

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 14 February 1990

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

PETITION: DISABLED PERSONS

A petition signed by 3 871 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to abolish payment by the disabled for parking permits was presented by Mrs Hutchinson.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

POLICE CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister of Emergency Services aware of a report or statement prepared within the Police Department which alleged that all but three members of the former Vice Squad had been involved in illegal or corrupt practices? If so, when did he first become aware of the report or statement? When did the Police Commissioner first become aware of it? What action has been taken within the Police Department to investigate the allegations made? Have those allegations been referred to the National Crime Authority? Do the allegations involve prostitution and/or drug dealing?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I assume that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to the same thing that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan referred to in another place yesterday. If he is, I can tell him that the Attorney-General, in his answer to the question yesterday, indicated that he would refer the matter to me. That has been done. I have referred it to the Police Commissioner and I assume that the appropriate thing to happen is for the Police Commissioner to provide an answer to the Attorney-General, which the Attorney-General can choose to make available to the other place. If the Leader is not referring to that, I would need to take his question on notice and bring back a response.

Mr S.J. Baker: Don't you know?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In response to the interjection by the Deputy Leader, who, I noticed, by the way, was promoted in the *Bulletin* the other day. I indicate that, having been Minister of Emergency Services for less than a year, I do not have an absolute knowledge of what every officer in the Police Force has done over the past 10 years. All that I can do under those circumstances is to ask for information. I am aware that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is one of those people who knows everything about everything, but not all of us live up to his standards of perfection.

TRICON

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction explain the details of the agreement between the South Australian Housing Trust and Tricon in relation to the proposed building development in Angas Street? The agreement to which I refer is obviously no longer effective following the development last week when Tricon went into receivership. The Liberal member, Mr Julian Stefani, in another place has claimed that the

South Australian taxpayer will be the loser now that the agreement will not go ahead.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question as it is important to put on the public record the contractual arrangement that exists between Tricon and the Housing Trust, so that the member in the other place cannot continue with this scuttlebutt in the community to mislead the public as to what is happening.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Sir, for the third time already this Question Time reference and indeed reflections on persons in the other place have been made from the other side of the Chamber. I draw your attention to the Standing Order which precludes any member, whether Minister or otherwise, from making such reflections on those other members.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is taken. Reflections are out of place on the actions and words of people in the other place. I ask the Minister to respect that Standing Order.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will do so. With regard to the circumstances surrounding the contractual relationship between the Trust and Tricon, the original contract and details of the transaction have, in the view of the trust, always been, and should always be, available to the public. The situation with that contractual arrangement is that it forms the commercial basis and publication depended on the agreement of the other party. Understandably in the circumstances, that agreement has not been given, but when I was contacted following the comments made by the member in another place in the public arena, via the media, I decided, in the circumstances and given the events that had occurred in a court hearing when those details had been disclosed, that it was appropriate to draw the attention of the public to the details of that contract. I will be quite precise in going through the arrangements.

The arrangements between the trust and Tricon provided for a purchase price of \$16.5 million payable in January 1992, comprising \$9 million for the site and \$7.5 million share of development profit, including an allowance for interest on the money which is left in the project. The contract for the sale of the land was secured by 10 per cent deposit comprising \$40 000 cash paid as an option fee and a bank guarantee of \$860 000 held by the trust to be exercised on redevelopment commencement date or 1 July 1990 (whichever occurs first). A further bank guarantee of \$16.46 million is to be provided on redevelopment commencement date or 1 July (whichever occurs first). This \$16.46 million guarantee comprises the \$9 million purchase price and the \$7.5 million development participation payment, less the \$40 000 option fee. The provision of the \$16.46 million guarantee will absorb the earlier \$860 000 guarantee which was provided.

As I indicated, there has been some speculation about the construction of the account, in particular the reference within the annual report of the Housing Trust and the accounting treatment taken with regard to that transaction. It has been policy for several years for a transaction of that sort to be recognised as a sale, because an enforceable legal contract was in place. That was in place on 7 June 1989. The trust asset balance was reduced by the book value sold, which was \$3.24 million. A debt of \$9 million was recorded in the accounts. As a consequence, the difference between the \$9 million value of the sale and the book value of \$3.24 million was identified as an extraordinary item in the published accounts. That explains the circumstances whereby the figure appeared in the accounts, to which an honourable member from another place referred.

Those are the circumstances of the account and the reference within the annual report to that figure, which seems to be drawing the attention and criticism of the honourable member in another place. The trust's accounting practice was and is in accord with approved accounting principles; consistent with practice in previous years; was accepted by the Auditor-General; and had proper respect for the commercial confidence of a major private sector enterprise.

It is important to note that the Opposition cannot have it both ways: it cannot criticise us for not supporting development in the State, yet on the other hand criticise us for being involved in a situation where these circumstances prevailed. The trust acted on the advice it received. Let me stress that the transaction was negotiated by the trust with the assistance of a highly respected commercial lawyer and supported by the expertise available in that field.

In the circumstances, the board (comprising several eminent people who are recognised in the business community) believes that it has made a sound and sensible transaction and has protected the assets of the trust. I know that the former Minister would agree with me. There can be no further speculation from members, either in this place or another place, with regard to the circumstances or the accounting practice. Members opposite who understand accounting techniques would realise that consistency is the most important approach with this practice. It differs in some ways from the commercial process of recognising profits; taxation is probably the major influence on changing those commercial practices with regard to the processes that have been followed by the trust in its declaration of 7 June 1989 as the point when the income is recognised.

I have laid before the House and the public the details of this matter. I have done so on the basis that most of the details have been outlined in a hearing before a court, and I feel that this should put to an end the speculation that is being put around by various members of the community.

POLICE CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. I refer to the statement by the Attorney-General on the Keith Conlon show this morning that 'there probably are' areas of corruption in the South Australian Police Force, which directly conflicts with the view of the Police Commissioner who, as reported in the *Advertiser* of 27 January, has stated in a newsletter to all South Australian police officers that despite years of corruption allegations 'exhaustive investigations had found no evidence of dishonesty or corruption'. I ask the Minister who the public should believe, the Attorney-General or the Police Commissioner and, if it is the Attorney-General, what evidence does the Government have to support his statement and when will that evidence be made public?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: My advice to the public would be not to believe the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

An honourable member: Just answer the question.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will try to answer the question, but it is a little discourteous to the people listening to the debate if I cannot be heard over interjections from the Opposition. There are about 3 500 officers in the South Australian Police Force. No-one in their right mind would believe that there is no possibility of corruption of any of those officers. From time to time there are bound to be corrupt officers in the South Australian Police Force, as I would argue there would be in any other body of 3 500 people.

If anyone in this State or in the Opposition is prepared to argue against that, we stop talking about serious matters and we start talking about the realms of fantasy. I would like to see any corrupt officers in the Police Force caught. The Government believes that; I am sure the Opposition believes that; and I am also absolutely certain that the people of this State would want any corruption weeded out of the South Australian Police Force. Indeed, that is why so many different bodies are looking at the Police Force with a fine tooth comb—to see whether there are any nests of corruption, either organised or individual, within the South Australian Police Force.

The fact is this: we can talk about corrupt police officers only when they have been brought before the courts and found guilty. The first step in this process is to look for them, and that is taking place.

APPRENTICES

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education tell the House how many apprentices are enrolled in TAFE courses for 1990?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Some figures made available yesterday show that a record 11 600 people are enrolled in TAFE apprenticeship courses for 1990. This should be of interest to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition; I am pleased that he is listening. This figure is 1 000 more apprentices than last year and 1 700 more apprentices than in 1988—more apprentices than at any level since well into the 1970s.

TAFE is clearly playing a major and vital part in training and upgrading the South Australian work force. If this State is to meet the challenges of competing in the national and international marketplace, it must provide a skilled workshop that attracts modern industry to establish or expand here. To attract job creating enterprises we must be seen to have a skilled work force which is broadly based across a range of industries and which is highly trained.

It is quite clear that TAFE is taking up the challenge in a spectacular fashion. Members opposite will be pleased to know that there are now 16 group apprenticeship schemes which employ a total of 802 apprentices and trainees. Also, the Government made a commitment to fund an extra 300 pre-vocational places in 1990, and this means 1 180 places have been offered this year. I am sure that the House would be pleased to know that currently 89 per cent of South Australian apprentices are successfully completing their training. South Australia's wastage rate is the lowest of all the States, and I think that this is a tribute to both our employer organisations and trade unions.

TOWN HALL RENOVATIONS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Why did the Minister of Labour not proceed with a promised inspection of work that was underway at the Adelaide Town Hall which could have ensured the completion of the project within the deadline required for Adelaide Festival events? Is the Minister satisfied with work practices on the site? I have been advised that some time before problems at the Town Hall became public and threatened to seriously disrupt the Festival program, the Minister was invited to the Town Hall to inspect the work site and to discuss some work practices which had been contributing to delays in the completion of the project.

However, shortly before the Minister was due to arrive at the Town Hall for this inspection, his office advised that

he had decided not to go on with it. I have been informed that there has been concern about the attitude of union officials to work being conducted during hot weather. While air-conditioning was installed within the work site to keep the temperature to 26 degrees, workers still did not continue on the job if the outside temperature exceeded 32 degrees. This was a significant contributor to the loss of 25 days of work on the project.

I am further informed that, when the workers returned to the job on a weekend at penalty rates, they also insisted that they be paid for the previous days not worked or there would be further industrial disruption to the project. I have been advised that, while Department of Labour inspectors certified that the installation of air-conditioning within the work site had created appropriate working conditions, notwithstanding the outside temperature, the Minister's refusal to involve himself in discussions to gain the agreement of union officials resulted in a continuation of delays on the site.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the shadow Minister for his question, but I wish that he could be a little more accurate. That is the problem: he is inaccurate. The office of the Town Hall has contacted me twice regarding the problems associated with the renovation of the Town Hall. Officers from the Town Hall contacted me prior to Christmas; they wanted me to instruct people to work during the January holiday period. My advice to them was that they should have consultation with the unions and reach an agreement with them in relation to people taking their annual leave.

The other contact was when the officers wanted me to tour the building site with the Lord Mayor so that we could encourage the people to work a bit harder. I find it strange—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That call to order applies to both sides of the House. The member for Napier will take notice as well.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I will continue. I find it strange that an organisation which employs a contractor who has contractual relationships with employees seeks to have a Minister and the Lord Mayor wander around the site to encourage people to do the work. We have an excellent industrial relations system in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Opposition is well aware of the course his actions will take.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Before I was rudely interrupted, I was going to say that we have an excellent industrial relations system in South Australia and it works extremely well. Fewer days are lost here than in any other State in Australia and, if we were to compare the number of days lost in disputes under this Government, the two previous Bannon Governments and the Tonkin Government, we would find that our record is far superior. I am surprised that these rowdy individuals opposite, who have lost all manners when it comes to industrial relations, who want to interrupt, and who do not hear the answers, do not believe their own industrial relations policy, which they call enterprise bargaining.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg will also take heed of his actions.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am surprised that they are not aware of their own industrial relations policy, which is for enterprise bargaining. 'Enterprise bargaining' means exactly what it says: the people at the enterprise bargain with their employer. I imagine there has been a fair amount of bargaining going on at the Town Hall renovation site, as

occurs anywhere else in South Australia and, indeed, in Australia, yet our friends opposite do not want that to happen. If they wanted it to happen, they would have allowed it to happen and allowed other parties to get on with their work. That is the responsibility of the people who are contracting to do the work—to fulfil their contract. It is between them and the Town Hall. There is very little that I could do to encourage them to do their work.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Has the Minister finished?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I wanted to say that, if the members for Alexandra and Victoria want to ask questions, you, Mr Speaker, could arrange for them to do so during the course of the day.

TEA TREE GULLY TAFE COLLEGE

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of the proposed timetable for the Tea Tree Gully TAFE college? The construction of this new TAFE college will service the fast growing suburbs of the north-eastern urban region and, particularly, it is of concern to the constituents of my electorate of Playford.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area in serving the needs of his electorate. The Tea Tree Gully TAFE college will greatly advantage the north-eastern and northern suburbs of South Australia. The new college will have a planned bias towards young full-time students, it will offer a wide range of TAFE programs and it will foster the development of alternative teaching methodologies.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I stand corrected, but I have an idea that the TAFE college question asked by the member for Playford involves a matter that the Public Works Standing Committee has not yet reported on to the Parliament. A number of TAFE colleges in that immediate region are under consideration and in the pipeline for consideration by that committee. But it is in contradiction of the Public Works Standing Committee Act to proceed if the college referred to is in the category that I have outlined.

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The honourable member is incorrect. In fact, this matter has been dealt with by the Public Works Standing Committee. I should imagine that, as a member of that committee, he would have been aware of that.

Stage 1 of the project started in September last year and it is proposed that the completion date be about November 1991. The project could not have started in September if it had not been approved by the Public Works Standing Committee.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, it was. The estimated cost of the project at completion was \$19.2 million. New purpose-built facilities were obviously needed at Tea Tree Gully, and hence the building program. The honourable member has pointed out that not only will it handle the increased volume of students but it will increase the diversity of courses provided in the north-eastern urban region. Stage 1 of the facility includes a library, which will be jointly funded by the City of Tea Tree Gully and the Department of TAFE, and the project is funded by a Commonwealth Government grant.

The confusion caused by the honourable member relates to stage 2 of the Tea Tree Gully project, which is yet to be

heard by the Public Works Standing Committee, and therefore I shall not be commenting on it. Having read today's *Bulletin* poll, I can understand why members are excited. Perhaps it is just Valentine's Day.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is to the Minister of Labour. Because at least four major Festival events are at risk due to industrial action by transport workers in New South Wales, will the Minister give his immediate and full support to a request made today by the Adelaide Festival organisers to both the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, Mr Lesses, and the Federal Secretary of the Transport Workers Union, Mr Hodgson, seeking exemptions from this dispute for significant loads of freight that must be trucked to Adelaide from Sydney to guarantee that these Festival events can be staged?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I will approach the two people that the member for Coles has mentioned. However, I would point out that she ought to talk to her colleagues in New South Wales about uniform road rules, which might help to overcome some of the problems that we are experiencing today.

COUNTRY ROADS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Transport give consideration to the provision of passing lanes on country roads?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the question.

Mr De LAINE: There is an urgent need for adequate double width sections of roadway to be established at intervals, even on flat sections of road, in the country to enable traffic to pass large trucks, buses, cars with caravans, and so on safely to help overcome the risk of head-on collisions.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Government is aware of the frustrations that occur from time to time on our country roads due to their being, in the main, single carriageways. Obviously it is not practical to have dual carriageways on all our roads. That would be and is desirable in some areas and we are making that provision. Clearly, the amount of public resources that would have to be invested in making every road a dual highway could not be warranted, and taxpayers would not tolerate that. We have already made some provision for vehicle overtaking. One of the most significant things that we have done is increase the speed limit for the road freight industry to 100 km/h. Part of the rationale behind that decision was to minimise the danger of head-on collisions occurring as a result of overtaking.

I am not convinced that lowering the speed limit for heavy vehicles would make the roads safer in any way. Some overtaking lanes are being considered, for example, on the Stuart Highway; between Berri and Renmark; and in conjunction with proposed rehabilitation of the section of road between the Gawler bypass and Daveyston. There are also some low-cost treatments that we can provide on roads, including the construction of short passing bays, or turnouts, and the sealing of a widened shoulder. These proposals are now being considered. Work is also included on the Mount Compass to Victor Harbor section of the Noarlunga to Victor Harbor road. I note that the roads to which I have referred are in Liberal held electorates, which

only goes to show that there is no discrimination by this Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will have that reviewed. Most South Australian rural roads have a very good standard of geometry which, together with relatively low traffic volumes, provides adequate overtaking opportunities.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am surprised at the reaction of members opposite. I am outlining projects to be undertaken at considerable cost to taxpayers which will enhance their own electorates, although I am sure that Liberal members will themselves claim full credit for these improvements when, of course, they have had nothing to do with them. However, the ideal situation on rural roads with high traffic volumes is to turn them into dual highways. We are doing that now on the Two Wells to Port Wakefield section of the Port Wakefield Road (again, in a Liberal held electorate) and also on the White Hill to Swanport Bridge section of the South-Eastern Freeway.

I believe that, with the financial constraints within which all Governments have to work, the Government and the Department of Road Transport are making every effort to maintain the very high standards which South Australia already has and which have been a credit to all Governments over the past 25 years. Finally, I point out that of those 25 years a Labor Government has been in office for 21 years.

HENLEY AND GRANGE COUNCIL

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Premier. In view of the fact that at a meeting yesterday morning with the Mayors of Woodville, West Torrens and Henley and Grange the Minister of Local Government informed them that the Local Government Advisory Commission had proposed the abolition of the Henley and Grange council, has the Government advised the member for Henley Beach of this decision; does he support it; does the Government now intend to have a proclamation issued to implement the commission's recommendation; and, if so, when?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will refer the question to both my colleague the Minister of Local Government and the member for Henley Beach to advise me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the Opposition that it is Question Time that members are wasting.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier in his capacity as Minister of Health. What is the nature of the relationship between the Flinders Medical Centre and the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park? Are the full resources of the Repat Hospital available to the South Australian Health Commission and the people of the southern suburbs?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: For some time there has been an informal arrangement between the Repat Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre—this I know from my own family's experience—but that has now become formalised into an agreement under which between eight and 12 beds per day will be made available to the Flinders Medical Centre specifically in the orthopaedic, urology and general surgery areas. This has been arranged on favourable

financial terms for the Flinders Medical Centre and will enable it to extend further its services to people in the southern suburbs. So, although the full facilities are not available they are available to the extent I have indicated.

This begs the question of the ultimate use of the facilities at Daw Park. All I can do here is reiterate what my predecessor said in the House on this subject some time ago; that is, that the Daw Park Hospital's becoming fully available to the South Australian Health Commission would be a considerable advantage to the Health Commission and to the delivery of health services in this State generally. However, we place two important conditions upon this happening: first, it should happen without financial disability to the State; and, secondly, the traditional consumer group for that hospital, represented as it is by the RSL, should be fully apprised and supportive of such a move. Both these conditions must be satisfied before the South Australian Government through the Health Commission would be prepared to take over the hospital fully. Discussions on this matter continue from time to time.

DUCK SHOOTING SEASON

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Why is the Government extending an open invitation to protesters to disrupt the coming duck shooting season and, by so doing, possibly endangering the lives of shooters, as well as interfering with the legally established rights of shooters who pay a permit fee?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I speak with some feeling and authority on this topic.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr LEWIS: If I may be permitted to complete my question. The duck shooting season begins on Saturday. The Minister has just declared, as published in the most recent *Gazette* of 8 February, the conditions which will apply. This year's conditions contain a significant and serious omission. Previously, entry to the game reserve during the shooting season was prohibited to anyone who did not hold a hunting permit to take duck or who was actively helping a duck shooter. National Parks and Wildlife officers and shooters have complained to me that last year some protesters—mostly from Victoria—recklessly defied this prohibition. They entered the water in front of shooters while lawful shooting was in progress.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: A day or two ago. Shooters who have complained to me have stated that they believe that the Minister has deliberately left out the prohibition condition this year after deciding last year to stop prosecutions against 15 people who last May protested and interfered with duck shooting in Bool Lagoon. The people to whom I refer are seriously concerned that the Minister's decision will actively encourage further protests this season.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: You will get your turn in a moment. They are concerned about incidents which could endanger the lives of protesters who would be interfering with the legally established rights of people who pay the Government an annual permit fee to shoot.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I understand that the honourable member has a vested interest in this question because

he was shot by an incompetent duck shooter. Having said that, I appreciate—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am not sure whether the shooter was incompetent and missed—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is very difficult to ascertain the circumstances under which the honourable member was shot. Notwithstanding that, I will answer his very long question. I have declared the duck shooting season for this year, following the normal processes which involved consultation with the Field and Game Association, members of the department and other interested individuals.

Last year, this issue was raised widely throughout the South Australian community. Some individuals and groups hold very strong views about duck shooting and there is no point any member of this place avoiding that issue. It is one on which people have very strong and polarised views. To try to resolve the issue in what can only be seen as a civilised, reasonable and intelligent way, I have established a review committee on which are represented the Field and Game Association and those individuals who strongly oppose duck shooting. Indeed, the committee comprises a whole range of other individuals and groups who represent the whole spectrum of opinion.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member did not appreciate my small interjection and I ask that he pays me the same courtesy that he expected me to extend to him. I have asked the review committee to report to me as soon as possible. I have had no criticism from anyone about the wide representation on the committee. In fact, it was as a result of representations by the Field and Game Association that I appointed it, and it has put up its own representatives. I have said consistently that I will not involve myself in the arguments because, at the end of the day, it will be up to me to take a recommendation on this very sensitive issue to my Cabinet colleagues. Therefore, I will not canvass the merits of the arguments for and against this issue.

The season has been proclaimed and, as far as I am aware, that is the end of the matter. I imagine that some people will protest. I share the concern of other members about that but the only course of action open to me while the review was in place was either not to have any shooting at all or to say that I did not want anything to do with it. I have not done that. I have accepted the recommendations of the review committee.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee has asked his question, yet he seems to want to answer it, as well. I ask him to allow the Minister to answer the question without interjection.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I conclude by saying that I gave my word to the Field and Game Association and to any other interested individual or group that we would continue with the same procedures as last year, and that is exactly what has been done.

RACIST REMARKS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Ethnic Affairs draw to the attention of the media, particularly the *Advertiser*, the need for vigilance to ensure that offensive, racist terms are not used in reference to ethnic groups? I refer to a letter concerning Marineland, which appeared in this morning's *Advertiser*. The letter expressed

a political opinion, which members of the public are entitled to do. Unfortunately, in making a political point, the writer used quite offensive language in saying:

Will the mysterious Chinaman move away when Aunt Dolly gets up a petition about his plans to build a joss house on the beach or will the Chinaman open up a laundry?

The expression 'Chinaman' is an anachronistic and offensive term, comparable to the expression 'nigger'.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will take up this matter with the *Advertiser*. It is appropriate to draw to the attention of the media generally the way in which members of the community are referred to. I found the letter to be whimsical, and I enjoyed reading it until I came across the remarks in point and I found them to be offensive to Chinese people. If members think that that is being unreasonable or super-sensitive, I ask them to consider other perjorative terms that are often used for Kooris (for blacks) in this country, and the names used for blacks in Africa, in the southern States of the United States, and for Japanese, Germans and any number of people. The question is whether such perjorative terms should willingly be published in a newspaper. Most members in this place on both sides would agree that that would not be appropriate. I take the point made by the honourable member and will raise it with the *Advertiser*.

HOMESURE SCHEME

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the current monthly cost to the Government of providing financial assistance to home buyers who so far have qualified under the Homesure program?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. We are still finalising some of the negotiations with regard to the arrangements for Homesure, so I cannot give a definite answer. However, in due course I will obtain the detail and report to the House and the member for Mount Gambier.

RETIREMENT VILLAGES

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Deputy Premier, in his capacity as Minister for the Aged, advise when the Government will introduce legislation to amend the Retirement Villages Act, and will the Deputy Premier advise what other measures the Government is considering to overcome the difficulties faced by residents in some retirement villages? I have been approached by a number of constituents who have bought into retirement villages on the basis of glossy brochures and assurances that further facilities would be provided. Unfortunately, in many cases the reality has not lived up to the promise. Last year the South Australian Council on the Ageing prepared a report documenting many of the problems that exist under the current arrangements.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The short answer is that the Form 6 legislation, as it has come to be known, will be introduced into another place this afternoon. As that is already on the Notice Paper, I assume that I am not in order canvassing the contents of that legislation. What the Government has in mind has become fairly well known to people. It follows a considerable consultative process. The nub of the honourable member's question, I believe, is that Form 6 legislation, it is conceded, will not satisfy all complaints that have come from this area and it has to be seen as the second of a three stage process through which we are moving.

The first stage was the actual introduction of the Retirement Villages Act in 1987. The second stage is the Form 6 legislation which, as I said, will be introduced in another place today and debated in both Houses during this session. The third stage will involve a very careful analysis of processes within the industry and will focus on providing better protection for residents and prospective residents of retirement villages. The third stage is the subject of a study presently being conducted by the Commissioner for the Ageing and the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs. In the course of the study the Commissioner will consult with interested parties such as the South Australian Council on the Ageing.

The necessity for this has arisen because the Form 6 legislation addresses the conditions of those entering the system at present rather than addressing the problems that those in the system claim they are facing. That legislation, as we understand it, cannot be made retrospective or anything like that. However, there may be, and almost certainly will be, other approaches to these problems, hence the study I have outlined which I would anticipate will issue in legislation later in this Parliament.

HOMESURE SCHEME

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I ask the Minister of Housing and Construction on what date the Government decided to restrict Homesure assistance for eligible home buyers only to those paying more than 30 per cent of gross household income in home loan repayments?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I think the honourable member's colleague yesterday endeavoured to mislead the House in the same way in asking a question. The situation is quite clear: as I said yesterday, the Cabinet made a decision, which the Premier announced as part of a policy speech. I draw the attention of the honourable member to the report in the *Advertiser* the day after the policy speech was made by the Premier, where he will clearly see a reference to the point he makes.

SAND REMOVAL

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House whether the department has had time to assess the advantage of using barges to replace the traditional transporting of sand by truck on metropolitan beach fronts? I have received many inquiries from people complaining about damage to roads, noise levels in residential areas and the speeding of trucks along beach front roads. Many of my constituents were delighted by the announcement that barge transport would possibly remove all of those problems and they are anxious to know whether the use of a sand barge is considered to be successful.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I know that other members on both sides of the Parliament, including you, I suspect, Mr Speaker, feel very strongly about the issue. As Minister for Environment and Planning I also feel strongly about the issue.

The current experiment to which the member for Henley Beach alluded is a contract to remove some 100 000 cubic metres of sand from North Haven to North Glenelg by means of dredging at North Haven and removing the sand by barge to North Glenelg where it is needed. The contract

is worth some \$1.234 million, and it is important that we assess objectively the cost benefit analysis of such a project.

The preliminary investigations indicate that there is not a large cost differential between the option of dredging and moving the sand by barge, and dredging and moving the sand by truck through the suburbs of Adelaide. This leads me to the conclusion, while the procedures have not been completed for this project, that it is looking positive for our long-term goal for all our off-shore sand dredging; we may be able to move the sand from North Haven to the areas where it is needed by barge rather than by truck. If there is a small cost differential and it is a little more expensive to do it in this way, that may well be a commitment that the Government will consider to improve the quality of the environment for those residents who have traditionally—

An honourable member: Why is it more expensive?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Because of the cost of the equipment, the hiring of the barge, etc. However, things are looking good in terms of the fact that there are not significant differences in the cost. Once we move to something like that full time, the costs may be lowered because of the extra use. At the moment we are assessing one project, which is a major project and is environmentally sound. I commend the honourable member for his question and hope that he will pass on the information to his constituents.

DUCK SHOOTING SEASON

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I ask the Minister for Environment and Planning whether she agrees, on reflection, that she has misled the House in answer to a question from the member for Murray-Mallee. The Minister indicated that the circumstances for duck shooting in the 1990 season were the same as they were for 1989. The 1989 duck season regulations appeared in the *Gazette* of 5 January 1989 at pages 15 to 17 inclusive and ran to 15 clauses.

The regulations in relation to the duck shooting season for 1990 appeared in the *Gazette* of 8 February (pages 399 to 401 inclusive) and ran to only 14 clauses. The clause which appeared in 1989 and which is not present in 1990 is as follows:

Declare that a person shall not enter or be in the waters of any part of a game reserve being a part of the reserve in respect of which an open season exists unless the person—

- (a) is the holder of a current hunting permit to take duck and is in possession of a firearm for the purpose of taking duck, being a firearm that complies with this proclamation; or
- (b) is actively engaged in assisting a person referred to in paragraph (a) to take duck.

The final conclusion clearly is that a person who is there to protest is not there to help people take duck.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The short answer to the honourable member's question as to whether I have misled the Parliament is that, if I have misled the Parliament, it has been totally unintentional and I do not believe I have.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It would be nice to have an opportunity to explain. St Valentine's Day notwithstanding, it is obviously the massacre of ducks we are talking about rather than people. When I answered the question I indicated to the member for Murray-Mallee that when I was approached by the Field and Game Association late last year I wrote to it indicating that I would retain the processes by which the length and conditions of the season were maintained. I am happy to provide to the member for Light a copy of that correspondence if he has not already been provided with it.

Mr FERGUSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The charge that has been made against the Minister—that she in fact misled the House—is probably one of the most serious charges that can come before Parliament. I believe that the Minister should be able to explain her position to the Parliament without being interrupted.

An honourable member: That is only your opinion; that is not a point of order.

The SPEAKER: I agree it is not a point of order. However, it is a serious charge. The Minister has the right to answer that charge in this House. I ask that she be given that opportunity in silence. Let us get to the bottom of it. If members want an answer, that is the only way we will get it. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I reiterate that I followed my commitment to the Field and Game Association to the letter, and I am happy to provide to the honourable member a copy of the correspondence I sent under my hand at the end of last year to the association. While I believe I have a very good memory and can carry around an enormous amount of information relating to my portfolios, my memory does not extend to every single regulation that is gazetted under every single one of my responsibilities.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: My answer was absolutely honest in terms of what I committed myself to with respect to the Field and Game Association and the rest of the community who are interested. The member for Light has the advantage of actually being able to quote the various regulations from one year to the next. I undertake to investigate the differences in those regulations and, if there are differences, I will provide the reason for those differences to the honourable member at the first opportunity.

ELIZABETH WEST RE-ENTRY SCHOOL

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Education indicate whether the Elizabeth West Re-entry School enrolments for 1990 are on target? The House would be aware that an important aspect of the restructured high schools in the Elizabeth and Munno Para areas was the converting of the old Elizabeth West High School as a re-entry college to cater for adults and for those whose education was cut short in the early years to enable them to gain certification in individual subjects or to complete their matriculation.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Some four years ago the enrolment intake for year 8 at the Elizabeth West High School was less than 30 students and the Education Department seriously considered closing that school. Indeed, it had a bleak future. That school was situated in a community with very high general unemployment, particularly youth unemployment, and there was a very low retention rate to year 12. I believed there was a need for a relevant education institution in that community.

The department did consider the disposal of that school to the Police Department. I thought that it would have been a shame if a value-laden institution such as a school had been taken away from that community. Fortunately, the decisions made by us at that time are now beginning to bear fruit.

Last year, I was at the graduation ceremony at that school, and some 320 re-entry students were enrolled at Elizabeth West. Indeed, it was a happy occasion where many students who had been away from that school—or, as the honourable member for Napier indicated, for one reason or another,

had had their schooling cut short—had returned there and undertaken a successful course of study. Many students were undertaking full matriculation courses so that they could enter tertiary institutions.

This year I understand that there are over 520 enrolments, so the success of the school continues. It now forms part of a network of schools which comprise a new secondary campus in the Elizabeth/Munno Para area. Indeed, a new and exciting era of education has been embarked upon in that area. It is important not only that equity and access to educational opportunities be afforded to all young people but also that our schools provide services which are attractive to a wide cross-section of the community, so that we do not have schools which are inclusive of some groups but which deny other groups access by their various structures. I can report to the House the exciting dimension to education now being achieved in the Elizabeth/Munno Para area.

STATE BANK

Mr BECKER (Hanson): My question is directed to the Premier. What is the latest advice the Government has received from the State Bank on its exposure to the Equiticorp and National Safety Council collapses and its total provision for doubtful debts? Will the bank's increasing provision for doubtful debts affect the Government's budgeted return from the bank's operation this financial year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have had no recent advice on the status of those two accounts. However, I do understand that, because of the way in which the bank has handled provisions, it will not have an impact on the return this financial year.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 1966. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to enable the Governor to make regulations prohibiting the consumption, possession, supply and sale of alcohol and other regulated substances in Aboriginal communities that occupy Aboriginal Lands Trust owned and controlled land. Its purpose is to reduce vandalism, assault and social disruption frequently experienced in certain Aboriginal communities because of the availability of alcoholic liquor and other substances. The Bill sets out to do the following:

- by regulation, restrict or prohibit the consumption, possession, sale or supply of alcoholic liquor on specified parts of Aboriginal Lands Trust lands;
- by regulation, prohibit the inhalation or consumption of any regulated substance (such as petrol) on specified parts of the lands;

- by regulation, prohibit the possession, sale or supply of any regulated substance on specified parts of the lands for the purposes of inhalation or consumption;
- by regulation, provide for the confiscation of alcoholic liquor or any regulated substance used in contravention of the regulations;
- by regulation, provide for the treatment or rehabilitation of any person affected by the misuse of alcoholic liquor or any regulated substance;
- by regulation, prescribe penalties for contravention of or non-compliance with the regulations;
- under certain circumstances provide for the confiscation of vehicles used in the distribution and supply of alcohol or a regulated substance.

It is important to emphasise that this is a self-regulating piece of legislation and that it does not necessarily cover every Aboriginal community.

The regulations will apply only to those areas where a recommendation is made to the Governor by the appropriate Aboriginal Community Council and the provisions may be varied or revoked only on the recommendation of that Community Council.

The need for this Bill has arisen because of the devastating effects that alcohol abuse has had on some Aboriginal communities. Some Aboriginal communities have unhappily been virtually decimated by drunks and exploitation by grog-runners and profiteers. The sad results have been chronic ill health, vandalism, domestic violence and threats to staff and community members. This Bill is designed to address this issue head-on and has been strongly supported by Aboriginal communities.

Until now Aboriginal Community Councils have made unsuccessful attempts to control drinking on community lands and to curb the sale and supply of liquor. Police have had only limited powers in this area and have been able to intervene when other associated offences have been committed. This Bill gives the police much wider powers in taking action against persons who consume, sell or distribute alcohol or other regulated substances on prescribed sections of the lands. It will also enable the courts to impose realistic penalties for offences committed against the regulations.

The wording of the Bill follows very closely the wording of provisions of section 43 of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1981, which were inserted in 1987. The by-laws made under that section have been effectively enforced on the Pitjantjatjara Lands by the police and police aids. On the two visits to the lands by the Pitjantjatjara Lands Parliamentary committee since the introduction of the by-laws, the committee has reported a marked improvement in the general health and well-being of the people including more effective law and order in communities. The committee has commented to the House on these matters in its reports tabled in 1988 and 1989.

Wide consultation with Aboriginal communities and departments which provide services to Aboriginal communities has occurred in the drafting of this Bill. An inter-departmental meeting including representatives of the Aboriginal Lands Trust and the Yalata Aboriginal Community Council was convened by the Office of Aboriginal Affairs in October 1988. This meeting recommended that strong laws should be enacted to control excessive alcohol abuse, vandalism, assault and domestic violence on Aboriginal communities especially at Yalata. This meeting was followed up by a community meeting at Yalata in November 1988, which was attended by the Aboriginal Lands Trust and the Office of Aboriginal Affairs. The meeting resolved that the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act should be amended in

line with this Bill. The Aboriginal Lands Trust concurred with this recommendation.

The Chairman of the Aboriginal Lands Trust and an officer from the Office of Aboriginal Affairs met with the Yalata Aboriginal Community Council on 20 September last year. The draft Bill was discussed and the council has endorsed its adoption in its entirety.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts new Part V into the principal Act consisting of new section 21. Subsection (1) empowers the Governor, on the recommendation of an Aboriginal community, to make regulations controlling the consumption, possession, sale and supply of alcoholic liquor and regulated substances (that is, petrol and other substances declared by the regulations to be regulated substances) on a specified part of the lands, providing for the confiscation of alcoholic liquor and regulated substances, providing for the treatment or rehabilitation (or both) of persons affected by the misuse of alcoholic liquor and regulated substances and prescribing fines (not exceeding \$2 000) for contravention of, or non-compliance with, a regulation.

Subsection (2) provides that a regulation under subsection (1) cannot be varied or revoked except on the recommendation of the Aboriginal community on whose recommendation the regulation was made. Subsection (3) empowers a member of the Police Force (which includes a special constable authorised by a member of the Police Force) to seize and impound any vehicle reasonably suspected of having been used in connection with the supply of alcoholic liquor in contravention of a regulation. Subsection (4) requires the seizure of a vehicle under subsection (3) to be referred to a magistrate.

Subsection (5) empowers a magistrate, in certain circumstances, to order the confiscation of a vehicle used in connection with the supply of alcoholic liquor in contravention of a regulation. Subsection (6) empowers a court by which a person is found to have been unlawfully in possession of alcoholic liquor or a regulated substance for personal use in contravention of a regulation, to undergo treatment or participate in a prescribed rehabilitation program. Subsection (7) makes a person who contravenes or fails to comply with a regulation guilty of a summary offence and liable to the penalty specified in the regulations, or, if the regulations do not specify a penalty, liable to a maximum division 7 fine (\$2 000).

Subsection (8) makes a person who contravenes a regulation regulating, restricting or prohibiting the sale of alcoholic liquor or prohibiting the sale or supply of a regulated substance for the purpose of inhalation or consumption, guilty of a summary offence and liable to a maximum division 7 fine or division 7 imprisonment (\$2 000 or six months). Subsection (9) is an interpretation provision.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 13 February. Page 60.)

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): It is with a great deal of pleasure that I make my maiden speech in this place in support of the Address in Reply. I should like to congratulate you, once again, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the Chair, and also the Deputy Speaker on his elevation to the position of Chairman of Committees.

There are a number of people of whom I would make specific mention. First, I pay tribute to the late Laurie Wallis, MHR for Grey from 1969 to 1983. He was the epitome of honesty and integrity, hard working and down to earth, and at all times he had the best interests of ordinary everyday working-class people at heart. He was a family man, sincere and compassionate, and he never lost sight of his goals to work to improve conditions for all Australians from all walks of life. He would not compromise his principles, and he earned the respect of his colleagues from both sides of politics. Unfortunately, Laurie died shortly after his retirement, but he leaves behind him a legacy, and that is an outstanding example of how to be a good representative of the people. He led by example and was a true, quiet achiever. Indeed, if I could follow his example in some small way, I would feel proud to do so. It is to this man that I owe my gratitude for teaching me so much about the world of politics. I would also like to thank Lloyd O'Neil, the current member for Grey, for his support. I enjoyed working for him over a period of seven years.

Another whom I must mention is my predecessor in this House, the previous member for Stuart, Gavin Keneally, who was also a Minister in the Bannon Government. Gavin represented the electors of Stuart in an exemplary manner for 19 years, first as a backbench member and later as a highly respected member of the Bannon Ministry. I was very interested to hear one member opposite comment on his wit in this place. His performance as a Minister earned him the respect of all those with whom he came into contact. He was a Minister in whom his Premier had complete confidence, and I believe that is justly so. Gavin Keneally has set a very high standard, and it will not be easy to follow such a high profile member. I will, however, endeavour at all times to promote the best interests of my electorate and the constituents and their families who make up that electorate.

Others of whom I would make mention and to whom I record here my sincere thanks and gratitude for their hard work over the past six months are Rhonda Neill of Port Augusta and Arthur Rich of Port Pirie, my assistant campaign directors. I would also thank all of those many people in Port Augusta and Port Pirie who assisted in any way during the election campaign. It is due to their hard work that I owe my success. To my colleague in the other place the Hon. Ron Roberts I would also offer my appreciation for all his assistance and hard work. Last, but certainly not least, I would extend my gratitude and appreciation to my family, without whose support I would have found my task so much more difficult.

In commenting on the Governor's address, I would indicate my pride in the achievements of the preceding Bannon Governments which have enabled a stable economic environment and an enhanced international profile which augur well for South Australia and the future long-term plans indicated in the four-year plan set down. Since the advent of the first Bannon Government, some of these achievements include the motor racing Grand Prix, the building of Technology Park and winning contracts for both the submarine project and the frigates contract. More recently there has been the finalisation of the plans for the entertainment centre. It does not hurt to emphasise these projects which have all been major achievements.

Premier Bannon's negotiating skills on behalf of South Australia have won him respect both nationally and internationally. I am sure that his skills, and those of his Cabinet colleagues, will prove invaluable in Adelaide's quest for the 1998 Commonwealth Games. The program laid down for the current term of this Parliament aims to build on those

hard won gains of previous Bannon Governments. There is a solid economic base on which to build, and South Australia is very lucky in this regard.

We have attracted developments to this State, however, mainly to the metropolitan area, and I believe that we need to seek further developments which could be located in country electorates such as my own of Stuart. There would be enormous benefits—both to the State as a whole and to those regional areas—from doing so. Stuart encompasses the two provincial cities of Port Augusta and Port Pirie located in the north of the State on Spencer Gulf. They are accessible to the major transport routes with an available pool of both unskilled and skilled workers. Youth unemployment also is high in this area. There will be a need in this current term of Parliament to address some of the problems affecting the ordinary person and their families—the aged on pensions and other retirement incomes, and the youth of our State. A start has already been made on all of these areas of concern.

This Government is very much aware of its responsibilities in this regard and has been working toward a long-term plan for South Australia. To date it has provided responsibility and stable Government, and this will continue so that South Australia will prosper and grow into the 1990s.

To my electors in Stuart, I would like to say that I see my role very much as pro development: development which is environmentally sound and complete with health standards. We are fortunate in Stuart to live in an area which lends itself to a range of development opportunities and we can offer a lot to developers. I look forward to working together with the local government and district councils of my electorate, as well as with the regional development committees, in an effort to promote my electorate with prospective developers.

I believe that we also have a very bright tourism future. South Australia has been steadily increasing its share of the national and international tourism markets. I want to see an increasing number of those tourists extending their travels in South Australia to include the North of the State, particularly the Flinders Ranges. The untapped beauty spots in the area are numerous and offer a lot to tourists who want to enjoy the unspoilt beauty of South Australia.

In the area of youth there is a lot we still need to do—in Stuart as well as elsewhere in South Australia—especially in relation to homeless youth, job opportunities for youth and, particularly in my electorate, recreational and entertainment opportunities. The Bannon Government has recognised this need and will, I am sure, address the many problems facing our young people today. Already much has been done in education and sport and, recently, in recognising the problems of homeless youth and looking at ways of overcoming them.

As I have stated, my own electorate has these problems and, indeed, particular problems for Aboriginal homeless youth which the Aboriginal community is working toward solving, together with other agencies and individuals. I shall be working with them in this matter and I must say here that it is extremely gratifying to see the community recognising its own problems and endeavouring to work out solutions for themselves. That is a step in the right direction.

Senior citizens have not been forgotten in this Government's program either. Transport concessions have been extended and security and safety measures have been adopted and there has been increased assistance for users of Access taxi services. All of these things will benefit senior citizens in my electorate. The increase in domiciliary care is of special benefit because for some time I have personally been aware of a particular need for an increase in funding

for this area. The jointly funded information service will also be of very real assistance to senior citizens living in country and rural electorates. I applaud this initiative as, I am sure, does the Member for Eyre.

A number of other initiatives indicate this Government's emphasis on the three aspects of its policies for senior citizens. They are support, care and dignity. As in all things there is a need to monitor policies continually and ensure that they are effective. I am sure that this will be done in consultation with representatives of the older people in our community and the groups representing them.

I have a particular interest in the area of health, both primary and preventive, as well as women's health. During my six years as Chairperson of the Port Augusta Hospital Board of Directors a number of issues came to my attention which I will continue to pursue. I am delighted that the redevelopment of the Port Pirie Hospital is now under way. There has been a very real need for this redevelopment for some time now. Once it has been completed I am sure that Port Pirie and districts will have a first-class hospital to provide high quality care to its clients and a top class working environment for its staff. I shall await its completion with a great deal of anticipation. The Port Augusta Hospital redevelopment has received a commitment to go ahead from the Minister of Health and, again, this will prove of enormous benefit to residents of the Port Augusta region. Funding for planning is due in 1990-91 and building work will commence in 1992-93.

Some areas which I believe still need to be addressed, particularly in my electorate of Stuart, are the increased provision of specialist services for regional health services. Increasing services provided from these regional services should in some small measure assist in respect of the problems currently facing metropolitan hospitals.

Allied health professionals are in demand for country areas and we need measures to attract them to electorates such as mine. They are an integral part of the total curative and preventive sides of health. There have been enormous difficulties in the past to persuade these professionals to locate in country areas. However, surprisingly, once having done so they find that there are great benefits in broadening their experience and strengthening and honing their skills.

In fact, only recently I spoke to a young physiotherapist who came from college to the Port August Hospital. She spoke in glowing terms of her gains in experience and confidence. She felt that she was in fact far ahead of her metropolitan colleagues because she had to draw so much on her own resources, particularly in decision-making and management type skills. She also felt that the range of services she had to provide was much higher. She was a very committed and competent young woman and indicated to me that she would be investigating ways and means of attracting other allied health professionals to our area. I will certainly support her in her attempts because I firmly believe that regional country health units need to provide the best quality care possible.

The recently announced Federal Government funding for mammography screenings for rural women, to follow the cervical cancer (PAP smear) program, is a step in the right direction. It is one in which I have been very interested since the PAP smear campaign commenced. The other Federal Government initiatives for women's health announced at the same time, specifically aimed at rural women, must also be commended. I hope to see both programs continue and others to be included from time to time so that preventive health measures continue to expand and take pressure off the currently overloaded health system in the metropolitan area. The ideal, of course, would be for a

women's health service to be located in a central location in the country and for a mobile unit to operate from that centre into outreach areas. In the very near future we must look at something along those lines.

I would like to take a little time here to mention a special person, a very dedicated professional, who deserves recognition for his contribution in the health field. We constantly hear of the problems in attracting doctors to country areas. That was not always the case. The person to whom I now refer, Dr John Thompson—fondly referred to by all and sundry as 'Thommo'—has dedicated 50 years to serving Port Augusta and surrounding areas as a general practitioner. Over those 50 years he built up a reputation of being a gentle, caring, compassionate person, very involved in his patients' problems. He was both confidant and friend to all those he served. He began in an era when the GP was doctor, specialist, surgeon and anaesthetist, and had very rudimentary and almost primitive facilities with which to work when compared with those available today.

Dr Thompson has coped extremely well with his constantly changing role over those 50 years. There has been increasing specialisation and changes in preventive health measures. There has also been a restructuring of nursing services and hospital administrative services. He has also had to keep abreast of the changing technologies in medicine, the advances in research, new diseases, and so on. It is an incredible achievement to give 50 years medical service to one community and, indeed, it may even be unique. Dr Thompson has done that and indicated great enjoyment in doing so.

On behalf of all those electors in Stuart who have benefited at some time or another from Dr Thompson's services, I pay tribute to him. He has dedicated his working life to a country community, giving of his services freely and unstintingly. I wish him and his wife Bonny well in their retirement and say thank you publicly for those many years of service, for he will be sadly missed by all.

In my electorate of Stuart there are a number of exciting projects. I have been consulting with the Port Pirie Development Committee on one such project which could create a number of opportunities in that city. However, it is still in its early stages; nevertheless, I am hoping for success. The project will need some injection of Government funding, and this needs to be negotiated.

In Port Augusta, there are another two exciting projects that I hope to see go ahead. One is about to start, and that is the Agridev-ETSA horticulture/aquaculture project at the Northern Power Station site. The potential for this project, should it be successful—I am sure that it will be—is tremendous in terms of national and international markets for its products. I shall be closely following developments in this area and I am sure that the Minister responsible, who visited the site late last year, will also be closely monitoring developments.

Many members would have heard of the Arid Lands Botanic Park in Port Augusta. As a member of the Friends of the Port Augusta Arid Lands Botanic Park Group—almost since its inception—I naturally have a very keen interest in this project. Here again there is a need for Government and other funding if this project is to realise its full potential. As an educational project, it will offer excellent opportunities to students. It will also encourage tourists from all over the world to come here to see such a unique park promoting our arid lands plants. Already the 'Friends' group boasts a number of international visitors as members.

Another avenue for the park—seed propagation—has commercial possibilities for both national and international

markets. These seeds would be used for soil protection from erosion and for a number of other valid projects which would be of significant environmental value. I am extremely keen to see this project go ahead as soon as possible, and I know that the Port Augusta City Council has devoted a lot of time and effort to it. I have been following up funding avenues with both State and Federal Governments and will continue to do so in support of the city council and the 'Friends' group.

For the past two and a half years I have been involved in the local TAFE college at Port Augusta as President of its council. During this period it has become increasingly obvious that there is a need for student boarding facilities in regional cities such as Port Augusta and Port Pirie and, indeed, elsewhere. I was delighted with the recent announcement by the Education Minister (Hon. Greg Crafter) of cottage boarding facilities in country areas, one of which was to be in Port Augusta, for the accommodation of secondary students. This meets a long-standing need for students from outback areas and other smaller centres who wish to continue their secondary education in Port Augusta. I believe that there is a need to expand these boarding facilities to include students from other centres who wish to continue their studies through the TAFE system of education. I have been pursuing this with the relevant Ministers and will continue to do so.

As a continuation on the education and training scheme, I have just relinquished my position on the Port Augusta Training Committee. The committee was set up initially by the Federal Minister for Employment and Education Services (Hon. Peter Duncan) to look at maximising the Australian National and ETSA training centres in Port Augusta, mainly in the area of apprenticeships, and then report to both Federal and State Ministers on its findings.

Since reporting to the Ministers, the training committee has made a commitment to continue as a committee to monitor training needs and, where possible, pursue resolution of problem areas. In addition it has decided to broaden its role to include all types of training. It has a very broad cross-section of community representation and just recently acquired funding for a skill-share project. It is a unique committee which aims to prevent duplication of services wherever possible, and all major groups represented ensure that there is free communication so that this can occur. The committee is involving itself in obtaining services for young people, and I applaud the efforts of its Chairperson (Mrs Sue Dallasanta) in her efforts to obtain funding to build a skateboard facility in Port Augusta.

Much that is derogatory has been written about Port Pirie and a lot of it is unwarranted. A great deal of money has been spent by the State Government, local government and Pasminco-BHAS in a major clean-up and redevelopment program. The lead decontamination program, the redevelopment of Solomontown Beach and the town centre and major works at the Pasminco-BHAS smelters are just a few of these programs. Port Pirie has a forward-thinking council and redevelopment committee and gives every indication of being a city on the move. I will support them in every way possible in their endeavours to promote and attract development to their city.

Safety and security is an issue which is becoming a problem in country areas as well as in the city. I was pleased to hear of additional funding for Neighbourhood Watch schemes by this Government and the sponsors of the scheme. I will actively pursue funding for both Port Augusta and Port Pirie. Port Pirie is already on the list and I soon hope to have certain areas of Port Augusta added. The scheme has had some excellent results and I am looking forward to

good results in Stuart once the scheme has received funding and become operational.

There have been major public housing developments in Port Augusta and Port Pirie over the past four years and the quality of housing offered is far above that offered by other States. That was made very clear to me at a housing conference attended by all the States. There is also a reasonable percentage of home ownership and, in the current economic climate, this has caused some problems. Schemes such as Homesure and Homestart, implemented by this Government, offer assistance, but we need to be constantly aware of further problem areas in order to assist homeowners and prospective homeowners if economic conditions do not improve. However, these conditions appear to be improving and homeowners may be able to see the light at the end of the tunnel. I read with interest yesterday of a drop in interest rates by some lending institutions in South Australia, so it appears that there is light at the end of the tunnel.

A South Australian Housing Trust, State Government and Federal Government project in Port Pirie deserves a special mention and may be of interest to members. It is an innovative project for independent cottage living for older citizens, sited on Port Pirie Hospital land, with access to hospital services by way of covered walkways. It has a communal eating area, if needed, or meals can be cooked in the individual units. Named the Charles Robertson Village, it is a tribute to the vision of its namesake. It was made possible because of the Government's foresight in providing funding, together with the Federal Labor Government and South Australian Housing Trust.

In the area of disabled services, I have recently been made aware of some problems with regard to parking for the disabled. I raise the question of the need to charge for permits for disabled persons, while no charge is made to able-bodied people, particularly in local government areas. The current review of disabled services will be looking at this and other perceived problems. I hope that the review's deliberations will resolve the concerns of the disabled in my area, who have a strong feeling that they are being discriminated against because of their disabilities.

A charge is also made for local government parking in Stuart, but I believe that this could be overcome by using a scheme such as that which is run by the Salisbury council. I commend that council for its foresight in introducing its parking scheme. The council issues free three-year permits for parking in the local government area, which are permits available after an interview at which the person qualifies. The permits can be used only in the local government area. The scheme indicates to me that the council has a commonsense and caring attitude to its disabled residents, and I believe that other councils could adopt that kind of approach.

I refer to an interesting concept which was raised in conversation with a good friend of mine, who is the mother of three teenage girls, and which is worth speaking about here. It relates to the Minister of Education, the Hon. Greg Crafter, and I have suggested to him that it is something we could consider. It is an essay competition for school-children, with the essay topic being 'The year 2000 and beyond: my vision for the future'. The entrants could be divided into sections for years 6 and 7, and two sections for secondary level, and it could be either a State or national competition, with both Government and private enterprise contributing to prizes for winners of the various divisions or sections. The divisional winners could have their essays printed in the local and State media. Prizes could be either money towards ongoing education or an educational trip,

together with an opportunity to meet their politicians—which I am sure they would enjoy—to tell them how they want to see the world in the year 2000. The children are our future, and we as politicians and legislators could profit from such an exercise. It is an interesting thought, anyway.

In the area of child-care, facilities have increased under both State and Federal Labor Governments, and I am proud of those achievements. However, there is still a need to increase funding for subsidised places in country and metropolitan electorates. I have a keen interest in pursuing an increased number of such places in Stuart and have already started along that path. Generally, the record has been quite good since the Labor Governments took office, but the needs have increased and this should be monitored on an ongoing basis to see when increases sensibly can take place, given funding constraints, which are always with us.

In summary, I feel that South Australia has a promising future and the Government will continue to actively promote future growth. I hope that my electorate will be involved in that growth in a positive way. If all of us in this House approach the next four-year term with a positive and constructive attitude, rather than a destructive and negative one, we can succeed in making this State greater. I feel that it is already a great State, but we can make it better with the support of all those involved in the Parliament.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this my eighth re-election to the Chamber. From the outset, I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on being elected to the highest office that the House can bestow on one of its members. I also congratulate your deputy, and I am sure that you will display the wisdom necessary to ensure that all members are given the opportunity to participate, and that the Government of the day is required to answer in the proper manner, which should always be the case in a democratically elected Parliament.

I also congratulate all new members. I am sorry that there is not one more in the Liberal Party ranks. However, I will be charitable and congratulate the Government on its re-election, even though it has destroyed once and for all the myth that the one vote one value system is a fair and reasonable electoral system. I was recently asked to prepare a submission for the Citizens for Democracy in Queensland. That group puts forward the premise that, if there is a one vote one value system, which in Australian terms is an equal number of electors in an electorate, there is a fair electoral system. That group wrote to me and provided a copy of a detailed questionnaire. I was happy to respond and to point out in some detail that the myth which has surrounded the story that the Labor Party has put around for some time that one vote one value is fair can easily be destroyed.

I believe in a fair and reasonable electoral system and in parliamentary representation. People should have the opportunity not only to stand for Parliament but also to become members of Parliament. Therefore, to ensure that course of action Parliament should be of a size that does not make it impossible for the average person, who may like to apply themselves, to become a member of Parliament. I do not support a reduction in the size of Parliaments: that would be a retrograde step. It would not be in the best interests of isolated communities.

We must be particularly careful over the next few months, when discussions will obviously take place across the whole political spectrum on what should occur electorally in South Australia—whether there should be a redistribution, a referendum or a change in the size of the Parliament. I would

vigorously oppose any attempt to reduce the size of the House of Assembly, because one cannot equate smaller government with smaller Parliaments: there is no relevance in that argument whatsoever. A real danger exists that, if we reduce the size of the Parliament, we will hand over more power to the bureaucracy—the Public Service—as there will be fewer elected members to keep a close and adequate watch upon the bureaucracy.

It is the role of members of Parliament to represent their electorates. What I am saying is completely consistent with what I said a few months ago in this Parliament when I responded to a motion put forward by the member for Fisher. On that occasion I responded on behalf of the Opposition. If we are not careful, if we interfere with the size of the Parliament, we will take away the opportunity for members of Parliament to keep a close watch on government and on the bureaucracy. It is even more important to have an adequate committee system. One of the failures of this Government since it came to office is that it has done nothing about deregulation in the areas it should have acted and it has done nothing about installing a committee system to examine all statutory authorities.

On three occasions I introduced legislation into Parliament that took into account all the criticisms that the Labor Party put forward when the Tonkin Government introduced the legislation. It would have been implemented had commonsense and goodwill prevailed on both sides. That committee should mirror the operations of the Public Accounts Committee, which has been a most successful committee in this Parliament. In my view it is very important that the Parliament look at this matter in a reasonable and responsible manner.

If the Government sets out to draw up an electoral system that will advantage only the Labor Party, it will fail and be acting contrary to the best interests of the people of this State. If the Government makes the Parliament smaller, it will be more difficult for people such as the members for Semaphore or Elizabeth to be elected to Parliament, because the Party machine will be so organised and the executives will have a lot more control over members of Parliament. That is a bad thing and something that I will not support.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: Did you support it at the election?

Mr GUNN: I made my position very clear more than 12 months ago in speaking in this Parliament in response to the motion moved by the member for Fisher to reduce the number of members of Parliament. The honourable member who was so critical of members interjecting a few months ago should look carefully at my speech in *Hansard* and he will be fully briefed. If he wants further information, I would be pleased to have a cup of tea with him and take him through my views. I have examined electoral systems around the world, but as a member who represents an isolated community I understand the frustrations and difficulties of those people.

I say to this Parliament and to the Premier that, if we are not careful and if we interfere with the electoral system to such a degree as to make it impossible for people in isolated communities to have one of their own elected to Parliament, we will sow the seeds for regional government in this State. People in isolated communities have had enough of having policies imposed upon them and of public servants arriving on aeroplanes, having no understanding or appreciation of their problems and then leaving. These people will start the movement to make their own decisions. Even though I do not agree with the concept of regional government, I understand the feeling, because I know how difficult it is to talk commonsense to Ministers and to Governments. Governments send public servants to those

areas even though those officers have no understanding of local issues, are insensitive and have come straight out of academic institutions. Such people attempt to impose their will on the community in a manner that is not only unfortunate but also contrary to the best interests of this State.

This Parliament and this Government have a heavy responsibility to ensure that they act in a fair and reasonable manner. I have been a member of this place for almost 20 years and have seen many things happen. I hope that commonsense will prevail. I seek your leave, Mr Speaker, to incorporate in *Hansard* a statistical table showing the two-Party preferred voting since 1970.

The SPEAKER: Is it purely statistical?

Mr GUNN: Yes, Sir, I assure you that it is.

Leave granted.

TWO-PARTY PREFERRED VOTING

	Liberal	Labor
1989	52.0%	48.0%
1985	47.0%	53.0%
1982	48.5%	51.5%
1979	55.0%	45.0%
1977	46.6%	53.4%
1975	50.8%	49.2%
1973	45.7%	54.3%
1970	46.9%	53.1%

Mr GUNN: The table clearly indicates that there have been at least three occasions on which the Liberal Party has received a greater percentage of the two-Party preferred vote than the Labor Party. In 1979 we received 55 per cent of the vote and only just got a majority. We can talk about one vote one value. That is a system designed, in Australian terms, to allow people to lock up their opponents' votes into very strong seats and to prevent the will of the people being put into effect on many occasions. I have studied various electoral systems around the world. I hope that the Government accepts the select committee principle that the Leader has put forward on behalf of the Opposition so that all sections of the community can sit down and, with a clear head, examine the electoral system and bring forward a central proposal. I can see nothing wrong with increasing the size of the House by a couple of members, because people are entitled to the right to be elected to Parliament—and that should not be the right of a few people—and people have the right to be represented.

I turn now to a number of other issues affecting my electorate and the people of this State. Law and order has been addressed by various members in various ways. I have been concerned for a long time that little or nothing has been done to deal with the delinquent problem, particularly in places like Ceduna. The Mayor of Port Augusta has complained about it. A problem also exists in Hindley Street. In Ceduna groups of juveniles roam the streets at night interfering with motor vehicles, breaking and entering homes, smashing windows and generally making a thorough nuisance of themselves.

To ensure that people's property is not damaged, hoodlums like this need to be firmly dealt with. Most members of the community, if left to themselves, are reasonable. However, they take strong exception to having stones thrown on their roofs and windows broken—and nothing done about it. One glazier at Ceduna has repaired 936 windows in 12 months, and other people have been called in to assist. On one night 43 windows at the school were broken. That is bad enough, but when people are woken in the middle of the night by stones being thrown on their roofs they get fed up.

Unless something is done very quickly to resolve this problem, people will take the law into their own hands. I

understand that, overwhelmingly, these problems are caused by young Aborigines. There will always be problems where there is high unemployment and a large group of people gather with nothing to do. Indeed, there is high unemployment at Ceduna, particularly among juvenile Aborigines.

I and other members of this place prevailed on the Government to increase the number of Aboriginal police aides. That scheme has been an outstanding success and has operated more effectively and efficiently than anyone imagined. The police officers involved in that scheme deserve full credit for its success. My only criticism of it is that it has not been extended to other parts of the State. I call on the Premier, the Attorney-General and the Minister in charge of the police to get off their backsides and extend the scheme as quickly as possible. There has been far too much discussion and far too little action.

It took years to declare dry areas at Ceduna. The public were insulted by the fools from the Health Commission who wrote stupid reports quoting 13 or 14 pages of that scoundrel, Al Grassby. In situations like this one can understand why people become very cynical about government. The Attorney-General should not be so weak; he should take firm action to deal with these hoodlums who are causing so much trouble by smashing people's cars, wrecking their property and going on a spate of break-ins. It is impossible for the police to be everywhere at once.

I know that when dealing with minority groups there will always be problems. I suggest that two Aboriginal police aides from the Pitjantjatjara lands should be brought to Ceduna for a month. I guarantee that if that occurred a large part of the problem would be solved. Those police aides have developed particular skills in policing Aboriginal areas, and they are very effective. This would allow the police at Ceduna to be relieved from this continual task.

The situation is completely out of hand. The public are now taking the law into their own hands. One constituent of mine came home to find his plants pulled out of his garden, his poultry gone and people throwing stones at his caravan, which was parked in his backyard. He had had enough, so he jumped a fence, chased after the offenders and gave them a cuff under the ear, which is the proper treatment for them. This decent, upright citizen is entitled to live in his house without being harassed or hindered by hoodlums. But, what happened to him? He was charged with assault. The following note has been dropped in letterboxes around Ceduna:

Do you wish to protect your property? Ken Wright did. Come and see justice done. Be at Ceduna courthouse on 20 February at 9.45 a.m. Come one, come all. Be there!

And hundreds of people will be there. This Government has been weak and ineffective, and it does not have the courage to put on a few more police aides. My constituent was charged with assault because he defended his property. Surely in a democratic society people are entitled to protect themselves.

I call on the Government, particularly the Attorney-General, to show a bit of courage. Instead of getting fools from the Health Commission to write stupid reports, he should get on with it. Blind Freddy knows that if two or three Aboriginal police aides were sent to Ceduna much of this problem would be solved. I am aware that this matter is controversial. My constituents have had enough of this nonsense. When the police were called to the school on the night that 43 windows were broken the legal representative of the offenders told them to say nothing and no-one was charged. That is nonsense. It is about time parents were made responsible for their children.

I hope that the Minister takes note of this because the problem is virtually out of control. Hundreds of people will

be at the courthouse, make no mistake about that. I would like to be there but this place is in session. I believe that what these people are doing to try to protect their rights is justified.

The continued debate in this country about whether we should go overboard to protect the environment, whether we should have development, and the role of agriculture have, in my view, come to a fairly dangerous point. Senator Richardson seems intent on keeping himself before the public and has little regard for the two industries—agriculture and mining—which continue to sustain the nation and which built this country.

The Hon. H. Allison: Forests.

Mr GUNN: I include forests in the general agricultural sector. We read in the *Australian Rural Times* of 11 January, under the headline 'Farmers may be cleared from marginal country', comments by that enlightened character, Senator Richardson. I ask: who will determine what is marginal?

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Ask Kerin about him.

Mr GUNN: Mr Kerin has had enough of it, and he has some knowledge of this. Unfortunately, the Government attempts to appease, at all costs, those vocal minority groups. If ever an argument in this State has become completely out of control it is this nonsense we read about a few seals at Marineland. Never have I heard such childishness. The cost to the taxpayers has been outrageous. This is occurring when, in my electorate, the Government says that it does not have the money to extend the port of Thevenard, which exports more than Port Lincoln. This port consistently provides income for the State—it is a profitable port—but there is not enough money to upgrade it.

Yet, Senator Richardson and other Ministers race around the country making all sorts of statements trying to appease minority groups to the detriment of the nation as a whole, and that is what concerns me—it is to the detriment of the nation as a whole. The article in the *Australian Rural Times* talks about paying people. I am concerned about who will determine what is marginal country. Who are the selected few? What will they do with the land? Will it be turned into a national or conservation park, which will then have to be properly managed? Before this argument goes any further I want to know where the State Government stands. I suggest that a number of people in my electorate will be earmarked for this.

Where does one draw the line? Does one use Goyder's line? There are people who are successfully farming outside Goyder's line; make no mistake about that. I do not know a lot about a number of areas, but I believe that I can say with some authority that I have had some experience in the agricultural area. I have probably been involved in the carting of more wheat than most members of this House have seen. This year, some of those areas that have been earmarked have produced record amounts of grain for the benefit of the community. For example, up to 31 January this year, Cooperative Bulk Handling has received 4.5 million tonnes of wheat, barley and other grains—a very large amount.

We will consider some of the silos and their productivity last year—some of them did not open. If one knows anything about the agricultural sector in South Australia and how the wheel turns one will find this interesting. As I understand it the previous year the Penong silo never opened; this year the Penong silo received in excess of 29 000 tonnes of grain. The Pintumbler silo, which is the farthest silo west in South Australia received some 14 000 tonnes of grain. Of course, other grain would have gone into Thevenard. The Thevenard silo system is virtually full. I was advised

that it is nearly impossible for all the wheat that has been reaped and stored this year to be shifted by the next season. It will have to average in excess of two boats a week, which will probably be impossible to achieve.

The 1989 report of the Minister of Marine and Harbors states that during the year 80 vessels entered the port of Thevenard, including three fishing vessels requiring assistance, four naval patrol boats and one sailing and training ship. Exports totalled 1.25 million tonnes compared with 1.1 million for the previous year. It states that gypsum was the major export commodity with just over 1 million tonnes being shipped compared with 900-odd tonnes the previous year. That was in a drought year.

Deepening the channel, improving the turning basin and increasing the turning capacity of the port are matters requiring action. The amount of money required may appear to be significant, but in my judgment the Government will get a good return on the money it invests. In some of these Government departments I understand it requires a cost recovery operation; whatever is spent must be recovered. That is well and good, but where does the Government intend to draw the line? Will it apply that criterion across all Government operations? If I was a betting person, I would wager that it would be on selected industries only. There would not be this great monstrosity of an entertainment centre on the Port Road. That will never get off the ground, it will just be a white elephant. Money goes out annually for the Festival Theatre, the STA, and so on. As usual, it appears that there are two sets of rules: one for the members of the community who can do something, and, of course, another for the non-producing areas.

Unfortunately, the Government does not seem to recognise the urgent need to upgrade Thevenard. My constituents are concerned because their viability is threatened. A letter from the State Manager of the Wheat Board to the district council, is as follows:

Further to our recent meeting and your letter of 21 September, I am writing to confirm our views regarding future use of Thevenard as a grain shipping port. As explained our shipping operations at Thevenard are extremely constrained because of the limitations of the port. Unfortunately these limitations are caused by a number of different factors including:

- (a) channel width
- (b) channel curvature radius
- (c) length of jetty
- (d) shipment outloader outreach
- (e) position of dredged berth.

The Department of Marine and Harbours has advised that all of these factors would need to be addressed if the port was to be upgraded to accommodate vessels up to 45 000 DWT. This is the size of ship preferred by many of our markets. Currently only vessels up to 30 000 DWT can be loaded and even then it is only possible to achieve at best a 60 per cent load. The vessel subsequently has to be topped up at a second port, usually Port Lincoln. Only vessels less than 15 000 DWT can fully load.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to provide small ships to service Thevenard. As you may be aware the board sells predominantly on an FOB basis (approximately 90 per cent of sales) and we therefore have little control over the size of vessel nominated by markets. Furthermore, it is often difficult to offer compensation to a buyer for supplying smaller ships except, perhaps, in those situations where port specific sales are made because of the quality preference of the buyer.

Our strategies to redress the problem are twofold. Firstly, we move some wheat 'interzone' to Port Lincoln, but only from those sites where the excess freight cost is not high. In the past this has included Yaninee, Minnipa, Poochera, Witera, Streaky Bay and Cungen. Secondly, the board will where possible negotiate with buyers for smaller vessels. However, there is a freight penalty associated with this and is borne by growers in the Thevenard zone as a port differential. I have enclosed with this letter a paper which summarises how port differentials are derived and the reason for applying them. For growers in the Thevenard zone a provisional deduction of \$2.28 will apply. A further deduction of \$1.20/tonne will be made to cover the extra freight cost of moving wheat to Port Lincoln.

That will have a detrimental effect. The letter continues:

As you will see, Thevenard zone growers are paying a penalty for the limitations of the port. Importantly, however, this penalty is significantly less than the costs that might be incurred for upgrading of the port.

That just briefly outlines the problems which those people will have. I sincerely hope that the Government recognises the difficulties which it will inflict upon that region unless it is prepared to take some action.

I believe most members received a copy of the Casino Supervisory Authority's annual report yesterday. Looking at it briefly, I was concerned to see that on page 11 a reference to section 17 of the Casino legislation, which it prohibits people from purchasing gambling material on credit or using chips in the casino. That is a provision which I had put into the Act, otherwise I never would have supported the legislation. I would be appalled if the Casino Authority, using its own Act, attempted to prevail upon the Government or any member to bring forward an amendment to alter that provision, because the legislation was negotiated in this House after a great deal of discussion. I am one of those people who believe in legal gambling, not illegal gambling; that is why I supported it. I am concerned that the authority is attempting to amend section 17, which provides:

Where a person (other than the person who is operating the casino) purchases gambling chips to use in an authorised game he must, before the chips are delivered to him, pay for them in full by banknote or coin.

I believe that any attempt to alter that provision is alarming. I would like to know how the situation has arisen whereby the casino operators are currently holding cheques to the value of \$1 million which have not been honoured. I would like the Minister responsible, by way of making a ministerial statement to this House, to report on why that situation has been allowed to arise. I believe that the House is entitled to know; I was interested to read how that situation arose. I look forward to this session, as there are many matters with which this Parliament will have to deal with on behalf of the people of this State.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling the honourable member for Gilles, I remind the House that this is the honourable member's maiden speech, and I ask that the usual courtesies be extended. The honourable member for Gilles.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): It is with a mixture of pride and humility that I rise to speak in the affirmative to the Address in Reply, pride in that I am a new member of this House, representing the Australian Labor Party, and pride in that I am able to continue my participation with the traditions of the Australian Labor Party and the philosophies of democratic socialism. I am humble because I was preselected by the rank and file of my Party to represent them and humble because the people of the electorate of Gilles supported me to represent them as a member of this House. It is with those same feelings that I can reflect on how I learnt about the values of democratic socialism espoused by the Australian Labor Party.

As many may know, my father, David McKee, was a member of this House representing the seat of Port Pirie from 1959 until his retirement as Minister of Labour in 1975. It is not unusual for sons to follow the work practices of their fathers. Indeed, the member for Morphett, also a past resident of Port Pirie, is a pharmacist like his father. Sons, and more latterly daughters, follow their fathers into trades and professions like carpentry, fitter and turner, boilermaker, mechanics, farming and the law. Given that posi-

tion, I am very grateful that my father saw fit early in his working life to give up his employment as a horse breaker.

Whilst I was never pushed into politics, growing up in a working class family, being surrounded by unionism and Labor politics, the Vietnam war and conscription—those events and that environment—moulded my opinions. I felt that participation in Labor politics was the only way that I could make a contribution, even if in only a small way, to the improvement of our community.

I became the organiser of the Musicians Union of South Australia. I must point out that the music industry in this country is a \$1 500 million a year industry and, because of its size, necessitates a strong union. In a couple of weeks South Australia will present the biennial Adelaide Festival, which will contribute not only to the coffers of this State but, just as importantly, to the artistic needs and well-being of the population.

Music can easily be taken for granted, and therefore the size of the industry can be ignored. For example, the Australian rock band INXS last year sold 8 million copies of its album overseas, earning much needed export dollars for our economy. Any company in the export business would, I am sure, like to sell 8 million units of its products overseas. When anyone turns on the car radio and listens to music, even when they turn on the television, they can hear and watch music being performed. When they go to dinner, a cabaret, a concert, or even to the pub, they can listen to music. It is an integral part of the day-to-day existence of human beings. Whether someone chooses to stay at home and put on the record player or the CD player and listen to their favourite opera or concerto, jazz or rock band, they are being entertained by and gain enjoyment from music.

I later became involved, like former Premier Don Dunstan and current Premier John Bannon, in the union for performers in radio, television, theatre and dance, known as Actors and Announcers Equity. I was fortunate to be able to build on the foundations laid down by those two gentlemen and gain, for the first time in this State, registration of the union in the Industrial Commission of South Australia. I am pleased to say that Actors Equity has gone on to grow in membership, employ a full-time official and office staff and provide the type of industrial protection that is deserved by professional artists. The arts represents a very deep-rooted expression of the character of human beings that has been detected as far back as modern archaeology can reach. It crosses every colour, every national boundary, every political belief and for me it is on the same level as the great scientific discoveries. I feel fortunate not only to understand that and appreciate it, but also to have had some involvement with it.

In 1979, after the loss of the Corcoran Government, I was elected to the position of State Organiser of the Labor Party. My first electoral bleeding came some five weeks later when I was sent out into the field to work in the Norwood by-election. That by-election culminated in the re-election of the current member and Minister of Education, the Hon. Greg Crafter; and, I might add, what a sensible decision by the people of Norwood it was then, just as it was last November.

During nearly 10 years at Party office I was fortunate to work with the then Secretary, Chris Schacht (now Senator Chris Schacht). We worked together on four State by-elections, three Federal elections and two State election campaigns, culminating in success in all but three by-elections. Incidentally, one of those by-elections was for the seat of Mitcham, which was won by the Democrats. Being traditionally a Liberal held seat, it could not be regarded as a total loss for the Labor Party.

My time in Party office brought home to me very clearly one of the great strengths of the ALP—its rank and file membership: not just for standing on polling booths and letter-boxing (although that does not diminish in any way), not only attending endless meetings at branch level, dealing in everything from electoral organisation to the inevitable fundraising, but I think one of the cornerstones of my Party, and that is direct involvement by the rank and file in policy formulation. I believe that aspect of our structure to be unique amongst political Parties whereby members across the State can not only contribute directly towards the making of the policy agenda but also, through their delegates, participate directly in the debates on the floor of convention that ultimately finalises our policies for the ensuing two years.

Next year we will see the centenary of the Australian Labor Party—an achievement that no other political Party in this country can claim. Our Party has a history, a tradition, a strength, that has seen it survive economic depressions, wars, a split and go on in office to make some of the great and historic and lasting decisions that have benefited the Australian people. We have come through the first 100 years; we will get through the next 100. If a Party can survive the amazing industrial, technological and political changes of the past 100 years, it is well equipped to face the challenges and changes that will come in the next 100. Challenges and changes are occurring this very minute in Eastern Europe and South Africa. The one thing that remains constant is change.

I believe that our most important challenge will be the approach we take in dealing with our environment. This is a direct challenge that can be dealt with only by political means. Society seems to have run a course of complacency which has slowly turned to worry and now to alarm. We must now turn to the questions of ethics, history, psychology, politics and plain commonsense, and these are the kinds of questions that the political system is uniquely suited to address. We must develop environmental strategies through the political process to explore the differences between demand and need. We need to ask ourselves where we want to be a long time hence, and then to ask what we must avoid in order to get there.

I believe that the Bannon Government has already taken steps to address many of these problems. Policies have been developed concerning such important areas as a sustainability program covering development, environmental resources, economics, education and information. We have constructed methods of dealing with our parks, nature vegetation, soil and water. Action has already been taken regarding the greenhouse effect and legislation has already been passed providing for controls over CFCs. Just about everybody will get on the environmental bandwagon over the next couple of years, for every imaginable reason, including political expediency. As outlined in the Governor's address, what will be needed is that which has already been demonstrated by this Government: a mixture of sensitivity, strong will, cool heads and a workable, sustainable, commonsense policy that will represent a balanced approach towards our future needs.

I would now like to turn to a subject raised as a matter of policy by the Opposition at the last State election. I refer to the Opposition's policy of non-compulsory voting—a legerdemain trick of the highest proportion. A very brief history shows that compulsory voting was first introduced in 1915 in Queensland and for Commonwealth elections in 1924, and by 1942 it was in operation in all States.

One must surely question the motives of a political Party in a modern democracy wanting to go backwards in time

to take away something that ensures the right of people to participate in the democratic process. Could it be that the Opposition can see some advantages for itself in non-compulsory voting?

Ian McAllister, whilst Professor of Politics, University College at the Australian Defence Force Academy, produced a paper that proves that very point. By using data from the 1977 Federal election and assuming the non-compulsory turnout of voters to be 75 per cent, which is the average voter turnout in Britain (which has non-compulsory voting) over an almost 20-year period from 1964 to 1983, McAllister proves that as follows:

One fact is immediately apparent: Labor makes more substantial gains when there is high turnout, the Liberals when there is a comparatively low turnout. For example, if turnout were 65 per cent rather than 75 per cent, the Liberals would expect to gain 2 per cent of the vote, while Labor would lose nearly 3 per cent. By contrast, a turnout of 80 per cent would narrow the gap between the parties to a few percentage points.

The people of Australia were asked in 1979 their opinion towards compulsory voting: 68 per cent of voters were in favour of retaining it. There has been no substantial shift in attitude towards compulsory voting since the question was first canvassed in an opinion survey in 1943.

The latter part of the quote from McAllister, which refers to the greater number of people turning out to vote 'narrows the gap between the Parties', is extremely important. By allowing more people to cast a vote, it puts more responsibility on the political Parties to perform, it forces political Parties to work harder at providing better policies, and therefore means better government for the people of Australia. That is certainly what the Labor Party and this Government is all about and it obviously raises serious doubts about the *raison d'être* of the Opposition. I would like to quote a passage, as follows:

I hate all race discrimination and in my hatred I am sustained by the fact that the overwhelming majority of people, here and abroad, hate it equally. I hate the systematic inculcation in children of colour prejudice and I am sustained in that hatred by the fact that the overwhelming majority of people, here and abroad, are with me in that. I hate the racial arrogance which decrees that the good things of life shall be retained as the exclusive right of a minority of the population, which reduces the majority of the population to a position of subservience and inferiority, and maintains them as voteless chattels to work where they are told and behave as they are told by the ruling minority. I am sustained in that hatred by the fact that the overwhelming majority of people, both in this country and abroad, are with me.

After that statement, Nelson Mandela was gaoled for three years for incitement to strike and two years on a second charge for leaving South Africa without a valid permit. I quote again from a second trial, as follows:

Our struggle is a truly national one. It is a struggle with the African people, inspired by our own suffering and our own experience. It is a struggle for the right to live. During my lifetime I have dedicated myself to this struggle of the African people. I have fought against white domination and I have fought against black domination. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and to achieve. But, if needs be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die.

These words were the last words South Africans, or indeed the people of the world, were to hear from Nelson Mandela for 27 years. His sentence was in fact to serve out the rest of his natural life in captivity on Robben Island. I want to pay tribute to the philosophy, the intellect, the courage and the determination of Nelson Mandela to endure 27 years imprisonment, to survive, and to still hold dear and be prepared to fight for the very principles for which he was imprisoned. Only a handful of people throughout history are remembered for their great sacrifices to right the wrongs in our society—Nelson Mandela is one of them.

In conclusion, I would like to talk about my electorate of Gilles. Bordering on Walkerville, it takes in the affluent suburbs of Vale Park and Manningham and moves through to the more working class areas of Windsor Gardens, Hillcrest, Northfield and Gilles Plains. I want to state here and now that, regardless of their political persuasion, my electorate door will always be open to the people of Gilles. In particular, for the less well-off in my electorate, I want to see not only the maintenance but an improvement in the provisions of Government services. Much has been said by political commentators that the Labor Government has neglected our traditional supporters to go and chase votes in marginal seats. I want to place on record that, in the life of the last Government, Labor spent about \$6 million in the electorate of Gilles. That expenditure covered such areas as public housing, education, home and community care, road maintenance and a new fire station. Labor does look after its traditional supporters and Labor will continue to do so.

I would like to pay tribute to the former member for Gilles, Mr Jack Slater. Jack first entered Parliament in 1970 and rose through the ranks to become Minister of Water Resources and Minister of Recreation and Sport. He served his Party and his electorate well and was of invaluable assistance to me in my campaign. I would also like to thank the members of my subbranch, the President, Erwin Williamson, the Secretary, Mark Hough, and the Federal candidate for Adelaide, Bob Catley, for their untiring assistance to me in my campaign.

I would also like to mention the assistance I received from Mr Terry Fitzgerald. Terry and I met at a public meeting concerning the proposed building of a juvenile detention centre in the electorate. I worked with Terry and organised deputations to see relevant Ministers and members of Caucus, and we were successful. We were successful because we were dealing with a Government that was prepared to listen and we saw in action a Government that demonstrated the politics of consultation and not confrontation. I consider myself to be fortunate to be in this House representing the people of Gilles and the Australian Labor Party. I hope I can maintain the standards set by the members who have gone before me, including my father, as well as those members who currently sit in this House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the member for Newland, I remind the House that it is the honourable member's maiden speech and I ask that the usual courtesies be observed.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech opening this first session of the forty-seventh Parliament. Through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I offer my congratulations to the Speaker on attaining the high office that he now holds. I would like to extend my thanks to those electors of Newland who indicated, by the strength of their individual votes, their displeasure and disappointment with current Government policies and supported my election to Parliament. I will undertake wholeheartedly the role of responsible representation for all the electors in Newland, regardless of political Party affiliations. In addition, it is my duty to deal with policy matters that will affect the entire State and, although the electorate of Newland will receive my first priority, the Bills presented in this place will receive my consideration in accordance with State needs. I would also like to acknowledge the former member for Newland for her past efforts and wish the former member success in her future endeavours.

Over the past two years my campaign committee and helpers, ably led by the Hon. John Burdett in another place and assisted by Mr Jack Ktisti, battled against the odds with little or no resources, working tirelessly to produce what has been a winning campaign. Many hundreds of people throughout Newland supported our campaign in various ways. I would also like to acknowledge my husband, Brian, and my two sons for their invaluable backing and support over what was a very long period of time. To all my supporters, please accept my sincere thanks.

The people of Newland attested, by their votes, their dissatisfaction of this Government policies, supported by 52 per cent of votes across this State. I will not attempt to canvass the subject of electoral redistribution at this time other than to recognise that inequitable distribution denies the principles of basic democracy, and I give notice of my intention to support any future changes to the Electoral Act which seek to remedy this disproportionate representation.

On 12 September 1954 at the Port Adelaide wharves, a 28 000 ton ship, the *Orcades* docked to unload its human cargo after a month long voyage from its port of origin, Southampton, England. The *Orcades* was an immigrant ship, one of many ships to undertake that voyage between 1947 and 1973, carrying one and a half million Britons to this country over that period. I was one of the children to disembark on that day in 1954, a child of a Scottish immigrant family of four.

A recent acquisition of the Parliamentary Library is a book entitled 'The Ten Pound Immigrants' by Reg Appleyard. The foreword states that this was the 'Best organised voluntary migration scheme ever undertaken by two countries'. I certainly cannot argue with that historically recorded summation. As I have come from a working class background, my life would have taken a totally different path if not for two important considerations:

1. That the assisted passage scheme was available in those days.
2. That my parents had the determination and resolve to leave their home, relatives, friends and all to which they were accustomed and depart to the other side of the globe into the unknown.

The following passage from the book to which I have referred typifies the expectations of the migrants to this country at that time and I suggest that a similar expectation exists today:

Australia was seen as a sunny, prosperous land where a man could earn higher wages and not be bound in his spending by a network of officially devised restrictions. It was a classless society where a man was paid according to his worth, and his achievements were not dependent on breeding, background and education. Working-class men could rise to positions unattainable in Britain, and, though many potential emigrants knew that they would never reach high positions, they believed that their children would have opportunities to do so.

My parents provided those opportunities for me, and the members of my family take pride in my achievements. I thank each of them for their most valued support.

In the year 1954 in South Australia and continuing for some years to come, the Australian dream of owning one's own home could become a reality. Those families on lower income were guaranteed a Housing Trust home within a year of application. I might add that it was a Liberal initiated scheme to guarantee housing for all. Our education, health, and law and order systems, in many aspects, were the envy of the Western world in those years. In 1990, after 20 years of Labor Governments, the infrastructures of those services remain comparative but the resources required to maintain quality of services have been diminished. Ask the constituents of Newland, the taxpayers and residents within this State what service, what quality of service, is available

today in those areas. Ask those who, due to unfortunate circumstances, have had to attend the casualty section of Modbury Hospital and wait for treatment because sufficient staff cannot be provided, or those who require pain relieving operations who wait expectantly on ever lengthening lists.

On law and order, upon which I will expand shortly, ask any member of our community how safe and secure they feel within their own homes. Then ask the parents of school-aged children within Newland about the burden of increased school fees in our free education system. Ask school councils what percentage fees had to be increased to meet the current year's school costs over and above their Government funding allocations.

As a person who has served on school councils over a period of 15 years and personally devised and run remedial programs on literacy for four or five years, I consider that in this declared International Year of Literacy 'action' should be the key word—action to implement and remedy. Illiteracy in general terms must be recognised as a major problem throughout our communities. Illiteracy at its base, the education system, must be recognised as a major problem.

This area of need has been identified by different groups of people, in my own experience, over the past 20 years; studies, assessments, reports and surveys have been conducted over this period and a need for remedy has been acknowledged. Programs have been implemented from time to time and in latter years have come under the auspices of special learning units and special education in schools. These programs have tinkered around the edges of the problem without coming to terms with the specifics that would enable a total curriculum implementation. Therefore, I again stress the key word—'action', but action to implement and remedy.

In the latter part of 1989 a survey of 17 schools in the north-eastern suburbs showed that an average 24 to 27 students needed extra assistance whilst at one secondary school 97 students needed extra assistance. Keeping in mind the fact that this particular survey sought information from only 17 schools from a comparative 700 schools across the State, we also note that the number of students requiring assistance totalled over 500. Consider the horrific implications if all 700 schools were to be surveyed.

The Tea Tree Gully school council's organisation in August of last year presented a submission to this Government stressing the urgency of its concerns and highlighting that an increasing number of parents were transferring children to private schools because they believed their children would receive better support for their learning problems. Surely this is an indictment on this Government's public education priorities. Special education is an area covering many specialised needs. In my opinion this important and integral component within our education system has become a token measure, a lip service to genuine need.

In the broader field, I believe that adult literacy programs receive token support. A recent two-year study carried out by Ms Rosie Wickert for Sydney's University of Technology discovered that 60 per cent of the respondents to that survey failed one or more elementary tasks and the alarming revelation was that there was only a marginal difference between those who had English as a first language and those who were migrants. The President of the South Australian council for Adult Literacy, Ms Trish Branson, stated in a recent *Advertiser* newspaper article that about one million Australians had difficulty with English and the problem could be costing the economy \$3.2 billion a year through lost productivity. Ms Branson went on to say:

If you add the health and social costs, the figure is probably greater.

The overall result of this immense problem indicates that an illiterate population does have a devastating impact on our social, cultural and economic development. Adult literacy problems will continue to compound with each school leaving year unless illiteracy is addressed by the implementation of corrective programs at the early learning stages in the very near future. Why have resources been channelled away from special need areas? What are the priorities of this Government? Those questions are being asked with a sense of helplessness, frustration and rage by parents attempting to develop educational services for children with disabilities.

To note one of many, I draw the attention of this House to the Down's Syndrome Association. The association, a non-government organisation, receives grants for special education from both Federal and State Education Departments. Funding in 1988 totalled \$135 035; in 1989, the total was \$87 113; and, in 1990, the anticipated total is \$75 731. The Down's Syndrome Association board of management has agreed to top up the 1990 grants by redeeming \$46 000 of its assets, thus leaving the association funds low and reducing income from interest. In order to remain viable the association must raise, through fundraising and donations, in the order of \$100 000 this year. Money must also be put aside for salaries in 1991, otherwise the association's developmental learning program will cease to exist. What are the priorities of this Government?

To complement all skills in the educative sphere of school curricula, decisions should be made on educational grounds instead of administrative or economic ones. In March 1988, the Primary School Review Report recommended an increase in the number of primary school physical education specialists. The sad tale to report in 1990 is that the Physical Education Branch instead of receiving approval for increases in numbers, received further staff cuts, which means that fitness programs in our schools, to any viable degree of quality and quantity, have become almost non-existent. At the end of last year's school term, members of the Physical Education Branch of the Education Department, instead of the normal end of year, pre Christmas drinks, held a wake to recognise the effective demise of physical education from our school system.

The illusionary powers of this Government are honed to perfection: the illusion that health and fitness needs of children are given urgent concern; the illusion that specialist education is catering for our children's needs; the illusion that the disabled are a priority; the illusion of a \$36 million housing scheme, which has become a better game than the pea and thimble trick; the illusion of protecting our Marine-land animals as they are killed off, one by one; and the illusion of a Government ruling by the democratic process of majority.

Education is an interaction of many skills. Motor skill acquisition should be given equal status in the curriculum with other subjects. It is imperative that the health and fitness needs of children are given urgent consideration in both school and community incentives. The first week of this State's recent election campaign in November 1989 was declared Physical Education Week. A vast array of activities took place throughout the week, culminating in awards for outstanding contributions to physical education presented at the Balcony Lounge of the Richmond Hotel. It was a week of media coverage for this Government, promoting the illusion of support. One wonders what illusions are in store for Physical Education Week 1990. When awards for outstanding contributions are presented, this Government must surely take the booby prize.

In South Australia 70.7 per cent of all employees work in the private sector. Small business is this State's largest employer, but small business in this State is the budding money tree that Government continues to prune at an ever-increasing rate. The number of South Australian small business bankruptcies represent 18 per cent of the national total. This is indeed a shameful and tragic record for South Australia.

Poor business practice is the theme promoted by the Government as the causal effect of the majority of bankruptcies. The February 1990 edition of *Hotel Gazette of South Australia* quotes the Minister of Small Business (Hon. Ms Weise) as saying:

In view of growing pressures and complexities, education in good business practice is becoming increasingly important. Poor business practice is one of the main reasons small business enterprises fail.

Once again, we see the thread of illusion being woven. If the majority of bankrupt small businesses have gone to the wall because of individual stupidity—defined as poor business practice—and if the Government succeeds in convincing the populace at large of the frailty and stupidity of the small business operator, the Government cannot be held responsible for imposing severe and unjust tax, sufficiently savage in its increase to nail small business to the wall.

But the true substance of reality is that no business, properly budgeted and administered, could possibly cope with unannounced and massive increases such as the latest land tax assessments. Small business has suffered from excessive interest rates running at 23 per cent initiated by Federal Labor policies, plus excessive land tax initiated by the State Labor Government. Small business then suffers the indignity of being accused of incompetence by this Government, whose short-sightedness shows a total lack of understanding of the realities of financial management. I call on the Premier to acknowledge the sheer injustice of State land tax and to remedy this iniquitous situation.

For the Liberal Party and me, the family is the fundamental unit of society. The family is an institution within our society which nurtures and cares for our young, the greatest asset in any civilisation. The moral, spiritual, ethical and social values of a civilised society are passed from one generation to another so that there is a shared system of values and attitudes that unites a community and enables its members to pursue shared goals from a sheltered and secure base.

In today's world, the family unit is under threat by social attitudes aided and abetted by Government policies which devalue the core of family relationships. Policies of Labor Governments, both Federal and State, have assisted to alter family status. Social and economic intervention by Government has produced social and economic change, the impact of which reverberates throughout our society. Families have been encouraged to break up. Self reliance tends to be lost and responsibility tends to disappear. The undermining of the authority of parental responsibility has separated children from traditional values and has encouraged the advent of homeless youth and provided the setting which leads young people to the treadmill of drug abuse and crime. In February 1989 the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission released the Burdekin report. One of the damning statistics of that report revealed that 70 per cent of Australia's street kids were in fact wards of the State.

The network of bureaucratic departments to deal with all manner of family related affairs has become an industry with a growth rate second to none, which in itself generates the marketable product—human misery—necessary for the function and growth of departmental bureaucratic networks

whose franchise promotes the perception of intervention rather than support.

I am not aware of any past time where the family has not held a prime position in our society, which is in itself a strident declaration to all political factions that the importance of the family in our society must not be denied. It is the responsibility of Government to provide a basic level of security in response to the needs of family.

An article appearing in Adelaide's *Advertiser* last Saturday, 10 February, featured the headline 'Family Violence Worst'. The opening paragraph stated:

'The Australian family is a breeding ground for violence' and 'The home is the most likely site of aggressive attacks' a major new Federal Government report has found.

The article went on to state, 'The report's most alarming finding deals with home and family violence' and quotes from the report, 'Families constitute the training ground for aggression.' Families throughout this nation must surely react in horror to the gratuitous interpretation of the family as a breeding ground not of future responsible Australians but of the aggressors of the future.

Violence within our homes must not be tolerated and those who abuse any member of the family must be dealt with in law in the most severe manner. Child abuse is a blight on the face of humanity and penalties of law, in my opinion, are nowhere near commensurate with the crimes. Having placed those statements on the record of this House, I take personal umbrage to this latest attack on families. A quotation by William Penn comes to mind, and I believe it is most relevant:

Men must be governed by God or they will be ruled by tyrants.

The attack on families has been long and constant, breeding the perception that the nuclear family is now a minority group. To those who would continue to perpetuate the myth that the nuclear family is now a minority preference today, allow me to correct that misconception. The Bureau of Statistics profile of Australian children, released on 2 February, showed that in 1989 the average child still lived in the nuclear family. About 434 800 children (12 per cent of the total) lived within one-parent families. Australia has an estimated 260 000 blended families, that is, with stepchildren; and 20 per cent of all families were extended, that is, other relatives living with the family.

Governments have not supported the family unit through economic measures, which is borne out by the Australian Institute of Family Studies whose April 1989 issue of *Family Matters* in an article on families and tax in 1989 had this to say:

There is no question that, since 1976, families have lost out in the tax transfer system. In 1976-77, a one-income couple with two children on average weekly earnings paid 46 per cent less tax than a single person. By 1988-89 this family tax concession had dropped to a mere 26 per cent. Family allowances have declined in real value by 43 per cent since they were introduced in 1976-77 and the real value of the dependent spouse rebate has fallen by 37 per cent in the same period. At the same time the real value of the sole parent rebate has fallen by 15 per cent.

In the same issue of *Family Matters* the Director of the Institute, Mr Don Edgar, said:

Equally, those in political circles who are embarrassed or offended by family talk need to be reminded that no society has ever not had families, that private family life always takes priority for most people over their public duties, and that no political or social reform ever succeeds until it is absorbed within the reality-testing of private family life, for families are the engine of social change, not just passive reactors to it. Ideas, such as the liberation of women, arise from the very contradictions and strains that are experienced by men and women in their private everyday relationships.

I conclude these comments on family matters with a final quote from the same source (Don Edgar):

Healthy children developed to their highest potential are our best guarantee of strength as a nation. Parents with sufficient finances and know-how, are the pathway to full child development. Access to know-how, resources, wide community service supports for the task of parenting are the keys to good parenting. We must face the fact that not everyone can be strong, that families will disintegrate and children will be in crisis. There must continue to be crisis oriented services because the ambulance at the bottom of the cliff can sometimes save the wounded. But it is the fence around the top that really matters, and no approach to family policy that ignores the universal needs of families for assistance can succeed.

I turn now to the question of law and order. This is of great concern to South Australians and, in particular, to electors in my electorate of Newland. There has in the past decade been a dramatic increase in all categories of crime.

For every 100 000 South Australians, violent crime has increased from 92 crimes in 1981-82 to 191 in 1988-89—a massive 107 per cent increase, with 23 crimes per week in 1981-82 and 52 in 1988-89.

For every 100 000 South Australians, property crime has increased from 5 712 crimes in 1981-82 to 8 139 in 1988-89—an increase of 42 per cent, with 1 455 property crimes per week (or 208 per day) compared with 2 216 in 1988-89 (or 317 per day).

Between 1981-82 and 1988-89 break-ins of dwellings increased by 102 per cent, and all breaking and entering offences during that period increased from 1 594 offences per 100 000 to 2 726—an increase of 71 per cent, with one break-in in 1988-89 every 13 minutes, compared with one every 25 minutes in 1981-82.

Robberies are up 78 per cent in number and 70 per cent per 100 000 of population between 1981-82 and 1988-89.

Serious assault is up by 123 per cent in the period 1981-82 to 1988-89. There are now 28 assaults of all kinds (excepting rape and attempted rape) each day.

Rapes and attempted rapes are up by 162 per cent in numbers and 156 per cent in rapes and attempted rapes per 100 000 of population.

Drug offences (including cannabis expiation notices) have increased by 302 per cent. Total numbers having risen from 3 470 in 1981-82 to 13 970 in 1988-89—an increase of 276 per cent for every 100 000 South Australians.

Cannabis offences (including cannabis expiation notices) have rocketed from 4 433 in 1982-83 (or 331 per 100 000 South Australians) to 13 131 in 1988-89. This is an increase per 100 000 South Australians of 180 per cent in just six years. There are now 36 cannabis expiation notices issued by the police each day.

Arson and wilful damage (which includes vandalism) increased by 60 per cent in 1988-89 compared with 1981-82.

Motor vehicle theft increased by 78 per cent per 1 000 registered motor vehicles.

Adelaide has become the break-and-enter capital of Australia. While break-ins are often not as dramatic as, say, murder or rape, they are more frequent and cause an enormous amount of trauma to the victims. Some writers, when drawing the distinction between offences against the person and offences against property, give the impression that offences against property are relatively unimportant because they do not injure the person. This impression ignores the personal devastation, shock and sense of loss and frustration caused to the victims of many offences against property, particularly in regard to break-ins. Imagine the feelings of an elderly couple who leave home on their weekly shopping expedition and return to find their house stripped of many of their possessions. My electorate of Newland has its share of break-ins. The *Messenger Leader* of 31 January 1990,

under the headline 'Two Householders Wake to Find Thief Busy Inside', states:

Tea Tree Gully police are looking for a man who broke into two adjoining houses in Waitara Road, Banksia Park, in the space of half an hour on 26 January. Between 11.30 p.m. and midnight a man was heard rummaging through the kitchen of the first house, after having entered through a laundry window. The owner woke up and chased the man away but he escaped with a wallet and cash, valued at \$250. Report 90-H76742.

Around midnight a neighbour awoke to see a man by his dressing table, flashing a torch. Thinking he was dreaming, he went back to sleep, only to wake up at 2 a.m. and realise he had been robbed. The thief, who entered through a rear sliding door, stole about \$100. He is described as male, 20 years old, with stocky build, 180 cm, black hair, wearing a brown waist-length bomber jacket. Report 90-H76743.

Under the headline 'Slept through theft' an article in the *Leader* states:

Jewellery, cash and credit cards, valued at \$12 590, were stolen from a house in Jet Road, Highbury, while the owners were asleep. Thieves entered through a rear window between 12.30 a.m. and 7.15 a.m. on 24 January. Report 90-H95939.

The same issue also reports the following other break-ins in the electorate:

Banksia Park—Milperra Avenue: thieves used pressure on a front bedroom window to enter a house and stole a VCR, cassette player, hi-fi system, cash and a camera. Value \$2 700. Report 90-HG77067.

Redwood Park—Kolwes Court: between 5 p.m. and 10.30 p.m. on 26 January thieves entered a shed through an open door and stole a lawn mower, generator and power tools. Value \$1 800. Report 90-H76947.

While, of course, no Government can be held responsible for all crimes, including break-ins, I feel that it is my duty as a local member to draw attention to what is clearly a real and perceived problem in the area. It behoves a Government to take what steps it can to prevent such happenings. First, there are the positive steps which can be taken—the preventive measures—to lessen the likelihood of crime being committed. The State and Commonwealth Governments must accept some of the responsibility for the current economic climate which makes it more likely that some members of the community will turn to dishonest means of increasing their income.

Next, educational initiatives ought to be taken to inculcate respect of the law. At this time, when many young people do not respect moral teachings, the churches or parental guidance, respect for the law is the only influence against wrongdoing. I am appalled to find that, among many young people, this respect has been greatly eroded. I hear of many young people who drive without obtaining a driver's licence. If they are caught the penalty is not severe and they frequently offend again.

Many young people also drive while under licence disqualification and do not seem to have imposed on them the rigours of the law, which ought to follow such an offence. I believe that this situation often leads young people to feel that if they can, more or less with impunity, disregard the law in this regard, they can disregard the law altogether including, for example, using drugs, disregard for personal safety and the property of others, and so on.

I make quite clear that I do not place all the blame for this situation on the youths themselves. There are very many decent law abiding young persons, and they are in the majority. On the other hand, neither governments nor leading people in the community give the necessary leadership and example in these matters. I have noted that a number of professional and other people in positions of status and authority openly make statements in support of drug use, regardless of the fact that it is against the law. Governments and people in leadership positions must take

the responsibility of setting the example of respect for the law.

The Bannon Government has trivialised the issue of drugs by making certain offences in regard to marijuana expiable, subject to on-the-spot fines. This, in young people's eyes, reduces such offences to the status of minor traffic offences. It is interesting to note that a Minister of the Crown, the Hon. Lynn Arnold, had the courage to cross the floor and vote against the Bill which provided for on-the-spot fines in regard to marijuana. Of course, however strong the educational and preventive measures are, crimes will still be committed, and it is a function of the Government to ensure that law enforcement is as effective as possible.

The South Australian police do an excellent job enforcing the law within the limitations of their resources. I have been most impressed with the efforts and the efficiency of the local Tea Tree Gully police. It was a policy of the Liberal Party at the last election to increase the Police Force at the operational level and this policy, of course, still stands.

In order to carry out their job properly, the police must have the necessary legal powers. The Bannon Government accepted proposals by the Liberal Party to increase substantially penalties for offences under the Summary Offences Act and to widen considerably the powers of police officers to apprehend criminals and bring them to justice.

However, it has weakened the power of the police in relation to street offences by limiting the offence of loitering. Under the present law, the major problem is that a request to cease loitering is difficult to enforce because there is no definition of the 'vicinity' in question. It was and is Liberal Party policy to provide effective loitering provisions by providing that a request by a police officer for a person to cease loitering shall specify an area of up to within one kilometre radius of the place where the police officer makes the request to cease loitering, and shall specify a period of up to eight hours during which the person so requested must stay away from that place.

I find that police officers are discouraged by the fact that, once they have apprehended a criminal, the penalty imposed is often so low as to be no real deterrent at all. There is widespread concern that, while maximum penalties are proposed in our criminal law, no guidance is given to the courts who fix penalties as to the minimum penalties which should be fixed for particular crimes even when committed by a repeat offender. Liberal policy is to establish a table of minimum penalties for repeat offenders for major crimes such as rape, robbery, assault and housebreaking. Liberal policy is also to provide that parole must be earned and not be automatic. Neighbourhood Watch has been a valuable protection to the community, but there is a backlog of more than 200 applications to be dealt with and the resources made available to the program are inadequate. This must be rectified.

Another issue of great concern to each of us is the environment. At the turn of the century the environment was defined in dictionary terms as 'immediate surroundings'. Modern interpretation encompasses a greater global concern as today's scientists uncover destructive elements of pollutants that affect our global system. The complex range of issues that require serious consideration are too numerous to cover in this address—I hope to do so at another time. I would like to comment on the positive elements that surround this issue. It is extremely heartening to recognise the awareness level of our communities and of individuals whose efforts in highlighting the need to take action have forced Governments, industry and the general populace to seek solutions across the total environmental spectrum.

The population of the world has increased during the past 75 years from 2 billion to 4.9 billion and will reach 10 billion in the next 75 years. It is imperative that informed debate ensues to provide the answers, including an answer on providing another 5 billion people with more food, more manufactured products and more power. Inevitably, more production requires more power and, unless a new source of power is available, more pollution will occur. I would like to make it quite clear that I deplore the role of the doomsday prophets whose irrational prophecies deny rational debate. The answer is to provide for the needs of the individual in harmony with our environment. Certainly, that is a mammoth task but, with a positive approach, it is not unattainable.

I would like to take a moment to talk about aspects of Liberalism which present the base of my beliefs. First, I would like to use the thoughts commonly attributed to, Abraham Lincoln, although I recognise there is controversy over the attribution to Lincoln. These words are central to Liberal Party philosophy. He said:

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot help the wage-earner by pulling down the wage-payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

In conclusion, the one disadvantage since my election to this House has occurred within my electorate office and reflects upon the effective manner in which one offers service to the community.

This Government, in its wisdom—which I question—chose to totally remove past records and files from the electorate office, which means that I do not have records of constituent inquiries which may have been current or indeed recurrent to the election date of 25 November 1989. Therefore, constituents who have had an inquiry pending need to reapply and reproduce all the relevant paperwork, as it no longer exists. Also, the entire electoral roll and word processing program was wiped from the office computer, which meant not only inconvenience to me and my staff in our first month of office but this unprofessional exercise also caused unnecessary expense for the six hours that it took to reprogram the unit. That expense was paid for by the taxpayer. I trust that after the next election, when Government members lose their seats to the incoming Liberal Government, no such ill-conceived and costly exercise will be permitted to recur.

I would like to reflect for a moment on the base of Liberalism, which calls for self-reliance, respect for individual, moral and spiritual values, and an understanding of the concept of service. The fostering and preservation of the family unit is all important. The right of an individual to hold private property is essential in a free society. Liberalism recognises the need to provide adequate social services to help those who cannot support themselves, and to maintain vital health standards. In the application of social services, it strives to maintain the dignity of the individual. Liberalism aims to create a society in which private enterprise is the major factor in achieving general economic progress. Liberalism emphasises that human satisfaction and well-deserved profit-making are vital to work and to achievement. The Liberal concept of government is that ultimate authority lies with the people.

Newland has a multitude of diverse characteristics which make it such an interesting electorate. The people are energetic and hard-working and proud of their choice of residency within this State. As the member for Newland I will

work to the best of my ability to represent the interests of Newland in this Parliament.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I congratulate His Excellency on the way in which he opened Parliament. I congratulate also those new members of the House on their election, particularly the member for Newland. She has indicated to all today that she will be a member of this place for a considerable length of time and an asset to this Parliament. I should like to refer briefly to the rejigged Labor Government. Its concession to change has been to sack the former Minister, the Hon. Mr Hemmings, and to replace him with the member for Briggs.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I understand that you were talking to the member for Eyre and you might have missed the comment that the member for Kavel made, but he referred to me by my name, not by my electorate. I ask that you request him to address me in the correct manner.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear it. The member for Napier has taken umbrage at those remarks and I ask the member for Kavel to withdraw them.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will give him his correct title. He is so forgettable that I forgot his electorate. Anyway, the Government's concession to enliven what is a tired and pussyfooted Government was to sack the member for Napier and to replace him with the member for Briggs. The member for Briggs must be the luckiest Minister in the history of this State, because he is a member of an illegitimate Government. He is a member of a minority Government which gained significant minority support at the polls in South Australia.

Last week I referred to an interview that I heard with former Premier Dunstan when, as I suggested, he was being interviewed by a sympathetic interviewer from the ABC. In fact, if I were to hazard a guess as to which political Party the interviewer supported, I could probably be right on the mark; I could nominate it in one. Anyway, this sympathetic interviewer suggested that there was a gerrymander in place before Dunstan acceded to power, and he said, 'Yes, we gained a clear plurality of votes in South Australia and yet we were denied government.' That was the cry. We well remember—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He was as forgettable as the member for Napier. I cannot remember the reporter's name, but I well recall Dunstan. I remember his tears. He was crying about those days in the past when he gained a majority of votes in 1968 and had been denied government. Those of us who were close to politics at the time well recall what went on after that election. The then Mrs Dunstan—Gretel—went on television and put on a classic performance. She said how the Labor Party had been denied government and how grossly unfair it all was. A rally was organised in the square to protest against this lack of democracy, and pamphlets were distributed. The Hon. Mr Virgo, then one of the heavies in the Labor Party in this place, said that the people of South Australia 'were prisoners of a rotten gerrymander'.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: But listen to the argument. I should like members opposite to address their minds to the argument. If the argument was valid then, it is certainly valid today. This was the argument.

An honourable member: Different circumstances.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The different circumstances are that, as we know, this is an illegitimate Government. The argument put forward by Virgo—one of the

heavies in the Labor Party—was that the greatest heights of hypocrisy had been reached in South Australia when a Party could receive 50 per cent of the votes and yet not govern in its own right. The argument is that we got a majority of votes. Former Premier Dunstan said last week that in 1968 his Party gained a clear plurality of votes and were denied government. History has now repeated itself.

Mr S.G. Evans: When things are different they are not the same.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, aren't they just. This is the yardstick by which fairness for electoral systems was judged and argued by Dunstan *et al* in 1968 and in the early 1970s. The argument was that if a political party gained more than half the votes it was entitled to govern. Of course, it was then conveniently linked to the number of electors in electorates. The conclusion to which the Labor Party leapt, quite falsely, was that if there were equal numbers in electorates that would ensure a fair electoral system. Of course, that is an absolute myth. We should all know that the derivation of the idea of a gerrymander was from Gerry in one of the States of the USA. He drew the boundaries in such a way as to build in an advantage so that he would have a significant electoral advantage and he would be re-elected.

Members opposite choose to treat my speeches in a jocular fashion or with aggro. If one is really biting, they try to laugh it off. They know that what I am saying is true. They are a bastard Government; they are illegitimate. They have no right to govern. I simply advance the same arguments as were advanced so tellingly by the Labor Party, which has a greater facility for renting a crowd than we have. It can rent a crowd just like that. It can ring up its mates on South Terrace and there they are. The Labor Party had the big protest rally with pamphlets saying, 'We have a majority of votes, but this terribly iniquitous system has denied us government.' Plenty of examples of this argument are being advanced.

Unfortunately, there does not seem to be the public hoo-ha in this day and age because the Labor Party has managed to impress on the public this false idea that if there are equal numbers in electorates there is a fair system—Bob's your uncle—but it forgets the argument it adduced that if a Party has a majority of votes it is entitled to govern. Some reputable political commentators unfortunately do not get the publicity which, in my judgment, they deserve. However, some of them have a rather different view.

An honourable member: Name them.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: One is Colin Hughes, the recently retired Federal Electoral Commissioner. He was not noted for his advocacy of the Liberal Party, or any other for that matter. Anyway, Colin Hughes is one, and Mackerras is another who is well known on the national scene. We remember the Labor Party adducing the same argument in Queensland, but it forgot to talk about the percentage of votes. It was easier for the Labor Party to win in Queensland than it is for the Liberal Party to win in South Australia. I have a recent letter from Mackerras.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Members opposite do not like what I am saying, so they make a lot of noise. This letter was written last year. I am sure that Mackerras does not consider that this letter needs to be kept private. He writes:

Thank you for your letter and material which I read with interest. Meanwhile, I return the compliment with the enclosed broadcast notes on the news on ABC Radio National.

This is a broadcast that Mackerras made. He continues:

The pro-Labor bias in South Australia is calculated as follows. Labor's overall SA vote December 1985 was 53 per cent. Labor's

vote in the median seat of Unley was 55 per cent. The pro-Labor bias is 2 per cent.

Earlier I mentioned the fact that the member for Briggs was now a Minister, and he is the luckiest Minister in the Labor Party ever known. However, he had a few hard things to say.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I detect a sympathetic chord in the member for Henley Beach. In 1986, when he was first elected to this place, in an obviously gloating but nonetheless bitter speech, the now honourable Mr Rann had a few hard things to say about the Liberal Party. He was gloating over the fact that the Labor Party received 53 per cent of the vote and had a record majority, as indeed it did—it had the highest majority that any Party had ever had in this State. However, what he neglected to say was that the highest vote for any Party ever recorded in the history of South Australia was in 1979 when the Liberal Party gained 55 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote. It was the highest vote by far ever recorded by a political Party in South Australia, and it won narrowly. If the same proportionality had applied to the Liberal Party result in 1979, it would have had about 35 seats and the Labor Party would not have had a hope in hell of knocking it off in 1982, despite the swing.

The member for Briggs—who, as I said, is the luckiest fellow to be sitting over there in this illegitimate Government—on 11 February 1986, said:

The opening of this Parliament follows a long, divisive and hard-fought election campaign which saw a Labor Government re-elected with a record majority.

But not a record vote, I interpose. This is the first speech that he made in this place. It was the first of a number of undistinguished speeches that he made subsequently. The member for Briggs also stated:

Others have said that the result was a victory for strategy over slogans, professionalism over amateurism, a triumph for the Labor movement. And they were right. The Liberals have learned the hardest way possible that the people of this State are not fools. They have massively endorsed a Premier who puts substance ahead of image, policies before gimmicks and planning and management before rhetoric.

Mr 48 per cent, the illegitimate Premier of this State, seems to have come down in the world a bit since his new Minister, who is the new image of this tired Government, made those remarks. The fact is, the Liberal Party gained 52 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote at the recent election and the Labor Party came in a poor second with 48 per cent. Clearly, 4 per cent is a decent lead, a decent electoral majority in this nation.

If we are to give any credence to the argument advanced by Dunstan, Virgo and other heavies in the Labor Party back in the 1960s, we recognise that that argument is equally valid today. We have the bastard Government opposite—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. Although in context the use of that word is not directly unparliamentary, I think it lowers the standard of debate in this place, and I ask the honourable member to consider his words.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, I will retract the word if you do not like it. It is a word in the dictionary, and we know what it means: it means 'illegitimate'. It means 'conceived out of wedlock'. This illegitimate Government has been elected with 48 per cent of the vote—a clear minority. Here is the Liberal Party—to use former Premier Dunstan's words of last week—with a clear plurality of votes being denied government.

Mr S.G. Evans: And they are proud of it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course they are proud of it: they love unfairness in the Labor Party. They

are not the least bit interested in fairness. They will hoodwink the public on electoral redistribution as much as anything else. In fact, there is a bias around Australia in favour of the Labor Party in every State, and South Australia runs second only to Western Australia in this regard. The Labor Party has effectively disfranchised a whole section of the community in South Australia.

Unfortunately, in my judgment political commentators in South Australia are rather more timid than one would expect them to be and they are not as forthcoming as the commentators to whom I referred earlier. I mention Mackerras and Colin Hughes. Of course, the Electoral Commissioner here is precluded by virtue of his office from making political comment, but we are about to see the two-Party preferred vote published. It was published by Jaensch last week. There might be some slight inaccuracy with Jaensch but his ballpark figure is right. He showed that the Liberal Party got 51.9 per cent and the Labor Party got 48.1—a very clear win to the Liberal Party.

However, Jaensch is strong on the equality of numbers of people in seats: he is not so strong on the fairness argument. Certainly, he is nothing like as strong as is Dr Colin Hughes, who has recently retired, or as strong as Dunstan or Virgo were when they adduced the argument: if you gain a majority of votes, you have a right to govern. No-one can argue that.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Jaensch is not strong on that. The other commentator from Flinders University, Andrew Parkin, was heard to say, after the recent election, although it was not widely reported, that we have an unfair electoral system. It is a pity that we cannot organise rallies in the square and distribute pamphlets to adduce the arguments with the vehemence of Dunstan and others. The Labor Party has a vested interest in confusing the issue, as we heard from the Premier, when the establishment of this select committee was canvassed in a question in this House. The Premier, as usual, when he knows he is cornered, fudges the issue.

An honourable member: And he ran for cover.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: And he ran for cover. Not only did he run for cover but he fudged the issue by suggesting that the voting patterns were not clear. They are perfectly clear. I refer to what Dr Hughes had to say about what constitutes electoral fairness.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I know that the former Minister loves all my speeches; that is why he stays here and makes a hell of a noise. I always take that as a compliment. If the place is quiet, I think it needs livening up. However, when the Labor Party is active, we know we are hitting a few bullseyes. Dr Colin Hughes, one of the more notable and intelligent commentators around Australia, who was in the Department of Political Science, was subsequently appointed Federal Electoral Commissioner and has now recently retired, said:

Elsewhere (Hughes 1978) it has been suggested that discussion will be clarified by speaking of equality when we refer to electors grouped by electoral districts and fairness when we refer to electorates grouped by support of a Party; that convention will be followed here. Too often these two aspects of representation are muddled together.

Conveniently, I might interpose, they are muddled together by the Labor Party to suit its purposes—initially, of course, to sustain an argument and now to demolish it. Let me return to Dr Hughes, who states:

Too often these two aspects . . . are muddled together. Even when they are not, there is frequently an assumption that their measures will be positively correlated, so that a set of boundaries which increases 'equality' of electors (that is equality of the enrol-

ments of electoral districts) must also increase 'fairness' in converting Party votes into Party seats in the Legislature, or that a set of boundaries which is low on 'equality' must be seriously 'unfair' to one Party or another, an interpretation which is particularly likely when one Party obtains a substantially higher proportion of the total vote than its rival.

That is a direct commentary on the reaction of Dunstan—

Mr Atkinson: What do you want?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We want a select committee, in the first instance, and the Labor Party, which wishes to embrace electoral fairness, unless there has been a great change in its thinking since 1960 or 1970, will grab that. Of course, the Labor Party professes to be a great champion of fairness, except when the electorate is stitched up on its behalf. Nevertheless, Hughes is making a clear distinction between equality of numbers and fairness. Although I do not have time to quote much of what he says, he further states:

Under a Westminster-model parliamentary system, the object of an election is to win at least a bare majority of seats in the Legislature—50 per cent plus one of the seats—in order to form the Government and secure the perquisites and opportunities of office. The best measure of fairness will be the relative ease (expressed as the necessary minimal proportions of the total vote each would require) with which each of the major Parties could attain that object.

He later states:

On the results of the 1982 election, the ALP could have won 24 seats despite a loss of up to 3.6 per cent of its actual two-Party-preferred vote; thus we can say the proportion of the total two-Party-preferred vote the ALP required to win was 47.3 per cent . . . The Liberals would have required an additional 3.7 per cent—

and this is South Australia—

to have won the necessary 24 seats, so their required share would have been 52.8 per cent . . . The difference between those two figures is 5.5 per cent . . . and that will be the measure of fairness, favouring on this occasion the ALP.

I do not wish to quote further at length from this rather long speech of Dr Hughes, but his comments are pertinent indeed to the current situation, where we have this illegitimate Government in South Australia that suddenly wants to forget about all the arguments it adduced on electoral fairness when it was seeking office. He states further:

Equality and fairness are two quite separate and independent characteristics of any particular electoral distribution even though they are likely to be conflated by the public and by politicians . . . Correspondingly, the retention of some inequality in Queensland encouraged the opinion that gross bias prevails, as indeed it used to, while a substantial increase in equality in New South Wales and South Australia distracted attention from the considerable bias under the new boundaries.

I think I will send this speech to Jaensch. I have no axe to grind or criticism to make of Jaensch, but he is hung up on equality and is very thin on fairness. He is the only spruiker that the media has who will get up and say something in South Australia, so it uses him over and over again. I do not know where he gets this garbage about the so-called two wings of the Liberal Party. Recently I heard him on the Conlon show. The Conlon show regularly digs him up. Sometimes I see his bewhiskered face on the *7.30 Report*. I do not know who feeds him his lines, but he is very strong on the so-called two wings of the Liberal Party, something which I have never observed in my 20 years in this Parliament. I have certainly observed the hard left of the Labor Party and the strong-arm tactics by which it enforces its rigid discipline.

Jaensch waxes eloquent on the so-called divisions in the Liberal Party—I heard him talking about our new Leader the other day. He waxes very strongly about how he will not resile from the equal numbers in seats aspect, but he is very thin on electoral fairness. The only timid response that I have heard Jaensch make was that no system is perfect.

What sort of commentary is that from a fellow who struts this State's stage talking about being an independent political commentator? I am told that he says he is a Liberal. If he is a Liberal, he had better read what Hughes has to say.

I am not an enemy of Jaensch: I just read what he says and I make my own judgment of his professionalism. I suggest that he study Mackerras and Colin Hughes and read my speech carefully. In 1968 he supported all the arguments, as did his mate, the Federal Minister for Health. Quite frankly, I thought he had a better balance then. His mate is forgettable, too. I am referring to Neal Blewett, a product of Flinders University, a political commentator. We know what makes him tick, but I thought he tried to be dispassionate and to give the appearance of fairness. But Jaensch and Blewett spoke loudly about how unfair the electoral system in South Australia was in those days. Now we do not hear a peep from them on the question of unfairness.

We now have a Government elected on 48 per cent of the vote. It clearly lost the election, under its own terms, and the Liberal Party with 52 per cent of the vote was denied government. Anyone who suggests that the current electoral system is fair—and I base this on any criteria, particularly the criteria of Colin Hughes, the recently retired Federal Electoral Commissioner—has rocks in their head.

I was pleased to hear former Premier Dunstan on the ABC last week, because he reminded me of that piece of history, the hysteria that was whipped up and the myth that is still promulgated by the Labor Party. The Labor Party dearly wanted to sew up Queensland.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, they stitched it up, because they got enough votes to win. That is fair enough. If they got more than 50 per cent, they deserve to win.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, under the old system, which was fairer than the one currently in operation in South Australia. Let us return to Hughes. If members opposite do not want to believe me, they should believe Hughes. The bias against the Labor Party in Queensland was 1.5 per cent, the second lowest of any in Australia. The bias in every other State is against the Liberal Party. In my remaining few minutes I will endeavour to quote figures for the members opposite who obviously do not like what I am saying, because it is statistical and factual comment. The fact is that the Labor Party was not grossly under-represented in Queensland for many years—the Liberal Party was. The socialists could win with 51.5 per cent of the vote, and that is what they did, but in South Australia the Liberals need 53 per cent of the vote to win. An even worse situation exists in Western Australia.

I cannot lay my hands on the figures, but members opposite can rest assured that an authority with more clout than I have in these matters has done a lot of work on fairness, and it is a fact that in South Australia we have a grossly unfair electoral system. Unless some of these so-called unbiased commentators are prepared to recognise this fact, we will have to keep trying to educate them.

The electoral system in Queensland was set up by Hanlon, a Labor man. The Hanlon redistribution method moved the figures up a vertical line away from complete equality of enrolment. I am referring to the Labor Party in its early days in Queensland, long before the Nationals gained supremacy. Hanlon moved away from complete equality of enrolment and brought the figures down towards the bottom base line. It will be noticed that the figures are fairly high in 1950, 1953 and 1956, reaching almost .2 in 1956 as a measure of inequality of electors. These figures are based

on a coefficient which is defined by Hughes. They are way out to the left in terms of bias—and this is a fairness criteria—reaching beyond 10 per cent bias in favour of the ALP at the 1953 State election.

The history of the electoral redistributions in Queensland shows that the Labor Party sewed it up in 1953 with a zonal system which gave it a 10 per cent advantage. Dr Hughes states:

In other words, at the 1953 State election, the ALP would have survived with something like 45 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote; the Coalition would have had to be on the sunny side of 55 per cent to have had a hope of winning a majority of the seats.

The Nationals inherited this system and it was changed over the years. It finished up with a bias against the Labor Party of 1.5 per cent. In relation to the question of fairness, the major bias in Queensland is against the Liberal Party.

So, the Labor Party cannot have it both ways. This Party, which says that it is committed to fairness and justice, has no option but to support the appointment of a select committee to devise a new system perhaps with some modification of the present system. The system should ensure that the criterion of the Party that gains majority support has the right to govern is followed. This was reinforced only last week by the Labor Party's hero, former Premier Dunstan. If it is to subscribe to the view that it has held for so long, that the Party gaining majority support has the right to govern, it has no option but to support the formation of this select committee to fix up this corrupt and grossly unfair electoral system, which has twice denied the Liberal Party government since I have been in Parliament. In 1975 and 1979 the Liberal Party gained a plurality of votes. In 1979 the Liberal Party was denied a record majority when it outpolled the Labor Party in a way which, notwithstanding the gloating of the new Minister, has never been recorded in South Australia previously. I support the Address in Reply.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I am pleased to support the members on the Government benches who proposed the adoption of the Address in Reply. I acknowledge the Governor's speech in presenting the Government's program for 1990 and I take this opportunity, supported by all members of the House, to express thanks to His Excellency and Lady Dunstan for the dignified manner and style that they have brought to their office over the past decade. To you, Mr Speaker, I again offer my congratulations. (I submitted them briefly during Question Time a few days ago.) I express some sympathy to the former Speaker who, we may euphemistically say, has been deposed on the basis of political pragmatism.

It is with great pleasure that I look around at the Liberal Party benches to see a number of new faces and to realise that, on this side, we have competent, confident new members as additions to our ranks.

Mr Groom interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Obviously, the member for Hartley has not been listening to the speeches, otherwise he would have been unable to make such an inane remark.

Mr Groom: They're all oncers.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member is doing his best to distract me, and he is succeeding, but he is giving me the ideal opportunity to point out that the seats which the new members on this side represent have changed hands three or four times and, while that supports his claim, I assure him that the present crop of Liberal Party members are here for a long time. He had only to listen to the speeches of the member for Newland and the member for Fisher to realise that they were well presented, carefully

researched and considered, and gave the House an excellent measure of the future contributions that will be made by those backbenchers.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not have to look for their support. I have my own way, as you well know.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member to direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, Mr Speaker, and I remind members on the Government benches, through you, that they have spent literally tens of millions of dollars in the Mount Gambier electorate over the past decade and a half with the intention of deposing the sitting member. I have only to point to the commitment of the same Government in the preceding decade—virtually zero—for members to realise the extent of the change that came about in Mount Gambier in 1975.

I acknowledge the service given to this House by Ron Payne, Roy Abbott, Gavin Keneally, Jack Slater and Keith Plunkett. It is a privilege to be able to use their names in the House, now that they are no longer simply cyphers—members representing an electorate—and I wish them all a happy retirement and recognise their service to the Government and to the people in their electorates. To the new members in the ALP ranks, I also wish them well in a minority Government, which is what it is and to which you, Mr Speaker, and the Chairman of Committees are testimony.

I also recognise the services of the past President of the Liberal Party and long-time Leader of the Opposition (John Olsen) who, in due course, when Senator Messner decides upon his retirement date, will make a new career for himself and an indelible mark on Federal politics. I believe that he was earmarked for that role before he entered State politics and I am sure that he has a great contribution to make in Federal politics. He led the Liberal Party to a virtual victory—52 per cent as against 48 per cent of the two Party preferred vote. I remind the gentlemen of the Government that they are statistics of the Electoral Commissioner, not a figment of the member for Mount Gambier's imagination. Those statistics show that the Government has a tenuous hold on office.

I support the comments made by the former Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Kavel, who quoted at length from a speech given by Dr Colin Hughes, the Federal Electoral Commissioner, at a seminar on Sunday 5 September 1982 on the Queensland electoral system. At page 6, in reference to his previous statement that we could have a perfectly fair electoral boundaries redistribution, Dr Hughes stated:

Perhaps it would be expecting too much of the world to suppose that they'd do that. What we can say, however, is that perhaps they ought to get decently close to that central axis at which bias to the ALP is minimal or bias to the Coalition is minimal.

Let's take a starting point. It will obviously be very hard to do such an incredibly elaborate set of sums as those involved in designing boundaries to produce perfect fairness, so it's unthinkable that you could aim to hit absolute zero. But plus or minus 1 per cent is probably a fair target to work towards. How often does that occur? It occurs only twice. Only twice have we had boundaries in those series of elections, probably around 40 elections, only twice did the degree of unfairness amount to less than 1 per cent.

New South Wales hit it in 1956 and Victoria in 1955. So perhaps 1 per cent is a bit unrealistic in a real world. Suppose, however, we go up to a permissible bias of 1.5 per cent plus or minus, we then find that a few more elections come into it. The Commonwealth hit it in 1966 but at only one Commonwealth election and we tend to set up the Commonwealth as exemplars of electoral fairness. Queensland at the last 3 elections—1974, 1977 and 1980—has managed to do it. So if one is looking for gold stars at the end of the day, one could say, and I must say despite what I had written earlier and which Sir Robert quoted

so tellingly earlier. I was mildly suprised myself when these figures came up out of the seven fairest elections that have been held in the Commonwealth and the three largest mainland States since 1949, Queensland accounts for three of them New South Wales—two, the Commonwealth—one, and Victoria—one.

This is the interesting addendum:

The figures aren't here for South Australia and West Australia but take my word they're not playing in this sort of ball game at all, they're way out in a different orbit of their own. We could go on making these perhaps telling, perhaps surprising, comparisons between States and the Commonwealth, but let us now start concentrating on Queensland—

He then elaborates as follows:

The implications of this are that, if you want a single proposition, to sum it up, at present the Queensland electoral boundaries provide less equality but more fairness than do the Commonwealth or the New South Wales or Victorian boundaries.

So, the very boundaries electoral distribution system that has been ridiculed by the Dunstan, Corcoran and ALP Governments has been stated by the Federal Electoral Commissioner to be among the fairest in Australia. That was in a substantial paper given to a public seminar.

So much for ridicule and so much for the truth that the South Australian boundaries are a gerrymander in their own right and that the Liberal Party needs approximately 55 per cent—as Ren DeGaris said in his recent publication redressing the imbalance—to be sure of winning Government, as indeed we won in 1979. The Labor Party needs to win only 47 to 48 per cent of the vote to win Government. Evidence of the Queensland so-called gerrymander lies in the fact that the Queensland Labor Party scored 53 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote at the last election and produced a majority of some 17 seats.

One vote one value can simply mean that the votes are locked away. For example, the South-East has three electorates with almost 75 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote resting with the Liberal Party, just as the Labor Party before the last election had several electorates with over 70 per cent locked up within their own boundaries. Obviously a need exists for the whole electoral redistribution system to go to a select committee for a number of alternatives to be propounded and for the electoral commissioners to be given a different set of criteria by which to redistribute, otherwise the one vote one value system as propounded and bounded—that is, limited—by the present set of criteria and statutes before the House will simply perpetuate an error in the electoral system. I simply ask that the system be revamped. I support one vote one value in principle, but in practice it will not work, as members opposite know.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The one vote one value system does not guarantee fairness and there are other systems, a number of which are operating throughout the world, as the member for Eyre said earlier. Such systems could be painlessly examined by the House and at least given consideration. I am not supporting any one of those systems but asking for them to be examined.

I express thanks to my Liberal Party electoral committee and to all my Party supporters in the South-East for their dedication and loyalty over the past decade or so. Also, as other members have done, I recognise the invaluable support role given by the wives of members of Parliament. My own wife is invaluable not only here, looking after the family and the home, but also in the daily routine matters when attending the vast number of functions we are jointly called on to attend in the course of representation.

That acceptance and recognition of work done by parliamentary wives does not rest purely in the House: it is recognised out in the electorate as shown by the number of votes one receives. Wife support is an important factor in being returned to a parliamentary seat.

In my own case I acknowledge also the large degree of confidence that has been placed in me not by Liberal voters alone but also by a substantial number of Labor Party voters. In 1975 I entered this House with a first preference vote of 34 per cent and some 80 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote, which gave me a little over 50 per cent of the vote. Since then in five out of six elections the electors of Mount Gambier have seen fit to give me a positive swing, that is, a swing towards my representation. In 1982, I lost some representation, but in the last two elections I was delighted to note that the Mount Gambier electorate scored the highest swing. In 1985, when the swing was against the Liberal Party and at the last election when it was in favour of the Liberal Party, the electorate of Mount Gambier gave me the highest swing of all seats in the State.

Mr Hamilton: What was the swing?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: In 1985 it was about 7 per cent and in 1989 it was 12.5 per cent. I draw that point to the attention of marginal seat members on both sides of the House, having been a marginal seat member for a long while. I suggest to marginal seat members that the criterion they should be using is to respect every member of their electorate—man, woman or child—irrespective of the political Party one believes they represent. One has no proof, when someone comes before them, and it is pointless asking in a democracy with a secret ballot. Respect everyone, listen to everyone attentively and do your best to ensure that they receive your best attention and the attention of the Government of the day. That is sound advice to all marginal seat members and indeed to members of Parliament generally. I do not have a copyright on that, but I assure members of the success of the formula. The respect I give to my electorate is genuine: false respect can soon be seen through.

The ALP program, to which I briefly advert, as proposed in the Governor's Speech, is extremely thin. There is a paucity of new legislation. The more substantial Bills to come before us—environmental, water resources, marine pollution and such—were introduced in the last session and now have to be debated again as they lapsed in the Upper House. Little of substance is contained in the program before us.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Before the dinner break the member for Hartley asked me whether I supported one vote one value and I gave him a qualified response and said it was incapable of being achieved. Over dinner I was reminded that at a Caucus meeting when pre-selection occurs, for example, the holding up of a card with 12 600 votes does not necessarily represent one vote one value. In fact, it is simply an expression of the single minded attitude towards the pre-selection of a union head or a number of union heads and, in fact, a proportion of the union members may wish to vote differently. Whichever way one looks at it, be it from the Liberal or Labor point of view, there are problems with the one vote one value system, and that is one more thing the Electoral Commissioner could look at.

Mr Ferguson: You can't fit them all in Trades Hall

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No, you can't fit them all in Trades Hall, but you could not fit all the South-East electors in Trades Hall either, and they would vote the other way. The question of a secret ballot and of putting out the ballot as the Labor Party purports to support would be a more appropriate way of balloting.

I now refer to the Governor's speech and the Government's intentions for the coming few months. As I said, the

Labor Party's program does not appear to be too strong but, in the short time since the election, a number of problems have emerged in my electorate. The first concerns the question of free bus travel for students. This is discriminatory because it means free bus travel for some students—the majority of metropolitan students and some students in a few rural cities—but the rest of the students throughout the State do not qualify.

Some Hills bus contractors are complaining that they, too, are excluded from providing a service. Disgruntled former passengers found that buses were arriving full after filling up three or four stops earlier. Free bus travel is marvellous for students, but what about the students who cannot participate? A constituent in Mount Schank complained about her child having to travel 10 kilometres to the Mount Gambier High School when the students in Mount Gambier could get free bus rides. The anomalies in the free bus travel scheme for students need to be addressed.

I now refer to the mortgage relief scheme. A few days ago a young man rang me and said that prior to the election his bank manager (or the person he made inquiries of) had told him he would qualify for assistance under the Government's Homesure scheme. However, after the election, he found that the scheme appeared to have been modified, as members on this side of the House have been claiming. We allege that some 15 000 people who thought they would be advantaged by voting Labor now find they will be disadvantaged and excluded from the scheme.

This matter is very contentious. I believe a private member's Bill, of which notice has already been given, will be introduced in the other House. Obviously, there is something wrong when the Government can claim that the Liberal Party mortgage relief scheme is impracticable on the Sunday it was announced by the then Leader of the Opposition and, within 24 hours, claim through its Premier, John Bannon, that it had discovered that it was practical and that the Government would do exactly the same, if not better. Then, after the election, the scheme is watered down.

That is an example of gross misrepresentation. The Government's announcement was aimed at canvassing votes to win the election. I hope that the electorate will see through that and will lay claim to what is rightfully theirs. Incidentally, today the Minister of Housing and Construction said that 300 people had already qualified for the mortgage relief scheme. I think it is marvellous that three months after the election 300 people have qualified for relief under a \$36 million scheme! I asked the Minister how much the scheme was costing per month, but the Minister could not provide an answer. Obviously, that is in the unimportant basket.

It is obvious that the NCA's problems are being avoided. A number of intelligent and probing questions have been addressed to the Premier and the Leader of the Government in the other place. Generally, there has been more obfuscation than clarity in the responses. I believe that South Australians are entitled to answers; they are entitled to know whether the allegations are properly founded; they are entitled to know whether our police system is being properly administered. The delays in bringing forward the original Stewart report and the subsequent report of Mr Faris—the watered down 10 or 20 page version—do not really give a foundation for confidence in the system. Fears could probably be allayed quite quickly if the Minister and his Cabinet gave electors the information to which they are entitled.

It strikes me as being extremely odd, but not unusual, that in this International Literacy Year, which is 2½ months down the track—and previously we have had the International Year of the Child and the International Year of the Youth—meetings held only 2 or 3 weeks ago at TAFE

offices throughout South Australia advised that the International Literacy Year could not be properly funded. The Federal Government has not yet made money available and it may be the end of March or into April before courses can be set in train. At least one college in the South East, which last year employed a young secretary on the literacy course and had 100 people voluntarily schooling illiterate people, has had to scale down that course this year. It seems to me to be the height of idiocy to proclaim a year and then do nothing about it.

It seems there is something wrong with State and Federal financial arrangements. The Federal Government generally tends to allocate funds in a calendar year. The South Australian Government, particularly the Education Department, operates on a financial year (from July to June). Here we are part of the way through a very important year and there is something wrong with the financial arrangements. The member for Newland in her thoughtful address made particular mention of illiteracy and the ultimate, extremely high, long-term costs which accrue to a nation which has too much illiteracy.

I would have thought that in a sophisticated country such as Australia, with one of the world's highest standards of living, problems like this would not arise. Yet, statistics show that we have a high proportion of illiterate people—and not all of them by any means come from non-English speaking migrant families. This problem should be addressed. Another Minister has claimed that our training of apprentices is among the world's best, and I think he mentioned 1 200 apprentices. He did not mention how many jobs would be available for them when they were trained. So, on the one hand, we have sophistication and, on the other hand, those who really need help to raise their standard of living are being neglected in the International Literacy Year. Attention needs to be paid, as a matter of urgency to that problem.

I was going to address environmental issues but, since the Water Resources Bill and the Marine Environment Protection Bill are before us, I cannot address matters canvassed by those Bills. I will raise those matters later. They are very important because, again, I think the Government was heavy on promise, splashing a lot of green paint on candidates before the last election. However, the Government has achieved nothing. I wonder whether anything has been done to ascertain the quantity and quality of water and the degree of pollution in underground aquifers since 1959 or 1969 when several hundred bores were put down in South Australia in a geometric pattern rather than a biased pattern in order to ascertain the quality of water in the South-East around Mount Gambier.

I cannot recall any similar program costing \$3 million or \$4 million having been put in train. Of course, one needs to know that sort of information if one is to be able to assess the amount of pollution in those extremely important aquifers. We know that the Murray River is closely akin to the Mississippi where one can have a good dinner with every glass of water one drinks, but that is another problem.

I would like to refer specifically to a problem at the Mount Gambier Hospital where resident medical officers are urgently required. They have never been available. I have been told that the AMA is not in favour and that other people have not been in favour—particularly, the Government which will have to pay about \$500 000 a year to keep five RMOs at the hospital. However, few doctors are available in rural areas. It is becoming harder and harder to obtain them. The Administrator of the Mount Gambier Hospital claims that poor pay, poor working conditions, the hard emergency work at all hours of the day, and the fact

that the AMA is not supportive of resident medical officers in Mount Gambier are all reasons put forward as to why the Government should not put them in.

We have a health system that is winding down. It is becoming harder and harder to see specialists and doctors in rural areas. I have been supportive of sending migrant doctors into the country areas of South Australia. Again, the AMA says, 'No'. The former Minister of Health, John Cornwall refused to accept a migrant application three years ago. He said, 'No, it is just not on.' The doctor went to Portland in Victoria. Recently the Federal member for Barker (James Porter) and I put in a plea to the Immigration Department to obtain a doctor for Mount Gambier because we are desperately short of staff.

I ask the Minister of Health to change the Government's attitude towards providing migrant doctors in rural areas. I ask him to agree that there are cases where it is appropriate to encourage migrants. We do not have enough doctors who are willing and available to go to country areas. We wanted to change the Government's attitude—this hard and fast, hide-bound attitude towards migration. I have written to the Minister and made him aware of a whole host of problems. In a brief reply a few days ago he said that the matter was under consideration.

There are a whole range of problems relative to my electorate which I have apprised Ministers of and which I will continue to raise in grievance debates, Bills and Question Time. There is not sufficient time left at present. Once again I offer my sincere congratulations to new members on both sides of the House, and particularly recognise the contributions in Address in Reply of the two new members on this side who have already spoken. The member for Fisher and, the member for Newland—and give way to the member for Adelaide, who I am sure will carry on the excellent tradition already established by the Liberal newcomers.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the member for Adelaide, I remind the House that it is the honourable member's maiden speech and ask that the usual courtesies be observed.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and I should like to commence by congratulating you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and the Speaker on your recent election to your positions in the House of Assembly. They are positions of great tradition and importance within the Westminster system, and I am certain that you will both uphold those traditions of impartiality and fairness in your guidance of the House. It is pleasing to note a general sense of goodwill about your elevation to these positions and I sincerely hope this will continue throughout the Parliament. I should also like to thank His Excellency the Governor for his speech when opening this Forty-Seventh Parliament on 8 February. Also, I congratulate the Governor and Lady Dunstan on the dignity with which they carry out their roles as representatives of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

Whilst in a congratulatory mood, I should like to extend my best wishes to all new members, particularly those on this side of the House with whom I have become firm friends over the past 18 months or so, sharing the ups and downs of being a political candidate with them and seeing their elation at being elected to Parliament. I acknowledge the diligence with which the previous member for Adelaide, Mr Michael Duigan, worked to further the cause of the Australian Labor Party and the constituents of the electorate of Adelaide during his time as the member. I point out to the House that I have known Mr Duigan since our mutual days at university, at which stage I was a recipient of his

personal generosity, and I emphasise that on a personal level I wish him and his family every success in the future.

I should also like to acknowledge the efforts and, indeed, the place in the history of this building of three previous members of this House who, in the past, held various parts of the electorate of Adelaide, which I now hold. I speak specifically of my friend, Mr Michael Wilson, and Mr John Coumbe, who were Liberal members when the seat was part of the seat of Torrens, and Mr Jack Wright, who was the member for the seat of Adelaide under the previous boundaries.

As a new member of Parliament faced with the potentially daunting prospect of a maiden speech, I sought inspiration and guidance from the maiden speeches of two great Liberals, Sir Thomas Playford and Sir Robert Menzies. Broadly speaking, Mr Playford, as he was at the time, in his maiden speech canvassed three major issues. These were: first, an unemployment problem which he hoped to alleviate using a land settlement scheme; secondly, transport problems within his electorate; and, thirdly, a high level of Federal petrol tax which was not being spent on road maintenance. I was struck by how appropriate these issues would have been even today and I feel his speech is a shining example of the old statement 'The more things change, the more they stay the same.'

I then went to the maiden speech of Sir Robert Menzies. Whilst noting that a large portion of his speech was given to debating the 1934 equivalent of today's productivity increases within industry, I could not take much solace or guidance from the speech of Mr Menzies, as he was, because by the time he made his maiden speech in Parliament, he was already Federal Attorney-General. Without wishing to attempt to give the House a history lesson, it is noteworthy that both maiden speeches were subject to interjections, so I am very grateful for the courtesy of the House being extended to me today.

The campaign to win the seat of Adelaide for the Liberal Party was one of the most invigorating and exciting times of my life. I enjoyed enormously the cut and thrust of the campaign and I was particularly taken with the electorate's response to me as a candidate and I was delighted to be of assistance to so many, at that stage, potential constituents. I am pleased to report that, judging by the number of problems being presented to me, the electorate has perceived me as a focus for its difficulties. Whilst talking about the campaign period, I wish to acknowledge my gratitude and debt to my supporters at large, but more particularly to my dedicated campaign team who were of such enormous support throughout the campaign. I acknowledge that such teams exist within all political Parties, but I specifically wish to draw attention to the fact that as volunteers they do not have the same incentive as a potential member of Parliament does to work hard throughout the campaign. It was a thrill to me to see all our plans come to fruition, and I believe that the volunteers derived enormous satisfaction from seeing their job well done.

No family person gets into Parliament without the support of his immediate family, and I am no different from others. I am very grateful for the unstinting moral support of my wife and three children over the past couple of years. I love them all very much and I am very grateful for their good humour in the times of stress, anxiety and tension that are part of an 18-month campaign to win a seat in Parliament. I am sure they are proud of my efforts.

On the occasion of my maiden speech, I want to say how proud I am to represent the electorate of Adelaide. I believe it is unique in that it contains elements of the whole spectrum that is important to South Australia. It contains the

business hub of South Australia, most of the facilities which enhance our cultural heritage, the parklands and many facilities which South Australians regard proudly as their own, such as The Botanic Gardens, the Zoo and the North Terrace Boulevard. It contains South Australia's main centres of learning and wonderful hospitals, Adelaide Oval with all its fine traditions, and so on. But, more importantly, the electorate of Adelaide contains an enormous cross-section of South Australians and, above all, it is those people whom I am proud to represent. I understand that across the spectrum of South Australians the problems will be of varying natures, but I am committed to representing all electors of Adelaide to the best of my ability and with my greatest energies.

Recently we have seen the unfortunate breakdown of the family unit, and that has been responsible for many of the social problems now faced by society. It is in the interests of the Government to support families actively in order to solve problems before they get out of hand, not to pick up the pieces after the damage has been done. To intervene early is cost-efficient in dollar terms but, much more importantly, the social cost is less.

The problem of street kids and the long-term homeless and unemployed is now well recognised and has received an increasing amount of publicity. Because of the facilities offered within the electorate of Adelaide, it is a focus for those problems. I signal to Parliament that I applaud the work of the many agencies that are responsible for the primary care of these people, but I also signal that I believe the most efficacious way of helping these people is in the true spirit of liberalism to show them and to provide them with the ways for helping themselves. Specifically I draw the attention of the House to a project of the Wright Court Day Centre in which huts along the Heysen trail have been renovated by the long-term unemployed. I believe that the spirit behind this project provides the most practical way of giving self-respect and skills and of helping people, and has much greater effect than some supporting schemes organised by Governments in the past. I believe it is part of the role of Government energetically to support self-help programs, and I will be pleased throughout my career to be at the forefront of such support, because of the proven efficacy of doing so.

The electorate of Adelaide is also quite unique in that one of the major contributors to its marvellous quality of life and general lifestyle is the built heritage within the boundaries of the electorate. Members of the House would no doubt be aware of the debate between heritage and development which ought to be of great concern to all South Australians and which is occurring at present. I believe it is important that decisions are made on the basis of fact rather than emotion, and consequently I am in favour of mooted plans for surveys to be done to indicate exactly what makes Adelaide and South Australia unique, so that we have firm guidelines to assist us in this debate. We must preserve the best of the past, but as we move into the 1990s Government decisions must strike the right balance between heritage and development. I am confident that many other members would have spoken to recent immigrants and visitors to South Australia, and I am sure they would have been struck by the vehemence with which these people say that Adelaide is a unique city.

Whilst on the subject of uniqueness and being the member for Adelaide, I would like also to discuss briefly the Adelaide Festival of Arts and the Festival Fringe and their contribution to the life of all South Australians. They are obviously of great economic benefit because of the money which the tourists from both overseas and interstate spend

within South Australia during each biennial Festival time. A survey performed during the last Festival by the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies indicated that in March 1988 South Australia attracted 10 000 extra visitors, that hotel and motel takings were up by \$1 million, and that the overall economic output in Adelaide, because of the 1988 Festival, increased by \$7 million. There was a combined total of 1.3 million attendances at the Fringe and the Festival in 1988. An interesting fact from the survey is that the average Festival visitor spends \$86 more in South Australia than a typical tourist or a Grand Prix visitor spends.

Indeed, I am sure that many South Australians are encouraged to spend money within their State at the time of the Festival as well, blessed as we are with such a wonderful environment and encouraged as we are to partake of the Festival and the Fringe acts, of which many are partaken easily and cheaply by families. But, more importantly, I consider that the Adelaide Festival is a landmark within South Australia, because it encourages not only our cultural heritage, but also it is an overt symbol of the value of lateral thinking, experimentation, the pursuit of excellence and what can be achieved after much hard work. Because of what the Festival stands for, I believe it is extremely important that the Government of the day is seen to be encouraging the Festivals and their values, because they have such broad significance to all South Australians. The values exemplified within the Festival are applicable throughout life.

Immediately prior to the election I circulated material in which I stated that, as a keen supporter of all forms of the arts, I believe our local talents should be encouraged and supported to enhance South Australia's reputation. As the member for the State seat of Adelaide I will support our local talent at every opportunity, and I believe that it is within the ambit of the Government to be supportive also. The same sense of encouragement of a new pursuit, some of which will be marvellous and some of which may fail, is just as valid in the sphere of the arts as it is at Technology Park.

To continue the theme of support for local talent, I indicate that during my time as the member for the seat of Adelaide I intend to work towards the creation of a sculpture park as a feature of the already marvellous improvements to the banks of the Torrens within my electorate. The River Torrens is a major feature of the electorate and, as it is such a prominent feature in the city, it therefore draws many tourists. I believe the opportunity is ripe both to capitalise on the beauty of the River Torrens banks and to make an increased commitment to the arts in the form of sculpture within South Australia.

I have discussed this concept with various members of the Adelaide City Council and they have viewed it favourably. I believe that as a cooperative project between the two levels of government an impartial, non-political body, consisting perhaps of the Director of the South Australian Art Gallery, the Principal of the South Australian School of Art and the Lord Mayor, or other such public figures, could be set up. The body would be charged with instituting an annual purchase of specifically local works in addition to the Art in Public Places Committee. Over time this would allow a group of works to be viewed on the banks of the Torrens by all South Australians and all visitors to Adelaide. Not only would this be perceived as direct encouragement for the arts and be of great benefit to the community in general, but I am confident that in the longer term it would become a major tourist attraction.

Having mentioned the encouragement of excellence and the value of incentives, I wish to register my formal protest, as the member for Adelaide, about the huge increases in land tax which have occurred since the last election, because land tax stifles incentive and discourages enterprise and excellence. I have been deluged with complaints from people of many backgrounds who are angry about the punitive taxation on their land.

Members of the House would be fully aware of the outcry which has arisen about this issue, and it is an issue which I feel the Government ought to address urgently. In many instances, the people being worst affected by these sudden, unheralded increases in land tax are small business people who have taken a risk with their capital and with their time and energies and who make up the largest employment force in Australia. To be faced suddenly with increases of up to 400 per cent in land tax can hardly be regarded as encouragement from the Government to continue their business, and certainly it is not an incentive to people wishing to strike out on their own to set up a small business, which, if successful, will employ other people and contribute to our overall economy in South Australia.

It also amazes me that Governments take such actions given that a number of my constituents have informed me that they are paying their land tax bill at the expense of sacking employees. This constitutes senseless government, and I will continue to highlight the inappropriateness of the present method of land taxation. But it is a problem not only for small business. I have been contacted by many constituents who have small components of their total property as income-earning areas, yet the whole of the property is subject to land tax rather than being granted exemption as their principal place of residence.

To me, this is unjust. Also, many of my constituents complain about the broad brush valuation system in place at present. For instance, they repeatedly make to me the perfectly valid point that villa style roofing is much more expensive than cottage roofing, because of extra materials. They ask whether stone walls and, in particular, bluestone and sandstone in the electorate of Adelaide are not more expensive than brick which, in turn, is more expensive than brick veneer walls. The point is valid that bathroom and wet area floors can be made of cement, tiles or terrazzo. And an unfortunate fact of life in the electorate of Adelaide is whether the walls are affected by salt damp, and whether any underpinning has been done to alleviate this problem. My constituents, in my view quite reasonably, expect an improved valuation system. It is well known amongst the community that the Liberal Party went to the last election with a policy of:

1. Instituting an inquiry into the valuation system in general.
2. Divorcing land tax from property valuation.
3. Ensuring that no land tax increases were greater than the CPI.

It would seem to me that this is a commonsense way of encouraging the small business sector and it allows some incentive to the populace to be involved in this sector.

Another concern I wish to address is the increasing tendency for the debate on our environment to be seen as a political football. Whilst I am pleased that it has become a political issue, I am anxious than an overall grand plan be adopted for our environment. It appears that what is happening at the moment is merely chipping at the edges for short-term political gain, and too much is at stake. In my view, there are many eminent Australians who are above politics and who would be willing volunteers in some overall planning capacity. This has occurred successfully in the

United States of America and I cite the example of the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors.

The sort of idea that may well be mooted by a body charged with overall environmental planning is that being proposed now by the well-known environmentalist, Vincent Serventy, to establish greenways for native animals to traverse Australia. I support this type of idea wholeheartedly. In case any member of the House feels that I am jumping on the environmental band wagon, I point out that amongst other practical commitments I have made to the environment was my time spent manning the Nature Conservation Society exhibit in the Bicentennial Exhibition when it was in Adelaide.

The Conservation Society's exhibit was excellent and, in my view, quite the best amongst other things that I thought were a scandalous waste of taxpayers' money being dragged around the country behind big trucks. I make this point not only to indicate my long-term commitment to the environment but also to indicate that throughout my parliamentary career I will vigorously oppose wastage of taxpayers' money on projects similar to the Bicentennial Exhibition.

I was pleased to note in the Governor's speech that his Government will give a high priority to health matters. Having been a self-employed medical practitioner for 15 years prior to being elected as a member of Parliament, I know the importance that the community places upon a first-class health system which is readily accessible, is not too overpowering and unfriendly and, above all, does the best possible job for the health of the individual. I am fully cognisant of the problems inherent in huge capital outlay for modern technology, but I believe that if the long-term problems are tackled with an energetic and above all innovative approach there is no reason why the South Australian public cannot have the best medical care available in the world. In fact, it is their right to expect no less.

Increasingly, the electorate of Adelaide, like South Australia in general, has a larger percentage of older people. As a doctor, and as someone who has been lucky enough to have experienced the joys of having older members of my own family, I am aware of the needs of older people, and of how some Government decisions seem to our ageing community to be bewildering and frightening. It is stating the obvious to say that South Australia's strengths have emanated in large part from the efforts and sacrifices of our ageing community. Accordingly, I believe that Governments ought to repay our older citizens for their years of effort and allow them the maximum possible dignity in their old age. As the member for Adelaide, I will work vigorously to help initiatives that encourage a sense of purpose in life for the aged and to improve the various services that are used by our ageing community, such as home care and maintenance services.

As I draw towards the conclusion of my maiden speech, I should like to adopt a more philosophical note about my view of government and of Parliament. Inherent in this view is a passionate belief in the basic tenets of liberalism which, in my view, are best encapsulated as 'fierce support for the individual in society', based on the belief that, by improving the lot of the individual and the individual's family, society will be the ultimate beneficiary. Also included in this is an obvious role for government of encouraging the individuals to better themselves.

Individual rights and freedoms are amongst the major tenets of the democratic process, and I cannot let an occasion such as my maiden speech in a democratic Parliament pass without expressing my support for, and delight in, the recent events in Eastern Europe. It is obvious that, in countries which have been dominated by totalitarianism and in

which the rights of the individual have been subjugated to the so-called glories of the State, the system of overall State control has been utterly and unerringly rejected. As a strong believer, as I have previously stated, in the rights of the individual and in the Liberal philosophy, I find great encouragement in these advances in Europe.

Government, and the Parliament, ought in my view to be a facilitator rather than a controller in society. Whilst it is obvious that laws are necessary for an ordered society, I believe it is not the role of the Government, or of Parliament, to enact laws which unnecessarily result in erosion of the individual's powers, rights and benefits within society. It is because of my belief in this principle that I first contemplated standing for Parliament and, having been successful in that aim, I will use every opportunity given to me to uphold this ideal.

Inherent in this is a belief in the efficiency of government. I do not believe there is a role for unnecessary intrusions into society by government and, if something can be done by the non-government sector, it ought to be allowed to do so. I do not anticipate agreeing very often with the new Labor Premier of Western Australia, though I was particularly interested in her statement, as follows:

Government involvement in business is over.

I hope this Government, and the Parliament, take note of the sentiment behind that statement, because I believe that taxpayers' money lost in Government business ventures, such as the New Zealand timber company, would have been much better spent providing teaching positions in our schools, or decreasing the Housing Trust waiting list or improving the hospital system. If, during the course of this Parliament, the Government sticks to governing and encourages individuals to better themselves, South Australia will be the better for it.

I should like, finally, to thank the electors of Adelaide for the confidence which they showed in me on 25 November 1989. I am sure that the problems in relation to which they will seek my help during my career will be both complex and challenging, and I anticipate a productive partnership between the electors of this wonderful and unique electorate and me, such that it is a better place for all of us to live.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I support the proposition before the House and I congratulate His Excellency the Governor on the speech that he gave to the Parliament. I have been fortunate enough to hear the Governor's speech on eight separate occasions, and I have never found one iota of criticism of any of the speeches he has delivered. I would like to congratulate him on the program that he has outlined for the coming financial year which I find to be a steady program as far as this State is concerned.

It has been my experience in this place that the Address in Reply debate, immediately following an election, gives members the opportunity to make some comments on that election and I intend to take the opportunity to do so. I would like to express my commiserations to the members of my Party who were not returned at the last election.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Gunn): Order! Members will not converse on the floor of the Chamber. The honourable member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON: I believe that everyone of them provided a talent that will be sadly missed by the Australian Labor Party, the Parliament and the State. When one examines the election figures for 1989, which I believe every person in this House will do extremely carefully, very little criticism could be levelled at those members who unluckily lost their seats in the recent contest.

From time to time over the years, I have heard criticisms of members of Parliament who have lost their seats, and/or contested seats from all shades of politics, that they did not work hard enough. This is a thing that I have become more and more sceptical about as my experience has deepened in the political field. It is my observation that all contestants work very hard and members in marginal seats work even harder. One only has to look at the swing table for two-Party preferred voting system, as provided in the statistical analysis by Mr Dean Jaensch on page 29 of that document, to attest to the truth of the statement that has just been made.

The average swing against the Government in the last election in the whole of the 47 seats was 5.11 per cent in round figures. If one examines the swings against the sitting marginal members, it is easy to see that in every case the swing against the sitting marginal members was much lower than the average swing. Diane Gayler, in Newland, had a swing of only 1.6 per cent against her; Derek Robertson, in Bright, had a swing of 2.6 per cent; Mike Duigan, in Adelaide, had a swing of 3.3 per cent; June Appleby, in Hayward, had a swing of 3.7 per cent, and Phil Tyler, in Fisher, had a swing of 4.2 per cent. So that, in fact, those people who have not returned to this Parliament due to defeat actually put up a better performance than the average, and I extend to them my commiserations for their non-return.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I am having difficulty shouting.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will cease interjecting. The member for Henley Beach has the call.

Mr FERGUSON: At the same time I congratulate all of those new members of the House, both on this side of the House and on the other side. I wish them all well in their careers and I hope they find the parliamentary life everything they expected it to be. We have recently seen the retirement from Cabinet of the member for Napier. I would like to pay tribute to the work he has accomplished during the past period of over seven years in his capacity as a Cabinet member. I have known him for all of that time and I have known of his achievements. Although not a lot has been made of this, history will reveal that one of the Bannon Government's achievements has been the substantial increase in housing completed during the Bannon term of office. Of course, the person at the head of the department concerned for most of that time was the member for Napier.

I had the pleasure of studying housing trends when I undertook an overseas study tour to the United Kingdom. Indeed, I had the opportunity to look at the methods employed by the Thatcher Government involving the United Kingdom's methodology in dealing with what was, and still is, a huge housing crisis. I was able to compare the methods used in South Australia with the methods used in that country and I can say without any hesitation that the Australian Government's methods in concert with the South Australian Government, with this State's former Minister in charge, is far superior to the way that the matter is being handled in Britain. Time does not permit me to make detailed comparisons but I have reported to the Parliament on this matter and my report is available in great detail as to why I think our methods, the South Australian Housing Trust, the Commonwealth Government and the former Housing Minister are so much better than those of other countries. I extend my congratulations to him for the way in which he handled his portfolios and I wish him well in his new capacity as Chairman of the Public Works Committee.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to the member for Briggs on his elevation to the Cabinet. I believe that he will show, in due course, that he has the capacity and the ability to enhance the Cabinet membership. To the new Speaker, the Hon. Norm Peterson, the member for Semaphore, I also would like to extend my congratulations on his elevation to that position. I am sure that he will handle, in a completely impartial way, the business of the House. To Mr Martin Evans I extend my congratulations for his election to the position of Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees.

On the Opposition benches we have seen a change of leadership during the parliamentary recess, and I extend my congratulations to Mr Dale Baker on his elevation to the leadership; and to Mr Stephen Baker on his elevation to the role of Deputy Leader. Although from time to time one has an opposite point of view to that of Opposition members, I have, over the years, admired the way that John Olsen, the member for Custance, has handled parliamentary debates with fire and enthusiasm, and I congratulate him on his potential elevation to the Senate. To his Deputy, who has now seen fit to stand down—Mr Roger Goldsworthy, the member for Kavel—I would also like to pay a small tribute for his contribution to the debates in this House.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Kavel has always impressed me with his ability to reply in debate instantaneously to any debating points which may have been made and I believe he has served his Party very well in his capacity as Deputy Leader. All in all, there has been a tremendous change in personnel in the new Parliament from the old Parliament. This is probably a good thing for the State as a whole, and I look forward to the coming Parliament with a great deal of interest.

It is usual during the Address in Reply to refer to the projects in progress in the local member's electorate. I would like to see some changes made during the term of this Parliament. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I can look back and see the things which have been achieved during the seven years I have been in office. I consider the introduction of child-care in my electorate to be one of the more notable achievements that I can look back on. However, it is not my intention to take the time of this Chamber to give a chronological report on the things that have been achieved in my electorate with some influence from myself.

I will look at the current projects in hand and use whatever influence and ability I have to see them come to fruition within my electorate. The first issue concerns child care. I commend the Henley and Grange council for their foresight in trying to establish another child-care centre in the beachside suburb of Grange. A survey has been taken of the possible number of people within the surrounding area who would use this service and I believe that a satisfactory proposition has been put to the Children's Services Office in respect of the number of children who would use a child-care centre if it was established in Grange.

For its part, the council has been prepared to put its money where its mouth is and it has purchased land which it is prepared to use in conjunction with the Children's Services Office for the provision of a child-care centre. As time goes by, it is my intention to give further details about this project in the hope that further support will be made available from the CSO in respect of building and staffing the child-care centre in this suburb.

In previous Parliaments, I have referred to the need to shift the Grange railway station from its Military Road site to its new location, and this has been achieved. However,

I am a little disappointed that the old station remains untouched. The work which had been projected to remove the old station has not yet been accomplished. In fairness, this is not a matter in which blame can be laid at the feet of the Highways Department. It has budgeted and provided the money for the alterations necessary to the old station but the design possibilities have not been completed by the Henley and Grange council. I hope that, within the next few months, agreement can be reached concerning the roadworks design so that the community will see the removal or partial removal of the old station. This will clear the way for further roadworks which are desirable and necessary, particularly from a safety point of view, on Military Road.

I am particularly concerned about the Jetty Street/Military Road intersection, which is a responsibility of the Highways Department. The number of accidents occurring at the intersection is very worrying. Roadworks are necessary at that dangerous intersection for the prevention of further accidents and I hope that, at least during the life of this Parliament, something can be done. During my last term, together with representatives from surrounding councils, I had two meetings, one with the Minister of Transport and one with departmental heads, about the necessity to reduce the volume of traffic passing through Henley and Grange on the way to Glenelg.

The main road is Tapleys Hill Road, which is a very good dual highway, but a lot of motorists are diverting from Tapleys Hill Road, along Military Road and Seaview Road, down past West Beach and on to Glenelg, via what could be described as the back road. This increase in the volume of traffic has been quite substantial and I understand that the Highways Department would prefer vehicles to use Tapleys Hill Road. Information was conveyed to me that the Highways Department and the councils along the route—mainly West Torrens, Henley and Grange, Woodville and Glenelg—are concerned at the number of vehicles that are trying to escape the traffic lights on Tapleys Hill Road.

The Highways Department is concerned about the problem but the information given to me is that no expenditure can be used to divert traffic back on to Tapleys Hill Road until the changes to that road have been completed. I was extremely pleased to note the recent announcement that work will soon commence on the completion of the dual highway where Tapleys Hill Road joins Anzac Highway. One of the problems alluded to during my meetings concerned the greens at the Holdfast Bay Bowling Club, which will be taken over to build part of the dual highway. These plans have been in preparation for some time and land acquisition has been under way for years. However, until the Highways Department completes this part of Tapleys Hill Road, it is not prepared to look at the problems associated with the increasing number of vehicles using Military Road and Seaview Road through the Henley and Grange areas.

Mr Oswald: It's 1991.

Mr FERGUSON: I will be pleased if something can be done before the end of this parliamentary term. If the honourable member's dates are right, perhaps something can be done—

Mr Oswald: That is the best estimate available.

Mr FERGUSON: Well, at least the honourable member has an estimate. At one time the Highways Department was not prepared to put a date on it. I am pleased that the honourable member now has a completion date.

Mr Oswald: It is a starting date.

Mr FERGUSON: One of the things I have found in politics is that one must be very patient, and such patience is eventually rewarded. However, I hope to see some pro-

gress with this problem before the end of the parliamentary term. I refer briefly to my support for the proposed alteration to the Charles Sturt cottage. Captain Charles Sturt was a person of great significance to the State of South Australia.

Mr Lewis: I don't know whether the Aborigines would agree.

Mr FERGUSON: Reference has been made to the fact that white people refer our history back to Captain Sturt, refusing to recognise earlier black history. That point of view is worth considering and there should be a greater study of black history in South Australia than has been undertaken so far. Notwithstanding that, so far as the State of South Australia is concerned and our settlement here, Captain Charles Sturt was the explorer who was most responsible for setting up the colony. If it were not for his journals and the reports of his explorations, which were sent back to the United Kingdom, it might have been many more years after 1836 before a colony was established here. It was as a result of his recommendations that Westminster passed the Act to establish the colony of South Australia under the Wakefield system.

Without a doubt it is absolutely beyond contesting that Captain Charles Sturt is the greatest explorer that South Australia ever saw. For this reason I support the conservation study that has taken place in Grange in which Captain Sturt's cottage is situated. Recommendations will be made following that study and estimates of the cost to restore the cottage to its original form have ranged from \$300 000 to \$1.5 million. I believe the final cost will be nearer to \$1.5 million. I know that people are somewhat taken aback by that figure, but one must remember that we are honouring South Australia's greatest explorer. In due course the cottage could become a focal point for tourism in South Australia because Captain Charles Sturt is known quite well in other States—particularly in New South Wales and Victoria—for his exploration work. Almost every school child in those States has heard something about Captain Charles Sturt.

Mr Lewis: A bit of a tourist himself, wasn't he?

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, not only did he go backwards and forwards from South Australia to the United Kingdom but he also travelled around South Australia. Anybody coming to South Australia would like to see his cottage. I believe that increased expenditure on promotion would be money well spent. In due course I will be making representations on behalf of the Charles Sturt Trust to the History Trust and to various Ministers. When the original restoration started at Grange the Housing Trust came to the party and was able to assist. On behalf of the Charles Sturt Trust I will make representation to whatever agency is available to ascertain whether we can properly rebuild this monument to South Australia's greatest explorer.

The matters I have mentioned so far are not the only achievements that I would like to see in my electorate during this parliamentary term. Of course, all will require the spending of money. It was with some pride that I heard during one of the maiden speeches from this side of the House that the member had seen \$35 million spent in his electorate. If I could ever get that much spent in my electorate in one parliamentary term, I would be extremely pleased.

I refer briefly to some of the environmental problems within my electorate and to some of the work I would like to see undertaken in that direction as soon as practicable. Legislation is pending and I will not dwell too strongly on the pollution of the gulf. However, it is a worry to me. Three of the main sources of that worry include the treatment works at Glenelg, the Patawalonga outlet and the

outlet of the River Torrens, all of which pollute the environment and the beaches of Henley and Grange. The main problem is not in the sea; it is the responsibility of councils along both riverways.

I agree with the speech made by the member for Coles about the pollution problems of the Torrens within her electorate. The problems to which she alluded in respect of pollution from the caravan park at lower North Adelaide were pertinent. Cans, packaging and everything else ends up in the Torrens. All those pollutants end up at the bottom end of the Torrens where the effluent flows out into the sea.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Like a sewer.

Mr FERGUSON: Yes. Some effluent is fed directly into the Torrens. The worst aspect of all is the cans and plastic packaging which seems to be indestructable. Cardboard cartons, drink containers and many other miscellaneous items that I ought not to mention here finish up in the ocean and are the responsibility of various councils along the riverway, to which not much attention has been given.

I will refer briefly to the upper reaches of the Port River between Trimmer Parade and Grange Road which feed into West Lakes. Stormwater run-off is a problem, as are all the different elements that go with it. The stinking and rotting garbage which gathers from time to time is a real problem for my electorate. I made an approach to the Minister of Marine to include within his study of the quality of West Lakes water the upper reach of the Port River so that something could be laid down on what may or may not be done to solve the problem. I was not successful in this venture—I was told that it is the responsibility of local government. Local government is in a position where it cannot spend sufficient money to resolve the problem. It is an environmental problem which adds to the poor water quality in West Lakes from time to time. I hope that we can find a solution to fix the problem.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I support the motion and congratulate everybody who should be congratulated. I have been very disappointed so far with the contribution of the Opposition's new members. Quite clearly, many of them will not be here all that long. In fact, not one new member opposite is in the Chamber this evening. So much for their interest in the workings of this Parliament! They all said how hard they had worked to get here and how they were going to work in the interests of the people but, when Parliament is sitting, not one new member from the Opposition ranks is in the Parliament. It is quite clear that many of them will have short political futures.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr GROOM: If you want to represent your constituents, if you say out there at election time that you will represent them to your fullest, you can at least come into this Chamber when the House is sitting and participate in the debate. It is very disappointing to have to speak to a Chamber that is virtually devoid of members opposite. There are plenty of new members from this side of the House in the Chamber tonight. The main matter I want to raise this evening is—

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: A newly elected member from the other side of the House has finally been encouraged into the Chamber. I congratulate the member for Fisher; at least he has displayed some interest. The matter I want to raise this evening is that of electoral reform. Last night and again today we heard platitudes from members opposite about this so-called corrupt electoral system. I will quote verbatim to the House—and I know it is accurate because it is in the *Advertiser* of 6 January and is a letter that emanated from

the member for Bragg—what the member for Bragg said about his new Leader. I have not seen the source letter, but I know that it is accurate, as it is quoted on the front page of the *Advertiser*, and that one does not put things in writing unless one wants them to appear in the relevant columns of the *Advertiser*. What does the member for Bragg say about the new Leader of the Opposition in relation to electoral reform? He says:

With respect to Dale [the member for Victoria], his views on electoral redistribution, as he has recently advocated to Liberal meetings, are fundamentally different from mine. The electoral issue of one vote one value was settled by our Party long ago. Any move—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! One speaker is on his feet, and that is the member for Hartley. The member for Albert Park will allow him to continue.

Mr GROOM: He continues:

Any move to restore weighting—

and we know what is on the Leader of the Opposition's agenda about one vote one value if he gets the chance—of the country vote will return us to the arguments that bedevilled the old Liberal and Country League and that have destroyed the Queensland National Party. It is on this point—

of one vote one value—

that the main choice will be made.

What did members opposite choose in the leadership competition? Two did not vote, and I do not know how they will get on in this Chamber. Two members opposite abstained from voting on the first critical issue in their Party room. So, the vote was 11 to eight. What did those 11 people do? They chose a Leader who represented anything but one vote one value. They chose a Leader who does not support one vote one value—and I know that that is accurate because, first, it is in the *Advertiser* and, secondly, it comes from the member for Bragg.

Last night members opposite spoke about the electoral system being corrupt. They do not intend to support one vote one value. The member for Goyder was carrying on about the corrupt electoral system and some alleged 52 per cent and 48 per cent. He cannot add up; we know he has difficulty with figures. That is what he said and that is what he wants to believe.

The member for Davenport also went on about electoral reform and the fairness of the electoral system. The only member opposite who was sufficiently honest was the member for Mount Gambier—and I know that that is because he serves on the Public Accounts Committee; I know he is reliable and truthful—who said that one vote one value is all right in principle. However, he implied that it did not work in practice. Members opposite have the audacity to criticise us on electoral reform when not one of them—

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I am sorry—not one of those 11, evidently, supports one vote one value, because they elected a Leader who does not support it; he supports the old weighted country vote, the old gerrymander. The other eight presumably support one vote one value. But, what you will find, Mr Speaker, is, when it comes to electoral reform, rural members opposite do not support one vote one value; and, they will not support it.

I predict that the member for Bragg will be the Leader when the next State election is held. I do not believe the member for Victoria will survive the next 18 months because he is a representative of big business and does not support a fair voting system; he supports a weighted system. I am sorry that I did not obtain a copy of the member for Bragg's letter—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr GROOM: If the member for Coles says that this is wrong, I welcome her contribution in a future debate. The article also outlines the member for Victoria's alleged conservative political attitude towards women's issues. We all know how important the women's vote is. Let the member for Coles get up and say that the new Leader is not conservative on women's issues, because the member for Bragg believes he is. And, not only that, the new Leader is alleged to be conservative on 'racial questions', whatever that means. It will be very interesting to find out the new Leader's views.

I know that the member for Victoria knows that this is a political forum, and he knows that I mean this in the nicest possible way, but he is now the Leader and his policies and utterances now have to be scrutinised because he now has a great deal of influence on members opposite. In his letter the member for Bragg evidently concluded by saying:

It also means policies which are non-discriminatory as to when citizens are men or women, or born in Australia or overseas . . . it is essential for our Leader to have a wide appeal across the metropolitan area.

One could not criticise the letter of the member for Bragg. We know he is a reliable member when it comes to accuracy. So, when I saw this article entitled 'Liberal leadership fight erupts over letter' I knew it was accurate for two reasons: first, it appeared in the *Advertiser*, and, secondly, it came from the member for Bragg.

So, we now have a situation where 11 members opposite support a gerrymander in this State by electing a Leader who has evidently advocated, in the Party room, the old Playford and Bjelke-Petersen type gerrymander. They rejected a Leader who represents the metropolitan area. The member for Bragg has spoken out, time and time again, in the interests of small business. He is quite properly in tune with community attitudes on women's issues and, of course, the other nebulous 'racial issues'. Those 11 members chose to put in a Leader who supports the opposite position; and, they expect to win Government.

I have been saying in this place for the past 10 years that one cannot trust members opposite. At election time in 1982, 1985 and again in 1989 the people of South Australia did not trust the Liberal Party. But, who trusted members opposite—the former Leader, the member for Custance. He was supposed to go to the Senate on St Valentine's Day. What happened? He will be in this Chamber, I suspect, until next August—and he trusted members opposite. He should have been listening to me for the past 10 years. I would have told him not to believe that he would move to the Senate in February. He is still here. What an embarrassment. He stood down, gave up \$600 a week and the white car all because Ren De Garis, as we all know, worked out a strategy and said that he was not to go, that the Liberals had to keep their numbers up in the House. One cannot trust members opposite. That is why the South Australian community rejected members opposite in 1982, 1985—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The member for Coles was a member of the Government which, in 1982, told the people of South Australia that the August 1982 budget was balanced. She was party to that. The Liberal Party went to the polls saying that the budget was balanced and, in reality, there was a \$63 million deficit; and that was the cause of our economic problems in South Australia. So, the member for Coles should not place her credibility on the line. She was prepared to be part of a Government that was going to mislead the people of South Australia, and that is a fact. The fact

of the matter is that Liberal Party policies are not acceptable to the people of South Australia.

Mr Such interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The member for Fisher can argue about that; but, he should talk about one vote one value. As a city member we might hear him supporting it. However, 11 members of his Party do not support it and two have no view. I would honestly like to know who those two people are. I have been trying to find out, but they are all very tight lipped. I have a suspicion who it is; I suspect one could be the member for Newland. But that is only a guess—she might tell us.

I wish to raise another issue which is very important because of the setting of the Federal election, and that is the capital gains tax. The capital gains tax will be a very important issue at the next Federal election. We must make no mistake about it: it is a fair and equitable tax. At present, it falls on about 1 per cent of corporate entities and individuals, the wealthier group in society who own property and land. What is the policy of members opposite? I have heard platitudes about the small business community, land tax and all the rest of it. I heard the member for Adelaide, in his maiden speech, say, 'You should not tie it to property values.' In other words, he was advocating, 'Let the wealthy get wealthier.' He was advocating that someone who owns \$2 million worth of property should pay the same land tax as someone who owns \$50 000 worth of property.

That is the position of members opposite. They are part of a Federal Party that supports the abolition of the capital gains tax. That tax raised about \$500 million during the past financial year, and it will raise probably 50 per cent more of that again during the next financial year. It has been an important mechanism in reducing personal income tax rates from 60c to 47c in the dollar, and they should come down to 39c in the dollar. It has been an important component in getting company tax down from 49c to 39c in the dollar.

At present, of the \$500 million raised in the last financial year through the capital gains tax, \$260 million was paid by individuals and \$240 million by companies. However, only 2.5 per cent of corporate entities paid any capital gains tax. They were all the top taxable income earners. As for individuals, the bulk of capital gains tax is raised as a result of the share market.

Members opposite would lift the capital gains tax in favour of some nebulous scheme to phase it out over five years. By the time the next financial year comes around, the capital gains tax would probably be responsible for three-quarters of a billion dollars in tax revenue. How will that revenue be replaced? If members opposite get into government—and we know they will not—they will introduce a consumption tax. At one stage, they were honest enough to say—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The honourable member should hear me out. At one stage members opposite announced that they would bring in a consumption tax, but the heat got too much. What did they say?

An honourable member: Not in this term.

Mr GROOM: Not in this term. But how does one take \$1 billion revenue out of the system and not replace it? I believe that members opposite would shift the burden of the capital gains tax from the 1 per cent, the wealthy sector of the community that pays that tax to the other 99 per cent. That is their policy. They will support big business. They have a big business leader now as Leader of the Opposition—and he knows that I mean that in a nice way. They have an Opposition leader who supports big business,

they rejected the small business advocate, and they support the lifting—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I know it is embarrassing to the member for Murray-Mallee. I know it is painful for him to have to listen to the crook policies that will be put to the people by his Party at the next Federal election. I know he is embarrassed by it; I know he wants to switch topics. I will debate any topic he wants to debate at any time. Let us stick to the capital gains tax, because it is very important. I heard speeches—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GROOM: As I said last night, if the honourable member would only spend more time in the Chamber, he would hear some of these speeches. In 10 years, I have missed only two sitting days. I have checked the books and in my entire parliamentary career I have been present every sitting day except for two days, and that was a special sitting that I could not attend and was paired. That is what members opposite are all about. The capital gains tax strikes the wealthy in the community. Who does it hit hardest? It hits their Federal President Mr Elliott. He is sitting—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The honourable member can debate that at any future time. There will be plenty of opportunity. But let us debate the issue of Liberal Leaders. I know that members opposite like to run away from the fact that Mr Elliott has 11.5 million bonus shares in Elders IXL and its subsidiaries. That came from 15.5 million 1c ordinary shares. He stands to gain \$17 million. Who is one of his biggest supporters? The honourable member for Victoria—the new Leader. And he supports Mr Ian McLachlan, another member of the New Right. His biggest supporter—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GROOM: If the honourable member wants to debate Holmes a Court, we will do that on another occasion. Let us stick to the people who are forming the nucleus of the support for the Leader of the Opposition in this State. There is Ian McLachlan and John Elliott—who stands to gain \$17 million from lifting the capital gains tax. Who is his biggest minder around the place? It is a former Upper House member. He stood up in the Parliament during the constitutional debates in 1968 and 1970 and advocated the permanent will of the people in the Upper House when they had a restricted suffrage. One had to be wealthy to get in there, and he is the minder.

So, one can see the way in which the conservatives—and I do not know whether they are the dries or the wets; I think they are half dry, half wet half the time—the conservative dries, have won out, and they defeated the member for Bragg.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GROOM: In the nineteenth century, the honourable member would have been recognised as a genius, but in the twentieth century a different view has to be taken of the member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GROOM: Thank you, Mr Speaker: I do need the protection of the Chair from time to time. The fact of the matter is that members opposite have signalled quite clearly to the people of South Australia that theirs is a big business Party. They will support big business against small business.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I ask members opposite to analyse objectively their speeches, as I have sought to do. There is no question that not one rural member will support a fair electoral system in reality. As the member for Mount Gam-

bier honestly put to this Parliament, one vote one value is all right in principle, and he acknowledged that he believes it does not work in practice. I know that the member for Bragg does support one vote one value.

Mr Lewis: One vote one value is not necessarily fair.

Mr GROOM: I know that the member for Murray-Mallee will not support one vote one value. In actual fact, their is tension because 11 members opposite do not support one vote, one value; only eight support one vote one value; and two do not have any view. I know that the tensions in the Liberal Party will result in the situation reverting to that which existed previously. Probably one of their best Leaders was Steele Hall. Make no mistake about it: Steele Hall was an honourable man, properly motivated and ahead of his time. What happened? The conservative rump led by the permanent will who now guides the destiny of the member for Victoria is back; the weighted country vote is back; and the gerrymanders will be back. They have now rejected a man who has displayed the qualities that might have been able to produce a trustworthy policy to put to the electors at the next State election. I believe that the tensions will become great because members opposite will not be able to achieve agreement on electoral reforms. They are talking about reducing the number of seats—anything to try to get into office if they can through the back door.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: They will not support a fair electoral system. I said earlier this evening that one cannot—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The member for Murray-Mallee knows that the people rejected Liberal Party policies at the 1982 election, at the 1985 election and at the 1989 election, and they will reject Liberal Party policies at the 1993 State election. It is true that we shall be in a tight position during the next four years, but we will survive. The Labor Party works better and well when it is in a difficult situation. We will regain the confidence of the people. I have no doubt that we will recover from this situation. We have done it before. We did it between 1975 and 1977 and between 1982 and 1985. We will get back the confidence of the people or a sufficient degree of confidence. Members opposite have helped us. There is no doubt but that it is a tight situation. However, I would much rather sit on this side of the House and be in government than sit on the Opposition benches. The one thing that members opposite are successful at is being in opposition, and they will continue to be successful at that game.

What I have seen in the past few days through the contributions of new members opposite simply leads me to the conclusion that there is no question but that members opposite will not be able to produce the right mix and blend of policies that is needed. Be that as it may, I predict that tensions will become so great in the Liberal Party over the next 18 months that we will see—

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: She would be a very capable Leader; she is a born again greenie, make no mistake about that. We will see the member for Bragg restored to the position that he ran for after the State election. I also predict that the Hawke-Keating Government will be returned at the next Federal election.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I know that members opposite have difficulty hearing. I will say it again. Watch my lips. The Hawke-Keating Government will be returned at the next Federal election, because it is a Government of substance and of leadership. The bottom line is that people in Aus-

tralia know that Hawke and Keating have guided Australia through very difficult economic times.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I will illustrate it with the capital gains tax. If members opposite get their way on capital gains tax, what will occur? If members opposite get into government and lift the capital gains tax, we shall see speculation back, because people will be fiddling around with income and capital all over again. If one gets an increase in wealth through capital growth, one should pay a fair share of that back in tax. In the same way, if one gets a growth in income, one pays more tax. That is a fair and equitable system. But if we start lifting the capital gains tax we will get back to tax avoidance, massive speculation and very poor investment in factories and other productive enterprises. We will get speculation in real estate once again.

The fact of the matter is that since capital gains tax has been in, Australia has experienced its biggest boom in investment. Investment grew about 15.5 per cent over the past five years. There has been 10.8 per cent investment growth over the past five years. When one compares that with the record of the Liberal Party when in government federally, one sees an investment growth rate of 2.2 per cent during their time. That is because people now are not fiddling around with investment properties. They are not speculating.

Mr Lewis: Not much!

Mr GROOM: If the Liberal Party lifts capital gains tax as it is going to do, and if one holds a \$20 million building around the town, one will make a packet, all tax free. Those are the policies that members opposite support—protecting the wealthy against people in a lesser position.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: If members want to talk about that, I will do so privately. It is *sub judice*. If anybody who owns a commercial property gets a substantial capital gain, they should pay tax. We are no different. I make no apologies for that. One should do that. It is right and proper that one should contribute a fair share of any capital growth by way of income tax. The member for Mitcham—

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

Mr GROOM: Anyway, Mr Speaker, I said that I would not take my full 30 minutes. I should now like to hear a contribution from the member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): First, I congratulate the new members on both sides of the House on their election. It is pleasant to see that new members can make and have made some excellent contributions to this place. It is a pity that the failed member for Hartley—the man from cobweb corner—has decided to come out and make what I thought was an unfair criticism of the new members. One of the privileges that we have when we come to this place is that we are individuals who gradually improve our presentation and learn what this place is all about. The member for Hartley tonight has demonstrated what it is all about. He has demonstrated that he can say one thing one night and then get up and say something else another night and expect us to believe him.

We ought to look at a couple of the remarks that he made last night which I thought were very interesting. Last night the member for Hartley said that in his opinion the Liberal Party always supported big business and was always against small business. I wonder where he places the Bonds, I wonder where he places the Abeles and I wonder where he places all the other significant supporters, such as Holmes

and a Court who support Labor in relation to big and small business.

It is fascinating when one hears the member for Hartley complaining about 38 per cent increases in rent, and rightly so. He says that rents should go up in line with the CPI. What does he say about land tax? It is fascinating to me that he should talk about land tax prices as being significantly increased, yet he says that rents should not go up any more than the CPI. I draw the attention of the member for Hartley to electricity rates under his Government. They have gone up in line with the CPI. Water rates in some areas have gone up only in line with the CPI and in other areas significantly more. However, land tax has gone up ridiculously in many areas.

The member for Hartley should know that this nonsense that he put before the House last night is a diatribe. The reason I say that is that, if he had anything to do with the practicalities of small business, he would know that, irrespective of whether or not the land tax is passed on as an outgoing expense, that income for the landlords would not go down. Income would be generated through rent. The member for Hartley stands up in this place as an expert, or saying that he is an expert, and puts down this absolute nonsense. He gets into landlords and says that they should not pass on the land tax, but that same cost would in reality be passed on in the rent if not as an extra outgoing. If he does not believe that—

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: No, I do not believe it is right. What I am saying is that one ought to put the truth down as it is and not put down all this sort of nonsense that the honourable member put down last night. The reality is that the landlords want \$X return per week and they will get that whether it comes from outgoings, rent or whatever. The remarks made by the member for Hartley are absolute nonsense. To talk about legislating to prevent landlords passing on tax is nonsense. I am glad that the member for Whyalla agrees with me, because it is nonsense. It is nice that he agrees, and I respect him for agreeing.

I should now like to talk about the election results and then about a whole range of other subjects which need to be addressed. As to the election result, it was clear that some 52 per cent of South Australians preferred the Liberal Party to be in Government and that only 48 per cent preferred the Labor Party. Any electoral system that gives such a result is obviously wrong and needs to be corrected. Certainly, people who talk about one vote one value and claim that the 52 per cent and 48 per cent result is fair and reasonable are talking nonsense. Our electoral system is not one of one vote one value because, if it were, the Party achieving 50 per cent plus one would win the election. That is fundamental and simple aspect of the one vote one value system.

This current system is clearly saying that it needs to be changed and, when we get to the private member's Bill in question, we will have the opportunity to put forward the changes that we believe should occur. I will take the opportunity then to put down my views on the direction that we should take. During the election campaign we saw for the first time since I was elected to Parliament panic by the Premier. For the first time, as a result of pressure applied by our side, we saw him panic and taken nearly to the end point. There were two examples of panic by the Government that stand out. The first was the Homesure scheme and many of my colleagues have talked about that. Clearly, that housing interest rebate scheme was put together the day after, or perhaps on the night of, the Liberal Party announcement simply to get back a few points. The result

today is obvious. The program was not thought through and is a mess, as we will see in the months to come.

Similarly, HomeStart was introduced by this Government on the run. The problems of HomeStart and Homesure will come to fruition in the next couple of months. The second point was the free travel fiasco. Members of the Government talk about, and are strongly opposed to, discrimination in this place. They have held themselves up as standard bearers against discrimination, claiming that everything they do is within social justice lines so that everyone in the community gets a fair deal. What is the position with free travel? It is a discriminatory exercise.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: We have lots of happy people.

Mr INGERSON: Yes, we have many happy people, and I do not disagree with that, but the scheme should be fair and reasonable in respect of everyone across the State. I acknowledge the Minister's comments. I noted a couple of days after the announcement of the policy there was another quick announcement from the Minister of Transport in respect of his own seat of Whyalla. Why was that made? Did the Minister forget his own electorate?

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: It seems the Minister almost forgot to include his own electorate of Whyalla, which has a subsidised transport system. What an embarrassment it would have been for the Minister if his own constituents could not take advantage of the free travel privilege. What about all the other people on the fringe of the city—people in Gawler, Bridgewater, Mount Barker and southern suburbs such as Aldinga who missed out? What about people in other country districts throughout the State? Obviously they are not important. What about children within three kilometres of country towns who cannot use the free school student bus service? We do not hear anything about that, because there was a blunder. There was an even a bigger blunder, because on the morning after the announcement the STA did not know anything about the scheme and it still does not know what the cost will be today.

I suspect that it will be between \$20 million and \$25 million in terms of the total cost over a full year when we take into account the need for extra buses and people required to run the scheme. The scheme has not been carried out fairly and reasonably and it is not applied in the social justice way about which the Government is so proud. Obviously, it is a badly assembled and managed scheme. I am disappointed, because I thought the Minister of Transport dotted his i's and crossed his t's. He came undone on this free travel scheme, and that is unfortunate for taxpayers.

Another area on which I would like to comment concerns the area for which I was responsible in the previous Parliament, that is, infrastructure. One of the biggest problems facing South Australia is the lack of funding, and the lack of awareness for required funding, for infrastructure in respect of roads and E&WS mains. I also refer to the need to ensure that expansion of school properties and Government properties generally is backed by sufficient money to allow improvements and maintenance.

As the Minister of Transport knows, he does not have sufficient funds to keep up to date and expand the transport network required in this State. As I see it, one of the most important issues is road safety and thus the need to have major two-lane highways between our cities. We do not have that. We have done a reasonable job in South Australia between Adelaide and Murray Bridge, and we are gradually expanding elsewhere into the country, but we need a long-term policy to ensure that we have two-lane highways between all major cities on other major carriageways. The

cost is significant, but I am saying that we are out of kilter in our funding of the whole program of infrastructure and its replacement.

Reverting, however, to the E&WS, we are facing a time bomb and, if members talk to departmental experts, this will be confirmed. We have pipes put under the ground 45 or 55 years ago, and anything could happen in the next 10 years. We do not have a significant enough program of pipe replacement. That came up in evidence before the Public Accounts Committee about 10 years ago and little has been done. We need a major replacement infrastructure program, yet we have not got one.

The STA and the E&WS are starting to implement a replacement program, and that is the direction in which we ought to be going. Infrastructure is a major problem for this Government and it will be a major problem for all Governments in the future if we do not start planning and making sure now that our programs have depreciation factors, included in the allocation of funds to replace existing assets. That is the way we should be going. In terms of general road funding, I have previously said that it is disgraceful that the State Government puts only \$25.7 million of the petrol tax that it collects into State roads. That is a decision the Government makes about its priorities, but it is wrong and should be changed. At least 50 per cent of the petrol tax collection and then an increasing share should be expended in the next 10 years. It is criminal that we do not have additional funding to reduce the biggest single controllable 'disease' problem in our community, that is, death on our roads. We are not doing enough to correct the problem because we are not putting enough funds into our roads program.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: It is a matter not of what the Government spends but of what I believe should happen. It is the Government's role to ensure that provision is made for these sorts of exercises. It is the Government's priority. If the Government chooses to ignore that priority, that is its decision: the Government makes that choice. My biggest disappointment in the area of road safety is that no Government has been willing to adopt an adequate training system for young persons before they get their licences.

We must be one of the few communities that demands that our children be educated in all the skills required for the work force, yet we hand them a driver's licence without any demand at all for training. The Opposition put forward as an alternative Government at the last election a program to introduce a compulsory 10 lessons for all young drivers over a maximum period of three years. I believe that that is the way we should go. This happens in Germany and Japan at different levels according to the number of lessons required. Such a training program would enable every child or person attempting to get a licence to be trained beforehand. It is the only skill which we allow children to have without being trained, and this should change.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What is the minimum driving age in Japan?

Mr INGERSON: I do not know, but I am aware of the program in Japan which provides that unless one has at least a minimum number of hours of training one cannot get into a vehicle to drive on a road. We need a modified program starting with 10 hours. This would give us an excellent opportunity to improve road safety because, if children are taught to drive, a better chance will exist to encourage them to develop the right attitudes on the road.

The best example in this community of the effectiveness of teaching children to improve the habits of others is the Kesab program which was taught in our schools. If children

saw their parents throwing things out of their car window or putting rubbish on the ground, they were encouraged to tell them to pick it up. It was the most effective program that we had in our schools and it shows that if children are trained an end result will be achieved which will be in the best interests of the community.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I would like to take up the point made by the Minister. It is a pity that he believes there is no evidence to prove it. I have been told this fact by three Ministers, but the problem is that Ministers do not ask people in driver training centres whether they feel that such a program would be successful: Ministers simply accept the fact that training is no good. The reality is that in every area where skilled training is required there is no doubt that if people are trained to improve their skills the end result is better. A Minister who has been involved with trade unions all his life should know that, if the skills of workers are improved, so their performance will improve, and if the skills of young drivers are improved there is no doubt that it will eventually lead to a significant improvement in road safety and in the ability of young people to drive well.

I will now talk about industry and commerce and, in particular, about the developing problems of WorkCover, the suggested amendments to the Acts, training and wage restructuring. Over the last 10 days I have been staggered by the number of people in industry who have expressed concern about the direction that WorkCover is taking. Their concerns are threefold. First, they are concerned about a possible breakout in levies. Some three years ago in this House we were told it was almost an absolute certainty that the WorkCover program could be run within the financial guidelines set by this Parliament with a maximum levy of 4.5 per cent. Now we find that for all sorts of reasons—some of which I will discuss in a minute—WorkCover levies cannot be managed within that sort of framework.

During the earlier debate, my colleague the member for Mitcham questioned the whole levy system and, in particular, asked whether we could sustain a 4.5 per cent levy. When the amending Bill comes before the House in the next few weeks we will know for certain that that could not be sustained. It is unbelievable when one looks back at the hype, the grandstanding and the promises made about this WorkCover scheme. The next question I ask is one that was asked at that time by the member for Mitcham: how will the administration costs be controlled? It is fascinating to see that within three years we have the Chamber of Commerce, the Employers Federation, the RTA and a whole group of employers saying—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: Of course they all have representatives on the board, but they now say to me on questioning that the administration costs of this monster are totally out of hand. In the last few days it has been put to me that the total number of people administering this undertaking in South Australia prior to the advent of WorkCover was about 100 to 150. Currently, over 400 people are employed on WorkCover, and administration costs have escalated by about \$2 million a month over budget. This problem has arisen since the takeover from SGIC.

The third part of this equation is that the control of the payment of benefits has become so poor that, unlike when the SGIC was managing it, there is now little control of bills paid and for questions asked, but simply an attitude of getting them through the system as quickly as possible.

So, there is a threefold problem: the amount of the levy, increased administration costs and the uncontrolled payment of claims with virtually no questions asked or checked.

The system appears to be out of control. It is fascinating, when one talks to the staff of WorkCover about the fact that it is unfunded, that one is told, depending on the actuarial advice, that it is approximately \$25 million unfunded. If the top end of the actuarial advice is given, then an amount of \$120 million to \$130 million is unfunded. That is the advice I received the other day. I hope that it is not correct.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I know that the actuarial people are aware of it. I hope that, when this Bill is considered by Parliament, these questions will be answered so that we can be given the answers. Today we have a potential monster which would be difficult for any Government to turn back. We need to ensure that WorkCover is put on its proper line.

The second area in relation to industry and commerce that I would like to discuss is the question of training. I support strongly the need for our work force to be better trained: no member would disagree with that. The current proposition put forward by the Federal Government in the training area is, in principle, acceptable. However, when one sees some of the definitions of training and asks questions about training on site and on the job, and it is found that at present those areas of training are not likely to be admitted or allowed only through a registered union-based training centre, one must ask why the training programs of employers, which have been in force over many years, need to be rejected?

There is concern about the direction that this national training program will take but, as I have said, very few people in industry and commerce disagree with the concept because, if we are to have award restructuring and if we are to have a new country that picks itself up and runs, all our skills need to be upgraded, improved and changed. However, we must have training programs that are acceptable to the employer as well as the employee. If there is no marriage between the two, there is no business, which means that there is no country. My advice from industry is that they are concerned about the issue of training, that the program needs to be straightened out very quickly.

Although most of our awards are Federal awards and this is, principally, a Federal Government matter, the training issue flows through to the State arena, particularly as it relates to the retail industry. Because as much training is required to be updated in the retail industry as elsewhere, we need to ensure that the employer/employee relationship is encouraged and enhanced so that a program can be developed that is reasonable and cost efficient and recognises on-the-job training.

Employers in this State are concerned about award restructuring. The feeling I get is that all it has achieved so far is to increase wages on the promise that something might happen, but nothing is happening in many award areas. Because of the restructuring, there have been significant increases in salaries, and wage drift and banding is occurring, giving a potential increase in wages of 11 per cent. Unless there is some productivity gain, it will be disastrous. Many employers feel that restructuring is just a fancy way of getting more money in the pockets of the employee. If that is the case, the issue needs to be brought to a head. At the moment, wage restructuring is a farce because there has been little improvement in productivity. This comment has been made by employers and employees.

With respect to the occupational health, safety and welfare legislation, one issue of concern is the registration of premises. Take the example of a shelf company or finance company of a private individual who works from his home.

His home office must be registered as a workplace under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act. It is an absolute nonsense. Such a person works at home for only a short time—he works out in the field most of the time—yet he must register his home because, under the Companies Act, his home is the registered office of his company. If the Government wants to put another tax on small business, it should not hook it into the occupational health and safety legislation in this way. I will comment on this matter later. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech to Parliament.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I wish to address an issue of concern to people in my electorate and in the wider community: graffiti vandalism on State Transport Authority property. I have been a regular user of STA services for over 20 years and, in the past 5 or 6 years, I have noticed the cancer of graffiti spreading on buildings and vehicles. I find this most distressing, annoying and wasteful. Almost every item of STA property, whether it be a station building, a fence or signal equipment, is covered in graffiti. Even lovely old buildings such as the Mitcham Railway Station have been totally defaced. In a sense, 'graffiti' is too kind a term to use because it is not humorous, nor is it clever. To call it graffiti is doing it a kindness that it does not really deserve.

The mural on the western wall of the showgrounds, which was created by a group of young women artists and paid for by a community grant, has been defaced. Everywhere on STA property and on properties alongside the railway tracks one can see graffiti, but the Government has done little or nothing about it. I find it quite unacceptable that the Government, which has been rather wimpy on this issue, has allowed this blot to continue. The cost to the community of this behaviour is considerable—it runs into tens of thousands of dollars.

It is strange that members opposite are not eager to have this vandalism reduced. The work of the tradespeople who paint these facilities is constantly destroyed.

Mr Hamilton: You want to do better homework and better research.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SUCH: I travelled on the train this morning, and I assure the honourable member that I have seen this graffiti. I invite all members to spend a little bit of time travelling on our public train system and have a look for themselves.

Mr Groom: What's your policy?

Mr SUCH: I will get to that in a moment. The point I am making is that it is demoralising for the tradespeople to have to paint these buildings and have their work constantly vandalised. It is not a good working environment for STA employees, for whom I have the highest regard. As I said I have travelled on STA transport for more than 20 years and I have always found its employees to be courteous and helpful. Every time the guard steps off the train at any of our stations, he or she is confronted with what is really a form of public acne. It is demoralising for the staff, it is costly, it is unproductive, and it annoys and concerns the community. People travelling into this city on interstate trains are confronted by this graffiti and must wonder what

sort of city they are entering. Some people might say that it is not as bad as some other places, but that is a strange and perverse form of logic. We should address this problem. With respect to STA railway tracks, we have become the city of graffiti.

Mr Groom: What is your policy?

Mr SUCH: I will come to that in a moment. We realise that it is a social malaise but that is no excuse for not doing anything about the consequences of that malaise. The offenders should be required to clean off the graffiti or to repaint and restore the damaged areas. Last year in the lead-up to the election campaign, I made a statement along those lines and the Attorney-General responded by saying that he already had that power. I have not seen any evidence of that being carried out.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park will come to order.

Mr SUCH: The solution is both long-term and short-term. The long-term one is addressing the question of the social malaise that brings it about. The short-term approach is to deal with the problem by requiring the offenders to clean up the mess, to repaint or restore the damage they have incurred.

Members interjecting:

Mr SUCH: Governments have a basic responsibility, first, to protect people and then to protect property. I would have thought that the Government would have the wish to protect public property. It has clearly failed to do so—it has been totally wimpy about the whole deal.

Members interjecting:

Mr SUCH: I am suggesting what should be done about it—put teeth into the legislation and make sure that the offenders carry out the tasks required.

Mr Groom: What does Greiner do?

Mr SUCH: The question must be addressed here. There is no point worrying about what is happening elsewhere. This Government has allowed the problem to escalate. It is an incentive for others to copy as it is the consequence of being wimpy about the whole deal. If the Government had taken a strong stand in the first place, the problem would have been knocked on the head. This is a major problem and it is of concern. The Government has done little about it and seems to be continuing to do little about it. I urge the Government to take up its responsibility to protect public property so that this mindless and senseless activity in our community ceases.

Mr De LAINE (Price): Tonight I wish to speak briefly about a very successful and extremely valuable resource in Port Adelaide. I refer to the Port Adelaide Information and Technology Centre (ITeC). Information and technology centres have been set up in all States of Australia on the initiative of the present Federal Government and the concept is based on a scheme in the United Kingdom. The Port ITeC was opened in August 1988 and has gone from strength to strength. In late 1987 the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide responded to the Federal Government's invitation for interested parties to apply for funding under the information and technology program through the Department of Employment, Education and Training.

On 21 March 1988 a cheque for \$250 000 was presented to the then Mayor of Port Adelaide (Mr Ron Hoskin) by the Federal Minister for Employment and Education Services (Hon Peter Duncan). On Monday 1 Aug 1988, just five months after receiving this Federal grant, 28 long-term unemployed and other disadvantaged people from the Port Adelaide area were accepted into a program and com-

menced 20-week courses in basic electronics and computer application.

Port ITeC is one of three Skillshare programs established in Port Adelaide, the other two being the Port Employment Project and Workskill, which trains people in automotive and light engineering. It is also different from other States in that no State funding is involved. It is appropriate that the Minister is in the Chamber at the moment as I will be discussing with him the possibility of State assistance for this worthwhile project. Whilst there is adequate sponsorship at the moment, with hard economic times it is not easy to obtain such and some State funding would be very beneficial. Whilst on the subject of Skillshare, throughout Australia it has been responsible for a more than 19 per cent drop in youth unemployment between the ages of 16 and 19 years. That is a great result.

Mr Hamilton: And the Libs want to knock it off.

Mr De LAINE: Yes. Port ITeC works in cooperation with the Federal Government, local industry and the community to provide industry-based hands-on training for long-term unemployed and other disadvantaged job seekers in the computer and electronic fields. It gives access to information and technology training, services and expertise for individuals, business and community groups. It also provides accommodation, equipment and support services to new and existing businesses within the Port Adelaide business and industrial environment.

This establishment is situated in Todd Street, Port Adelaide in a very nice building which was designed and built along traditional historical lines that fit in well with historical buildings in the area. Much of the equipment has been donated or loaned by various companies in the form of sponsorship. The landlord is a local property owner, Leo Conci, who is an extremely good landlord because of the low rents he charges and the cooperation he gives to Port ITeC people in relation to the property. There are 11 members on the board, representing the Port Adelaide council, Skillshare, Port Adelaide TAFE, Adelaide ITeC, Rod Safford (the Federal member for Port Adelaide) and several sponsors.

Port ITeC has six staff including Miss Jan Air, who is manager of the establishment. The staff are very dedicated and work many extra unpaid hours. If one passes the place at any hour of the night, one will find one or two people working extra hours. To give an indication of the dedication of some of the staff members, one took sign language lessons in an effort to assist in communicating with one of the deaf trainees. All staff teach and share the administration and routine chores of the place. It is a great team effort.

The funding of the centre is by way of a Federal Government \$300 000 triennial grant which must be matched dollar-for-dollar by sponsorships. That has been achieved to a remarkable degree although, because of hard economic times, sponsorships are not easy to get. I will be approaching the appropriate Minister to seek assistance with State funds. The major sponsor is the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide, which contributes \$52 000 a year towards this worthwhile project. It is a great community effort and I applaud it.

This initiative was taken in the last term of the Port council when Ron Hoskin was Mayor. I commend Ron Hoskin because in his term as Mayor this was one of the many initiatives he saw through to fruition in Port Adelaide—a worthwhile community service. Trainees are aged between 16 and 60 years with the average being in the late 20s, and 52 per cent are disabled either physically or mentally. There is a varying range of disabilities from minor impairment through to muscular dystrophy, total deafness and so on. The main target group for these trainees is job

seekers of all ages who have been out of work or formal education for at least six out of the past nine months.

The centre especially targets migrant job seekers, sole supporting parents, people with disabilities and Aborigines. A whole range of training courses and services are available including evening short courses in computing and application software, day training workshops of one to two days in computing and application software, training workshops tailored in response to employer, business or industry needs, desk top publishing facilities and the hire of training rooms and facilities at competitive rates.

Companies can sponsor the scheme in seven ways: direct financial support; discounted equipment; expert assistance; training of ITeC staff; contributions of equipment; staff secondment; and, provision of work experience placements to ITeC trainees. The nine major benefits to the company are: to broaden information technology awareness in the community; widen product exposure through activities such as the showcasing of equipment; personnel training; a supply of trained personnel; marketing opportunities flowing from involvement in a self-help program; market growth from increasing exposure to company products of different community sectors, that is, small business, community groups and training participants; expanding business from the ITeCs themselves as they grow and update equipment; corporate advertising within the ITeC network; and Government acknowledgement of corporate sector involvement.

While the major focus is on the unemployed, ITeC also provides night courses for individuals or groups of people who are currently employed and who want to learn new skills or update existing skills. There are two main ways employers can take on, at no cost, professionally trained staff. Employees with general needs can undertake a course and gain work experience and, quite often, if they measure up to the standards required by the employer, they are permanently employed.

If an employer has a specific need an ITeC trainer will visit the business establishment, determine exactly what training is required and train a person or persons accordingly. The employer then assesses the persons who underwent the work experience and, if found suitable, they are employed. The main strength of the scheme is that it provides tailor-made training which is specific to the requirements of the individual industry or business. It is a worthwhile project. The results have been extremely successful with a 75 per cent success rate.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): It has been claimed that lightning does not strike twice in the same place, but at least one of my constituents believes that that is the case. I will briefly go through the difficulties experienced in 1988 and at the end of 1989 by my constituent's son. In December 1988 my constituent rang to say that their 15½ year old son was questioning very deeply what was wrong with society and why he was attacked when leaving a Jimmy Barnes concert at Thebarton.

The story was that he, at 15½ years of age with an older brother and others from the Nuriootpa area, had gone to the Jimmy Barnes concert at Thebarton. After they left the venue and were moving towards their parked car a group of youths moved around them. One fell behind the 15½ year old, another pushed him over the top of the one who was on the ground and then they stuck in the boots. This happened to four of the group of five. The youths separated them, did the damage and hightailed it. Great, brave fellows!

Mr Hamilton: Absolute cowards.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I will accept that from the member for Albert Park; they were absolute cowards. This

incident was the subject of newspaper reporting over a period of days following the Jimmy Barnes concert. The incident is not isolated; the same has occurred at other venues. Members will recognise that the problem is not unusual in and around Hindley Street, and even around the Casino people have been attacked.

This particular 15½-year old took the incident very poorly, and questioned why, even though police were in the vicinity, nothing could be done, and he should be attacked in this way. He asked why society was not helping to protect him and those who were with him. With some help from a psychologist, he tried to put the whole matter into perspective and, after a period of time, still with some trauma and fear of crowded places, he started to overcome his concern.

This last Christmas the same lad went to Edithburgh—a place well known to the member for Napier—and when asleep in his sleeping bag in a designated park he was attacked by a 17 year old lad wielding a cricket bat. A letter, written by his mother at my suggestion to the Minister for Crime Prevention, states:

We were shocked and horrified when woken by a phone call from the Yorketown hospital on the morning of 30 January this year.

In actual fact, I believe that she meant 30 December because of the configuration of dates which follow. The letter continues:

Our son, who had gone to Edithburgh camping ground for the New Year weekend with his brother and a group of friends 18 to 20 years old, had been bashed in the head with a cricket bat while sleeping in his swag on the ground in the park. He had been stitched in three places—mainly to the head, with a small wound on the cheek from a blow across the eye. There were 36 stitches in total. We were to phone back later to hear results of X-rays and a skull probe.

The agony of waiting to find out whether there were any skull fractures or brain damage was indescribable. We were lucky, but there was still the chance of symptoms indicating internal damage for two weeks following the wounding. Five weeks later I am still haunted by the dreadful possibilities which could have resulted from such a vicious attack to his head.

Psychological damage to Nick is being investigated. He was emotionally 'cold', and became angry whenever the incident was mentioned—wanting to forget it. He has only just told us after we 'forced' a police interview with our local police that he was terrified every night before he went to sleep even though he was safely in bed miles away from his attacker.

This is the effect it had subsequent to 30 December. The letter continues:

The friend, who was sleeping alongside our son, awoke to the sound of the bat hitting our son's head. The friend was able to protect himself from serious injury by protecting his head with his arm. He was treated in hospital for an arm injury and a wound on the back of his head. He has suffered considerable psychological damage, frequent forgetfulness, headaches and depression.

Our other son was asleep in the car during the attack and woke to see his brother standing in a dazed state with blood pouring from his head. While the offender (who is 17 years old) was attacking our son and his friend the attacker's older brother (aged 20) was slashing a tent and holding another member of the group at knife-point. The girlfriend of the person being held at knife-point screamed, and then both assailants fled.

My husband and I have made in excess of 100 phone calls in attempts to find out the procedure of the law and have received very little support and information. First, we have no legal input as victims. After five weeks we finally organised an interview to add personal sufferings and losses to the police impact statement which is to be used in the trial.

Secondly, the juvenile was released into his parents' custody despite the fact that he and his brother had committed other crimes only days prior to this incident. We believe he didn't even leave the district of Edithburgh where his family was holidaying. His (the attacker's) life is unchanged. Thirdly, all the court hearings are made to suit him, his lawyer and his family. We, as victims, may not attend any of the court sessions.

That is because of the 17 year age factor. The letter continues:

Fourthly, the juvenile is quite likely to receive a very light punishment without ever having to confront his victims or see the results of his crimes. At his hearing on 19 January in the Adelaide Juvenile Court the offender did not plead, but the conditions of bail were changed to allow him to work and study in Adelaide.

It seems to us that in many cases a juvenile offender who is given most of the privileges and the freedom of an adult—that is, alcohol drinking in public, walking without adult supervision into shops and public places or wherever he likes—is then excused as being only a child when a vicious crime is committed. We object that he is free and may be for months; and indefinitely if he 'wins' his court case.

In fact the offender's parents have been in touch with the parents of the lad who was affected acknowledging that it was their sons who were responsible for the actions. They pointed out that they were very sorry that they were unable to control those two kids (17 and 20 years of age), particularly when they got grog into them. The letter continues:

The police, the offender, the victims, the offender's parents and many other people know that he committed the crime. The police should have more power to lock up the offenders before the trial.

And so it goes on. Those people have expressed what I believe would be the reaction of many members on both sides of this place, and certainly of many people in the community. They are concerned about the consequences for perpetrators of crimes of this nature which could well turn out to be murder or manslaughter, depending upon the nature of the charge that is lodged.

The points that I put on the record tonight are part of an ongoing case before the Juvenile Court. I have expressed a point of view which is expressed to me frequently. The Minister at the table would acknowledge the number of occasions on which letters appear in the *Messenger Press* newspaper, which circulates in his area and mine, written by aged people and young people who are fearful in their own homes. The number of bashings that have occurred in the Salisbury area—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Exactly, and it happens elsewhere. I believe it is high time that we get off our backs and do something on behalf of the police and the people we represent to make sure that the perpetrators of these sorts of ills are treated not as children but as persons responsible for the actions they have taken.

Motion carried.

At 10.3 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 15 February at 11 a.m.