that it does give is flexibility for the employers to avoid minimum wage rates and conditions of employment as determined by the Industrial Commission, which is a worker's only safeguard.

However, all is not lost, and there is some good news. I understand that the new Labor Premier of Queensland, Wayne Goss, has stated that the Labor Government will take immediate steps to repeal the National Party's voluntary agreement legislation, thereby ensuring that award rates of pay and conditions of employment determined by the Industrial Commission are applied, and this should restore competitive tendering in the security industry.

Now that justice will be restored to the workers in Queensland, we have to contend with proposals by the New South Wales Greiner Government to introduce similar legislation, despite calls from both employer organisations and trade unions saying that it is unworkable and would make industrial relations a sham in that State.

In the proposal announced by the New South Wales Liberal Industrial Relations Minister, John Fahey, a tripartite working party was formed. This working party was made up of representatives from Government, employer

and unions, with industrial relations expertise. Understandably, they did not reach agreement on all issues, but a number of recommendations were put to the Government and, not surprisingly, nearly all those recommendations have been ignored by the Greiner Government.

But what has been proposed is a policy designed to crush the trade union movement in its justifiable role of protecting workers' rights. I understand that legislation will be introduced into the New South Wales Parliament early this year to allow for the setting up of enterprise agreements similar to the Queensland voluntary employment agreements. These agreements will allow, among other things, the following:

- the undercutting of existing award rates of pay and conditions as determined by the Industrial Commission;
- that they be fixed for a period of up to three years;
- that they should not be scrutinised by the Industrial Commission, or be subject to arbitration, should any problem arise;
- that they will be confidential and/or secret.

Again, I say that these types of agreements only allow for backyard operators to avoid paying minimum rates of pay and minimum conditions of employment as previously determined by the Industrial Commission. Unions in name only, run by the bosses, would be the end result, rather than responsible unions looking after the rights and interests of their members. Enterprise agreements are especially detrimental in workplaces where the workers do not have the industrial knowledge or expertise to negotiate a satisfactory agreement.

There can only be one motive for legislation like this and that is to destroy the basis of the trade union movement and ultimately do away with the centralised wage fixation system. Registered industrial agreements under the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in this State are not new, with over 400 industrial agreements currently registered. The difference is that these agreements have the same (or superior) provisions as the awards which set out minimum wages and conditions of employment.

The centralised system is supported by all affiliates of the ACTU, and this system, with all its faults, is the best system and method by which we can operate, more so because it protects women, the young, and lower paid workers.

By way of illustration I will now direct my attention to the child-care services which are available. It is my understanding that employers in the private sector are not taking up the incentives offered to them by the State and Federal Labor Governments to commence work based child-care programs. The South Australian Labor Government has announced a series of initiatives in the area of child-care to meet the demand for available quality care for all sectors of the community, not just the wealthy. Additional capital expenditure announced in conjunction with the Hawke Labor Government will see increased child-care places, with emphasis placed on providing trained staff, better facilities, and an environment upon which parents can rely. Effective, quality child-care is a vital part of ensuring that future generations develop in the proper way. Child-care is, in all, an integral part of this Government's commitment to gender, as well as social equality.

Single parents, the vast majority of whom are women, and women who have chosen a more traditional family role, can now re-enter the work force free of worry about casual care arrangements and the problem of so-called latch-key kids. We are aware that, as part of that equality, child-care workers deserve to have their skills and responsibilities recognised and rewarded. This is an issue which this Government and the community will need to face in the near future.

Another interest or pet subject of mine is occupational health and safety, and I was very pleased when this Government introduced the new Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act in 1986. The main objects of that Act are:

- to secure the health, safety and welfare of persons at work;

- to eliminate, at the source, risks to the health, safety and welfare of persons at work;

- to protect the public against risks to health or safety arising out of or in connection with the activities of persons at work;

- to involve employees and employers in issues affecting occupational health, safety and welfare; and

- to encourage registered associations to take a constructive role in promoting improvements in occupational health, safety and welfare practices, and assist employees to achieve a healthier and safer working environment.

Section 7 of the Act allows for the establishment of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission. The commission is made up of employee, employer, health and Government representatives. It has a wide range of qualifications and objectives as well as various statutory functions. The progress of the commission should not be hindered through a lack of resources for this most important issue.

Members on the other side of the House may be surprised to know that 10 times more work time is lost through injury and disease than through industrial disputation and that five times more accidents occur at the workplace than on the State's highways. These figures are frightening. Employers, unions and Governments should leave no stone unturned in making our workplaces safer.

National standards for occupational health and safety are essential, and it is pleasing to hear that the commission is providing input into standards being developed by the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission (Worksafe Australia). Indeed, the Hawke Labor Government introduced Worksafe Australia, which demonstrates that the State Government and the Federal Labor Government are committed to an overall reduction in the number of injuries and diseases attributed to the workplace.

Another important step was taken last year by the State Labor Government when the Department of Labour appointed five female and seven male inspectors of occupational health and safety. The increase in the number of inspectors was essential because the old Act did not apply or extend, for example, to health agencies or educational institutions which were not classified or recognised as an industrial workplace.

Section 39 of the Act relates to improvement notices and prohibition notices. This allows for where an inspector is of the opinion that a person is contravening a provision of the Act or has contravened a provision of the Act in circumstances that make it likely that the contravention will be repeated. Last year there were 12 convictions under the Act totalling nearly \$45 000 in penalties.

An enormous amount of time, effort, energy and money goes into every case mounted for prosecution and, even with increased penalties under the new Act, employers are still paying insufficient notice to their responsibilities. Improvement notices issued by the Department of Labour Inspectorate for the 12 months to 30 June 1989 totalled 539. Of these, 257 notices were for defective guarding of machinery. There is still a long way to go before a satisfactory standard in this area can be achieved.

Notifiable work-related injuries for the 12 months to 30 June 1989 totalled 5 934, of which 20 were fatal. Even with the improved Act, 20 workers still lost their lives; that is to say, one life was lost every 18.2 days of the year. Section

26 of the Act relates to health and safety representatives. In short, the role of the representative is to monitor and ensure that all employees are working in a healthy and safe environment.

Under the Act, safety representatives are required to complete a basic training course. For the 12 months to the end of June 1989, 1 730 representatives have received training. The commission approved five courses which were provided by the United Trades and Labor Council, the Trade Union Training Authority (TUTA), the National Safety Council of Australia (SA Division), the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and the South Australian Employers Federation.

It is interesting to note that, of the 1 730 safety representatives trained, the United Trades and Labor Council has trained 67.6 per cent, the Trade Union Training Authority has trained 21.7 per cent, the National Safety Council has trained 4.6 per cent, the Chamber of Commerce has trained 5.6 per cent and the South Australian Employers Federation has trained .5 per cent. I cannot emphasise strongly enough the importance of employers and workers consulting and working together to make our workplaces a safer environment in which to work, in accordance with the objects of the Act.

Quite clearly, the training of almost 90 per cent of all representatives in this State has been done by employee organisations. After this time, I suggest that these figures clearly demonstrate who is 'fair dinkum' about a work-safe environment for the workers to carry out their employment. I welcome the initiatives announced in His Excellency's opening speech aimed, in particular, at occupational health and safety and child-care service matters.

No doubt a number of matters of importance to my electors will be raised for consideration in this House in the course of this Parliament. In conclusion, I place on record my undertaking to work for and on behalf of my electorate, the residents of Peake and organisations serving the local community, and to assist the Labor Government and the Australian Labor Party to implement our initiatives, programs and policies. I am proud to be a member of this Government representing the constituents of Peake in the Forty-Seventh Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Fisher, I remind the House that this is the honourable member's maiden speech and I ask that the usual courtesy be given.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): It is with a sense of pride in being elected to this place that I rise to speak. I consider it a great privilege and honour to be a member of the House of Assembly. First, I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your elevation to the Chair and I indicate that I will abide with your directions as far as possible. As I said, I am proud to be here because, as many members know, I left school at the age of 14 to work as a farm labourer. I returned to study and became a teacher and a lecturer and now, finally, I am the member for Fisher.

My motivation in standing for Parliament is to help people and to do something worthwhile for the community and for the State. I thank my family, my supporters, the volunteer Party workers and my parliamentary colleagues who assisted me during my campaign. It was a long, gruelling campaign—I doorknocked over 7 000 homes—and I was motivated, among other things, by a strong commitment to see John Olsen become Premier. That was denied him, through no fault of his own, and I pay tribute to the effort that he put in, as Leader, in seeking to become the Premier of this State. I acknowledge the work of the previous member for Fisher (Mr Phil Tyler) and his contri-

bution to the electorate. I also acknowledge the untiring efforts of Mr Evans, when he was the member for Fisher, although the electorate's boundaries were different then.

The electorate of Fisher is named after Sir James Fisher, the first Resident Commissioner of South Australia, the first Mayor of Adelaide and the President of the first fully elected Legislative Council. I would aspire to follow in the footsteps of not only him but also other parliamentarians who have served the State well. The electorate of Fisher has approximately 27 500 electors and is growing rapidly. From 1985 to 1989 it saw a net gain of 5 000 electors, so questions of electoral distribution are of particular significance to me. I will come back to that point later. The electorate stretches from Eden Hills in the north, down to Reynella, across to Sheidow Park, Trott Park, a portion of Hallett Cove and back to the Clarendon road in Coromandel Valley, taking in the suburbs of Flagstaff Hill, Aberfoyle Park and so on. It is an attractive area with rolling hills, remnants of vineyards, the Sturt Gorge, Glenthorne Farm and other attributes. It is a pleasant environment and one in which I am happy to serve the people.

Fisher is a young electorate. In fact, according to the 1986 census, approximately 36 per cent of the electorate is under the age of 17. As befalls all of us, the average age of the electorate is increasing. The establishment of successful retirement villages in the area has seen more retired people move into the area to be with their children and grandchildren. Whilst the electorate is young, and has the problems that confront young families, the average age is increasing.

The electorate is what I once called 'dinky di'. By that I meant that the residents are essentially Australian and Australian born. Some people took it to mean something else. The largest ethnic component is 1.2 per cent German. It is above average in occupation and employment, but we should not get away from the fact that not everyone is well off. Most people in the electorate are what I call 'middle' Australian—middle-class, middle-income Australians. However, it also has single parents on low incomes and so on.

The electorate is very much family-centred with young families seeking to establish themselves and develop a future for their children and themselves. Fisher constitutes what I call a 'forgotten people'. It is part of the forgotten south, an area overlooked to a large extent by the present Government and its predecessors. Many issues confront the electorate of Fisher. My information was gained from door-knocking, surveying and constant interaction with the electorate. One of the basic issues facing the forgotten south, which includes Fisher, is an inadequate arterial road system, the current system being more suited to the horse-and-buggy era than to the 1990s.

The Labor Government sold off the arterial land from Darlington to the city, which was one of the most foolish decisions ever taken by a Government of this State. The people of Fisher have paid the price. We are confronted with a bottleneck at Darlington where people do the daily Darlington shuffle. All arterial roads in the area are substandard including Panatalinga Road, Flagstaff Road and Main South Road: they are all inadequate. The inadequacy or lack of an arterial road system is constantly brought to my attention. Unfortunately, most of the residents do not have the privilege of a white car and are not marathon runners, so they seek a decent road system to get them into the city.

We also face the problem of an inadequate public transport system. I noticed in the Governor's Speech reference to the Government's investigating various alternatives for better and faster access to the southern suburbs with the potential of extending the Glenelg tram line. I trust that

that is not empty rhetoric, because the electorate of Fisher, particularly the south-eastern section of Happy Valley, needs something equivalent to the O-Bahn or a light rail system to complement the decent road system that it also needs.

The area also has a great demand for child-care services, and I acknowledge that recently some contribution has been made to assist schools to set up out-of-school care as well as other child care facilities. I will be working hard to ensure that that continues. It is a young electorate and, in fairness to the women in the area in particular, child-care facilities are an ongoing need.

One of the constant concerns of people in the area and elsewhere is the ever rising cost of electricity, gas and water, including recent supply charges, which have annoyed many local constituents. Paragraph 48 of the Governor's speech states:

Further efforts will be directed at reducing the real cost of these energy supplies.

I hope that that is the case as there is a cumulative effect of those costs added on to other costs. It is not just interest rates in isolation that hurt people but also, the cumulative effect of interest rates and other costs and charges.

A concern related to that was raised by some of the elderly citizens of the area, namely, concessions for superannuants and pensioners for electricity, water and so on. That needs to be addressed. Being a young electorate, parents are concerned about the future of their children and particularly their employment opportunities. I will be working towards improving job opportunities for young people of the area. Again, the Governor's speech states:

... development of a strong, outward looking economy, which emphasises quality and the provision of jobs with those skills which will ensure an enduring future for our young people.

I certainly hope that that is the case. Whilst in Fisher we have an employment rate below the State average, any person out of work is at a great disadvantage. I would like to see a situation where again we come close to almost zero unemployment. Work has been somewhat devalued in recent times, but we must remember that employment gives purpose, meaning and discipline to people, and I will be striving for such in providing job opportunities for the young people of my area.

I turn now to Homesure and interest rates. The Homesure scheme is a Clayton's scheme: it is the interest rate relief scheme you have when you are not having interest rate relief. I have been approached by many constituents who feel betrayed by that broken promise. They are angry about it. I will pursue that matter at a later date in this place. Within the electorate great concern exists about what people would classify as a breakdown in traditional values, including the work ethic and other values which we in Australia considered to be standard a few years ago—honesty, integrity, respect for others and their property, self-help, mateship, a recognition of the contribution of pioneers and those who gave or risked their lives in wars for us and respect for the elderly. The Governor also mentioned the need for anti-age discrimination. I point out that a need exists for an inculcation of respect for the aged in our society. This is one of the things that I would seek to realise and promote in my career as a member of Parliament.

Concern exists amongst many parents about what they see as a constant diet of violence via the media. It is not surprising that that diet is reflected in the behaviour of young people and others and expressed in terms of violence towards others, aggressive behaviour on the roads and destruction of property.

Another matter of concern in the electorate of Fisher is the lack of filtered water in many of the suburbs. It is ironic that the suburbs that will be the last to get filtered water

are the ones nearest the water filtration plant, and that irony is not lost on those who live in Aberfoyle Park, Flagstaff Hill, part of Happy Valley, Eden Hills and Bellevue Heights. People have told me that their children are reluctant to step into a bath because the water is so dirty. I trust that the Government will proceed with haste and ensure that the people who live so close to the water filtration plant will soon be supplied with filtered water.

The Governor's speech referred to sporting facilities in relation to the much sought after Commonwealth Games and states:

Our credentials are reflected in a range of sporting facilities which are completed, under construction or planned. They include the velodrome, upgrading of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium, construction of a new baseball stadium and the State shooting park which will host a world title competition later this year.

I ask whether there is anything in this for the south. One of the greatest needs of the southern area is first grade sporting facilities that can be used by its rapidly growing population. People in the south feel that they have been forgotten and overlooked. They look to the north and see the O-Bahn and sporting facilities, and I do not decry those. Good luck to the people in the north! However, in fairness, it is about time the south had a fair go. Maybe it is time for social justice down south.

Another area of concern in my electorate is housing. In the past few weeks I have constantly been approached by people who are concerned about Housing Trust accommodation, and I have discovered that the trust has a five-year waiting list. I note that the Governor's speech referred to measures to help families buy their own homes. I ask, 'What about accommodation via the trust?'

Another concern in the south, and there are quite a few—and I guess, to a large extent, that that is why I was elected—is the perception of the lack of police presence. This is not a fault of the Police Force but is due to a lack of resources. The people of Fisher have not had the privilege I have had, of having a local sergeant (who was the father of the Minister of Labour) offering words of wisdom and sometimes delivering a swift 'kick' when appropriate. The people of Fisher do not enjoy that sort of policing. There is a strong perception, particularly amongst the women in the electorate, that there is a lack of police presence.

I now turn to health. I acknowledge that the Noarlunga Health Centre is going ahead, but I noted in a recent publication from the Flinders Medical Centre that arrived in my office last week the following statement:

The southern suburbs do not have enough hospital beds to meet the demands of the population. On the basis of current population and hospital activity data this area has a shortfall of 200 beds and, on projected data, this shortfall will increase to more than 300 beds by the year 2001.

The Flinders Medical Centre is an excellent hospital just on the border of the electorate of Fisher but, on its own admission, there is no way that the southern suburbs will be catered for in terms of hospital beds, and I will come back to this issue at a later date.

I now turn my attention to education. Fisher has fine schools in terms of dedicated staff, school councils and its children. There are some 19 schools in the electorate, plus the kindergartens and other education establishments. One of the concerns which was raised by teachers and which I recognise as being rife in the community is the devaluing of teaching and the whole education process. That is sad and it makes me very concerned. Teachers say that they are looking for the opportunity to get on and teach with less bureaucratic interference—and I will come back to that also later.

Another major issue in Fisher concerns electoral fairness. As I mentioned earlier, there are approximately 27 500 vot-

ers in Fisher represented by one able member of Parliament. Where is the social justice in that? Where is the value of their vote? When the often touted one vote one value system is considered, we must remember that the people in Fisher are being short-changed.

I am keen to see, and I will support, proper measures that bring about a genuine fairness in the electoral system. The Governor's speech stated that electoral redistribution would be reviewed, and I trust that it will be more than just reviewed and that we will see a positive outcome that enshrines basic fair play.

A consequence of the fact that the electorate of Fisher is large is that my office—and I only reflect on this, I do not wish to point the bone—has to service a large number of people, many of whom, as I indicated earlier, are young, family people who come from an area with growing needs, increasing demands for services, and so on. I ask members to reflect on the justice of one member trying to satisfy the legitimate needs of more than 27 500 voters, not counting the children within the families.

I have raised some of the more local but still very important issues in the electorate of Fisher. I flag that part of my focus in this Parliament will be the environment, in which I have a particular interest based on many years of research and teaching. I would like to see ecology and economics brought together—both having the same Greek derivation, *oikos*—in a way that has not happened in this State or, indeed, in this country.

Another interest of mine is education. I have spent a lifetime in education. As I indicated earlier, I left school without even an intermediate certificate and was quickly brought into line by farm labouring on the Yorke Peninsula. I have come to appreciate the value of education and I would like to see education elevated to a much higher position than the one it currently occupies in this country. As I indicated earlier, I believe that teachers are grossly undervalued in this country. We are losing a lot of good teachers from the State system and I believe that teaching, in a real sense, is the 'mother profession'. If we are not careful, that profession will slip even further from the high position that it should occupy.

Another of my interests is equal opportunities for people in our society, both men and women. We have focused on the needs of women—quite legitimately; however, we should also spend some time focusing on the needs of men in our society. Obviously, there is a link between the two. In many ways, assisting men to come to terms with aspects of our contemporary life will assist the women in our society. I am concerned that we have a society which is just, that is, a society which includes the Australian concept of a 'fair go'. I will be keen to support measures that accomplish that goal. I believe that the Liberal Party is the genuine Party of equal opportunity and I will be promoting that idea and pushing it in this place.

Another of my interests is the Aboriginal people of this State. I will canvass this issue only briefly at this stage, but in many respects we have gone from one extreme to the other. The salvation of the Aboriginal people will come about only through their own directed efforts; it will not be solved by pouring in money and looking for quick fix solutions. We can learn a lot from the Aboriginal people. I went to school with some of them, I have taught them, I have lectured to them and, in turn, I have learnt from them. I think that we can learn a lot from many of their traditional values. It is rather sad to see some of the young Aborigines who have been separated from many of those fine elements of their traditional system. It is ironic that, in terms of the environment, the Aboriginal people, in the traditional set-

ting, were practising the very values that people now say are essential for our survival: a steady State economy, stable population growth and an equitable distribution of what is produced.

We can learn a lot of other things from the Aboriginal people. Aborigines tended to give young children a lot of freedom and, when the youngsters reached the teen years, the screws were put on—and I use that term metaphorically. However, that was when very strict discipline was imposed. We do the opposite, we are very strict with our very young children but, when they get to the teen years, we throw them the car keys, the alcohol and whatever, and say, 'Go to it.' They are just a couple of examples of what we can learn from traditional Aboriginal culture: the notion that we belong to the land, we do not own it. In many respects, we have things around the wrong way. I will come back to that theme in the future in this place.

With respect to economic development, this State has a lot going for it, but we still have not achieved what I consider to be the essential goals of full employment and the necessary development. I believe in development that is compatible with the environment. Good economics takes account of ecology: if it does not, it is not good economics. At a later stage I will be referring to my interest in the extent to which we can make greater use of our primary products. I noticed that in the Governor's speech reference was made to the contribution of the rural sector. However, in a real sense, we do not make full use of that contribution. Most of the food products in our supermarkets do not even come from South Australia, and that is absolutely amazing. They come from interstate or overseas. Our supermarkets are stocked with products that we do not produce in South Australia. That is an opportunity for value added, for sophisticated techniques. We are all familiar with things like chicken nuggets and some of the more contemporary food products, but we can, and we must, go a lot further by processing our primary products so that we enjoy the benefits accrued, so that our children and young people get the employment opportunities and so that we are not exporting jobs and opportunities.

I am very concerned about value systems, and I alluded to this previously. There seems to be a view in our society that we have to take what exists, that it is a sign of the times. I consider that to be absolute nonsense. Society is what one makes it or allows it to become. There are plenty of examples of people sitting back and letting things happen. People are not prepared to stand up and be counted. We know there has been a decline in organised religion, but we need to develop a value system to give people something to live by.

For many people that is a religious value system, and that is fine. However, for one reason or another many people do not subscribe to such a view, and I believe it is in our education system, particularly in our State schools, that this matter must be addressed. It is one thing to understand society and people, and it is another thing to have commitment. The great thing that is missing, I believe, is a commitment to values, respect for people, their property, and so on.

That is at the core of many of our problems today. Too often we are addressing outcomes rather than looking at their causes. We are out there with bandaids treating problems which arise from people having no value system to guide them and for them to follow. It is not surprising that we have street kids and all these other problems, because we try to address problems that should be tackled much earlier.

In summary, my approach to being in Parliament, as I said earlier, will be to represent the people of Fisher and to give 100 per cent effort to their needs. I consider it a great honour to represent them. It is a privilege that they have bestowed such an honour on me. My philosophy is to give credit where credit is due and to give the stick where I believe the Government has not delivered or has been unfair to the people in my district. I expect the Government to give the south a fair go. I expect the people there to be considered part of any labelled social justice strategy.

Finally, I note that I have used only half my allowed time, but I do not believe in speaking just for the sake of it. I congratulate all members on their election here. I have already congratulated members who have been elevated, including you, Mr Speaker. I wish all members well and I trust that through our behaviour the status of members of Parliament will be somewhat more elevated than it is now. If our status or stature in the community is diminished, we have only ourselves to blame, and I hope that my behaviour does not in any way contribute to a denigration of the important place of the member of Parliament in our society.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the next member, I remind the House that this is not his maiden speech.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): In congratulating His Excellency the Governor on the opening of the parliamentary session, I support the motion. His Excellency has been a credit to his office in carrying out his many and varied duties with dignity and understanding. His involvement and that of Lady Dunstan in a wide variety of State and organisational activities is appreciated by all South Australians.

I also take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your elevation to the Chair, the most important position in Parliament. I know that you will carry out your responsibilities with dedication and humour to the benefit of all who sit in this Chamber. Further, I wish to thank long serving members—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much noise in this Chamber.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Further, I wish to thank long serving members who are no longer with us from the other side of the House and who contributed much to my learning curve over the past seven years. In particular, I refer to Roy Abbott, a true gentleman and a person of his word whom I respected, and to Gavin Keneally, who will be remembered for his wit and capacity to perform on his feet. Ron Payne was a dour competitor, with whom I built up a rapport in the latter years. Also, I thank Keith Plunkett for his basic simple honesty and dedication to the ALP and, last but not least, Jack Slater for his good naturedness. To them and their families go my best wishes. May they enjoy their retirement and benefit from far better health than some of those members experienced while in this House.

Newer members in the form of June Appleby, Mike Duigan, Di Gayler, Derek Robertson and Phil Tyler all made positive contributions during their time here, but I would be less than honest if I expressed sadness at their departure. One final word while I am handing out bouquets: John Olsen will be departing from this Parliament for the Senate, and his presence will be missed. It would have been all too easy for a Leader to give up the fight after the 1985 election result.

Under enormous pressure, John singlehandedly took the Liberal Opposition within an ace of achieving Government, with success eluding him only through the electoral system being weighted against the Liberals in this State. That takes

a special kind of person. For sheer determination and his never-say-die approach, John deserves the accolades of all his peers.

A very special welcome is extended to my new parliamentary colleagues: Dorothy Kotz, the member for Newland; Michael Armitage, the member for Adelaide; Mark Brindal, the member for Hayward; Wayne Matthew, the member for Bright; and Bob Such, the member for Fisher, who has just made his maiden speech. It is marvellous to look around and view the strength on this side of the House. More importantly, all are talented and will make a strong contribution to the electorates they now serve and the Parliament of South Australia. Likewise, I welcome Colleen Hutchison, the member for Stuart; Michael Atkinson, the member for Spence; Vic Heron, the member for Peake; Paul Holloway, the member for Mitchell; Colin McKee, the member for Gilles; and John Quirke, the member for Playford.

I intended to devote a substantial section of this debate to the question of democracy and the unfairness of the current electoral system, which prevents a Party—the Liberal Party—from gaining Government with 52 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote. However, that subject will be covered in depth during the debate on the motion to be moved by the Leader of the Opposition in private members' time next week.

The three subject areas that I wish to canvass briefly in this debate are, first, the performance of the State Government and its Premier; secondly, parliamentary reform; and, thirdly, the Mitcham City Council. As a watcher of Parliament since 1963 and as a member since 1982, I cannot recall a more pathetic program placed before the people of South Australia than the one we have before us. It offers no incentive, no initiative, no joy and no hope. The people are crying out for leadership but Premier Bannon has once again been found wanting. He shows a vapid interest in the family, has a fleeting embrace with environmental issues and has a nonchalant acknowledgement of the problems facing this State.

Where is this marvellous program, promised before the last State election, to help struggling home buyers? Where is the much vaunted recycling plant? What about the school kids who travel other than by public transport? When I reflect on the Premier it reminds me of the story of Cinderella. Most of us were told that story when we were youngsters. At midnight, the coach turned into a pumpkin. The Premier reminds me of that pumpkin. Indeed, he goes further and, like the ugly sisters, his word cannot be trusted.

I have sat in this House since 1982 and on each occasion after an election, the Premier, who has made some very strong promises during the election, inevitably has broken over half of them in the post-election Parliament. It is time that the Government of this State was made accountable. It is time that we saw a Premier of this State who was willing to tackle the issues with vigour and determination, which have been missing in the past seven years or more. When the Premier stands up before the people of South Australia and makes a promise, we expect it to be kept. More than that, when he breaks that promise we expect him to be here to stand up and say why he broke that promise.

Every election we have seen the promises trotted out. Of course, the Government promised more than it could deliver, which is the normal way that the ALP operates. However, when it comes time for breaking the promises, the Premier is nowhere to be found. Whenever there is a dirty issue or something that needs a bit of strength the Premier is nowhere to be found, and that is the way he has run this State for

the past seven years, to the cost of the people and to the cost of this State.

Let us now take up the issue of the Homesure scheme. The Premier has deliberately misled the people of this State. Then, when he had deliberately misled them (he must have known at the beginning that they could not be afforded because he had not costed his policies anyway), and when he decided to break his promise, the Premier conveniently ensured that, when the announcements came forth, he was elsewhere; he was nowhere to be found.

When the transport details became fully known, and people suddenly realised that this was a policy of discrimination, where was the Premier? The Premier was away. When the NCA scandal arose, where was he? I do not believe that he can hide any longer. Members of the press gallery in this State do not believe that he can hide any longer, so the leopard will have to change its spots. That means that the Premier will have to perform in a way that he has not been seen to perform in the past seven years. He can no longer hide from the fact that this State is the poorest performer on the mainland and that he is responsible. He can no longer hide from the fact that retail sales in this State are running, in real terms, according to the CPI, 2 per cent behind, and that means that all the retailers out there are suffering. Of course, the consumers lack confidence in both the Hawke and Bannon Governments anyway.

In terms of unemployment, again we are up at the top of the other mainland States. The Premier of this State has had seven years to implement policies that will allow this State to grow and develop during that time. The time frame is there. Any economist would say that an initiative flow-on into the economy would occur within two or three years. Within two or three years the man could have shown his mettle, but seven years down the track we are still waiting to see it.

We can examine a number of other statistics: motor vehicle registration is an indicator of the good health or otherwise of this State. Again, each year we keep dropping back. Some members of the private sector are saying, 'Mr Bannon, where are you, because we are bleeding?' A recent survey of interstate investors shows that they do not want to have a bar of South Australia, because of the Premier of this State. They do not want to try and invest their money in this State when they are not sure whether their developments will ever come to pass, because the Premier tends to fiddle while Rome burns. He cannot make a decision, he cannot stick by his undertakings. The development industry is in a parlous state, because people cannot trust the Bannon Government; nor are they getting any incentive to undertake projects that are needed here.

We have the home building construction industry, through which we would like to provide as much housing as possible for our populace, yet frequently the press talks about the homeless people. That number is growing daily, as is the number of people who cannot afford to buy their own homes. We might like to say that we are the cheapest State on the mainland for house building, but the fact of life is that, even though we may well be, it is not happening: building is not taking place, because there is no dynamic in this economy. People have no faith that this Government will provide them with a future. One therefore finds that the rental statistics have gone up while home ownership has decreased.

The leader of any Government has to make hard decisions. I know that if Dale Baker were Premier of this State he would not resile from making hard decisions. He would not be hiding around some corner from any difficulties that might arise. He would not be taking an overseas trip and

saying, 'Announce all the bad things now because I'm going to be away for two weeks.' That is not the mettle of the former Leader of the Opposition, John Olsen, either. People want toughness; they want decisions to be made on their behalf. They do not want a wimp; a person who is incapable of fronting up when the going gets tough. If the media cannot drag the Premier up to the mark, he will eventually fall, as he should have fallen at the last election and the election before that. These issues will be followed up in the forthcoming private members' time.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Indeed, who got 52 per cent of the vote at the last election? How the Government can stand before the people and say 'We were elected with 48 per cent of the vote' will be an interesting exercise over time.

There are two other items with which I wish to deal during the debate. One relates to parliamentary reform. I have been a member of this place for seven years and I have studied Parliament since 1963, which adds up to about 27 years. Never in my memory have I found a time more regrettable than the past four years of Parliament not only because I was here in that time but also in terms of what has happened to parliamentary democracy. I believe that the rights of members in this Parliament have been eroded by Executive Government. Executive Government has made decisions and Government members have not fought those decisions. They have fallen in line because they did not want to buck the Party system.

During the seven years that I have been in this place, I know that my privileges have been taken away. I believe that democracy has been the great loser. This has been a convenience for the Government. One could hardly say a convenience, because on certain occasions it has caused the Government a great deal of stress. It is almost like a necessary evil for the Government. In the process, with that belief behind it, the Government has twisted and tortured the rules. It is high time for reform so that all members, particularly new ALP and new Liberal members, can have a fair go in a Parliament where free speech is allowed, where time allocations are proper for debates, where we debate some of the issues facing the State and get together and solve them.

I have put at the top of my list proper time for debate and consideration of Bills with full consultation prior to their introduction. How many times during the past four years has a Minister brought a Bill before the House and blithely said, 'I have fully consulted'? Of course, that Minister has never fully consulted. On several occasions it has been discovered that he has never talked outside his own room about the legislation that he has brought before the House. That is not good enough. If we are to change people's lives, those people have the right to be consulted. If people are not consulted, if full consultation has not taken place, we give fair warning to the Government that we will have the debate adjourned. If it means losing the legislation, so be it. If Ministers come before this Parliament in the way that they did over the past four years and say that they have consulted and got full support and that is found not to be the case, there will be some ramifications.

I believe that there must be greater use of select committees. For the edification of new members, select committees are a very good device for arriving at a consensus or some form of agreement on often difficult issues. We do not have the Party stances which we see within these four walls. On almost all occasions we have what I class as a very fruitful and constructive debate within a small group of people of different persuasions. Inevitably, the results of those discussions are far better than the somewhat histrionic stances

taken by Parties in this Parliament. If we can use select committees more in the forthcoming session I shall be delighted, because they are a means of developing the best ways of tackling particular problems.

There is no doubt that the Government will decide to have fewer sittings of Parliament and thus avoid embarrassment. It should ensure that Parliament sits more frequently to debate some of the serious issues and at least try to find some common ground. There is common ground on many issues, but it rarely seeks it—it pressures and pushes and then wonders why it does not have support. When it does enjoy the fruits of a previous endeavour, which may have been a Liberal initiative, or it may have been one of its own making, it fails to recognise the beginnings which, quite often, have involved contributions from this side of the House as well as its own side.

I believe that Ministers should be more accountable. Question time in this Parliament is an absolute joke and a farce. Ministers have spent the time abusing the Opposition, evading the question and, I believe, decreasing the standing of this Parliament. There has to be greater accountability of Ministers in this Parliament. They should be required to answer questions, one would hope, truthfully. That matter will have to be addressed by the Ministers themselves, but I am sure that the Speaker has already indicated that we will not have the waffle we have had in the past.

We look forward to receiving clean Bills. We will not have the situation where second reading speeches are moved in this House but no Bills are available, or no amendments are on file, yet we are expected to debate them. Those days are finished. We will actually debate issues on their merits and with the proper information.

I hope that we will have consolidated legislation to which we can actually refer, rather than having to start at 1975 and work our way through Acts that have been subject to a large number of amendments. I have raised that problem ever since I became a member of Parliament in 1982. Perhaps now that we have a more evenly balanced Parliament—and I hope a more constructive Parliament—we can get together on this issue so that all members have an opportunity to pick up an amendment or Bill and go to the actual Act containing all the amendments rather than having to wade through 14 books.

As to the question of accommodation resources, I am not affected as a city member. I do not think that my previous accommodation was up to scratch, but it did not affect me greatly, because I had an electorate office with facilities, and the time I spent in the office here was mainly during sitting hours and only then for perhaps four or five hours a week, at the very most. Although the question of accommodation does not affect me, it does affect those members who come from outside the metropolitan area. I can go back to my office at night, or in the morning or before the Parliament starts and do some work. Those members who come from outside Adelaide do not have that facility. Decent facilities should be provided in this Parliament so that they can operate effectively. Metropolitan members should not be the only ones to benefit because of locality.

I am not saying we are benefiting a great deal from the quality of accommodation. However, top priority should be given to upgrading accommodation. We should also think about upgrading the resources. How farcical is it that some of us now have word processors and some of us do not!

Mr Lewis: Those who inherited them had to mutilate them.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, I believe that will be the subject of another debate. Importantly, in this day and age, why should not all members have word processors and fax facil-

ities? It is a disgrace that the Opposition does not have research resources. As I have said previously, I hope that, when we have what I think will be a far more meaningful Parliament, we will be able to address those issues constructively and get some reforms.

I would like to think also that in that process we will return to some of the Westminster traditions. It may well be that this will be brought about by assistance from the press. Some traditions should be followed. One tradition is that if a Minister is under investigation that person should stand aside. Other traditions which relate to ministerial conduct and behaviour have not been adhered to in the past seven years—perhaps that situation will change.

I can count a number of Ministers who blame the heads of their departments or someone else when they have a difficulty. One of the Westminster traditions is that the buck stops with the Minister. Perhaps we will have Ministers standing up and saying, 'I made a mistake, I was wrong and I will correct it.' That would be a welcome change to the way in which this House has operated in the past.

I would also like to say that Ministers should do their homework. It is fortuitous that the Minister of Education is in the House at present because he is well aware of the fact that I was very unhappy about the way in which legal Bills were handled in this House. I put on notice for the benefit of the Minister of Education that if the Opposition cannot be treated with respect in this House it will have to take action. That action may well be that, if Ministers do not have answers, we will adjourn the debate until they are found, so that we do not have this ludicrous situation of asking a question and the Minister's saying that he is too tired, careless or unwilling to find out about it. That has to stop.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I have never said that.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister in response to questions on legal matters has, in the past, shown a complete disinterest in the Bills he has handled. If somebody else wants to handle those Bills—fine, but the Minister would be well aware that I became irate on a large number of occasions because the Opposition was not given the information needed to deal properly with Bills in this House. If Bills emanate from the Upper House, it is up to those Ministers with the carriage of the Bills in the Lower House to find out about them—to check the questions, read the debates and find some of the answers that will be needed when questions are asked during the Committee stage.

This situation must improve. I give an undertaking that, if we do not get some interest from the Ministers handling Bills in this House that have emanated from the Upper House, we will think of something quite painful, such as adjournment of the debate for some time, until the Minister gets the appropriate knowledge so that Parliament can be answered. That is a long list of reforms.

I will briefly refer to the electorate of Mitcham, which is very dear to my heart. A great campaign was won by the people of Mitcham. For the benefit of newer members, the rallies that took place after the decision of the Local Government Advisory Committee and the Minister to split the Council of the City of Mitcham were attended by over 20 000 people. Petitions were submitted by more than 30 000 people and written submissions by more than 3 000. It was extraordinary—something the like of which has probably never been seen in this State.

The Government can hide behind the Local Government Advisory Committee all it likes, but what it tried to do was to say, 'The Unley and Happy Valley councils have overspent and been irresponsible. They need financial support, so we will chop up the best performing and most efficient

council in this State—Mitcham.' Mitcham ratepayers enjoy the lowest rates in the State because the council has been responsible. That was the Government's game plan, but it did not work because the people of Mitcham decided to revolt, and revolt they did in a variety of ways.

I would like to pay a special tribute to the people of Mitcham who got off their backsides and showed their resentment. I hope that all governments take notice that people cannot be walked on at the wish and whim of government.

I make special mention of some of the heroes, if you like, such as my colleague Stan Evans, for the precipitate action he took at the very outset and for his assistance to the people of the Hills area. I also mention the members of the Poll for Justice Committee and the Save Mitcham Committee, including Michael White, Ivan Brooks, John Halbert and Ray Hill who, with their committees, formed the backbone of a campaign which we saw reach heights such as this State has never seen, and the way the fight was fought was a credit to all those people.

The fact was that the Government had trodden on the people. To those people I say a very special thank you for the hours, days, weeks and months during which they relentlessly fought. They kept going day after day, believing in what they did. That action, of course, was supported by many other people, and I could give 200 names and still miss people along the way: the council workers, including Lofty, from council, who was in and out of my office, the groundswell of opinion that was generated and the marvellous community feeling we had with our council. Debts are owed to the people who fought the battle on behalf of the Mitcham City Council. In the words of one of my friends, Ray Hill, 'Mitcham should be emulated, not decimated.' That is probably the neatest statement I have in relation to the Mitcham issue.

Now that Mitcham has been thrown into the spotlight— notwithstanding that the LGAC still made a few gratuitous remarks about the performance of Mitcham—I suggest that all members take a leaf out of Mitcham's book. If all members study the way in which they have conducted their affairs over a period and apply those principles to the government of this State, we may be far better off. I thank members for the opportunity to participate in this debate.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I am pleased to be able to support the adoption of the Address in Reply. At the outset, may I take the opportunity to congratulate and commend His Excellency the Governor and Lady Dunstan on the excellent service they continue to provide to the people of South Australia. We are fortunate to have a couple so totally committed to their responsibilities, and I am sure that the majority of people in this State welcome that commitment.

In their absence, I should also like to congratulate both the Speaker and Deputy Speaker on their appointment to higher office and, in particular, to wish the new Speaker well. I have always enjoyed a close relationship with the honourable member who now holds that important position in this Parliament, and I hope I will be able to continue that relationship. I want to extend a welcome to the new members on both sides of this House, and I wish them well in their important role of representing their constituents.

I enjoyed the opportunity we had this afternoon to listen to some of the maiden speeches given in this place, and I look forward to hearing from the others a little later. While I am handing out accolades, I should like to express my thanks to the previous Leader of the Liberal Party in this State, John Olsen, and not only to John but to his wife,

Julie. I have very much enjoyed working with John Olsen and under his leadership, and I wish both John and Julie well in the coming years.

I am pleased to be able to speak this afternoon on some of the issues that relate to my new-found responsibilities in the portfolios that I represent: environment and planning and Aboriginal affairs. I have had some experience with the environment and planning portfolio, both in Government and in Opposition, and I have enjoyed immensely working in those important and challenging portfolios. I look forward to being able to continue to represent the Liberal Party in those areas.

Aboriginal affairs is very much a new ball game for me. I have always been most interested in matters relating to Aboriginal affairs. It is my intention to take every opportunity available to me in the near future to meet and talk with as many of the traditional people as possible. Many of us recognise the problems that they are experiencing and the contribution that they make to our community, so I am looking forward to developing a close relationship with them.

It is difficult in a 30 minute Address in Reply speech to know what to speak about because there are so many issues. It is an opportunity for all members to discuss issues that are of interest to them and those that relate to their portfolio responsibilities or their electorates. At a later stage I will take the opportunity to speak on matters relating to Aboriginal affairs and to consider in detail some of the issues pertaining to the planning portfolio. Today I will concentrate on some of the environmental and conservation issues that we are facing in this State.

Along with many South Australians, I was interested to hear the Premier say in November, just before the election, that he had assumed responsibility for the overall issues of State development and that one of his first priorities would be to initiate a comprehensive review of South Australia's planning laws, including a major overhaul of the metropolitan Adelaide development plan. I am most interested to know how the Government will tackle the job. I am also interested in the terms of reference that will be used and whether changes will be made through the Planning Act. I believe that this State's planning system is one of the most effective in Australia, and that feeling is shared by many people associated with planning in Australia. I am sure that the review will provide improvements, but I am interested to know how they will be achieved. There is certainly a very real need for improvement in the administration of the legislation and, I suggest, in the administration of the department.

I have always believed that we in this State are very fortunate to have so many competent and dedicated people working in the Department of Environment and Planning. They are probably some of the most dedicated people in the Public Service, but it concerns me greatly that the administration of the department at ministerial level leaves much to be desired. That is another matter to which I will refer at a later stage.

There is really not very much in the Governor's Speech (which, of course, is prepared by the Government) relating to environment and planning. In fact, there is very little. When addressing the range of issues involved in environmental protection, the Governor said that the Government will be reintroducing a Bill to reform the present Water Resources Act, with particular accent on those activities which cause water pollution. Of course, that is not new.

That was introduced during the last session of Parliament and has already been reintroduced. The Governor further stated:

These amendments will partner proposals in the Marine Environment Protection Act and other powers that have already received assent under the Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) Act 1984.

Once again, that legislation has been introduced in the previous Parliament and will be reintroduced for further debate. Really, that is all that is said in any detail about the environment and planning portfolio. For a Government which suggests it is so concerned about environmental issues and so keen to involve itself in improving conservation value in this State, that is a rather strange situation to find. At the beginning of his speech, the Governor referred to the Government's program of initiatives and new policy directions. He stated:

At that election my Government put forward an agenda which emphasised four key points.

The third point is:

My Government is committed to a new approach to planning which will lead to a sustainable environmental future, balancing investment and the environment in a sensible, rational way.

Further, the Governor said:

My Government believes these changes will present a comprehensive reassessment of our State's potential, balanced against those environmental concerns which properly value the quality of our future.

There is a lot in the Government's program that I do not agree with, but that is one area with which I do agree. It is something that needs to be recognised on a bipartisan basis. It is important to do everything we can to bring the conservation and development debate together. I like the term used by my new colleague, the member for Fisher, 'bringing ecology and economics together'. That is really what it is all about. It is absolutely essential that that should happen. Any political Party, in Government or in Opposition, which ignores environmental issues, does so at its own peril.

There are many different groups of voters these days expressing an interest in environmental issues. Farmers and people in rural areas are concerned about a number of issues, including the scale of soil degradation, salination, and there are many others. People in urban areas complain about pollution of their air, their beaches and the mismanagement of their parks. The majority of people in this State are understandably worried about the hazards associated with the depletion of the ozone layer. That is a subject on which I intend to speak at some length on another occasion. There is no doubt at all that the majority of people are very concerned about the hazards associated with the depletion of the ozone layer.

Debate on all of these issues has changed considerably in recent years. We now have well educated and articulate individuals who are part of well run and well funded organisations. They want to be assured that the people who make the laws in this State understand and share their concerns and that they are prepared to take measures to solve these problems. The Liberal Party in this State has a responsibility to make clear to all South Australians that we do share the concerns of these people and that we have well thought out and comprehensive policies and plans that aim to bring such problems under control.

Colin Howard, Professor of Law at the Melbourne University, in a recent article referred to a number of issues in the *Economist*, which he described as being the most strongly market oriented and probably the most influential current affairs journal in the English language. These articles explored ways in which conservation problems can be overcome in a reasonably straightforward manner by making it com-

mercially advantageous to conserve instead of wasting or polluting: reward by result instead of endlessly prohibiting people from doing things. In Professor Howard's words, 'Nothing could be more compatible with conservative free market principles.' It is imperative that we sort out, as a matter of urgency, what has unfortunately become the development versus conservation conflict in South Australia, once and for all.

Again I refer to the terminology used by my colleague in that, rather than concentrating on it being a debate which sees environmental considerations working against development, or *vice versa*, we look at it bringing ecology and economics closer together. It is important that as a matter of urgency we sort out this debate, because development and conservation are not only compatible but also so often they are dependent on each other for their long-term existence. I am sure that all members in this place who have read both the Australian and world conservation strategies (and I hope that we all have) would recognise that both strategies point out that much development is dependent on environmental resources, such as soils, water, forests, fisheries, and so on. It is therefore in the interests of these industries to ensure that the environmental resources on which they depend are managed sustainably. The protection of soil in catchments is important to farmers in order to maintain production, just as the protection of mangroves is essential in providing nursery grounds for fish species on which the fishing industry depends.

In recent times we have seen much debate on tourist related development. Without proper consideration of environmental issues and without due regard being given to the coastal setting, the heritage site, wildlife, or the many natural drawcards that equate with visitor attraction, there would be no tourist industry. It is vitally important that an information and data base be formulated to allow policies and projects to be formulated in anticipation of their environmental impact rather than in response to an impact after a project has been announced or perhaps the damage caused. Liberal Party policy would see the establishment of an environment and land use commission, which would create a framework for a continuing process of assimilating economic and environmental interests in the community.

It is essential that we focus our energy on positive and balanced results and look forward to the creation of jobs, income and a sound economic base for future generations, but it is also essential that we do not compromise our environment for the quality of life and longevity of our community. I am sure that we all look forward to a new era of economic growth based on policies that sustain and expand the environmental resource base.

I do not believe that any of us could be aware of the many statements on environmental issues made by people whom we respect, without taking on board many of the points raised. I guess we could spend the rest of the afternoon referring to some of the comments that have been made by people who are concerned about environmental policy. In 1983 at the National Conservation Strategy Conference dinner the then Governor-General, the Right Honourable Sir Ninian Stephen, said:

Economic man turns no clock back; we neither will nor can return Australia to its former state. Nor would it support us, or help us to support the populations of other countries, if we did attempt such a turning back. That is why we must find a happy balance between the development needed to maintain ourselves and others on this crowded globe, and the degree of conservation without which this same globe will cease to be a place worth living in. If we now concentrate part of our great resource of knowledge and technology upon the task of preventing further degradation of the environment and, indeed, of enhancing it, we should be both serving well the ecology and acting in the best

interests of ourselves and of those who come after us; a happy combination of idealism and self-interest.

There is much in that speech of which we could take note. David Attenborough, whom we have all come to respect through his association with *The Living Planet*, has made many references to the importance of conservation. His parting message in *The Living Planet* is really what it is all about. He said:

The notion that an ever-bountiful nature, lying beyond man's habitations and influence, will always supply his wants, no matter how much he takes from it or how he maltreats it, is false. We can no longer rely on providence to maintain the delicate interconnected communities of animals and plants on which we depend. We now, whether we want to or not, materially influence every part of the globe . . . we must do our utmost to maintain the diversity of the earth's animals and plants. It is not just that we depend on many of them for our foods—though that is the case. It is not just that we still know so little about them or the practical value they might have for us in the future—though that, too, is so. It is, surely, that we have no moral right to exterminate forever the creatures with which we share this earth.

In November 1989 the Chairman of the Business Council's Taskforce on the Environment, Mr Stan Wallace, argued for a commitment to rational debate and dialogue aimed at establishing the truth based on fact, not emotions, with a commitment to sorting out the priority issues and with a need for input from all sides based on a commitment to both economic growth and environment protection and the integration of these elements and a commitment to a stable and predictable decision-making process. He did so because he felt it was important that all players knew the rules and that all players could contribute to the debate knowing where they were going.

If members of this House have not read that debate I suggest that they do so. It is readily available in the Parliamentary Library and it is one that I believe all members of Parliament should read. I will cite parts of that debate. In the introduction Mr Wallis refers to the role of the Business Council of Australia (BCA). He states:

The BCA represents 70 or so of Australia's largest companies—who directly or indirectly are responsible: for a large proportion of Australia's private new capital investment; for a large proportion of Australia's work force; for a large proportion of Australia's economic well-being . . . We have never seen ourselves—

and he is here referring to the BCA—

as a pressure group nor as a body which negotiates on behalf of industry with Governments or trade unions. Rather we have endeavoured to focus our efforts on solving some of the major issues confronting the economy and Australia in general. . .

On the question of the environment there has been considerable reflection within the BCA membership as to whether we should enter the public debate . . .

In the event, because of the national importance of the issues involved, we have decided to proceed, recognising that a great many interest groups and organisations around the globe are injecting highly authoritative views on the subject . . . the BCA membership will embrace two very important principles: first, an acceptance of the responsibility for Australia's larger companies to continue to carry out their activities in an environmentally sound manner; and, secondly, that Australia must achieve economic growth if we are to improve living standards (both absolutely and compared to the rest of the world) and if we are to meet the aspirations of the Australian community.

Under the heading 'What then is the state of the environmental debate in Australia today?' Mr Stan Wallis states:

The voice of reason is hard to find and small indeed. Businesses which have put decades of work into environmental science and consistently conformed with regulatory standards are under attack for disregarding the environment.

Conservationists are defensive and angry . . . The media is consumed with crises and sensationalism.

Governments are nervous, setting aside established frameworks for decision-making and taking impulsive decisions with no apparent regard for the real long-term consequences.

The public is simply bewildered. All these are the outward symptoms of a debate which is overheated and heading nowhere.

I have puzzled over the intensity of the debate because I am one of those who believe we can master our environmental problems, whilst maintaining growth or as others have said, we can only solve the issues through growth . . . How then do we get out of the impasse?

In essence we need to rejuvenate the debate by agreeing that sustainable development is the goal. On the face of it, we should be able to reach agreement on how we can integrate economic concerns with environmental concerns. After all, the major interest groups ranging right across the spectrum from the environmental movement to the trade unions to leading business figures agree that we must have sustainable development.

Furthermore, the vast majority accept the United Nations sponsored Brundtland Commission's definition of sustainable development—that is, growth ensuring ' . . . that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'.

We must agree that the key to the debate is sustainable development. Economic growth goes hand in hand with environmental protection. Have no doubt about this! As someone more astute than I put it—poverty is toxic to the environment . . . I want to focus on how to improve the Australian debate on sustainable development and, in doing so, how to improve processes for identifying the real issues and developing economically-viable solutions to real problems.

I would like to read the whole of that debate into *Hansard*. I cannot do that, but I again suggest—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If members opposite are not interested in this, I feel sorry for them. I suggest that they get hold of the speech and read it, because it is very worthwhile reading. They might learn something.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

The Legislative Council intimated that it had concurred in the request of the House of Assembly for the appointment of the committee in accordance with Joint Standing Orders 19 to 31, the members of the joint committee to represent the Legislative Council being the Hons J.C. Burdett, M.S. Feleppa and G. Weatherill.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption resumed.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Mr Speaker, I would like to begin my first speech in this House by paying a tribute to the former member for Mitchell, the Hon. Ron Payne, who gave outstanding service to the people of Mitchell and to the State over a period of 20 years. Ron Payne entered Parliament in 1970 as the first member for Mitchell. From 1970 to 1975 he served on the Flinders University Council and the Council of the Institute of Technology, where he had previously worked as a senior electronics technician.

Ron entered Cabinet as Minister of Community Welfare in July 1975, a ministry he held until March 1979. During that period he also served as Chairman of select committees into various aspects of health and the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill. From March 1979 to the election in September of that year, Ron was Minister of Planning, Housing and Water Resources. As a member of the State Opposition from September 1979 to November 1982, he was shadow Mines and Energy Minister and a member of the Public Works Standing Committee.

Following the 1982 election, Ron was appointed Minister of Mines and Energy, a position he held until his retirement from Cabinet in 1988. During that period one of Ron's

most significant achievements was to preside over the development of Roxby Downs from an exploration camp into the major mining centre that it is today. Ron served in the ministry for almost 10 years with very many achievements and very few hiccups. Over a period when many talented Ministers served in Labor Governments, he contributed his own brand of individuality and commonsense.

Ron Payne also set an enviable standard of service to his electors. Indeed, in the past few years, as candidate for Mitchell, I met many people who attested to the help that he had given them. I owe Ron Payne a great deal for the assistance he gave me prior to the last election, and I sincerely thank him and the members of the Labor Party in Mitchell for their support.

It is with great pride that I sit in this House as a member of the Australian Labor Party. It is the oldest and largest political Party in Australia. The ALP has always been the pacesetter for progress and reform in this State and the nation as a whole. The blueprint for South Australia, as outlined in the Governor's Speech, ensures that this will continue for the next four years. I am particularly pleased to be a member of this House during the centenary of the foundation of the Australian Labor Party, which followed the shearers and maritime strikes of 1890. In May next year it will be the centenary of the election of the first Labor member to sit in this House.

During the life of this Parliament we will also celebrate the centenary of the beginnings of the Australian Federation movement. One hundred years ago this month representatives of the six Australian colonies and New Zealand met in Melbourne to consider the need for a true Australian Federation. The substantial achievement of that meeting was a unanimous resolution, moved by Sir Henry Parkes, calling for the union of the colonies under one legislative and executive government on principles just to the several colonies and a consequential resolution that the members would procure the nomination by their Legislatures of representatives to attend a convention to consider and report upon an adequate scheme for a Federal constitution. That first national Australasian convention was held in Sydney in March 1891. The second convention was, of course, held here in Adelaide in March 1897. The centenary decade of Federation is an appropriate time to consider the relevance of our national constitution and the future role of the States in our Federal system.

We should recognise that the functions of government are undergoing fundamental change. When the Federal Constitution was drafted, the founding fathers, some of whose photographs hang in this Chamber, had no conception of motor vehicles, aircraft, wireless or television, let alone computers or satellites. Although only 89 years old, Australia's Constitution truly belongs to the horse and buggy days.

With the relentless advance of communications and transport technology, the focus of many Government activities is shifting from the local to the national and to the international arena.

In financial markets, someone in Tokyo or New York can instantaneously obtain on a computer screen via satellite every detail imaginable about Australian stocks and shares, the state of the economy and future growth prospects, and make investment decisions accordingly. Only 20 years ago this was not possible. As a major trading country we cannot just put our head in the sand and hope this new technology and what it means for our economy will go away. We are part of a global economy and our economic sovereignty is increasingly being diminished.

Similarly, with greater ease of communications and transport, all forms of crime are continuing to spread beyond State and national boundaries and international cooperation on law and order is becoming more and more necessary for effective solutions to be obtained. While we will always need a local Police Force, we have seen the need for national crime bodies and international treaties and cooperation on terrorism, extradition and taxation evasion, to name just a few areas.

With the environment, problems such as the greenhouse effect, acid rain and air and water pollution are increasingly spreading beyond State and national boundaries. With the massive increase in tourism and population movement since the Second World War, we have seen a trend towards greater international cooperation and standardisation in such areas as traffic laws, social security, health insurance arrangements, banking, and so forth. National and local individuality in cultural expression is steadily being eroded under the influence of television, tourism and transnational corporations.

In 1992 we will see this process accelerate with the emergence of a Europe united on a whole range of social and economic policies. Within our own region closer economic relations with New Zealand are the forerunner to what inevitably must be greater integration of the Australian economy into Asia. The world is a much smaller place than it was even 10 or 20 years ago.

Thus the focus of much law-making is moving not so much from the States to Canberra but from the local to the international arena. However, as last week's High Court decisions on beverage containers and corporation law show, the Australian Constitution is poorly equipped to cope with such developments.

While the Australian Government may be called upon to negotiate an ever-increasing list of global problems, I come to this Chamber believing that the States still have an important part to play in our society.

The advantages of local knowledge and familiarity in effective administration will, in my view, always provide a useful role for State Governments. In matters of education, health, community welfare, roads, and national parks—wherever the services have to be provided—local decision making and administration will always have an advantage. Observers of the Australian system of government have long claimed that the main problem in our Federal-State relations is the imbalance in revenue raising power which leave the States too dependent on the Commonwealth. Using its superior financial strength, the Commonwealth has expanded its bureaucracy to monitor and direct many aspects of traditional State functions—such as health, welfare, education and roads—in ways which have not always been justified by the need for national action. While uniformity in standards and approach is often desirable, wasteful duplication in bureaucracy is not.

I would now like to turn to water resource management in Australia, because it is an issue which not only typifies the shortcomings and prospects for Commonwealth-State relations but which also is an issue that is vital for the future of this State. In an age of increasing environmental awareness, there is no issue more important to South Australia than the state of the Murray River.

The control of water resources and, in particular, the Murray-Darling system, was one of the issues that took up a great deal of debate at the Federation conventions of a century ago. The main concern of South Australian delegates at those early conventions was to protect the navigability of the Murray, and thus the river boat trade, against the threat posed by the emerging irrigation industry in

Victoria and New South Wales. The larger upstream States naturally did not wish to cede any powers to the new national Government which might curtail such development. The result, section 100 of the Constitution, was an unsatisfactory compromise whose legacy still plagues this State.

Following Federation and the pivotal role of the Commonwealth, the River Murray Waters Agreement was finally signed in 1914 by South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth to guarantee South Australia an apportionment of the waters of the river, and to construct a system of locks and weirs which would keep the river navigable. It was a pioneering agreement not just for Australia, but for other Federal systems. However, the River Murray Commission, established under the agreement, was very limited in its authority.

The Commonwealth could not have enacted the agreement but for the fact that the river was still being used for interstate navigation, a matter on which the Australian Parliament can make laws. Ironically, by the time the agreement was made, the river boat trade was already in terminal decline due to the competition from rail and road transport. The river boat trade led to the destruction of vast quantities of trees along the river for fuel for boilers, and the construction of locks further altered the riverine environment. The expansion of irrigation in the first half of this century further contributed to rising water tables and the problem of salinity which began to emerge as a major threat in the 1960s. Thus, water quality, rather than water quantity, became the prime concern of this State.

I am pleased to say that it was Labor Governments, particularly in this State, which led the way in addressing the problems of water quality. In 1973 Don Dunstan convinced the Whitlam Government to establish a River Murray Working Party to review the inadequacies of the River Murray Waters Agreement and to examine the water quality problem. For the first time the river was viewed as an ecological system rather than as a freely provided pipeline. The obstruction to progress remained the upstream States, particularly New South Wales and its Water Resources Commission, and the impetus for change was lost with the defeat of the Whitlam Government. In 1983 the concurrence of Labor Governments in South Australia, New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth provided a unique opportunity to put aside Party political point scoring on this question, even if interstate jealousies remained.

I was fortunate to play a minor role in this process as a research officer to Ralph Jacobi, the Federal Member for Hawker, and as a member of an ALP task force which was established in 1982 to develop policy in this area. Ralph Jacobi had proposed that the powers of the Commonwealth over research be utilised to establish an Institute of Freshwater Studies to investigate the problems of the Murray-Darling Basin and properly air those issues which were not being addressed by the River Murray Commission.

The major problems with the River Murray Waters Agreement, in spite of amendments passed in 1983, were that the River Murray Commission could act only if all the riparian States and the Commonwealth were in agreement—that is, any one party could veto decisions—and management of the river was effectively in the hands of water supply engineers, despite the fact that agriculture, tourism, environment, health and other interests had a vital stake in the river. The agreement covered only the waters of the Murray and lower Darling, and neglected other tributaries and land use questions which were at the heart of the salinity problem.

South Australia, in the early days of the Bannon Government, recognised the need to tackle the problems of the Murray in a multi-disciplinary manner. Management of the Murray in South Australia ceased to be the exclusive preserve of the Engineering and Water Supply Department but was expanded through interdepartmental arrangements to involve all relevant portfolios. This important initiative spread to other States and led to the establishment of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission in November 1985. The new commission included Ministers of Agriculture and the Environment, as well as the Ministers of Water Resources. The Commonwealth Government also increased its presence in water research through the establishment of the Murray-Darling Freshwater Research Centre at Albury.

While considerable progress has been made in achieving better management of the Murray-Darling Basin in the past decade, there is still much to be done. Queensland plays no part in the Murray-Darling Basin Commission although the area of basin catchment in Queensland is larger than Victoria. While the contribution from this catchment to average flows into South Australia is relatively small, there have been years when floodwater from the upper Darling has been crucial to South Australia's water supplies. The catchment in Queensland is relatively undeveloped, but the recent use of chemical clearance in the Brigalow country could exacerbate erosion and salinity problems. The Darling River is already the main contributor to turbidity in our water supplies.

With the election of a Labor Government there is at last some hope that Queensland will take a more responsible attitude to environmental problems, and be willing to cooperate with other States and the Commonwealth. I trust that South Australia will again take the initiative on Murray-Darling management and seek to bring Queensland into joint management of the entire basin. Queensland has long been a party to the Border Rivers Agreement which seeks to control the common river border between New South Wales and Queensland. With self-government in Canberra, the largest city within the Murray-Darling Basin, there will also be a need to involve the ACT in basin management more fully.

The fundamental problem which bedevils management of the Murray-Darling Basin is the fact that any State can veto decisions of the commission. This problem has been overcome in interstate river systems in the United States through the use of compacts, which effectively vest the combined authority of all the States and Federal Government into a Basin Commission. Unlike the River Murray Commission, which requires unanimity to reach a decision, the US commissions work on a majority vote.

In 1984, at the instigation of Ralph Jacobi, the Federal Government invited the Director of the Delaware River Basin Commission to tour Australia to promote the benefits, and to allay some of the fears, about such a system of river basin management. I believe we in South Australia should not rest until we achieve a similar management structure for the entire Murray-Darling Basin, because it is the only practical solution to the inadequacies of the Australian Constitution in matters of water resources. As an aside, may I suggest that a compact on company law, analogous to the Delaware Basin compact, is an alternative worth considering following the recent decision of the High Court to reject Commonwealth securities industry legislation.

The nature and extent of environmental problems means that much more of the time of this Parliament will be devoted to such issues in the future. In an address given last year, the Director of the Murray-Darling Freshwater Research Centre, Dr David Mitchell, concluded:

... to put the environment before self and the future before the present calls for a fundamental change in the human psyche. Yet, without such a widespread change, conservation programs are likely to succeed only until another form of land use is deemed by the community to be more important. It follows unavoidably that the Australian community needs a new ethic that is less selfish, less materialistic and less concerned with the immediate present.

Dr Mitchell continued:

This is a crucial question but it goes deeper than just environmental issues. It strikes right at the moral centre of this nation. It is not possible to have one set of ethics about the environment that is unselfish and non-materialistic and to do what you like in your private and business relationships. And it is not what people say that counts as much as what they do.

Therefore, even if we know what to do and even if authorities at as high a level as the Prime Minister give environmental concern their support, little will actually be done in the final analysis unless the community wants it done.

We are fortunate that the Bannon Government has the track record, the understanding and the commitment to provide the leadership necessary to tackle our environmental problems.

The concern with community morals and ethics expressed by Dr Mitchell is an issue I expect we will hear much more of in the future. The *Advertiser* reported last week that a prominent banker claimed the decadent values of the 'yuppie' 1980s had put Australia on the road to moral decay and economic disaster. The *Advertiser* article continued:

Taking a thinly veiled swipe at high-profile business chiefs who built their empires on borrowings, he said, 'It was the decade of the yuppies, when decadence became an attractive lifestyle for some with spending, not saving, the objective. Greed was good (and) envy began to colour efforts to change society. Short-term gains became the driving force of business activity with debt-driven takeovers the name of the game.'

This incredible hypocrisy from a banker is rather like Al Capone lamenting the rise of crime in Chicago.

The Fitzgerald report into Queensland corruption blew the whistle on the behaviour of banks and their own moral standards. Mr Fitzgerald reserved special criticism for the Australian Bankers Association and major State branches which had 'declined to cooperate' with the commission's investigation of false accounts used to conceal profits from crime.

Apart from a question of amnesties for staff who might expose their own and their bank's involvement in illegal activities, bankers had observed that the focus on false bank accounts placed them at a disadvantage with building societies. 'Disclosure would mean that those wanting to open false accounts would take their business to building societies', the report says, in summing up the attitude of the banks. Mr Fitzgerald asserts that the bankers' apparent rejection of an obligation to help expose and punish criminals involved could be regarded as a 'window into the community's moral attitude'. Lawyers and accountants, who helped criminals launder profits from prostitution, drug trafficking and child pornography without committing any offence themselves, provide an 'acute example of community cynicism'. 'Claiming high standards of personal probity while knowingly helping criminals achieve their ends is hypocrisy', Mr Fitzgerald said.

When the finance industry was deregulated in 1983, many in the industry also took it as the signal to deregulate caution, fiscal responsibility and business morality. We now have accountants and taxation lawyers at the top of the earnings tree while scientists, engineers and other productive

workers languish at the bottom. The economic success of countries such as Japan and West Germany is not based on the skills of their accountants and lawyers, but on their concentration on research and development, production and marketing.

In my view this distortion in our society has its origins in deficiencies in our legal system and in our laws and regulations which govern business activity. The case of Alan Bond and his business interests illustrates the point perfectly. Bond is now using the legal system to delay the inevitable demise of his interests in a manner which is unprecedented in Australian history. The legal system is being used as a weapon to avoid justice, not to achieve it. Millions of dollars of shareholders' money will flow into the pockets of lawyers without a single contribution to production. The Bond empire has always been run by accountants and lawyers whose prime concern is to manipulate assets rather than to produce them.

In his Australia Day address the Federal Minister for Education, John Dawkins, commented on the move away from science and engineering at our universities towards accountancy and law. While the corporate abuse of our legal system, accountancy standards, and company laws is allowed to continue, it is inevitable that our most able students will be drawn towards the rich rewards available from financial manipulation. We are fortunate that the messy demise of the Bond empire will have less effect in this State than otherwise would be the case thanks to the actions of the former Deputy Premier, Hugh Hudson.

I would commend to anyone who is interested in the Bond Corporation to read the speech which Hugh Hudson made on 24 May 1979 while introducing the Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings) Bill. This legislation was of course introduced to prevent the Bond Corporation taking control of Santos, the key operator in the Cooper Basin gas fields. The attempted takeover of 51 per cent of Santos by Bond was typically based on massive borrowings. The interest costs alone on those borrowings were predicted to exceed \$3 million a year with only \$872 000 worth of dividend to offset the payment. Bond clearly intended to use the financial strength of Santos to finance his takeover of that same company.

In his speech Hugh Hudson suggested a number of tactics that Bond would employ, such as the payment of consulting fees to the Bond Corporation, the sale of subsidiary companies owned by Bond to Santos at prices which might not reflect their proper asset value, or substantial increases in Santos dividends. Hudson also observed how the accounts of Bond Corporation were impossible to interpret properly without many hours of study, the notes to two pages of the accounts alone covering 24 pages. He also criticised Bond's attempts to use the media to boost the price of Santos shares as possibly illegal and certainly unethical. Hudson also commented, 'It is noteworthy that merchant banks, which have refused to be associated with raising money for the Bond Corporation as well as raising loans for Santos, on the grounds of conflict of interest, have either not been employed or had their employment terminated so far as Santos loan raisings are concerned. In other words, if one wanted to fund Santos, one had to fund Mr Bond as well.'

Anyone who has followed the recent reports of money transfers within Bond Brewing and other Bond interests would appreciate the astuteness of Hugh Hudson's judgments 11 years ago. At the time, however, Hugh Hudson was vilified by the press and the then Opposition Leader, Dr Tonkin, for attacking the 'spirit of enterprise, endeavour and initiative that has put South Australia on the map'.

Tonkin said:

'Unless this Bill is passed in its present form, we are told that the Bond Corporation will set in train a series of sinister and nefarious corporate activities, and that it will be able to do so with impunity.

The Deputy Premier has not advanced one shred of evidence for this view—only conjecture. He has totally ignored the provisions of the Companies Act which impose strict duties upon both shareholders and directors of public companies. He has used hearsay rather than hard facts to present his case to this Parliament. There are also the associated common law provisions which impose obligations and duties upon those who hold fiduciary positions in public companies.

Of course, the provisions of the Companies Act and the associated common law provisions were never likely to be effective against the likes of Bond, and they are not to this day. The National Companies and Securities Commission is hot on the trail of Bond—10 years too late. I have raised this matter in some detail because I believe the distortions in our economic system which result from this kind of unethical business behaviour are substantial and our inability to check them will cost us all dearly.

I would now like to turn to some matters of more local concern to the electors of Mitchell. In my short time as a member I have met a surprisingly large number of residents of retirement villages who are concerned about their rights. The owners of some of these villages have clearly exploited loopholes under existing legislation to rip off elderly residents. Further to my comments about banking morals, one of the worst of these retirement village owners is a prominent financial institution which last year derived half of its total profit from a handful of retirement villages. I am pleased that the Governor's address announced the Government's intention to legislate to improve consumer protection in this area.

In the time since my preselection as candidate for Mitchell there have been two issues where local residents strongly and overwhelmingly objected to the decisions of quasi-judicial bodies established by this Parliament. First, residents objected to proposals by the Geographical Names Board to rename their suburb Edwardstown East. The preference of over 90 per cent of affected residents was for their suburb to be called Melrose Park in honour of pioneer aviator Jimmy Melrose who had used an airstrip in the district. Secondly, residents in Mitcham council objected to Local Government Advisory Commission recommendations to transfer the Hills wards of Mitcham council into the proposed new City of Flinders. I am pleased to say that the wishes of residents ultimately prevailed in both of these cases.

Independent tribunals and advisory bodies will only perform satisfactorily if they have the confidence of the people. If they make unpopular decisions their 'independence' is of no consolation to us politicians who must ultimately accept the responsibility for their actions. With my experience on these two issues, I assure the House I will closely scrutinise any future measures which propose to enact away the powers of this Parliament to non-elected bodies. I also look forward to the outcome of the Committee of Review into the Local Government Advisory Commission and the adoption of better procedures which will ensure that the experience of Mitcham, and over half of my electors, was not in vain.

As a representative for Mitchell I believe I have a special responsibility. Mitchell has a particularly large number of disabled and low income residents whose quality of life is heavily dependent on Government. Mitchell also contains major contributors to the economy of this State such as Mitsubishi, Bridgestone and Hills Industries. It contains many dynamic small to medium businesses. Mitchell also

includes major institutions of learning and research such as Flinders University, Sturt College, Flinders Medical Centre, the South Australian Telecom Training School and the new Science Park, which is under construction following its opening by the Premier late last year.

I am proud to represent an area which will play such a vital role in the future of South Australia. I am also proud to represent the electors of Mitchell and the Bannon Labor Government.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and, in doing so, I reaffirm my loyalty to the Queen and to her representative. I congratulate the Speaker on his election to high office and I congratulate you, Sir, on your re-election to Parliament and your election as Deputy Speaker. I congratulate new members on both sides and particularly those who have spoken in this debate so far for the thoughtful contribution they have made.

One thing has struck me as quite interesting, and I hope that members from neither side will take it as offensive. In some cases it has been difficult to tell from the speeches that have been made whether the member is from the Labor Party or the Liberal Party. The expressions of compassionate concern from the member for Fisher are commonly considered to be the monopoly of Labor members, although that is not the case. The expressions of concern that we have just heard from the member for Mitchell in respect of the activities of Mr Bond are concerns that, I believe, the majority of Australians and I share. That common thread speaks well for the cooperation and the singleness of purpose in the interests of this State which, I hope, will characterise the deliberations of this Parliament.

I also congratulate the new Leader of the Opposition on his election to that extraordinarily demanding position and I also congratulate his predecessor, the member for Custance, on the valiant fight that he put up over a period of seven years in an attempt to bring the Liberal Party to Government in this State. The fact that he was not successful is no reflection upon John Olsen's leadership; rather, as has been pointed out, it is a reflection on an electoral system that enables a Party with only 48 per cent of the vote to be elected to Government.

On the day after the auspicious election of Dr Carmen Lawrence as Premier of Western Australia, I record my sincere congratulations to her on what is an historic achievement, one which, surprisingly, has not generated quite the interest and publicity that it warrants. I see nods of agreement from the other side. Dr Lawrence's election is a very historic event for Australia. I acknowledge that, had her election been as a result of the vote of the people—in other words, had she won a general election—it would have been more historic and I hope that, when that moment comes, it comes to a woman leader of a Liberal Party in one of the States. Who knows, it may well be Western Australia. I wish her well. She will bring a more civilised approach to politics in Western Australia and I hope that her influence spreads around the country.

I am pleased to express my gratitude to my own constituents and, in particular, to record that the swing to the Liberal Party in Coles was the biggest swing of any to the

Liberal Party in the metropolitan area and that the proportion of Democrat preferences accorded to the Liberal Party in Coles was greater than that in any other seat in the metropolitan area. That gives me considerable satisfaction. I express my gratitude to my husband and to my electorate committee, who have been unstinting and extremely loyal over many years in helping me represent the seat of Coles and in working for my re-election on five occasions.

When one's spirit and energy flags, one of the things that certainly keep me going is the knowledge that I am working not only for the ideals in which I believe but for the people who are prepared to work for those ideals behind the scenes. In particular, I think of one woman on my electorate committee who has been unstinting over a period of 12 years and whose strength of feeling for liberalism is such that she is prepared to continue, despite the repeated disappointment of defeat at general elections because, as she says, 'Jennifer, I don't want my boys to be fettered. I want them to live in a freer society than that which we experience under Labor Governments.' So, here I am back on the back bench, after 10 years in the front line and 12½ years in Parliament.

As I said, I congratulate all members who have been elected and, in particular, the 11 new MPs who took their seat in the House of Assembly last week. If these MPs feel as I did when I was first elected, they will be somewhat overwhelmed by the importance of their calling, and it is indeed an important calling—and they will be paralysed by nerves during their maiden speech, and those nerves will not cease in many cases as the years go by. Some of them at least will be disconcerted, as I was, by the rowdy behaviour of their colleagues. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we note that you are not disconcerted: you know how to handle it. Many of them will be deeply concerned at what they perceive to be their ignorance of procedure, law, policy and public affairs in general. It does indeed take time to absorb all these lessons, and all of us are continually learning.

The new members, and those of us who are continuing, are participating in a profession which has fallen into disrepute. The newcomers will find that they are treated with respect in their own electorates, certainly by their Party organisations and by the people with whom they come into close touch, but they will be regarded, as we all are, by many voters simply as Party lackies who sit with comfortable salaries and good superannuation, who continue to fleece the public with ever increasing taxes, and who are nothing more than voting fodder for their Party. To me (and, I believe, to all of us) these notions are hard to take.

I vividly remember when I was contemplating entering political activity—not Parliament—I visited Sydney to speak to the then State Director of the Liberal Party of New South Wales, later Senator Sir John Carrick. I visited him in his dingy Ash Street offices and asked him what it was like to be involved in politics. One of the first things he said to me was that, in his eyes, politics was second only to the priesthood in the opportunities it gives us to serve our fellow human beings. That is an idea that is as foreign to most people as we might say Bob Hawke is from Mother Theresa. The electorate at large does not hold that kind of view of politicians, and we can see the reasons why. Everyone of us would be keenly aware that people are very much alienated from the major political Parties. There is scarcely a major political or general columnist writing for the Australian press over the past two years both in the States and nationally who has not commented upon this with some depth of feeling.

To look at the reasons why this is occurring, we need to look at history. Political Parties developed for various reasons, and they were principally associated with the extension

of suffrage in Great Britain which began in the late 1860s. As the distinguished British Labour MP Richard Crossman put it in his introduction to the edition of Bagehot's *Constitution of England*:

Once votes became too numerous to buy, organised corruption was gradually replaced by Party organisation; and the voter was wooed not with offers of ready cash but with promises of State-financed benefits to come. The Party which, up to now, had been a weak organisation became a centralised, extra-parliamentary machine, constantly seeking to impose its discipline and its doctrine on the member of Parliament as well as on the Party worker.

Of course, increasingly this is what happened. The character of Parliament, in which members were once at liberty to speak and vote as they wished, has been altered beyond recognition. I believe the electorate's deep frustration is focussed principally on the fact that decisions are no longer made on the floor of Parliament on the merits of the case but are made in the Party rooms in the interests of what the political Parties see as their greatest advantage. In turn, that means that debate on the floor of the House has become a formality, and divisions where the Government has a majority are a foregone conclusion.

There is no doubt that the rigidity of the Party system does inhibit the free expression of views by members. It weakens Parliament's power to scrutinise and supervise Ministers' behaviour, and in the past two or three years in this House we have seen abundant evidence of this. There must have been times when members of the former Government—members of Caucus—were deeply ashamed of their Ministers and knew that they should have gone, but in the interests of Party unity they simply voted to support those Ministers who continued to serve out their time until it suited the Party to invite them to retire or resign. That Party discipline also circumscribes public debate and, above all, frustrates an electorate that really is yearning for full-blooded public expression of views on the great controversial issues of our time. If we could have that, we would be much closer to resolving some of those issues instead of dribbling, as one might say, towards the end of the twentieth century with so many of the great issues unaddressed.

The frustrations that I am expressing are of course by no means new. I was looking at a file on this matter of parliamentary reform and noted that in the *Canberra Times* of 16 May 1966 a former Conservative member of the House of Commons, Christopher Hollis, wrote that the question of reform should be urgently addressed. We are talking about a time nearly 30 years ago. He said that:

For the present system, though it does not suit backbenchers, suits the frontbenchers very well. They much prefer that the monopoly of parliamentary debate should remain in their hands.

He further states:

There may be reforms but whether they will be real reforms or just eyewash reforms, not intended really to change anything but just to keep the backbenchers quiet, remains to be seen. It remains equally to be seen how long the present enthusiasm for reform will persist. Fighting for reform, arguing with whips, making yourself unpopular is a very wearing business.

How true. Later, also in 1966 on 30 July, Kim Beazley, MP, then a backbencher, wrote:

For the majority Party, for narrow political advantage, will abet the Executive in its invasion of Parliamentary rights.

Of course, the political Party in office will therefore always support the Executive.

Mr Justice Kirby in 1984, in addressing a Young Liberal State Convention in New South Wales, talking about the role of a backbencher, said:

If trivia, loyalty and responding to division bells become the chief virtues of the backbench paragon, people of originality and ideas will look upon the parliamentary life with distaste.

That attitude will only be reinforced by the daily reports of personal denigration, the loss of personal and family privacy and

the other thankless burdens and calumny we tend to heap on our political representatives.

Mr Justice Kirby expressed the hope that, as the level of education of future politicians rose, it was unlikely that people of top quality would accept such a banal existence against the off-chance that after many years of service they would be rewarded with a ministerial portfolio.

I return to this Parliament, as it is presently constituted, for what will obviously be a very interesting term, and observe the nature of both the Parties and, with respect, the nature of the Independent members. We see that the Labor Party, by its very nature and principles, imposes uncompromisingly rigid discipline. That means that if the Liberal Party permits the full exercise of freedom by its members it will always be disadvantaged on the floor of the House, and that, in itself, is a tremendous discipline upon any individual member.

In a hung Parliament, of course, pressure will be placed on all MPs as never before and the Independents have a power and responsibility that most politicians can only dream of. Mr Speaker, I feel reasonably sure that the vast majority of voters in South Australia will be envying the people of Elizabeth and Semaphore. They have really come into their own and I feel sure that their representation over the next four years, or however long this Parliament lasts, will be of a high order.

It is worth noting that the concept of the so-called conscience vote, which is restricted to social issues such as abortion, capital punishment, gambling, and the like, is so narrow, in my opinion, as to be almost meaningless, especially in today's circumstances.

The founder of the Liberal Party, Sir Robert Menzies, laid it down that every Liberal member of Parliament should have the right to vote as he or she sees fit on any matter. There are no binding Liberal caucus decisions as in the ALP and there is certainly no automatic expulsion. There is, however, as there is in all Parties a feeling of loyalty to one's colleagues who are fighting for a cause just as strongly and with just as much commitment as an individual who may disagree with them is. It is worth noting that during the period of the Fraser Government there were 101 floor crossings by the Liberals. They did not all occur in the Senate, and I think that that is a tribute to the individual members and to the strength of a Party which permits that free expression of opinion. But it would be wrong to say that in the Liberal Party loyalty is not valued above all else. The obligation of loyalty, of course, is enforced by the preselection process and by the power of electoral colleges.

In deciding to go on to the back bench I have chosen to try to exercise a greater freedom than I was able to exercise as a frontbencher, constrained in comment and policy development largely to the portfolio issues for which I was responsible. I must say I have a feeling of liberation. How long that feeling lasts remains to be seen, but there are three particular themes, rather than issues, that I would like to explore during this period on the back bench.

The first is the environment with its myriad issues. The second is the economy, also with its myriad issues and variations. The third is greater than those two, it embraces those two and affects all of us, and it is the very nature of representation. I believe that political parties in the West, just as in the Eastern bloc, are in a state of transition. We are so close to that state of transition that many of us cannot see it, but anyone who believes that the failure of communism in the Eastern bloc simply means the success of capitalism in the west is sadly deluding themselves. The failure of communism and the realisation that people need freedom if they are to exercise any control over their destiny

is reflected in the deep frustrations held in virtually all the Western democracies.

Those frustrations find their greatest focus, I believe, in the issues relating to the environment. It is no accident that West Germany, which might be described as the crucible of the environmental debate, is a microcosm of what is happening, because West Germany was one of the first nations—partly because of its voting system, as in Tasmania—to return members who have as their principle issue the environment. West Germany has experienced first hand the appalling effects of pollution: the Black Forest and acid rain, and it has also, of course, experienced the appalling political effects and the fear of being right at the heart of the great power debate of the last four decades.

What we are seeing in the Eastern Bloc, in a rather dramatic fashion, I believe we are also seeing in a more subtle way in Western democracies. That is, we ponder the very nature of representation—how we can make political freedoms more meaningful to people and how we can, in a modern, highly educated society, with all the benefits of technology, give people more control over the decisions that affect them. For those reasons I have chosen to go to the back bench. Clearly, one person cannot make a very big difference—

An honourable member: How long will you stay there?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I might choose to stay on the back bench for the remainder of my parliamentary career. At this stage I cannot tell. I simply say that sometimes to step back and take a detached view of the great issues can be more important and rewarding than being in the front line on a day-to-day basis engaging in what might in this place be described as hand-to-hand combat. I conclude by again congratulating you, Mr Speaker, and wishing you well in carrying out the responsibilities that are obviously more onerous than those faced by most Speakers. Again, I express gratitude to my constituents for their confidence in me. I assure them that I will do my best to not let them down.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I support the Address in Reply. As a new member in this place I ask for the indulgence of members. I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment to your high office. I know that you will defend the privileges and Standing Orders of this House. I sought election to this House partly because I believe in the rule of law and in the making of laws by the Crown in the Parliament. I assure you, Mr Speaker, that I will always cooperate in the proper dispatch of business. As the youngest member of this Parliament I hope to make my association with this House a long one.

Mr Speaker, your predecessor, the member for Walsh, deserves mention because of his worthy service to this House in the last Parliament. I thank him for his work in bringing so many South Australians to a better understanding of the Parliament and its history.

I offer my good wishes to the new Leader of the Opposition. He has the intellectual honesty to give the South Australian Liberal Party its first genuine alternative program for decades. I expect something more than the carping of the old Liberal Party. I trust that the time and leisure which the people of South Australia gave members opposite will be put to better use than the past seven years. I am sure that a detailed reading of the Governor's speech would be a rewarding use of that time and leisure.

I am grateful to the Australian Labor Party for its endorsement in Spence. I deeply appreciate the loyalty and diligence of my comrades in the Spence East ALP sub-branch and the Woodville and Kilkenny ALP sub-branch. I thank the

electors of Spence for sticking with our great Party, despite serious challenges from a record number of candidates. The swing against the ALP in Spence was lower than in any of the 19 safe Labor seats—if there is such a thing as a safe seat.

Without the generosity and forbearance of my old employer, the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association, my campaign would have been much less effective. The SDA is my union, and I am proud of its role in industrial relations and in the South Australian Labor movement.

The former member for Spence (Hon. Roy Abbott) gave me many useful tips for contesting the seat. I thank him for his tolerance and good humour. I acknowledge the Hon. Chris Hurford, from whom I learnt much about government; and the late Cyril Hutchens, who provided a fine example of how Labor ought to serve the Croydon and Brompton areas.

My family has given me staunch backing in politics, especially my late father, John Atkinson, who included some Anglo-Irish commonsense and historical perspective in the raw socialism that I inherited from my mother. My wife, Joan, and my two children, Hugh and Bridget, have made sacrifices to help Labor retain Spence. I am sure that they attracted many votes to Labor in that electorate.

My family, on its Australian side, has been Labor for generations. My ancestors chose Labor on the New South Wales goldfields and in the Broken Hill mines. I am a Labor man. I did not join the Australian Labor Party to pursue a single issue, to assuage urban *bourgeois* guilt or for a course in political therapy. I am in this House to give voice and help to the people who vote Labor in the good times and in the bad times. There is no need to itemise in this speech the priorities in Spence. I know them, so do my neighbours and, soon enough, so will Ministers. I will always live in the Spence electorate, so voters know where to find me if they are dissatisfied.

I will address two aspects of His Excellency's speech. The first is his reference to the altered balance of international politics. I want to remark on how that affects the Australian Labor Party as a Socialist Party. The second issue is the proposed reform of the laws governing information.

In the past 12 months the power of Russian Communism has waned. Popular revolts have weakened the military threat it has posed for the past 40 years. The chances of another world war are receding. We owe this genuine peace not to the peaceniks or to the process of *detente*: we owe it to the cold war warriors, from Harry Truman to Andrei Sakharov, who defended western values and rejected the popular notion of a moral equivalence between the two power blocs.

I believe that Australian Governments, including Labor Governments, have been right to keep us in the Western alliance. I thank God I have lived to see the fall of totalitarian dictatorships in Central and Eastern Europe, especially in Poland, a country in which I have a long standing interest. I am delighted for the many Ukrainians, Hungarians and Serbs in the Spence electorate who have kept their faith in exile and defended the truth about their homelands against fashionable revisionism. The Communist dictatorships of Central and Eastern Europe featured purges, secret police, torture, show trials or summary execution, organised lying and the persecution of the Church. These regimes prohibited trade unions, a truthful press and opposition political Parties. They abrogated the rule of law. Along with the German Nazi Party, they inaugurated a model of tyranny more complete than anything in history.

After 40 years of so-called socialism in Poland, Polish workers took home less than \$A50 a week and could buy little with it. In Poland, after Solidarity was outlawed, a story circulated of a man running through the streets distributing leaflets. He is chased and caught by a squad of policemen. The police notice that the leaflets are blank and demand to know why nothing is written on them. The offender replies, 'Writing? Who needs writing? Everything is obvious.' Yet for more than 40 years these dictatorships found willing apologists in the west, especially in Australian universities. The so-called Socialist Alliance and its fellow travellers waged a strong campaign against me in Spence and did me the honour of directing their second preferences away from Labor.

The English democratic socialist writer George Orwell characterised these apologists nicely when he wrote, 'They can swallow totalitarianism because they have no experience of anything but Liberalism.' The dictatorships of Central and Eastern Europe called themselves socialist: they discredited socialism. The leader of the New South Wales Labor Party, Mr Bob Carr, has argued that the vast majority of Labor voters have no interest in socialism. He says the word 'socialism' is so badly soiled it ought to be dropped from Labor's objective. I disagree. I believe that the Australian Labor Party ought to renew socialism and continue to struggle for our own version of this humane doctrine that has achieved so much when combined with Western values and institutions.

There is no better place to start than with George Orwell's definition in *The Road to Wigan Pier*. Orwell asked 'What is the mark of a real socialist?' He says: 'I suggest that a real socialist is one who wishes—not merely conceives it as desirable, but actively wishes—to see tyranny overthrown.' But, Orwell continues, 'I get the impression that to orthodox Marxists the whole socialist movement is nothing more than a kind of exciting heresy hunt—a leaping to and fro of frenzied witch-doctors to the beat of tom-toms and the tune of 'fee fi fo fum, I smell the blood of a right-wing deviationist.'

I believe the renewal of socialism in the West must borrow from the experience of Eastern Bloc dissent. We must understand the message of those who suffered under the caricature of socialism in the Soviet Bloc, no matter how deeply that message challenges our assumptions. Leszek Kolakowski, the Polish historian of marxism, could not get a hearing from the British Left when he fled Warsaw for Oxford and wrote in 1974:

When I say 'socialism' I do not mean a state of perfection but rather a movement trying to satisfy demands for equality, freedom, and efficiency, a movement that is worth trouble only as far as it is aware not only of the complexity of the problems hidden in each of these values separately but also of the fact that they limit each other and can be implemented only through compromises.

Turning to the second aspect of my remarks, His Excellency's speech mentions the Government's intention to introduce a freedom of information law. I welcome that. But I believe it needs to be supplemented by a new defamation law.

South Australians ought to have free and robust debate about public matters, but public debate in South Australia is often muffled because the defamation law is being misused. What Adelaide journalist has not received the threat, 'If you write about that I'll sue you for all you're worth?' Adelaide's journalists must share some of the blame for the timidity of much public debate. Reporters do not try to understand the law of defamation although, when the late Bob Jervis was cadet counsellor at the *Advertiser*, they had no excuse not to. Sub-editors underestimate existing def-

ences, such as fair comment and fair report. Timid editors treat gagging or stop writs as if they were injunctions.

But the law is mainly to blame. Since the failure of the proposed uniform defamation law in 1984, South Australia has been free to go its own way on defamation. The main change that is needed is a limit on defamation actions by public officials and public figures, including politicians. I am not expecting a rush of support from either side of the House for this proposal. However, I am disgusted by the number of public figures who boast of buying expensive cars and swimming pools from the proceeds provided by newspaper executives who are scared of going to court. I am outraged by those who gloat about the success of their stop writs in suppressing further public debate on matters that they do not want discussed. Millionaires and people who can hire lawyers without cost to themselves are mocking press freedom in Australia, especially the freedom of the small independent journals.

The defamation law needs to change its focus from damages to prompt retractions and corrections. Judges should be able to order corrections to be published and also direct the publisher as to the content, time, form, extent and manner. This, not damages, will force the editorial floor to lift its game. Money damages for defamation are now ridiculously high and do not remedy the wrong which is done to the plaintiff's reputation and not his wallet.

The defamation law must be changed so that public figures cannot recover damages unless they can prove that the defamatory statement was made with malice—with knowledge that the statement was false or in reckless disregard of the statement's truth or falsity. This has been the law in the United States since the 1964 U.S. Supreme Court decision in *The New York Times v. Sullivan*. In a society that allows freedom of expression, erroneous statements will often be made either deliberately or mistakenly. But free debate is so precious that even erroneous statements, provided that they are not malicious, ought to be given qualified protection so that free debate may have the breathing space it needs to survive and flourish.

Public figures should be handicapped in defamation law for three reasons. First, public figures are privileged. They are more likely to have their statements reported in the media than are private individuals, so they have a better chance of replying to false statements about them. Politicians have absolute privilege when replying in Parliament. Secondly, in seeking the limelight, public figures voluntarily take on the risk that false statements may be made about them. Finally, we know of several cases in which public figures have had their defamation cases funded by their company or Consolidated Revenue. The defamation law is not a level playing field.

In conclusion, I would like to share with the House some words of G.K. Chesterton in his biography of Saint Francis, which I read not long after the Mareeba Hospital controversy first washed over my campaign and my family. The words could apply to all new members. They certainly apply to me. Chesterton wrote:

Nobody knows better than I do now that it is a road upon which angels might fear to tread, but though I am certain of failure I am not altogether overcome by fear.

I thank the House for the courtesy with which it has heard me.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to support the Address in Reply and have the opportunity to speak. At the outset I should like to offer a few congratulations. The first is to you, Mr Speaker, on your election to very high office in this Parliament. I have no doubt that you will acquit yourself admirably, and you will have the respect of members on both sides of the House. I look forward to being a

member of the Opposition with you as Speaker, and I trust that things will go well.

I congratulate all new members on their election to this House. It is the biggest change that I have witnessed since coming here seven years ago. There are six new members on the Government side and five on the Opposition. I cast my mind back some years when members of Parliament seemed to be down in the sights of the general public. Hopefully that situation has improved considerably since then. At that stage people were saying that they ought to throw all members out of Parliament and bring in a new lot of people. Looking back about 22 years, that is exactly what has happened in this House, with the exception of one or two members. Basically, those who wanted all the old members out and new ones in have had their wishes fulfilled. It is to be hoped that we are running under a much better parliamentary system, with a better group of people. I am sure that all those who are here in parliament in 1990 will agree that we are doing our best to serve the people as well and efficiently as we can. Having heard some of the new members on both sides. I think the public can look forward to good representation.

I should like to mention particularly the new members on the Opposition side. First, the member for Adelaide, Dr Armitage, has brought the seat back to where it should be—in the Liberal camp. I know that he will be an excellent representative. He will ensure that his constituents have full representation, and this Parliament will hear much more from him.

The member for Bright, Mr Wayne Matthew, has still to make his maiden speech, and I look forward to hearing it. He has worked hard. He has set himself up in a new office and is looking to be a force in the Parliament.

Mr Lewis: The Minister of Housing and Construction is so stingy that he will not even give him a power point for his cook unit.

Mr MEIER: I am sure the Minister of Housing and Construction will. It must be an oversight. I trust that all new members will be looked after in the way that members of Parliament should be.

The new members for Fisher, Mr Bob Such, for Hayward, Mr Mark Brindal, and for Newland, Mrs Dorothy Kotz, were all excellent candidates and are now members of Parliament. We shall hear much more from them, and their constituents can look to them for excellent representation.

It is a very interesting situation to have a minority Government in power. Many of my constituents and friends have said, 'Well, there is little doubt that this Government will not last the four years.' I suppose that no-one knows the outcome until the expiration of that period. In a sense, it is interesting to see how the Premier has gone from Mr 70 per cent plus to Mr 48 per cent, and before and since the election he really has looked a defeated Premier. I am sure that his colleagues must be very worried about his performance and how things are going.

I suppose it is just a matter of time before he is replaced, but I do not think that will make any difference, because the Labor Party, which has been in power for some 20 of the past 25 years, has come almost to the end of its run. Perhaps that is epitomised by the fact that you, Mr Speaker, are in the Chair, and I compliment you on your appointment. You perhaps epitomise the fact that the Labor Party does not have anyone it can put into the position of Speaker and it is very lucky to hang onto office at this stage—we will soon find out for how long. What an interesting election it was. The Liberals made the front running from the word 'go'. The Liberals' first-class policies would have enabled us

to win hands down if it were not for the misinformation that came from the Labor Party.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr MEIER: And, as my colleague reminds me, because of the crook election system—52 per cent of the vote, and we do not win—we are still in Opposition. It is worse than the Queensland system and, thankfully, we are seeking to address the problem so that at least a Party that gets more than 50 per cent of the vote will be in Government. I trust that we will be able to remedy that problem as soon as possible, and I look forward to the recommendations of the select committee in due course. I must admit that I was somewhat surprised to see how the Labor Party dragged its feet so terribly and how it was completely caught out, because the Liberal Party did some things well before the election that worried me a little, and I will tell the House why.

We announced many of our policies well before the election. I thought it was a situation of showing our hand too early. I said to some of my colleagues, 'I don't like it. We are forewarning the Labor Party. We're asking for trouble, and they'll counter us wherever they can.' However, it did not happen. We went into the campaign with the new and additional policies that had not been released. We emphasised some of the policies that had been well received by the public. The Labor Party was caught napping. All they could come up with—

Mr Lewis: The 'me too' approach.

Mr MEIER: Yes. The member for Briggs tried to get a lot of publicity when he asked where the money was coming from, and they tried to drum that up. In the meantime, they were outbidding the Liberal Party all the time. I refer to a classic statement in the *Advertiser*, made towards the end of the campaign, under the headline 'Bannon plans \$200 million Victoria Square facelift', as follows:

Mr Bannon said he hoped the multi-million dollar upgrading could be finished in time for Year 2000 celebrations. He said the proposals would cost 'more than \$200 million' but precise figures had yet to be worked out.

At the same time, the member for Briggs, who in earlier days was referred to as the fabricator—and we will wait and see how he performs as a Minister—was saying, 'Where is the money coming from, Liberals?', only to have his Premier saying, 'Not too loud, because we're pouring it out, too, don't forget.'

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Yes, there was supposed to be some private finance. I wonder how many deals had been signed already and how many companies had been given a commitment. We knew full well that the Government was flying a big kite and saying, 'We're in desperate trouble. We have to have a headline to get the people back on side. What needs development? Victoria Square should work well.' Whether or not that managed to swing people in a few of the marginal seats, no-one will ever know. Whatever the case, it was not the only topic that was brought into the debate.

Members will recall that early last year the Liberal Party started to put out statements about its shacks policy. In about June the full policy was released for general discussion. What happened? We were lambasted by the Government as being irresponsible: the freeholding of shacks was not on; what right did these people have to freehold their shacks! These people who want to get away for a holiday have no right to freehold! The Liberals were told they were totally irresponsible. We got it week after week from the Minister of Lands, the Hon. Susan Lenehan, and it kept going up to the election campaign. One week and three days before the actual campaign began the Minister finally had sufficient pressure put on her by the Premier, who told her,

'Susan, do something about the Liberals, because they're winning hands down.' What did she do? She sent out a letter to all shack owners.

I give her full credit for the timing of this letter, because it was sent to most shack owners either on the Friday, one week before the election campaign began, or on the Monday, less than a week before. It was difficult for the Liberal Party to put out a subsequent statement. I am sure that all members know that to get articles published in the press in the last week before an election, they must be of monumental importance. I was sufficiently wise to know that we could not counter this move through the press.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I am referring to the shack sites policy, which the Government itself did not have. The Liberals had had a policy for many months before. A week before the election because the Premier pushed the Minister and told her to do something, she decided to give life tenure to those people whose leases were to expire in either 1994 or 1999. I quote from the Minister's letter to shack owners in which she states in the fourth paragraph:

As the owner of a site whose lease expires between 1994 and 1999 you are now entitled to life tenure. This new tenure applies from 4 November 1989 and will be granted to the registered owners of a Crown lease or council licence. It is a non-transferable right of occupation for your lifetime and will guarantee continued right of occupation to your surviving spouse.

I (and other Liberal members) received quite a few phone calls asking 'Is this right?' I said, 'You will have to ask the Minister.' She had left it to the eleventh hour to suddenly make a statement, having caned the Liberal Party for trying to give increased tenure to shack owners. She said that that was irresponsible, but at the eleventh hour she did a very similar thing.

The Hon. H. Allison: It's called shack relief.

Mr MEIER: Yes. I must admit that most people did not see the second part of that statement indicating that it would be a non-transferable right. I know that my colleague the new shadow Minister of Lands has been approached, as I have, by people who suddenly want to sell their shacks. People have always been able to do so in the past, even though they had a limited prospect—either to 1994 or to 1999. Thus, the price went down accordingly. But guess what? They cannot sell them now. It is probably the only item in this State that one can think of for which one can have a lease which one cannot transfer or sell.

Those people are in a totally hopeless position, and the Minister is shown up for having thrown together a policy at the eleventh hour to try to appease a section of the community. Whether that was the thing that helped to swing a few votes, we will never know, but the Minister has left this State with an enormous mess, and I would like to know how she will get over this problem, when people cannot sell their shacks. I know that the new shadow Minister of Lands has already had many inquiries on this topic.

What really upset me in that letter was the mistruths. The Minister said:

The Opposition policy is directed towards the freeholding of life tenure shacks and does not specify sites such as yours which are held on a terminating lease. Even without this qualification, I point out that the policy does not provide for automatic freeholding of all sites, and I ask you to consider the following questions in relation to your site.

She then goes through quite a few. The Minister would have been well advised to look at the Liberal Party's shack site policy dated November 1989. I said earlier that the first one came out in June. We received back many comments, and the new policy was almost identical, with a few exceptions. Some of the shack owners said, 'We need more clarification on the term "life tenure". What do you mean?' As

the person handling the lands portfolio at that time, I said, 'We are talking about those sites that will come up for termination from 1994 to 1999, generally referred to as non-acceptable sites.'

They said, 'Why don't you specify that in the policy?' and I said, 'I am quite happy to change the wording.' I checked with the Party, and it was quite happy because that is what was meant. If the Minister had bothered to obtain our policy she would have found that we did refer to the terminating, to life tenure and to unacceptable shacks. I am happy to make this freely available to anyone who wants to see it, since it went out to many people during the election campaign. So, I was very upset that mistruths were peddled during the election campaign by the Minister of Lands. It is disconcerting that an election can be won by using false statements.

I could say many other things regarding the campaign, but members on both sides are well aware of them. However, I think that the height of hypocrisy was reached by the Australian Democrats—the Party which should not be with us, so far as I am concerned. On Tuesday 21 November an advertisement appeared in the *News* with a photograph of Ian Gilfillan, the Leader. It said:

Democrat votes are never wasted.

That is a false statement for a start, although I will not go into that too deeply. The advertisement reads:

This Saturday, use the full power of South Australia's preferential voting system. Give your number 1 vote to the Democrats and your number 2 to your next choice. If your Democrat candidate is counted out, then your full vote will go on to your next choice. There are Democrat candidates in every seat.

Personally, I believe that they are wasted votes, because the Democrats can promise anything yet do not have to deliver, since they will not be in power. The sooner people wake up to this fact, the sooner we will have better and more responsible Government both in this State and federally.

The advertisement contains the following classic statement, which was highlighted:

Make 'em sweat!

not even correct English—

No matter who is Premier after Saturday, you will need Ian Gilfillan and other Democrats in the Upper House to make them keep their promises and steer South Australia towards a sustainable economy.

They do not have the foggiest idea what they are on about, but they made that statement. In the *Advertiser* of Thursday 23 November an article appeared with the following heading, 'Voluntary vote to fail'. The article carried a photograph of Mr Elliott, one of the Democrats in the Upper House. He was not up for election last year, and let us hope that he does not get re-elected at the next election.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I can see nothing rough with that statement. It is a statement of fact.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: No, I want to see responsible government in this State and we are not having it. Enough said.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: No, we wouldn't have him.

The SPEAKER: Order! I direct the attention of the honourable member to the fact that interjections are out of order and I ask him to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I quote from that article as follows:

The push for voluntary voting in State elections would not be supported by the Australian Democrats, who will hold the balance of power in the Upper House after Saturday's poll... The Democrats' Mr Mike Elliott said today there was no way in the wide, wide world his Party would support the idea of voluntary voting, and he knew the Labor Party felt the same way.

I remind members that the Democrats advertisement said that, to make the Government keep its promises, the people needed the Democrats. One of the Liberal Party's key promises was to introduce voluntary voting. The Democrats said that they would make us keep our promises; yet, two days later, they stated that they would not allow voluntary voting. They are complete hypocrites. They do not know what they are on about and, the sooner the Australian Democrats are out of Parliament and the sooner the people of South Australia see through them for what they are, the better off we will be.

I turn my remarks to two matters that will generate a lot more debate in this House. First, I mention HomeSafe, the 'me too' principle of the Labor Party. They even got the name wrong, showing how the proposal was trumped up on the Sunday night, when it was decided that the Liberal Party's policy, which had been criticised by the Premier, had to be countered in some way. The Labor Party decided to eat its words and imitate our policy. I quote from the *Advertiser's* report of the ALP policy speech, as follows:

Mr Bannon said that as part of a Families of the Future program, from 1 January next year, a Labor Government would direct grants of \$86 a month to families with a gross income of up to \$55 640 a year who took out a home loan after April 1986. 'It will help up to 35 000 South Australian families, and will be in place while interest rates remain above 15 per cent,' Mr Bannon said.

That sounds fantastic. After the proposal had been well publicised, the Minister was asked last week how many people were on the list. It could have been expected that as many as 70 000 would be waiting for assistance or that the figure might be 35 000, 20 000 or even only 10 000. What was it? If my memory serves me correctly, just over 300 families are being helped. We will hear a lot more about that. It is a disgrace that the Labor Party decided to go for this proposal and said, 'Promise it now, get in, and we can cancel it later.' That is exactly what is happening.

Another issue is free transport for schoolchildren. A few people rang me and said, 'Look, what can you Liberals offer?' These people admitted that it would save them X amount of dollars per week, totalling so many dollars per year. I acknowledge that it was certainly a vote grabber. What really upsets me is that the Labor Party, headed by the member for Briggs, asked the Liberals where the money was coming from; yet they were pushing this and other programs. Where is the money coming from for free school transport?

I heard one member on our side of the House say that already three extra buses have been put on one route in the morning period. If that is being duplicated all over the place, where is the money coming from? No figure seems to be available at present. It is another of the uncosted Labor Party promises. However, a figure of in excess of \$20 million has been mentioned. If that is the case, and the STA was in debt for about \$120 million last year, will it go to \$140 million? (However, allowing for inflation it will probably be \$150 million this year.) It worries me terribly how it will be paid for. Once something like this is brought in, the people love it and welcome it, but where are we going to—

Mr Ferguson: What is your policy?

Mr MEIER: At the last election, the then Leader (Mr Olsen) was asked, 'Will you duplicate it?' He said, 'We would love to but we cannot afford to do that.'

Mr Ferguson: So you are opposing it?

Mr MEIER: Do you want me to state it again? We said the money is not available at this stage to implement it, but Labor said, 'No, we will implement it. The \$200 million-odd facelift for Victoria Square—no worries. Our big pro-

gram for housing—no worries.' It is all coming from somewhere.

Mr Groom: Where were you going to get the money from?

Mr MEIER: We were not going to provide free transport—do you not hear me? That was a large figure that Labor exceeded, as with this one, and I just wonder how we will fare with increases in taxes and charges in the coming year. Labor will probably blame us somehow, saying that we asked for these things.

Mr Groom: Do you not support this?

Mr MEIER: It is a marvellous thing. I would love to have free everything—free taxis, free cars, free houses—it would be beautiful. Who would I be to knock that? But, as a jolly responsible person, I just ask, 'Where are the diamond mines in this State? Where are the huge gold mines? Where is all the money coming from at a time when our country is in massive foreign debt and we should be tightening our purse strings?'

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The honourable member is still very upset that he did not get a position in the Ministry. He is trying to make up for it by interjecting all the time.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The member for Hartley knows that.

Mr MEIER: I acknowledge that when we come into Government, probably before four years have expired, the system will be entrenched, so how could we suddenly say 'No'? We would have all the people up in arms against us, and you could understand them. The Labor Party brought it in, just as it brought in free tertiary education some years ago but, after a while, realising that it got them into power, members opposite wondered how they could get rid of it. They said, 'We will have to make them start paying.' Slowly they have had to bring it back, so paying is all right—they abolished free tertiary education. They thought that the Liberals would not be able to criticise that move because our original policy was for those students to pay, anyway. The Liberals brought in a much better system, but they even get criticised for that. You cannot win in this game.

I am very concerned about many of the promises that Labor has made, and it is understandable in its Homesafe or Homesure policy, as it is calling it now, that it has had to back-pedal. Much of the free transport seems to apply only to STA, yet the outlying areas are experiencing great difficulties, including people in rural areas. Many people have contacted me asking, 'What about complete free transport?' I have said, 'You do have the school buses.' They say, 'Yes, but we don't have the freedom to send our children to the school of our choice. Therefore, we should be provided with free transport.' I have said that that is a very good point, and the Premier has had quite a few letters in that respect, let alone free transport on other road lines.

I wonder how the photograph system will work. My two sons live in Maitland so, when they come to the city, they can get free transport, but does that mean they must have a photograph to prove who they are? I suppose time will tell on that matter. I could say many other things about the election campaign. It was one where the wrong Party was put into Government, even though the other Party got 52 per cent of the vote. It is a disgraceful situation where the Government sits on the other side with 48 per cent of the vote. Let us hope that that situation will be changed as soon as possible.

I am looking forward to taking up the new challenges as shadow Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Marine. I want to publicly acknowledge the assistance of the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, who has already been supportive of me. Whilst I know that we will spar across the floor

of this Chamber, I certainly have great respect for the Minister and look forward to taking up the challenge in agriculture and fisheries and learning a lot more about them. Also, I know that things are in train to have a briefing with the appropriate marine officers. I feel at home with the marine portfolio as there are many ports and wharves in my area, but I have a lot to learn about other areas of this State. The Opposition will be able to ensure that the Government is doing the right thing by the various industries and by the people of South Australia generally. As I said at the beginning, I support the Address in Reply.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I am grateful for the opportunity to speak. I am disappointed that I am still on this side of the Chamber

Mr Hamilton: What happened?

Mr S.G. EVANS: I will come to that. I am grateful for the interjection. I will not name each individual who left the Parliament during the last term, but I appreciated their company, their comradeship and at times conflict, no matter on which side of the House they were. The chemistry works with individuals, regardless of politics: sometimes in this game you can have your best friend on the other side of the Chamber and your worst enemy on your own side of the Chamber.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: That's true—it is about 50 per cent, and the honourable member has about 75 per cent. I welcome the new members. I have not had the opportunity to get to know many of the new members opposite, but I wish them well in representing their electorate. I hope that they have this one successful term and not come back next time, as no doubt they would wish upon me. To those behind me who have come into the Parliament and will move forward later—the new members for Adelaide, Newland, Fisher, Hayward and Bright—I wish them all the best in their parliamentary career and guarantee that I will help them as much as I can in the future. I appreciated the opportunity to help them in the last campaign.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Mount Gambier suggests that I will help them out: that occurs opposite but not on this side of the Chamber. I wish to raise some issues relating to my electorate and of concern to the people in my area. Such matters should also be of concern to the Government. At the junction of Sheoak Road, James Road and Upper Sturt Road, Belair, a bridge, which passes over the main Melbourne permanent way, had to be replaced. The old bridge was too low for standard containers. Money was made available to raise the bridge. The new bridge was built and I must give credit for that. At the planning stage we asked for work to be delayed until after the bushfire season and to help the little storekeeper prior to the Christmas period of 1988-89. The Government agreed to that change and it was appreciated because, if there was a fire, there was no quick access out of the area if the fire was coming from Brownhill Creek or Torrens Park, depending on which way the wind was blowing.

The bridge was completed and it was to be opened on the Monday or Tuesday before the election. Unfortunately, the Minister of Transport was in Port Augusta trying to win a couple of votes that he thought he had lost and he could not get back for the opening. Nobody was told about the proposed opening except the candidate for the area, but I got wind that it might be opened and thought that I would drift along. The candidate was trying to find the Minister to say, 'Look, Frank, we need you to open this bridge.'

Be that as it may, the bridge was opened by just letting the traffic flow through, and on the first day, an STA bus

driver said, 'Sorry, we won't use it.' This bridge was built in the 1990s; we are now close to the twentieth century; and yet the bridge was built in such a way that the STA buses could not negotiate it without either hitting a concrete wall or travelling over the double lines, which is an offence. The poor old bus driver, and I feel sorry for him, who hit the concrete wall and did a little bit of damage, not much, was placed in a position of having to contact his superiors and say, 'The bridge is just not traffickable with our buses.' So the buses were re-routed while assessments were made.

It is difficult to accept that in this day and age we have built a bridge over only a short span, costing over half a million dollars, which is not suitable for heavy vehicles to travel on. If two buses or a truck and a bus met on a corner it was impossible for them to pass. When I raised the problem, the first suggestion was to do away with the double line and put in a single line so that they would not break the law if they crossed over to the other side. This is on a bridge right alongside a school crossing, over a railway line. That is just ludicrous and it is playing with the lives of people.

The department had one difficulty. There was a sewer inspection point half way across the bridge. The concrete wall was there to try to protect that. In the end, the engineers did take out part of the concrete wall, shifted the safety barriers out a little bit on the western side and so made it traffickable. I make the point to the House: one cannot sack people for that and I am not suggesting it, but why does it occur? The men working in the trucks knew there was a problem but their superiors did not take any notice of them. They had more commonsense than their superiors, and to top it off the E&WS Department knew six months before that the mains needed to be changed before the bridge could be completed and in the last 10 days they were trying to change the alignment for the water mains. The sewer mains were fixed. The Highways Department workers were frustrated. They are a very dedicated gang of guys and they were frustrated because they had to sit around virtually waiting for the E&WS to do something that it had known for months needed to be done.

That is the sort of waste that upsets the people in the electorate, especially when next door, in the Belair recreation park, the Minister for Environment and Planning quite openly allowed the destruction of a massive number of mature trees because they happened to be exotics and somebody said they would spread rapidly through the area and cause infiltration amongst the native vegetation. Not in 88 years had anybody gone through that park and pulled out one pine seedling, to my knowledge, as a planned program. I was not around all of that time—

Mr Becker: Close!

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Hanson says 'Close'—well, he is not far behind me, but he looks older. However, people much older than myself, who have lived there all their lives, were absolutely amazed. Yet, the Minister says, 'We will set up a committee and have a look to see which ones we can save and people can submit lists.' I would not bother to do it as an individual because the people involved are determined to say that pine trees are a weed. In most cases, as to radiata, insignis and cyprus they say we should get rid of them.

It would have been a simple process to take out those trees that were a problem and on a regular basis, say every couple of years, pull them out or let them grow to three or four feet and sell them as Christmas trees or give them to a local charity, such as the Crippled Children's organisation, to sell as a money raiser.

If controls had been instigated large numbers of trees would not have been involved. The cyprus pines in the beautiful spot alongside the dam where many people used to go for recreation were cut down. We are being told to protect ourselves from the rays of the sun because of the risk of cancer and yet we take out the best shade trees in the park. Members should remember that this is a recreation park, not a conservation park, although I agree that parts of it need to be conserved. This park was the second national park named in Australia. I can understand people being upset about these trees being removed.

Only two years ago a decision was made to charge people entering this park. However, if one bought a plant from the Woods and Forests nursery in the park and showed it or the receipt for it on leaving the park one got one's money back. The money collected from this charge was put into the park reserve fund. I thought that all of the money went into that fund but I now find that that is not the case, that the wages of the attendants who collect the money at the entrance to the park are debited to that account.

At about the time of the protests in relation to cutting down the trees the Minister unveiled a plaque for a path to commemorate a person who had put a lot of time and effort into that park in years gone by. I have to give her credit for the way in which she handled herself in a difficult situation; many people admired the way in which she handled the situation. At the unveiling the Minister said that the money charged for entering the park would be used to carry out improvements to it. But we now find that a lot of that money is used to pay wages.

The Minister has not told us that what now occurs (and I believe Cleland park might be next on the list) is that attendants no longer man the entrance to the park on weekdays and that there is an honour box there for people to put money into if they wish. Those who believe in the park and know that it is a great spot will put their money in; some may put extra money in; but others will not. I believe that attendants will be at the entrance to the park on public holidays, school holidays, Saturdays and Sundays. I understand that the reason for the sacking of the attendants, who were employed on a permanent casual basis, for the days when it will not be manned is because the Belair park reserve fund was overspent by \$53 000.

That is not the fault of the staff; it is the fault of management. Some of those part-timers who were relying on that money to help them with their studies or to gain other employment were suddenly told that the fund had been overspent and that they would be required only on public holidays, school holidays, Saturdays and Sundays.

When the Hon. Don Hopgood, the Deputy Premier, was the Minister responsible, a wire netting fence with barbs on top was erected around the park. It was called a vermin-proof fence. It may have kept dogs out, but it will not keep foxes out. It has been proven beyond doubt that foxes can climb up to eight feet over barbed wire netting, and that the only way they can be stopped is with an electric fence. A lady in her 60s living on Upper Sturt Road, who used to walk into the park, asked about having a gate put in the fence opposite her home so that she, and others living nearby, some two kilometres from the main gate and about one kilometre from the more south-easterly gate of the park, could continue to do that. However, she was told in a very sarcastic way that the fence was erected to keep out vermin.

I told her to write to the Minister giving the names of the two officers, in particular the name of the officer who made the comments, because, initially, that lady was promised a gate in the fence by two officers who left their names, but, when they came to put up the fence they did not leave

an opening—a hand gate or even a stile as seen in many parts of Europe. In other words, it was to say to those who wish to enjoy the park, even to pedestrians, 'Keep out.' At the same time they put out poison for foxes before the fence was completed, so they said. Let me say to the House quite clearly, poison baits anywhere near a residential area are a risk and I was brought up in the bush and I know it, as do people in the bush and on farms because if a bird, a crow or a magpie in particular, picks up the bait, it senses that something is wrong and one is lucky to poison either of those two species. The birds will pick up the baits and carry them, and they can be dropped anywhere. One lady lost a dog, which went into the park, but the fence was not there then. There has not been a dog-proof fence there since I went to school in the area in 1935.

This is what we call a conservation park; in fact, it is part of the Belair Recreation Park. We will not stop the cats getting over the top of that fence and we will not stop the foxes getting in. It might keep out a few domestic dogs or stray dogs but primarily the fence was to stop human beings walking in from outside. Someone in the department got a bug. People have already cut holes in the fence on the northern side of the park, and near the Belair golf course. On Sheoak Road, which runs on the northern side of the park, the Mitcham and Stirling council decided to put a gate on the fire track. This really is a public road, but the Stirling council has not sealed its side. What do the locals do? They carry bolt cutters. They do not go back; they just cut it and it takes the council a few days to put another chain on the gate. It is a waste of public money.

I will refer briefly to one other aspect of bad engineering, that is the bridge over the South Eastern freeway, just as one passes through Crafers. I am unsure whether that bridge was built by the Liberal Government or during the latter part of the administration of the Walsh/Dunstan Government. However, it was in the Liberal Government's administration of 1968-70 that I wrote to the Hon. Murray Hill asking why the bridge had been built so low that there is the necessity for a sign saying, 'High vehicles detour'. Those vehicles must detour through the main street of Crafers, which is not a big town, but people shop there, reside there and recreate there. Therefore, high vehicles, if they are travelling to Melbourne, must detour through the township or if they are travelling the other way, must detour around the on and off ramps on the south-western side.

Just after New Year's Day, or around that time, I was coming down the road and a truck was jammed under the bridge because the driver thought that the bridge was of a standard height. There is a sign on the bridge saying that it is only 14 feet and a couple of inches high. However, as people drive over the crest of the hill, they are heading down and the top of the bridge is higher and above normal sight line. About one-third of a kilometre nearer the city, a sign states, 'High vehicles detour', but people do not see it. There is already enough to occupy their mind. The drivers are carrying standard loads which pass under every other bridge on the road, including the foot bridge that is within 150 metres and the bridge at Stirling, about one kilometre farther on and another bridge two kilometres farther along at Bridgewater.

One does not even think about the bridge being under height if one is not used to the road. I do not know whether the truck in which two people were killed recently clipped the top of that bridge; no-one knows for sure. I have some doubts, but inevitably accidents have happened and trucks have been jammed under the bridge. Often a break-down vehicle has had to pull them out, because the truck could not be dislodged.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member suggests letting the tyres down, but I am not sure about that. But why in these modern days do we not take a piece out of the road, even if it affects the road's foundations, or raise the bridge by about nine inches? Why do we not fix the problem that exists on the main road to Melbourne? I do not care whether the problem has arisen under a Labor or a Liberal Government. Certainly, the Hon. Murray Hill explained the problem to me in 1969 when he said the bridge was built according to the Road Traffic Act requirement at that time and not to the national highways standard. That was a sneaky way to get around the problem. Even if those two recent deaths were not associated with the bridge, someone's life will be lost as a result of that hazard. Many people have been injured or shaken up.

Recently there has been talk about electoral boundaries and the Premier has said that we have a fair and just electoral system in South Australia. He describes it as one vote one value. It is not one vote one value. When the new electoral boundaries were introduced I said that they were bad. I think I used the term 'shonky' or 'crook'. I believe that sincerely. I do not know why that redistribution occurred. Who in their right mind would include old Port Noarlunga in the district covering Mount Barker, or include Clarendon in the district covering Mount Osmond? I refer to the area from Stirling to Mount Barker in Heysen going back to Clarendon and picking up old Noarlunga, and there are many other similar examples.

Who would have made the District of Fisher virtually line ball on the mean of about 19 000 constituents, as in my present seat of Davenport? Those responsible knew that there would not be much growth in Davenport but that there would be a lot of growth in Fisher. Everyone knew that. What about the district of Elizabeth, with a decreasing number of constituents? The number has gone down to about 16 000 constituents—below the mean. There are many other examples, such as the Premier's district and country districts.

I have copped a bit of flack about the suggestion that there be fewer parliamentarians, and all sorts of things. But the problem was that the country districts were placed way over the quota that they should have had. I refer to the districts of Victoria, Murray-Mallee or Chaffey and the suggestion that those districts should have a quota of about 21 000 or 22 000, yet Elizabeth has as few as 16 000 constituents and other metropolitan districts such as my district have about 19 000 constituents. Who would say that such a redistribution was fair and just? Nevertheless, I have heard the Premier claim recently that the principle is there.

The principle means nothing if in reality it is not practised. It means absolutely nothing. The former member for Fisher (Mr Tyler) was defeated and the new member for Fisher, was chosen in a district with 27 000 electors compared with the 16 000 electors in Elizabeth. Such a situation is a disgrace. Some country seats have 22 000 or 23 000 electors compared with many fewer electors in metropolitan seats. We could more quickly ride around such seats on roller skates or on crutches than country members could get around their districts no matter how they travel.

I believe that the 10 per cent electoral tolerance was not used in a fair and equitable manner, and there was an inference in a speech by the Premier recently that the Liberals at one time suggested a system of multi member electorates, in other words, electorates with three, five or seven members, something like the Hare-Clarke system that applies in Tasmania. To my knowledge, that has never been suggested.

I would never support it. People like Frank Staniford, an ALP member for whom people had great respect and with whom I went to many meetings in the Hills because I was his driver as he became more elderly, and Shannon and Playford, who had lived through that system of three-member electorates in the seat of Murray I think it was called, said, 'Do not go to it, because you will have members playing one against the other. If there is something good, they will all be battling to get on stage to say, "I am the greatest thing since sliced bread; vote for me. I think you have a great community project." But if something rough is going on, they will pass the buck down to the others'. Multiple member electorates are not on. But there is a way of doing it with a single member electorate. I have said this in the House before and I will say it again.

The term in the Act that says existing boundaries must be taken into consideration was put there by members to protect members. It should not be there if we want a one vote, one value system, because it locks the commissioners in to keep boundaries where they are.

We should not be afraid to represent a new area. What does a new member coming in do? It is totally new to him; it is a totally new electorate. If an existing member has his constituency boundaries changed completely—that is unlikely, unless a member gets into pre-selection fights, which I have been through at times—so what? That is no different from any newly elected member, except that the existing member had an electorate office building up to it and he was been able to work within it.

We should have terms of reference saying that the commissioners must attempt to take into consideration previous voting patterns and try to draw the boundaries so that any group or Party polling more than 50 per cent of the vote should have a reasonable chance of governing. There must be a clear indication to the tribunal that we want one vote, one value, and we want the commissioners to consider that if a Party wins more than 50 per cent of the vote it should have a reasonable chance of governing.

I do not want the Premier to come back with the comment that the Liberal Party fought against the constitutional proposal put forward by the Federal Government, because that, too, was shonky.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Hartley snarls that it is not shonky. It was not an interjection; it was a snarl. At the last election federally the ALP polled 49.5 per cent of the vote and the Conservatives polled 50.5 per cent. That is a difference of 1 per cent, and that is a lot.

For the Liberals to win in South Australia at the last election was just as difficult as it was for the ALP to win in Queensland. But do we hear any squeals from the ALP here? Do we find the Vincent Smiths writing articles saying that the deal is shonky? Not a word. Do we find the Randall Ashbournes writing articles saying that the deal is shonky? Not a word. That is because one man, Randall Ashbourne, achieved what he said he would achieve about seven years ago when he went to the Liberal Party function at Christmas and enjoyed the food and drink. I do not think he choked on it; he quite enjoyed it. As he left, he said, 'As long as I can put pen to paper, I will make sure that John Olsen never becomes Premier.' He can be proud that he helped to achieve that goal. But at least he was honest in his philosophy. He clearly stated, indicated and showed to the public where he stood. I give him credit for that. He is so far Left that he cannot write anything that is Right, except in the early part of the Parliamentary term when he will write one or two articles as a sop, until it comes to the last three weeks.

I go back to Vincent Smith and an article that he wrote recently about the Opposition. He asked: Why does the Opposition always oppose? Why does it not agree at times with the Government? That segment of his regular article was on that theme.

I invite him to get the digest of what goes through Parliament. I know that members of the ALP will agree that the large percentage of Bills are agreed to by both sides of politics. People think that we oppose them (and that is whether the Labor Party or Liberal Party is in Opposition) because the media only writes it up when we fight or argue over a Bill, but they never give credit to any agreement about a Bill. If the community's attitude is that Oppositions oppose too much, then let the media judge themselves, because they bring about the development of that attitude in the community.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this adjournment debate I wish once more to bring to the attention of the House the question of the best way to settle disputes between strata title owners and strata title companies.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I agree with the member for Mitcham when he interjects and says that something should have been done about this some time ago. I note that his contribution on this matter in this House has gone along those lines, as has that of the member for Murray-Mallee. I agree with the proposition put by both of them that there should be a better way of settling disputes. Both sides of the House generally agree with the Corporate Affairs Commission that there should be a better way. The Attorney-General has also agreed and has said that we should find a better way of settling disputes instead of pursuing the long and expensive remedies that now have to be taken by strata title owners against a strata title company but, as always, the problem is that nobody is prepared to find a way to finance a provision that will solve the problem. I wish to keep this matter alive in the Parliament from time to time because, if nothing is said, this issue will disappear and nothing will be done to solve the problem.

The problem concerns my electorate because in the 1960s and 1970s there was a rush of development along the beach front that in those days was called 'flat development'. A number of homes were removed and multi-storey units or flats were put up in their place. Eventually, when the strata title legislation was passed by Parliament, application was made to convert flats and units to strata title so they could be marketed more easily. There is a multiplicity of this type of dwelling in my electorate and there has been a rush of development along the seafront. This is not a problem, but part of the reason for this development is that valuations, especially on the seafront and in nearby areas, are increasing at an amazing rate.

I have had discussions and previously put propositions before this House in relation to increasing valuations. There is a problem for those people who have lived in my electorate for 20, 30 and more years in normal dwellings when companies and individuals buy homes next door or nearby to develop strata title units at a later stage. This has had

the effect of increasing valuations to an enormous degree and has put pressure on these people in terms of the payment of water and council rates. This is not the time to take up this matter but I will do so later.

My concern about strata title units is that problems are being encountered by owners who are unhappy with the way in which strata title companies are being conducted. Their only redress is an application to the civil courts, and that means that they must engage a solicitor. This type of action escalates costs immediately. I know of pensioners who have started actions in the courts because of complaints about the way in which strata titles have been conducted. I have seen receipts for amounts of \$200 and \$400 and more when pensioners have tried to remedy a particular situation but have not been able to go on because of the cost involved. A lot of people are concerned about this matter.

Pensioners sell their family home to move into a strata title establishment so that they do not have to worry about gardening and upkeep. Thus in retirement they move into a small unit, and that reduces the amount of work that they have to do. Generally speaking, these people are not flush with money and are drawing social security benefits of one sort or another. They do not have the money required to take action through the courts to right what they conceive to be a problem.

I do not contend that people who come to me with strata title problems are always right. In my judgment, quite often many of them are incorrect. Their complaints about increased costs for maintenance or insurance are not necessarily justified, because the inflation rate is rising as are building costs. The hourly rates of painters, carpenters and plumbers are increasing. People on a fixed income or pension tend not to realise how fast prices are increasing. So, their complaints about a strata title company are not necessarily justified.

I have said previously—and I say now—that there is a need for a commissioner, an ombudsman or a person of any title that the Parliament would like to bestow, to adjudicate upon strata title problems in the first instance. I would like to see the establishment of a tribunal that would provide, in the first instance, a quick means to solve or adjudicate upon problems in order to straighten out any abuses of the system and at the same time provide individual unit holders with the opportunity to relieve their minds of what they consider to be an injustice but what may not be determined an injustice when the matter is investigated fully.

There is no doubt that some companies are being run in a haphazard fashion. No sinking fund has been established for the maintenance of the block of units concerned, and when the managers of the strata title company realise that outside maintenance must be undertaken a surprisingly high levy is struck in order to provide for this maintenance. This, in turn, usually causes consternation among the unit holders who often are elderly, on a fixed income or drawing social security benefits. The provision in the rules to call special meetings has been known to be ignored, as has the maintenance of proper minutes and accounts.

In the past I have referred to the report of the Western Australian Law Reform Commission on the Strata Title Act, project number 56. That report refers to the problems of office bearers in strata title companies, and states that office bearers of strata title companies have complained from time to time about the impracticability of enforcing by-laws under the existing Act. Allegations have been made of proprietors and tenants parking their vehicles in a manner contrary to the prescribed by-law of the strata title company, of noisy behaviour by residents and of the unau-

thorised construction by proprietors of improvements on the common property for their own use.

I stress that this report comes from Western Australia, but councils concerned found that they were unable to deal effectively with such matters. The report referred to problems arising from the inability of proprietors of some strata title schemes to organise the schemes in a business-like way. This may arise not only from a lack of goodwill on the part of those involved but also from a lack of management skills. I strongly suggest that this is another problem we have in South Australia. The Act, which contains all the necessary regulations for a strata title company, was further improved back in 1984.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I take the opportunity this evening to draw the attention of the House to the treatment meted out by this Government to charitable organisations working in the area of youth. In particular, I wish to refer to Camp Kedron, run by the Lutheran Church of Australia, which is a youth camp on the shores of Lake Bonney at Barmera in the Riverland. Since 1984 the Government has made the land available to the Lutheran Church to provide youth camp hostel-type facilities at no profit to the church. It is run as a service to the youth of this State.

In 1984 the Government set a rental of \$240 which increased over the next five years to \$351. On 21 September 1988 an officer of the Department of Lands wrote to the Lutheran Church saying:

I refer to section 476, McIntosh Division, Cobdogla Irrigation Area held by you under miscellaneous lease 18687. Lease 18687 commenced on 1 July 1984 for Youth Camp Accommodation purposes and, under the conditions of this lease, the rental is subject to review every five years. Approval has been granted for the rental for the next five year period commencing on 1 July 1989 to be fixed at \$200 per annum.

The Lutheran Church was very pleased with that letter until it received a further letter on 23 January 1989 stating:

I refer to my letter of 21 September 1988 advising that the rental for the miscellaneous lease 18687 for the next five-year period commencing on 1 July 1989 was to be fixed at \$200 per annum. I regret to inform you that there was a typing error in this letter and the rental to apply is \$2 000 per annum and not \$200 per annum as advised.

This piece of land has little use other than as a church camp which provides activities for the youth of South Australia. For the Government to consider levying a tax of \$2 000—that is all it can be described as—on the church for the privilege of providing a charitable service for the youth of South Australia is absolutely outrageous.

The church objected to that and, as a result of its objection, a further letter was sent to the Lutheran Church on 30 August 1989, which stated:

I refer to your request for reduction in the rental applicable to irrigation miscellaneous lease 18687, held by the Lutheran Church of Australia. The rental of \$2 000 fixed for lease 18687 for the next rental period commencing 1 July 1989 will remain on the lease but I am pleased to advise that approval has been granted for a concessional rent of \$1 000 per annum to apply for this period commencing 1 July 1989.

Despite the reduction, the rent for this charitable facility has increased by 300 per cent from \$351 to \$1 000. As I said before, it is not a profit-making organisation. The camp is run by voluntary labour for charitable purposes. For the Government to charge the church \$1 000 is beyond belief.

I raised the issue with the Minister of Lands and pointed out to her that it is quite unacceptable. In response, the Minister stated:

I refer to your letter dated 9 October 1989 concerning the rental payable by the Lutheran Church of Australia, South Australian District Inc., for the lease over Camp Kedron. I advise that the market rental payable was reduced from \$3 660—

that was the original starting point—

to \$2 000 on 1 July 1989 following reassessment of the unimproved value of the site by the Valuer-General.

As a result of further representations by the Lutheran Church, a concession was applied and the rent now stands at \$1 000. A church which performs this kind of work for the community and for the youth of South Australia, does not have a spare \$1 000 lying around. It is not costing the Government a cent to make this land available to the church. There are literally thousands of hectares of similar land around the fringe of Lake Bonney, which has a shoreline of approximately 20 kilometres, and the Government collects very little from that.

I believe that the approach of the Government is totally wrong. It should rethink its position in relation to some of these charitable organisations, otherwise we will not have any charitable groups providing some of these essential services to the youth of South Australia. If it were not for organisations such as the Lutheran Church, many children throughout South Australia would not have the opportunity to go to a supervised camp in a place like the Riverland, on the shores of Lake Bonney, not only to enjoy that area but as part and parcel of their school studies.

I call on the Minister of Lands to rethink the position, to come down on the side of logic and common sense and to reduce the rental at least to what it was last year. In fact, Mr Speaker, having regard to the purpose for which this land has been used, the benefits to the youth of South Australia and the service that the Lutheran Church is providing to the Government, the land should be provided rent-free to the church, not at a charge of \$1 000. I call on the Minister to reconsider her position on this matter.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): In 1985, members will recall that this Parliament passed legislation to reform the law dealing with commercial leases, that is, to set new standards of fairness in relation to—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr GROOM: You have no platform from which to argue on commercial leasing. When members opposite were in Government in 1981, they had a report on commercial leasing and found that there were no iniquitous practices. In other words, they supported big business against small business. We came into office in 1983 and had a report about 12 months later and, sure enough, the small business community came out. The 1985 legislation was supported across Parties and new standards of fairness were set in relation to commercial leasing. One would have thought that the lessors would get the message. I am not only referring to private lessors—make no mistake about that—but government instrumentalities, superannuation funds, councils and statutory authorities. They are all in the business of imposing what are grossly iniquitous commercial leasing terms.

As I have said, one would have thought that they got the message in 1985, but no, the practice has continued. Consequently, last October, before the State election, we introduced further legislation reforming the law dealing with commercial leases, and I understand that that legislation will soon be reintroduced. The reforms are much needed. The unfair practices simply continue. The dominance of the larger interests in the marketplace prevail over the smaller business interests. As a consequence of my activities in this area since 1978, I constantly have copies of leases provided to me by small retailers.

I will go through the terms of one that came to me recently so that members can see the sorts of practices still being imposed on commercial tenants. There are three methods of assessing rent. One is by an annual review. This simply means that a valuer revalues the property every 12

months and up goes the rent in accordance with that value. Another method is in relation to the CPI or 10 per cent, whichever is the greater. Therefore, a small retailer never knows from one year to the next what the rent will be.

I believe that the Trade Practices Commission may look at these market rents, because they are quite iniquitous. The rent may go up by 38 per cent simply because it is in the lessor's interests to have a revaluation of the property, because that means more rent, and the rates and taxes are being thrust on to the small business community. I have previously made speeches in this Chamber stating that rates and taxes, land tax and council rates are capital taxes on the owners of premises. They are not taxes on the small retailer but are being passed on to the small retailer through iniquitous provisions in leases, and the small retailer is required to pick up the tab.

The small retailer does not own the land and does not benefit from the capital gain in relation to that land, yet is required to pick up the tab. It does not occur in residential tenancies and it is quite an iniquitous practice to pass on these capital taxes to small retailers who do not share in the benefit when that land is sold again.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: We will deal with that on another occasion. I have made a number of speeches about this matter because it is grossly iniquitous. It has to be looked at on a proper and rational basis—a national basis—because the problem occurs in every other State. Big business will play one State off against another. It will say, 'If you do that here, we will move interstate.' It needs to be tackled properly on a national basis.

I refer also to outgoings. In this lease there are 21 separate outgoings in addition to the rent. Many leases now go one step further: not only are lessors passing on single holding land tax, but lessors are inserting into leases multiple holdings tax provisions. So, if one is unlucky enough to have a lessor with three or four properties and paying on a multiple holding land tax basis, such taxes are passed on to the tenants. I have seen that in many leases over the past 12 months or two years and it is becoming increasingly prevalent.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Legislation is coming. The honourable member will have his opportunity. Legislation was introduced before the State election. I notice that it was not contained in Liberal policy before the State election. Members opposite know that they are in a dilemma in relation to reform of small business because it conflicts with their big business interests—make no mistake. That is why they found in 1981 no iniquitous practices in leases, simply because you went down that path. Members opposite will always support big business against small business. They have a history of doing so and are on the record as doing it. They will continue to do it whilst mouthing support for small business. Their present Leader is a representative of the big business community—make no mistake about that.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: We will deal with that on another occasion, but I bet that he has a bigger budget than the Treasurer. Included in outgoings is the cost of managing, controlling and administering the centre. That is unjustifiable. Lessors are getting down to the nitty gritty of a tenant's business, quite improperly. Tenants are being required to keep records of their gross receipts. Every item must be documented and, in fact, the lease in front of me states:

The tenant shall furnish, within seven days at the end of each month, an accurate written statement signed by the lessee of the gross receipts of the lessee during the preceding month or part thereof, as the case may require.

How iniquitous and oppressive to say to a commercial tenant, 'I want to see your gross receipts every month.' There is not a corresponding requirement on the part of the lessor. I would like to see big shopping centre proprietors turn over their receipts to small retailers! They would not do that at all.

I still know of practices whereby cash registers are wired up so that tenants cannot cheat on lessors who use such information to set the rents. There is no relationship to productivity at all. I know of rents in the city having gone up something like 38 per cent when the CPI has gone up only 7 per cent, simply because the building has been revalued.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The honourable member opposite knows that land tax is a problem. There is no question: it is a problem. Members opposite should get out and support small retailers as against big business interests. They should get out and support the fact that it is a capital tax on the owners of land.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: You were in office in the 1960s when they were passed on to small retailers under the Playford administration.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will direct his comments through the Chair.

Mr GROOM: If I have erred, Sir, I apologise. Fancy small retailers being required to produce gross receipts every month to the lessor! It is quite iniquitous! There is a provision in this lease that requires the lessee to not only pay

all the outgoings and all the other costs, but to have consent to the use of the name and, in relation to business hours, listen to this clause:

The lessee shall cause any trade or business conducted in the demised premises to remain open for business not less than the regular customary days and hours for businesses of a like nature in the trading area in which . . . is located or for not less than 44 hours per week spread over six days, whichever is the greater.

In other words someone who is supposed to be a small retailer, an independent operator, is being told in a lease that he cannot shut his doors and go home when he wants to. He is being told that he must work 44 hours when the State standard is about 38 hours and moving to 35 hours-44 hours spread over six days, so it includes a Saturday or a Sunday. I have seen the BOMA lease, which is touted around town as the standard for lessors. It is an appalling lease. Lessors even tell me that they cannot understand it.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr T. GROOM: We will. The honourable member will get his opportunity and I welcome his contribution. He has not said much on this issue since he has been a member. Legislation was introduced last October and it will be reintroduced. It is always this Government that protects small retailers.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The honourable member can laugh, but his Party's record is appalling when it comes to small business.

Motion carried.

At 10.7 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 14 February at 2 p.m.