

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 20 February 1990

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

## SUPPLY BILL

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

The **Hon. TED CHAPMAN**: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order and request that you insist upon observance of certain rules of this House, and remind all members that, when they have a school group in, it is the responsibility of the member concerned to ensure that that school group knows the rules of the House—one of which is to stand during the delivery of prayers. This did not occur today, so your instruction to all members to insist on that procedure would be appreciated.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair has noted the point of order, and action will be taken.

The **Hon. J.P. TRAINER**: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I understand that it is not appropriate for any reference ever to be made to people in the gallery.

The **SPEAKER**: As far as the general proceedings of the Parliament are concerned, the point made by the member for Walsh is probably correct but, as far as the proceedings of Parliament are concerned, we as members are responsible to the Parliament and the people of South Australia for the conduct of it, and in that spirit I accepted that point of order.

## PETITION: CEMETERIES

A petition signed by 1 406 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to permit only cremation or interment in cemeteries within a residential area was presented by Mr Holloway.

Petition received.

## PETITION: CENTENNIAL PARK CEMETERY

A petition signed by 1 413 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to approve the construction of a garden mausoleum at Centennial Park cemetery was presented by Mr Holloway.

Petition received.

## PETITION: MARINO ROCKS DEVELOPMENT

A petition signed by 749 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to make public all aspects of the proposed marina development at Marino Rocks was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

## PETITION: MALLALA AMBULANCE SERVICE

A petition signed by 664 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain the

Mallala St John Ambulance Service was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

## QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 2, 3, 7, 14, 19, 24 and 29; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

## DUCK SHOOTING SEASON

In reply to **Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light)** 15 February.

The **Hon. S.M. LENEHAN**: The member for Light will be aware that regulations 5 and 42 of the park regulations under the National Parks and Wildlife Act contain the mechanism to allow the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to impose conditions of entry to persons entering the waters of a game reserve where it is in the interests of public safety to do so. I have been advised by National Parks and Wildlife Service officers that this provides the best way of preventing conflict between shooters and protesters at Bool Lagoon where all previous protest activity has been centred.

The date of the first Bool Lagoon shoot has not yet been established as National Parks and Wildlife officers are still monitoring the breeding of egrets to ensure young birds have left the nesting area. When the date of the first shoot is known, a Director's notice under regulations 5 and 42 of the park regulations will be gazetted to address potential safety problems on open days at Bool Lagoon and possibly Poocher Swamp Game Reserves. I might add that the regulations to which I refer came into operation following amendments on 9 March 1989 and therefore were not available as an option at the time the season was gazetted on 5 January 1989.

The circumstances which allow protesters and others to come into close contact with hunters do not generally exist in other game reserves because of the need for specialised equipment such as 4WD vehicles and boats used in order to reach preferred hunting locations. Should information become available to suggest a potential safety problem will occur as a result of protests against duck hunting at other game reserves, then the Director of National Parks and Wildlife Service can issue a gazettal notice restricting access to persons other than hunters on declared open days within game reserves. Whilst the strategy for managing safety issues has changed, my officers are aware of the problems which may occur when any person moves into the close proximity of guns being discharged. Any breaches against the legislation will be policed by National Parks and Wildlife Service staff.

It is clear therefore that I have acted in accordance with my undertaking to the Field and Game Association, to maintain traditional arrangements, and although it is acknowledged that the strategy for addressing safety issues has changed from a gazetted notice under open season provisions of the Act to a Director's notice under park regulations, the intent remains the same.

## EURILLA

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON: (Heysen)** 13 February.  
**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Rockleigh Developments submitted four applications for development of the property known as Eurilla to the District Council of Stirling on 31 August 1989. These applications related to a health retreat, an office and dwelling, and a Country House/Restaurant/Reception and Convention Centre and Reception Centre.

2. The council granted consent under the Planning Act to all four applications on 13 November 1989. The council treated the four applications as consent applications.

3. The Department of Environment and Planning considers the applications to be prohibited within the area known as the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed zone and within the rural landscape zone under that part of the development plan which relates to the area of the District Council of Stirling, and that the applications should have been referred to the South Australian Planning Commission.

4. As the Minister responsible for the administration of the Planning Act, I requested the Crown Solicitor to seek a judicial review as to whether the applications are consent or prohibited uses.

5. The matter was listed in the Supreme Court. Justice Matheson heard and completed the hearing on Tuesday 13 February. I do not wish to comment on the merits of the case while we are waiting for the judgment.

6. As I stated in this House yesterday, I totally refute any suggestion that these applications are being judicially reviewed because of the Government's interests in development at Mount Lofty. It is most improper of the honourable member to make such an allegation. I would like to point out that the applications in question are within the Mount Lofty watershed zone whereas the proposed development on Mount Lofty summit is outside the watershed zone.

7. The Government has reached no opinion on the merits of this development, which it hopes will be considered by the independent South Australian Planning Commission in due course.

8. In relation to the honourable member's statement reported in the *Advertiser* yesterday morning that the council had consulted the Department (of Environment and Planning) extensively before giving approval on 13 November, I would like to set the record straight. This is totally inaccurate: the council advised the department of its intention to approve the applications as consent uses. The department informed the council that they were prohibited and should be referred to the Planning Commission. This advice was ignored by the council.

## MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**The SPEAKER:** A matter of privilege was raised in relation to this Parliament some time ago. I intended to raise it today, but I have been given an undertaking from the parties concerned that the matter will definitely be raised tomorrow. Therefore, I will not raise it today.

## PAPERS TABLED

The follows papers were laid on the table:

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

Committee appointed to examine and report on abortions notified in South Australia—Report, 1988.

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

Public Parks Act 1943—Disposal of Parklands, Clare and Kapunda Roads, Kapunda.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MARINELAND

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I now table nearly 1 000 pages of documents relating to decisions leading to, first, the Tribond redevelopment proposal for Marineland, and subsequently the Zhen Yun proposal. I also table a chronology of events and relevant *Hansard* extracts.

As the House is no doubt aware, in the near future members in another place will vote on the question of establishing a select committee to investigate issues relating to the decisions concerning the redevelopment of Marineland. The Government believes such an inquiry would be both costly and unnecessary as we have been very forthcoming in discussing a range of issues both in the Parliament (and that is reflected in the substantial amount of *Hansard* references attached to these documents) and in comments made outside this place.

As members would be aware, we have also offered full briefings to the Opposition and the Leader of the Democrats—offers which have been rejected. I note also that a recent offer by the West Beach Trust to brief all members of Parliament on Marineland issues was taken up by only one member. Therefore, these documents are being tabled in both Houses today to give members in another place the opportunity to consider the facts before they vote on a select committee. In urging members in another place to consider seriously the need for a select committee, I make it clear that the Government will cooperate fully if a committee is established.

The material which is being tabled today and which I will also be making available to the media constitutes, to the best of my knowledge, all the files in the possession of my ministry and that of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology relevant to the Tribond proposal and the subsequent decision allowing Zhen Yun to develop the Marineland site. I have also asked my colleague the Minister of Local Government to request the West Beach Trust to provide for tabling all relevant documents.

Not included in the material I am tabling today are Cabinet documents, intra-Government legal advice from the Crown Solicitor, minor material (such as invoices) relating to specific payments under the guarantee, and some specific financial information which would be clearly prejudicial to the commercial position of the developers.

Apart from Cabinet documents and Crown Solicitor's advice, all this other material will be made available to members if they wish a private viewing. This can be arranged through my office. In tabling this material I can also confirm the decision to release all parties from the 'confidentiality clause' included in compensation agreements relating to the wind-up of Tribond. On 6 October last year I wrote to the solicitors for the Abels indicating I would agree to a release from the clause, but we are still awaiting a final response from the Abels to the matters raised.

Given that a select committee would wish to examine all aspects of the matter, the Government has decided to do this, notwithstanding that we have not yet received a response from the solicitors for the Abels to the Crown Solicitor's latest letter of 4 December 1989. I make it clear, however, that there are still two cases before the courts and these

limit the comments I can make in relation to the Marineland project. This Government supports and acts on 'Separation of Powers' and it would be quite improper for me to comment on, or answer questions relating to, matters before the court as this may be seen as having a propensity to influence the court. This has been a key point in the exchange of correspondence between the legal representatives of the Government and the Abels.

Therefore, while I have tabled the documents, I am constrained as to the comments I am able to make on their contents, and I will also be constrained in my response to comments that may be made by others about their contents in the public arena. I conclude by reminding members that the Government has at all times endeavoured to provide as much information as possible on this topic, but has had to do so within boundaries of legal and commercial propriety.

**Mr BECKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, in his ministerial statement, the Minister said:

I note also that a recent offer by the West Beach Trust to brief all members of Parliament on Marineland issues was taken up by only one member.

The point of order is that—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The point of order is not accepted by the Chair.

**Mr BECKER:** On a further point of order, Mr Speaker, on what ground is the point of order not accepted? I did not get a chance to explain.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I heard enough from the honourable member to suggest that there was not a point of order in what he was raising.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOMESURE SCHEME

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** On Thursday, 15 February, the Leader of the Opposition raised a question relating to incorrect advice being provided to Homesure applicants. Regrettably, some applicants for Homesure were wrongly advised by Homesure and for this I have written to those people affected and offered my sincere apology. The facts of the case are as follows:

Shortly after the Homesure computer system became operational a program error resulted in the computer issuing a small number of incorrect letters. This error was not detected for some days during which the system issued second and correct letters to some of these applicants. Unfortunately, as the error was a system fault which was subsequently corrected by improvement to the system the numbers of applicants receiving incorrect advice cannot be determined, but it is believed that about six applicants were affected.

When the error was detected, all applications processed to date were checked manually to verify that correct advice had been sent to every applicant and the Housing Trust is confident that every application processed has now been correctly responded to and that the computerised and manual systems are now in place to avoid any further errors of this type. Each application is now checked three times.

While this mistake was most unfortunate, it is clear that it resulted from administrative error and not policy change as has been inferred by the Opposition.

## QUESTION TIME

### TRUCK DRIVERS DISPUTE

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition):** Has the Premier consulted the Prime Minister about the truck drivers dispute; will he seek the Prime Minister's intervention in view of the national impact of the dispute and suggest he should use the same tactics adopted against the pilots, namely, cancelling the awards of truck drivers; and will the South Australian Government also provide police protection to those truck drivers who do not wish to participate in blockades and other action which is stopping general cargo into and out of South Australia?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The situation with the truck dispute is very concerning. What looked like a settlement last week was obviously not a formula that was satisfactory to a large number of those involved, and the dispute has been renewed and seems to be spreading. Obviously, the implications of this dispute on commerce in this country, and on a number of other areas, are very grave. I make the point that the origin of this dispute lies in the approach taken by the New South Wales Government following a particularly bad road smash in that State after which certain policies were produced and announced very rapidly. From that position the matter has been very hard to resolve.

I might say that the New South Wales Liberal Government—the philosophy and policies of which are closely adhered to by the South Australian Opposition—has a singularly bad record in relation to industrial matters. Over the past year or so there has been absolute chaos in a number of sectors of New South Wales industry, both public and private, and this situation is a further example of something that has got out of hand. One wonders whether, if this Government was a little more skilled and a little less ideologically based, it might have been able to see it through. Now, of course, that State is in big trouble, and so is the nation. It is calling on the Prime Minister to step in and fix the problem.

At this stage I am not aware of the moves being made at national levels, but I know that the Minister for Land Transport and Shipping Support and other Federal Ministers are involved in the matter and it is hoped that some resolution will take place at that level. The South Australian Minister of Labour has also been involved in discussions but, as this is a national dispute, not a great deal can be done directly from this end. We will certainly lend any assistance that we can towards a speedy and effective settlement.

However, I repeat that the origins of the dispute lie in another jurisdiction which is out of our hands and consequently is hard to solve. The effects of it have certainly been felt. An analogy has been drawn by the Leader of the Opposition who suggests that the approach taken should be akin to that taken in the pilots' dispute where the union placed itself outside the normal industrial relations framework and was eventually put in the position of being rendered ineffective and null and void industrially. I make the point that in that case the union went completely outside the wages agreement and accord which had been observed by the trade union movement and which is fundamental to wage stability and the economic progress of this country. I suggest that the circumstances which led to that point are different from those existing in this situation, which is not a dispute about wages or the direction of the economy but is related to impositions upon truck drivers to which they are objecting.

I hope that the matter is solved speedily, but it is interesting to note that the New South Wales Government,

which is involved in this fracas, is demanding that the Prime Minister intervene. I hope he is able to do something, but I throw back to the Leader of the Opposition the suggestion that he should talk to his colleague in the Liberal Party of New South Wales and see whether he can prevail on him to do something for South Australia. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition has a lot more influence over Mr Greiner than I and I therefore ask him to take up the matter with him.

#### COALITION AGAINST CRIME

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** Will the Premier inform the House when the first meeting of the Coalition Against Crime will be held and who will be invited to that meeting? During the latter part of 1989 the Government announced that \$10 million had been allocated for the prevention of crime over the next five years. Part of that announcement included the formation of the Coalition Against Crime to comprise community representatives, members of Neighbourhood Watch, community leaders, representatives of local government, business and unions and church and youth organisations.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am pleased to advise the honourable member that the first meeting of the Coalition against Crime has been scheduled for this Thursday evening, 22 February. I will be chairing that meeting and my colleagues will be joining me to discuss, on an inaugural basis, the role that that group can play in our Government crime prevention plan. It is a matter of highest priority. I remind the House that the plan, which involves, amongst other things, setting aside some \$10 million over the next five years to fund crime prevention initiatives, including grants to community groups and the non-government sector, is now under way.

In the current year we have seen funding for programs to extend the Police Department's blue light concept to include camps and other youth activities; the establishment of a police deputies club; the computer mapping of crime data by the Police Department to pin-point target areas for crime prevention activities; funding for the provision of activities for street kids away from the inner city; and advice and practical handy-person assistance to the aged on home security.

We believe that all these programs, and a number of others that are under way, including Neighbourhood Watch, as referred to by the honourable member, will be effective only if there is a broad-based coalition to guarantee continued community involvement in developing priorities for our crime prevention program. The issue is not for someone else to deal with, whether it be government or anybody else; it is for us to deal with collectively as a community. As a consequence a wide representation has been sought for the coalition from the groups mentioned by the honourable member in his explanation, and I will certainly be happy to supply members, upon request, with a list of those invited.

The Government is committed to the plan and the involvement of the community. I believe that, by working together, we can do some trail-blazing work on an international basis here in South Australia in dealing with crime not only as it is manifest in our community at the moment but also with the underlying causes and social problems that lead to criminal behaviour.

#### TRUCK DRIVERS DISPUTE

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that a Coalition member of the Legisla-

tive Council in Victoria, Mr Ken Wright, has negotiated an agreement with truckies to allow wine grapes, table grapes and citrus to be moved through blockades in Victoria and New South Wales? Has the Minister attempted to negotiate similar agreements for South Australian producers who wish to move produce through Mildura or Wentworth? If not, will he do so? Members of the TWU have blockaded bridges at Mildura and Wentworth for grapes and fresh fruit bound for South Australia and for South Australian fruit bound for Victoria and New South Wales.

We have been contacted by Hardy's Wines of Reynella and others who say that South Australian fruit is perishing in the sun and, in addition, that the South Australian Riverland grapes normally processed at Mildara winery are being halted at the border while Victorian fruit is being allowed through because of the exemption negotiated by Mr Ken Wright.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am not aware of the Upper House member in the Victorian Legislature. The press reports this morning with respect to the Transport Workers Union in this State indicated that it was allowing perishables to move. That was my understanding. If that were the case, grapes should be moving. If the honourable member is saying that perishables are not moving, I will certainly make inquiries to see whether or not any consideration can be given to perishable products being allowed to move, as I take the point that the honourable member raises. As the Premier previously indicated, we are dealing with matters involving other jurisdictions and it is not within my power to involve myself in those other jurisdictions. If the press reports are inaccurate, as they might be, given the honourable member's question, I will make intercession on behalf of the agricultural sector in an attempt to allow perishables to move.

#### ABORIGINAL MOBILE PATROLS

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say how many people the mobile Aboriginal patrols have assisted in the first month of operation? The Muirhead Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody identified a high proportion of deaths being related to short terms of confinement for drunkenness. The Commissioner emphasised the desirability of appropriate civilians being responsible for intoxicated people, including transporting them to places of care.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** As he is a former Minister, I am aware of the honourable member's interest and work in this area. In late December last year, the Deputy Premier and I announced the establishment of a mobile assistance patrol. The patrol will be based at the Aboriginal Sobriety Group to cover the Adelaide metropolitan area, Calperum, Murray Bridge and the Lower Murray area. The patrols are managed and operated by Aboriginal people, and that is absolutely essential: the Muirhead Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody recommended specifically that, if these schemes are to be successful, they must be run and operated by Aboriginal people to gain acceptance from that community.

The patrols will be able to assist with the transfer of intoxicated Aborigines to places of safety such as a sobering up centre, the ASG's own facility, their homes, hospital, or other appropriate facilities. The service will be a much more acceptable alternative to having drunken persons being picked up by the police and placed in cells where they are at risk. The patrols are funded by the South Australian Health Commission under the Government's social justice

strategy, and the two services that are in operation will cost in the vicinity of \$300 000 a year to service on a 24-hour call-out basis.

In the first month of operation (January), the mobile assistance patrol, without all the facilities that will be essential for it to be up and running during the year, assisted 82 persons. As was indicated in last night's edition of the *7.30 Report*, the Government believes that this scheme could prove to be a major step forward in eliminating Aboriginal deaths in custody in this State. We must look at constructive, long-term solutions, not knee-jerk reactions to serious social problems.

#### STATE BANK

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Can the Premier confirm a report in yesterday's *Melbourne Age* that the State Bank group has exposures of \$275 million to five major groups, not including the National Safety Council, which have gone into receivership in the past year? Can he identify the groups involved and provide estimates of the amount by which the State Bank will increase its provision for bad and doubtful debts?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I presume that the honourable member was referring to the State Bank of South Australia, so I will make some inquiries to see what information I can provide.

#### NATIONAL TASK FORCE ON PACKAGING

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House of the aims of the new national task force on packaging?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** The new national task force on packaging is yet another example of South Australians showing the rest of Australia the way to do things. Last year at the ANZEC conference—the Australian and New Zealand Environment Ministers Council—I suggested to the interstate and New Zealand Environment Ministers that a national approach was needed to address the issue of packaging of products for sale. The council agreed, and the Australian and New Zealand Environment Council has now established a national task force which will be administered through the South Australian Department of Environment and Planning.

Product packaging is an important environmental issue in the litter and waste debate. This Government is committed to taking effective measures to ensure reduction in the amount of waste produced. It is also committed to tackling litter and pollution problems. It is important to ease the pressure on waste disposal sites by conserving our resources and this can be achieved through reducing the amount of packaging and altering the type of packaging.

Some of the terms of reference of the task force include: first, an investigation of packaging degradability, which obviously (as I am sure all members would recognise) is an important aspect; secondly, the use of resources in the production of packaging; thirdly, packaging litter, recycling and economics (in other words, one must examine the economics of such proposals); and, finally, an examination of the need for national guidelines for product packaging. The task force, which will involve representatives from Government, industry, and consumer and conservation groups, will prepare a specific strategy, which will also have public input before the final report goes before the Environment Ministers' Council in July of this year.

#### WEST BEACH SEAWALL

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise this House why last year she authorised the suppression of bungled negotiations for the financing of a seawall associated with the proposed Zhen Yun development at West Beach?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I have no knowledge of any such proposal or of the question that the honourable member has raised. I am not aware of any seawall proposal and bungling, and it is certainly not my responsibility as Minister for Environment and Planning to be involved in such financial negotiations.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Mr Speaker, if I am allowed to answer the question: I guess one can only answer the question as honestly as the facts stand. I do not have any information at the moment about this particular question.

#### NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** Can the Minister of Emergency Services confirm a report in this morning's *Sydney Morning Herald* that the first Operation Ark report completed by Mr Justice Stewart questioned the Police Commissioner's oversight of the Internal Investigations Branch of the Police Force and, if so, what action, if any, does the Government intend to take over this matter?

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I do not intend to release any information or to comment on any questions people have on a report that has not been released.

#### BICYCLE HELMETS

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** Can the Minister of Transport inform the House when bicycle helmets for school children will again be available under the Government's rebate scheme? In November 1989 the Government introduced a bicycle helmet rebate scheme to increase the wearing of helmets by children. The first stage of that scheme ended in December last year and some 5 000 helmets were purchased. Stage 2 was to commence early this year.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Mitchell for his question. As members would know, stage 1 of the scheme has been completed, and it was very successful indeed. The \$10 rebate resulted in some 5 000 of the helmets available being sold in about three weeks. That was a very successful first stage. The commencement of stage 2, to which the member for Mitchell refers, has been held up slightly because of negotiations taking place between manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers. Some retailers approached me and suggested that they were disadvantaged by not being able to be part of the scheme and that, with the helmets available in stage 1 being available only through community health centres, they felt it was costing them some business.

I had some sympathy with that point of view. It was not our intention to disadvantage anyone: our principal aim, of course, was to see that as many schoolchildren as possible had helmets that their parents could afford at the commencement of the school term. However, I am very pleased to be able to announce that stage 2 will commence in the middle of March. The scheme will operate somewhat differently from stage 1, with individual schools being more involved in its organisation.

Information will soon be sent to schools but, essentially, this scheme will work by schools and their parent groups getting together with selected retailers and wholesalers to bulk purchase the helmets they require. So, there may well be something in it also for the schools, and that would be tremendous. The bulk purchase program, along with our rebate, will make the helmets even cheaper, and we hope this will encourage even more schoolchildren to wear helmets when riding their bicycles.

However, it is not just a case of buying helmets off the shelf. The helmet must be fitted to suit the individual child, so we have agreed with participating retailers and suppliers that the individual fitting of the helmet will be done by those people involved in the scheme. Starting from about the middle of March, a further 5 000 helmets will be available, and I hope that long before the end of this year we will have a scheme in place that provides a further 25 000 helmets.

I am sure that all members of the House will agree that this is a very desirable scheme, and I hope that we do not reach the stage of having to legislate for the compulsory wearing of helmets for people who ride bicycles. However, I think that that will be the next stage, and the Federal Government, with its road safety package, appears to be adamant on that. I implore all parents to ensure that their children get in now whilst the helmets are cheaper, because it is likely that in the not too distant future it will be compulsory for helmets to be worn.

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on the next question, I inform the House that two questions asked earlier today seeking opinions on newspaper reports are clearly out of order under Standing Orders, and I will be so ruling in the future. The honourable member for Peake.

#### 'FEELING GREAT' CAMPAIGN

**Mr HERON (Peake):** Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport outline to the House the recently launched concept 'Feeling great', which I believe is an initiative of the South Australian Recreation Institute, a division of the South Australian Department of Recreation and Sport?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I am delighted to be able to outline to the House the basis of our 'Feeling great' campaign, which I am sure most members would support in terms of their own lifestyle. 'Feeling great' is important in terms of the strategies which we have developed with the South Australian Recreation Institute. It is a slogan that will be used throughout the year, and various stages will be developed during 1990 to highlight to the community the benefits of recreation, whether it involves walking or any other form of recreation.

The first launch was conducted on 16 February to tie in with the celebration of the first anniversary of the 'Getting out' supplement issued in the *Advertiser* each Friday. The idea is to reach as many people in the community as possible in order to enhance their level of awareness of the benefits of active recreation and also to highlight the activities that will be available throughout the year for the benefit of the South Australian community. The slogan has been chosen carefully to engender a feeling within the community that will encourage people themselves actually to participate in recreation, rather than sit back in a passive sense; to provide throughout the community a widespread basis for recreation; and, as with the 'Life. Be in it' campaign, to strike a chord with which most people will feel some empathy.

It is very important that, with the slogan, we bring home the aspects of not only active recreation but also relaxation:

increased self-awareness and self-esteem; an interest in learning and being included in these groups which participate in learning as part of recreation; achieving in one's own right, as well as being part of a group that achieves; and responsibility in recreating: whether it be walking, bush walking, cycling or anything else, it is part of the socialising, the fun, and being in the recreation environment.

We are also bringing home the fact that it is a cohesive force that brings families together. In fact, participation is not only for the community but also for families. We have seen many successful events. During the past year, we had the great honour of staging one of the most outstanding recreation awards ceremonies—it was certainly unique in Australia—at the Hilton Hotel. We saw people from all walks of life—boy scouts, community groups, child care groups and people who are actively involved in such things as kindergym.

It is important that we, as a community, realise the benefits of recreation. That is why we, as a Government, have supported, and will continue to support, the achievements of the South Australian Recreation Institute, which we see as unique and which has made a very significant contribution to South Australia. I encourage all members to get out and join the 'Feeling Great' campaign during 1990 and to enjoy our recreation facilities.

#### WEST BEACH SEAWALL

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** Does the Premier accept responsibility for the bungling by his department of negotiations for the construction of a seawall at West Beach to protect the Zhen Yun development and does the Government accept the advice of the Coast Protection Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning that its acceptance of financial responsibility for construction and maintenance of the seawall sets a precedent that will allow local government councils to seek similar financial support for coast protection in their area?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Like the Minister for Environment and Planning, I am not aware of the seawall proposal. Therefore, I am afraid I cannot comment any further.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### PORT RIVER POLLUTION

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Can the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House whether Port River water pollution is caused, or aggravated, by the release of ballast water from ships' holds? A recent media report suggested that polluted ballast water from ships could be the cause of algal blooms and other pollution in the Port River.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I am aware of his involvement in terms of protection of the environment in his electorate, which, of course, includes part of the Port River. I also note your involvement, Mr Speaker, in some of these issues. First, ships do discharge ballast into the Port River and, although there are some exotic species that appear to have been introduced into South Australian waters by shipping, at this stage there is only circumstantial evidence that includes some of the algae involved in the red tides in these waters. In terms of what we can do about this situation, there are no international controls on organisms that are carried in ballast or as fouling on ships.

It is unlikely that any country will act unilaterally to set standards in this area, but I believe that effective control will probably have to wait for the extension of negotiations on the London Convention which, of course, covers the environmental aspects and effects of ships at sea. To answer the honourable member's question, I am concerned about the allegations. However, at this stage, there is no hard or definitive evidence to support the allegations and I think that we will have to work on it. Certainly, my colleague the Minister of Marine will no doubt be involved in future negotiations in relation to the London Convention. I hope that we can achieve an across-the-board setting of standards to ensure that the problem does not continue in ports right around the world.

#### NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** Has the Premier or his Director-General received any written communication recently from the National Crime Authority about its investigation of certain matters referred to the authority in February last year by the Attorney-General and, if so, when was that communication received and is the Premier in a position to reveal what was contained in the communication?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** No, I am not aware of any written communication on that matter. I imagine that the honourable member is referring to a particular matter in which the Attorney-General himself was involved—that reference to the NCA. If that is the case, I am not aware of any written report, progress document or anything of that kind. As I understand it, obviously it will not be until inquiries are concluded that the Government will be in receipt of a report on that matter.

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

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** My colleague, the Deputy Premier, mentions that that was confirmed to him at the time that he was Acting Premier.

#### HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** What provision is the Minister of Health preparing to make for the delivery of health services in South Australia should the national Government change at the next election? I have noticed in a recent letter-boxed Liberal pamphlet a list of policy releases. I looked under 'H' and found nothing for health. Has the Minister had any better luck?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I think that the honourable member who asked the question really—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I think that the honourable member who asked the question expects a little too much of me, because it is very difficult to make any plans predicated against a policy which simply does not exist. I also have this rather shoddily produced publication in front of me, it having been handed to me earlier today. It talks about 32 Coalition policies launched since the last election. It is an alphabetical list. I also find that between Foreign Affairs and Heritage there is no reference to Health whatsoever. This is very serious indeed. Health is one of the major concerns of any individual who looks at the policies of the major Parties in determining the way in which he or she should vote at a particular election. The concern is that the Liberal Party is asking us to—

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader will please come to order.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The concern is that there is and will be no policy and people are being asked to buy a pig in a poke. The concern for the States must be this. We have a system in this country which is supported by most of the State Administrations and, I believe, by a considerable majority of the electors. That says that we should have a mixed system in the delivery of health and health care in this country. If one wants to go out and purchase a health service just as one purchases a television set, one can do so; but if one does not want to do that—almost certainly because it is beyond one's means—there is another way in which that occurs, and that is that the State purchases that service on behalf of the individual and delivers it to him or her. That is what the Medicare agreement is all about and that is what I support.

If the Liberal Party is intending to abandon that policy (and that would be consistent with its general philosophy), what sort of transfer payments are to be put in place to ensure that modest to low-income earners can still have access to reasonable health services, which we may well claim are as good as any which are available around the civilised world? What sort of transfer payments are available? The alternative is that the States must have a reasonable share of the taxation dollar so that these services, which are provided through the States, can continue to be provided.

The plain fact of the matter is that there is no policy and we do not know whether Medicare will continue should the people of Australia be so misled as to vote for the Liberals or, if so, in what form it will continue, or what may replace it. I suggest that we may well anticipate a new advertisement on television before very long: the question will be 'Dear Andrew, why do you not have a policy?' and the answer will be 'Because I cannot think of one.'

#### ETSA

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy review immediately practices followed by the Electricity Trust without adequate public consultation in view of representations that he has received from the Stirling council complaining that ETSA's intention to cut trees along 40 roads in the council area will amount to 'indiscriminate vandalism', cause a 'totally unacceptable level of damage' and result in 'in many instances total removal of magnificent tree specimens'. The council also accuses the trust of making 'no realistic attempt to investigate the alternative means available to achieve a compromise between environmental concerns and electricity distribution considerations'.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I remind the honourable member that the Electricity Trust of South Australia is acting under an Act and regulations which have been passed by both Houses of this Parliament. Having said that, I am prepared to take this particular case under consideration.

#### PAP SMEAR CAMPAIGN

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Can the Minister of Health say whether he is aware of any intention to continue the funding of the Pap smear campaign, an important pilot project currently operating in the Spencer Gulf region? Because of an abnormally high incidence of cervical cancer



deaths in the region in comparison with national figures, a project was commenced to educate women on the importance of presenting themselves for screening tests to allow for early detection of cancer and preventive measures, if needed, which could reduce the number of deaths.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I can give the honourable member that assurance. The Health Commission is concerned that these sorts of programs—and I instance also the mammography screening program—should continue because of their considerable capacity to reduce not only hospitalisation but death from these forms of disease. However, I do not have the specific details of the extent of the continuation of the campaign or its scope, but I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

## SECONDARY SCHOOL ENROLMENTS

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** My question, directed to the Minister of Education, is about Bannon's Berlin wall. Will Mount Gambier's two high schools continue to accept enrolment of students living in the Glenelg River district of Western Victoria and, if so, why has the Minister made representations to the Victorian Government to prevent any more South Australian students from being enrolled at Murrayville Secondary College in Victoria? Will the Minister seek a review of this decision following local reaction to it?

South Australian school buses cross the border daily to ferry students from Nelson and elsewhere in the Glenelg River district of Western Victoria to Grant and Mount Gambier High Schools.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes. However, in what appears to be a complete negation of the Government's professed equal opportunity and social justice strategies, the Minister has acted to prevent students in the Murray-Mallee near Pinnaroo from crossing the border to attend secondary school at Murrayville in Victoria.

Since it was revealed early this month that the Minister had asked his Victorian counterpart to stop further South Australian enrolments at Murrayville Secondary College, many parents in the community from both sides of the border and from the area of the District Council of Pinnaroo have spoken out against this decision. Coming on top of last year's closure of secondary school courses at the Pinnaroo Area School, this ban will condemn some students to travelling up to 160 kms per day to attend the Lamerook Area School when they would need to travel only 50 kms a day to attend Murrayville.

I have received a letter from Mr Philip Wood, the District Clerk of the Pinnaroo District Council, which summarises the local response. He states:

Council believe that education of children is a basic democratic right and that it is the parents freedom of choice to send their children to Lamerook, Murrayville, Adelaide or wherever. Surely the border should not become a 'Berlin wall' for the residents who utilise both sides of the border for educational, health, sporting, business and religious activities.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for raising the question and for allowing me the opportunity to put on record the reality of the situation with which we are faced in this area of the State in our attempt to improve the quality of education and offering to students in a climate of declining enrolments. With respect to schools around Mount Gambier, there have been long established and quite adequate arrangements for the education of children, particularly those who live closer to the schools in Victoria. Those long established arrangements serve the community well. A similar arrangement exists with respect

to children from South Australia who live close to the school at Murrayville. Those children will continue to attend that school, as will their brothers and sisters when they reach school age.

Clearly there has been an attempt by a group of people to take a different course of action to bring down or destabilise the new secondary arrangements we have established for children in that area, namely, the combination of the secondary program in three area schools: Lamerook, Pinnaroo and Geranium. That is an attempt to broaden the curriculum offering for those students to provide assistance to children who want to stay on at school until Year 12 and to cope with a climate of declining enrolments.

Whilst people want to have freedom of choice, who will pay for it? The honourable member might like to tell his constituents, local councils and indeed the community who will pay the additional costs associated with this disparity in enrolments. We have a situation of declining enrolments in a school and that school saying that it wants to receive grants and apportionment of funds greater than those for other schools in the State because it does not want to accept change: it wants to leave things as they are. People have told me, sadly, that they do not want the new curriculum offering; they do not want access to greater educational opportunities, because their children do not need them as they will be doing certain types of work in the local community.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the member for Kavel to take note of his behaviour as he is well aware of the results if he continues as he is.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** People do not want to face the reality that demands will be placed on young children entering our schools. The demands that will be placed on them when they come out of our schools are different from and greater than those perceived by their parents and local communities. We have an obligation to provide those educational opportunities—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Murray-Mallee.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** Where a local community wants to see an education system run down, to look backwards rather than to the future and to put at risk the opportunities for young people, we have a different situation to manage, indeed. Over recent years discussions have been going on in these local communities and it got to the stage where the school council agreed that changes had to be made and that there had to be a restructuring of schools in that area. Since that time there has been substantial discussion in the community through public meetings and with various levels of the Education Department. I have received deputations from the council, from representatives of the school, community, and so on. We have tried to work our way through this complex and difficult situation for that rural community. We had to make change. We have tried to make the changes that we believe are in the interests of the community in conjunction with discussions held within that community. It is not true to say that the whole community opposes these moves: substantial support exists within the community for them.

On the other hand, it is true to say that a number of people have opposed them from the very beginning, and still oppose them, and have taken this step to transfer children from the South Australian school system. It is not true to say that I issued a directive to the Victorian Government. There were discussions at officer level about this matter to try to resolve the situation in the best interests of



both education systems, and I believe that the arrangements that have been reached are appropriate in the circumstances. However, if there are cases of extreme hardship, as the honourable member suggests, they will be looked at on a case by case basis, as has always been done in the past.

This issue is not quite as simple as the honourable member may perceive it to be and it is certainly not a matter of frivolity: it is a serious matter. The Education Department is vested with grave responsibilities and it will not shirk difficult decisions or see our schools run down through lack of action. Young people will not be disadvantaged because there is a lack of will either within the Education Department or within local communities to accept changing circumstances.

### MILK VENDORS

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Will the Minister of Agriculture advise the House whether any changes have been made to the hours when milk vendors are able to deliver to households? I understand that last night a television news segment showed the Minister delivering milk, complete with apron and van. This morning I had a query from a constituent who saw the segment and wanted to know whether the Minister was moonlighting.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** In answer to the last part of the honourable member's question, I advise that I have not received any recompense, not even a carton of milk. What I can say is that a very exciting development has taken place for householders who have milk delivered and for milk vendors. Until recently, milk vendors had to deliver milk after midnight and before dawn so that, in hot weather, milk left on the doorstep would not foul. That meant numerous problems for many milk vendors, in terms of the possibility of milk money being stolen and in terms of householders not being able to make a last minute change of mind because they might be soundly asleep at the time milk was delivered.

That has probably contributed to the decline, over the past 15 years, in the number of households that have milk delivered. About 15 years ago, 70 per cent of households had milk delivered; that figure is now 34 per cent. The number has reached a plateau but is still down on the 1970s figure. The Metropolitan Milk Board conducted a trial over 12 months with five milk vendors who were permitted to deliver milk between 5 o'clock in the afternoon and late evening. Those five vendors all found that they increased not only the volume of milk they delivered but also the number of households receiving deliveries. It also benefited the turnover of those peripheral products that milk vendors are permitted to sell. It meant a better return for the vendors and better service for their customers, who could add or delete items from their order while speaking to the vendor.

I am advised that a further 12 milk vendors are expressing strong interest in this program and, ultimately, 150 of the 340 vendors in this State may find it a worthwhile proposition to move to these delivery times. I commend the Metropolitan Milk Board for its experiment and the Metropolitan Milk Vendors Association for being part of it. I believe it has good potential for households and milk vendors who have seen their marketplace being eroded over the past 15 years.

### ADELAIDE WATER SUPPLY

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** Will the Minister of Water Resources confirm that the Engineering and Water Supply

Department has been aware for some time of high algae counts in the Adelaide water supply but was directed to take no action to correct the problem until the public began to complain about it? There are now widespread complaints being made in the north-eastern suburbs about the taste and odour of the water supply. I have been advised by a very reliable source that water in Millbrook reservoir, which supplies the north-eastern suburbs, has had a high algae count for many weeks, but the department did nothing about this until the quality of water deteriorated to the point where the public began to complain about it. It was only last Friday that the department began treating the Millbrook reservoir, which feeds the Anstey Hill filtration plant supplying the north-east. I am further advised that the reason that the department allowed the water quality to deteriorate to a totally unacceptable standard was that of budget constraints imposed by the Government.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** There are a number of aspects to that question, not the least of which is asking the question and answering it as well. The department has made some public statements on this situation, and I share the concerns of residents about the quality of water. However, I am informed by the department that the problem which arose leading to the poor water quality received by residents in the north, including, I understand, suburbs such as Golden Grove, Tea Tree Gully, Modbury and Northfield, was not something that could easily be controlled. The honourable member has made some accusations against the department, imputing motives to the department and suggesting that it has not—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I am sure members would like to think it was the Minister. I assure the House that I have not given any orders, issued any instructions or anything else to the department to say that it was not to proceed with this treatment. I am happy to inform the House what the treatment was. The treatment of the plant with activated carbon had reduced the taste and odours caused by the algae, but these were still very noticeable. Mr Alexander, the Chief Executive Officer of the department, has informed me that the department could not change over immediately to supplying the plant from the Millbrook reservoir, as this was affected by other species of algae. This is not a simple matter, and I am sure the honourable member is aware that the whole question is not one that can simply be addressed overnight.

Quite rightly, she pointed out to the House that the Millbrook reservoir was treated on Friday to get rid of algae, and that the department was able to start using it to supply the Anstey Hill plant shortly after that. Some parts of the area supplied will start to notice an improvement very shortly but it could take two or three days for the filtered Millbrook water to reach most consumers, and possibly longer on the outskirts of the area.

I regret that this has happened and that the quality of water in this area is not up to its usual high standard. I remind members that we have the poorest quality of water in the country to start with. Water comes from the Murray River and, indeed, from our own catchment area which, I am sure members opposite who represent some of those areas would support me in saying, is highly used. Investigations are already under way to look at ways of preserving our water quality. Notwithstanding that, this Government has spent millions of dollars on filtration plants, the latest and not the least of which is in the area represented by the member for Fisher, and that is the Happy Valley filtration plant. I believe that we are doing as much as is humanly possible for any Government to provide safe, clean and

filtered water to the citizens of Adelaide. Again, I apologise to those citizens in the north-east who have had to put up with this temporary problem, but I reject the assertions and allegations made against my department by the honourable member.

#### DOMICILIARY CARE

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** I address my question to the Deputy Premier, in his capacity as Minister of Community Welfare. Can the Minister inform the House when the report of the review into domiciliary care services will be released?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Yes, I certainly can, and I would direct the attention of members to the contents of that report. There are a number of detailed recommendations in it, through which my officers will be working. It is all very much part of our strategy in relation to the way in which we should be delivering health services these days.

As we move more and more into day surgery, obviously that puts greater strains on the services of the Royal District Nursing Society (RDNS) and Domiciliary Care, as people who would otherwise be under the care of a hospital are at home and, therefore, given that there is some continuing care required in the convalescent phase, are under the care of Domiciliary Care or the RDNS. So, we understand how important it is that these services should continue to be delivered in as efficient a manner as possible, and this report is an attempt to ensure that that occurs. I draw the attention of members to the recommendations of that report, which is available right now.

#### SCRIMBER

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** Will the Minister of Forests advise the House as to the volume of scrimber so far produced for commercial sale? The Minister will recall that in March 1988 the Scrimber International process development engineer indicated publicly that production would commence in October 1988.

The Minister may also recall that, during the budget Estimates Committee hearing, he acknowledged that there had been some delays but predicted that from the date of commissioning up to 30 June 1990 some 12 000 cubic metres would have been produced commercially. I think that the Minister said at the same time that he did not want to be held specifically to that target.

The Minister also indicated that, as from February 1990, or thereabouts, an annual production rate of 45 000 cubic metres should have been reached with the plant in full production. A recent press release from the Managing Director of Scrimber International (dated 19 January) now appears to indicate that full production—even the first stage of commercial production—is still some way off. In the *Border Watch* he is quoted as saying:

We are talking of reaching full production in terms of fully testing all stages rather than giving out speculative dates that for one reason or another cannot be met. Regardless of when—it will happen. That is the line we are taking.

The Managing Director indicated that the three levels of design ranged from the point where there was random production, then commercial suitability—which I understand is the position currently—with the plant operating eight hours a day, followed by full production of 24 hours a day for 365 days a year. Will the Minister advise the present situation regarding commercial manufacture of this excellent product?

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I thank the honourable member for, in his question (which is an important one), quoting me accurately instead of merely taking one part of the quote and leaving the rest. Certainly, I have been careful to try to avoid being held to specific dates, because we are dealing with a completely new product. This scrimber product, as everyone knows, is a world first; consequently, one can expect some problems during the commissioning stage. Unfortunately, they have, in fact, occurred. Commissioning problems and mechanical problems have arisen during the early production trials. Equipment suppliers have been involved with scrimber engineers in resolving those problems. In consequence, there will be a delay before the product reaches the market.

One thing that is making the scrimber engineers and producers very careful is the fact that we are producing a new product, and the first few months production will probably determine the attitude of the market to this product. If we do not get it absolutely right from the word 'go', we will spend years trying to overcome the early scepticism about the quality of the product. Therefore, it is with my blessing that it is being looked at as carefully as possible, and all the strength and consistency characteristics that are capable of being produced in scrimber should, in fact, be present right from the very first beam sold on a commercial basis.

Therefore, it is likely that full production will not now take place until June or July. It is difficult to give a specific date, because commercial production will depend on being able to guarantee quality, and for that we need the guaranteed quality of the machinery.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HENLEY AND GRANGE COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education):** I lay on the table the ministerial statement relating to Henley and Grange council boundaries made earlier today in another place by my colleague (the Minister of Local Government).

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: TRUCK BLOCKADE

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** During Question Time today the member for Chaffey advised the House that there was a blockage of transport at Mildura, and that Hardy's had a truckload of grapes rotting in the sun. I know that the member for Chaffey would not deliberately mislead the House, and I believe that he has been misled. When I asked my officers to check with Hardy's, they were advised that Hardy's has yet to have a grape truck go through today. Hardy's stopped grape picking for fear of its trucks being stopped.

The company has recommenced picking and trucks are due to go through tonight. The Transport Workers' Union advises that grapes will be classified as perishable goods and excluded under the bans along with fresh vegetables, livestock and medical supplies.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Sir, it is normal when a ministerial statement is before the House that copies are supplied to the Opposition, and we would appreciate that courtesy.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is not upheld.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WEST BEACH TRUST**

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** I seek leave to make an explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I believe that I have been misrepresented in this place by the Minister of State Development. In his ministerial statement today, he made the following assertion:

I note also that a recent offer by the West Beach Trust to brief all members of Parliament on Marineland issues has been taken up by only one member.

An offer might have been made either before or during the *interregnum* of the State election but, since the previous member for Hayward chose to remove from her office all records relating to her duties, I cannot comment on that. However, since I have been the member for Hayward I have received no invitation, either verbal or written, from the West Beach Trust and, therefore, I ask in that spirit that the Minister modify his explanation.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WEST BEACH TRUST**

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr BECKER:** My personal explanation follows along the lines of that of the member for Hayward in relation to the—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** It is not pitiful, and this is the crux of the whole issue. The ministerial statement related to the offer of the West Beach Trust to brief members. I have not been approached by the West Beach Trust to be briefed on any Marineland issues. As the member of Parliament for the district, I was constantly kept informed by the former Chairman and by the late General Manager, Bob Porter, of any major happenings, proposals or developments.

I understand that the Opposition has not received any such offer, either. I consider that the Minister's statement is further proof of the misleading information and errors made by the Government over this issue, as well as locking up the real story in Cabinet documents.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION: TRUCK BLOCKADE**

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The Minister of Labour has suggested that I misled the House. I want to assure the Minister that truckloads of grapes in transit from the Riverland of South Australia to the Mildara Winery are being blocked. The Transport Workers' Union might be supporting the passage of fruit to Mildura, but the truck operators themselves are blocking the highway. The Minister, as a keen wine drinker, would be aware that wine grapes left in a truck for a matter of only a few hours are literally destroyed. Grapes are a highly perishable commodity. In fact, an additional hour in a truck can have a devastating effect on the quality of wine made from those grapes. I ask the Minister to reconsider what he has just said; it is an urgent situation.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That comment is out of order.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WEST BEACH TRUST**

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr OSWALD:** In relation to the offer to brief members on the West Beach Trust, I am one of the members with an electorate immediately adjacent to the West Beach Trust. I state quite categorically that no invitation was extended. Some weeks ago, indeed at about Christmas, I wrote to the Premier seeking such a briefing from either him or his officers, on what was happening in the West Beach Trust area. The Premier has not even had the courtesy to acknowledge that letter. It is one thing to refuse a briefing, it is another thing to at least write back acknowledging receipt of the letter and thanking me. I totally deny the suggestion that we were offered a briefing; we were not offered a briefing and it is about time the Government was honest in its explanations.

**ADDRESS IN REPLY**

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 15 February. Page 228.)

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition):** I begin by commending His Excellency for his continuing service to this State. It is traditional to do so in this debate. However, I go further than that in stating that Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan have earned our appreciation for many more reasons. During November last year they travelled extensively in the South-East of South Australia and I was at most of the functions they attended. I believe that their affinity with the people of the district and their understanding of the needs and opportunities of those people is outstanding. I believe it is a great credit to Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan that they have this understanding of people throughout South Australia. During this Parliament it will be the duty of the Government to nominate their successors and I trust that the Government will act in the same wise manner as the Tonkin Government in nominating the Dunstans.

It is appropriate that I congratulate the Premier on his re-election. Putting our political differences aside, any person in political life today who leads his or her Party for a decade and takes it to three election victories deserves recognition for those achievements. I have pleasure in acknowledging the Premier's achievements. However, I will not be a political John McEnroe. I do not question the verdict of the umpires at the last election. But, in congratulating the Premier, I must say that the system under which he was elected could be fairer, and that matter will be raised later today and again later in this session.

I also congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your election to the highest office of this House. Over the years that I have known you, Sir, you have demonstrated your ability to get on well with members on both sides of this House and I believe that that will be of great assistance to you in the performance of your duties. The member for Elizabeth has also taken on an important role in this House. From discussions with the member for Elizabeth, I am aware of his strong commitment to the effective working of the Parliament and that the Parliament should be used to review sensibly and intensely all legislation that comes before it. He also has a very strong commitment to the people that he represents. Both independent members have the utmost

integrity and I am sure that they will ensure that the traditions of the Westminster system are upheld during this Parliament.

I welcome the new members to this House. The names of the new members on both sides of the House are well documented. However, on the Government side they are: Michael Atkinson (member for Spence), Vic Heron (member for Peake), Paul Holloway (member for Mitchell), Colleen Hutchison (member for Stuart), Colin McKee (member for Gilles) and John Quirke (member for Playford). The new Opposition members are: Mark Brindal (member for Hayward), Michael Armitage (member for Adelaide), Dorothy Kotz (member for Newland), Wayne Matthew (member for Bright) and Bob Such (member for Fisher). I also pay tribute to those members who were defeated. I believe that they acted in what they saw as the best interests of their constituents during their very short time in this Parliament.

I pay a small tribute to the retiring Labor members whose last term (1985 to 1989) was my first term in Parliament. They are: the Hon. Roy Abbott (former Minister of Lands), the Hon. Gavin Keneally, the Hon. Terry McRae, the Hon. Ron Payne, the Hon. Jack Slater and Keith Plunkett. When one first becomes a member in this place—especially a member representing a country electorate—there are many times when you have to go to Ministers on the Government side for help, there are many times when you must lead deputations to Ministers and I must say, without fear or favour, that Ministers on the Government side during my first term in Parliament were very helpful: they listened intently and, where they could do something, I believe they genuinely did it. I pay tribute to those people, not as a political gesture but as a gesture to the people themselves and I wish them well in their retirement. I also thank the electors of Victoria who, in spite of me, managed to increase the majority that I held to make that seat the safest Liberal seat in South Australia.

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

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** You helped a little bit with some of your interjections during the last session of Parliament. I am sure that once my electors read *Hansard* they supported me more strongly. I also pay tribute to the member for Mount Gambier who has taken Mount Gambier from a very marginal seat three elections ago to the point where it is the second safest Liberal Party seat in South Australia. The Hon. Harold Allison has done a tremendous job in the South-East in looking after all of the people in his electorate and also representing the Liberal Party with the highest integrity.

Of course, since the election, there have been some other changes in this Parliament, not the least of which is the change in the leadership of the Liberal party. I am conscious of the new position that I hold and I follow a long line of respected leaders—Sir Richard Butler, Sir Thomas Playford, Steele Hall, Bruce Eastick (who is still with us today), David Tonkin and John Olsen. All of them have made a distinctive contribution to the Party and in representing South Australians. Each has pursued Liberalism as he saw it. I am honoured to be given the opportunity to build on my Party's support—and we do not have to build much more as we already have 52 per cent of the two Party preferred vote.

I make specific mention of my predecessor, John Olsen. It is largely through his efforts that we have five new members in this House. His enthusiasm and energy, and the way in which he fought constantly to put the Liberal Party's view forward, is a tribute to John and it has given us five enthusiastic and energetic new members who, I am sure, will make significant contributions in this place. I

believe that, with John's leadership, we set the political agenda in South Australia and we were leaders in policy reform. It is obvious to all members on both sides of this House that we clearly won the election campaign, and that is a tribute to John Olsen's effectiveness in getting those policies and the message out to the people of South Australia. I hope that they are examples that I can follow when John does leave this place and takes his place in the Senate in the near future.

We have already foreshadowed our agenda for the new Parliament. As priorities we have nominated electoral reform and the introduction of comprehensive freedom of information legislation, and we will be working to guarantee more effective, accountable and fairly elected Government. It is quite obvious that the present Government does not enjoy a majority in either House of Parliament.

This presents many opportunities for improving the administration of the State and it will return Parliament to its rightful place in our democratic system of government. No longer will the Parliament be a rubber stamp; no longer will we see the arrogance that related to some of the legislation that was passed in this Parliament in the last session. It will be a better place for all South Australians to put their views and, given that the Independents will also scrutinise that legislation, South Australians will be better governed, because the Opposition will have a direct say in what goes on. Oppositions must have a countervailing force. I believe that the power of the Government has to be curbed; if not, we shall see what happened in the last four years of this Government.

One of the things that concerns me—and it is already happening—is that this Government is starting to break some fundamental election promises. I do not think we can allow that to happen. We will make sure that this Government lives up to its election promises. It is, of course, by those checks and balances that we can provide an effective Opposition.

We will be watching, in particular, to ensure that the Government does not impose any further tax burdens on the people of South Australia. I challenge the Government. During the election campaign it constantly said that, if a Liberal Government was elected, it would impose significant tax increases. Clearly, that is nonsense. It was only Labor, it was said, that could keep taxes down. The Liberal Party intends to hold the Government quite firmly to that promise. I believe that the Government has a mandate only to keep taxes down, not to increase them. Should it seek to break that promise before serving the minimum term, the people must be given an opportunity to express their views through the ballot box.

Therefore, I challenge the Premier to give a commitment that any legislation that he introduces to increase existing rates of taxation or to introduce new taxes be declared legislation of special importance under section 28 of the Constitution Act. Such a declaration would result in an election should the legislation fail to pass. In my view this is one way in which this Parliament can hold this Government to be immediately accountable. We can therefore ensure that the Government fulfils one of the most important commitments that it made at the election. The goal of all of us must be to ensure that the will of the people, as expressed in the election, is properly fulfilled by this Parliament.

We cannot have a fully effective democracy in this State under the present electoral system. At the election, the Liberal Party gained 52 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote, yet it did not form a Government. I believe that we cannot accept this position. We must try to find a fairer

way that guarantees that the Party that receives a majority of the two-Party preferred vote has a reasonable chance of forming a Government.

We have heard much over the past 20 years about one vote one value. I agree with equality of representation, that is, that no member of this House should be required to represent significantly more or fewer electors than any other member. However, one vote one value extends beyond electorate representation. One vote one value means that, it does not matter where one resides in this State (whether it be Mount Gambier, Woomera or Port Adelaide), each vote cast should have an equal chance of determining which Party shall form the Government of the day.

At the last State election the Liberal Party preferred vote exceeded the ALP preferred vote by more than 35 000 or the equivalent of almost two average sized seats. However, because of the constrictions in the Electoral Commission and the current electoral boundary redistribution, there is an entrenched advantage to the Labor Party. It intrigues me to hear bleating that, when we achieve 52 per cent of the vote in this State, it is a fair election but that in Queensland an achievement of 52 per cent of the vote represents a gerrymander. It is about time that we looked at this issue in a fair and reasonable way. It is time that we listened to some of the experts on voting patterns around Australia. We understand that Labor's potential vote is spread over significantly more seats than is the Liberal Party vote. The strong non-Labor vote is heavily concentrated. This was graphically illustrated at the last election when the seats of Flinders, Victoria, Mount Gambier, Custance, Murray-Mallee and Bragg returned two-Party preferred votes in excess of 70 per cent for the successful member. None of those seats was held by the Government. At the last election no Labor member obtained a vote as high as 70 per cent.

The advantage to Labor from this concentration of the non-Labor vote will remain while the Boundaries Commission is constrained by the criteria that, as far as practicable, it should not disturb existing boundaries. Any move by the Government to paper over this unfairness simply by advancing the date of the next redistribution will be quite firmly resisted by the Liberal Party.

**Mr Groom:** You don't believe in one vote one value.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I heard the rubbish that the member for Hartley espoused in this House last week on one vote one value. One vote one value means, as I have already stated (and obviously the honourable member was not listening), that no matter where one resides in this State, when casting a vote one has an equal chance of electing a Government. It is about time—

**The Hon. J.P. Trainer:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker. The honourable member must direct his remarks through the Chair.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member preempted me. I was about to call the honourable Leader to order and request that he direct his remarks through the Chair.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The member for Hartley is supposedly one of the most scholastically brilliant members in this House. If he cannot understand what one vote one value is, no wonder he cannot get onto the front bench. He has come down from cobweb corner one bench in the whole time that I have been here. I know that he cannot get there because of the Premier's friend. However, I should like to take him aside and explain to him one day what one vote one value means.

All we are asking for is a fair election. Does the member for Hartley think that, even though we gained 52 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote but could not form a Gov-

ernment, it was a fair election? Would you, Mr Speaker, like to ask the member for Hartley at some stage in the future?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** No wonder you did not get into the ministry.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader will direct his remarks through the Chair.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Our policy, to be finalised during the select committee process, will result in no vote having more or less value than any other vote wherever it is cast around the State. I believe it is very important, when dealing with this issue, not to become preoccupied with what has happened in the past. I was not around in those days, however long ago, when there were some arguments about it. All we are asking for is that the Party that gets 50 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote, plus one, has a chance of forming the Government. Nothing could be simpler or fairer than that.

In dealing with attitudes to democracy and the role of Parliament, I make clear my view that, in the true Westminster tradition, Her Majesty's loyal Opposition deserves respect and recognition for the vital role that it has to play in the process of government. Any Government that I lead in the future will accord appropriate respect to the Opposition. As Premier, I will not regard this House simply as a place in which to work over the Opposition or to criticise and condemn Opposition members for base Party political motives. Such behaviour wastes the time of the House, and, more importantly, it demeans the institution of Parliament. As Premier, I will also recognise the legitimate role of the Opposition to scrutinise—and scrutinise very closely—the Government's actions to ensure full accountability through this Parliament to the people. This can occur only when the Parliament is able to act on full information about Government actions.

While I am Leader, I will work to ensure that the Opposition fulfils this role responsibly in the public interest. I will also continue the positive role of an Opposition in putting up alternatives to the Government. By doing so—and by taking further initiatives in policy reform—we will demonstrate that we are ready for government and that, at any time called upon, we will have vibrant and economically sensible policies that will lead this State in the future.

I also recognise that no Leader is immune from criticism. Often, as many members would know, such criticism comes from within the Leader's own Party. This is inevitable. My colleagues have entrusted their political futures to me, placing confidence in my ability to lead my Party to election victory. They demand a high standard of consistent performance—and rightly so. I am confident that the people of South Australia, during this parliamentary term, will get the Opposition they need—an Opposition that is united and determined in its endeavours to fulfil its key role, which is to keep the Government accountable.

I have, I believe, a very reasonable and realistic view of the political process. At all times—and I have intimated this privately and in public—I will be constructive in my criticism and in the ideas I put forward. However, some Labor members and journalists have tried to portray my outlook as extreme. I assure them that that will not succeed. I noted that, in a recent newspaper article in the *Advertiser*, some union officials attempted to use Ian McLachlan and me as targets of a campaign. They intend to raise \$50 000 to denigrate us. That is absolutely fantastic and shows how the unions are out of touch. It is alleged that we are anti-

worker. All I can say to them is that they should ask some of the people who are employed by Ian McLachlan and me about our attitude to our employees. We do not pay employees good wages because the union forces us to do so; we pay them good wages because we value their hard work and their commitment to our enterprises. Members should remember that no-one works for me: they work with me. I know that the member for Hartley has not had any experience in the real world. He should move around a bit.

**Mr Groom:** What is the real world?

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** The honourable member has never been out in it, so he would not know. Union officials who throw around anti-worker labels are attempting to hide their own inadequacies. I believe they are trying to hide their failure to represent the interests of their members. Their manic determination to abuse their position and throw some of that onto me, in particular, will fall flat.

I now turn to another issue that always amuses me. It is said by certain sections of the press and, in particular, by a certain television reporter, that I am some sort of millionaire grazier. He might be referring to the liabilities; he might then say 'multi-millionaire'.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Slightly less than the liabilities. Following the death of his father in the 1890s, my father, one of 10 children, came to Australia from England 80 years ago. He took up land in the South-East of South Australia. He had one vision: to work hard and to try to provide for his family. None of my reputed wealth is inherited, nor is it retained wealth, because all of the wealth that I am reputed to have is at risk every day of the week in an endeavour to produce and generate more income for South Australia and, indeed, for Australia. My family does not sit on its laurels: we get out there and try to do things for the good of the country. It is about time some of the members on the other side of the House stopped criticising the people who get off their bottoms and go out and do things to help employ more people in an endeavour to make this State a better place, and started doing something themselves. If we can keep people in work and keep producing, we will have a chance to get this country out of the parlous situation that it is in.

If I were to get personal—and I will not—I could throw some labels around to the television media about the Premier and his performance over the past few years. However, I will never get down to that level. I believe that we have to face economic challenges. It is a bad trait in Australia that people who endeavour to do things are dragged down. My father came to this country 80 years ago with one attitude in mind—to provide for the future. My attitude is that what I have I hold in trust for future generations, and that is an attitude which we should all have.

On the subject of political labels, I must comment on some of the labels—progressive, moderate, conservative, New Right, New Left, green, wet and dry—that are thrown around by the media and in this House. I have always wanted to answer the media when asked, 'Are you a member of the New Right?' by saying, 'No, I have always been right,' but I have never been game to do it because I do not know what they will make of it. However, I can say this to members of this House.

**Mr Ferguson:** And we believe you, too.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I knew that the member for Henley Beach would believe me, because he is a non-biased member. Such labels devalue intelligent political debate. We should not put these ridiculous labels on people because they do nothing for intelligent political debate and scrutiny of the performance of the Government at large and, in

particular, of legislation that comes before this House. The member for Hartley has fallen for it already; he does not understand what one vote one value means. It is time that we explained to the people of South Australia exactly what this means and we intend to do that in the near future.

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** As I said, 52 per cent in Queensland is considered to be a gerrymander, but 52 per cent here is all right.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I believe that the public is owed an unvarnished and uncluttered explanation of the philosophies and principles that guide our approach to politics. These names that are being thrashed around are not in the best interests of anyone. Wherever possible, we must make it easier for people to provide for themselves.

The word 'incentive' has been just about lost from the Australian language in the past few years. If we cannot provide incentive to the people of South Australia and, indeed, the people of Australia, this country will not get out of this economic mess or create greater economic and employment opportunities or resources to help people provide for themselves and their families. We need more rugged individualism in this country and more willingness to work hard, take risks and to dare to succeed. We can do that only if incentive is built into the system.

There was a time in this State, which was founded as a radical experiment in colonisation, when it thrived on competitive spirit. Its origins owe virtually everything to people who were prepared to be independent and industrious. These are the values of our heritage. I believe that we have to rediscover them, because people are not generally incompetent; it is Governments that treat them as such.

That is why it is very hard to justify more Government interference in their lives, more rules and regulations, more taxes to pay, more coercion and more restrictions on individual choice. To the maximum extent possible, and certainly to a much greater extent than is possible now, people must be free to make for themselves the key decisions which directly influence their daily lives and the use of the resources they develop to enjoy, through their own hard work, a better life. Too many of these decisions have been surrendered to Government, to union officials and to other significant power bases remote from individuals and insensitive to individual needs and concerns. It flows from these beliefs that I want to limit and, where appropriate, reduce the role and cost of Government as well as the way in which Government interferes with our lives.

We on this side of the House have a very basic philosophy. We have a moral obligation to look after the needy and disadvantaged and, after that, we want to get off the backs and out of the pockets of those citizens of South Australia who want to get on and better themselves. It would be very fair to say that I stand for the supporting and strengthening of the private enterprise system and of the small business sector, as this State cannot be guaranteed future prosperity unless those people are functioning in the way that we believe they should. Of course, Government must, without unnecessarily restricting individual choice, retain an essential role in education and health, in helping to support the genuinely in need and in maintaining the role of security of persons and property through the police. To interfere and compete with individuals and businesses is what the Government is now doing, stifling innovation and progress, and this can only lead to higher taxes.

If we look back over the past four years that I have been in this place, we see the debacle of the Government's attempt



to compete with private enterprise and become involved in business activities. It is an absolute indictment of the incompetence of the Government and of the people concerned. Only through liberalism, which emphasises the individual rights of people rather than Government power, can we guarantee a more caring and cooperative society.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Yes, we heard that today in the House. Labor's way has been to encourage people to ask more of Government, but the more people ask of Government the more power Government must have. That is why I come back to the moral obligation to look after the needy and disadvantaged and then letting people in this State get on with what they are doing. The Labor Party has failed in imagination; it has failed to acknowledge personal freedoms and rights and in offering encouragement and help to others.

In the last term of Parliament we saw an amazing occurrence when the Labor Party virtually stopped volunteers helping in the St John Ambulance Service. What better role can anyone play in this State than being a volunteer and helping the St John Ambulance? No longer will we be able to call on those volunteers, because of bowing to the power of the unions. We will see volunteers only in the country, where the unions do not have control, but in the city we will have paid officers only. The aspect of personal compassion and charity has also declined as the Government has encouraged bureaucratic solutions to local community problems. In many cases these solutions have not worked.

Labor's commitment to compulsory unionism is a stark demonstration that union officials lack sufficient faith in their own abilities to attract membership. Labor's resistance to non-compulsory voting is further evidence of failed imagination. It shows that Labor lacks faith in its appeal to voters, so they have to be forced, rather than encouraged, to turn up at polling booths. It is easy to hide behind the vehicle of compulsion as the conveyor of collective behaviour. This way—the Labor way—denies the community the benefit of the vibrancy and vigour of competition in ideas and in the provision of services. Labor relies on the wealth creation of risk takers, in healthy competition with each other, to generate the taxes to pay for big government, but it has no real understanding of the risks they take. That is fundamentally important. Labor is keen to rip off taxes from the people who have been successful but is never keen to help them take the risks that they must take in making those profits.

Nothing illustrates this point more starkly than the response by the Minister of Transport to concerns expressed by private bus operators about the impact on their businesses of the discriminatory aspects of free bus travel for students. A reference to the Minister appeared in the *Advertiser* of 30 January 1990, as follows:

The scheme was designed to increase patronage of STA services, and if the operators found they were losing patronage he would be more likely to applaud this.

I find that an incredible statement to be attributed to the Minister. In other words he was trying to force private bus operators out of business. He condemns them whilst supporting the STA, which last year recorded an operating deficit of some \$120 million, or ran up losses at the rate of \$18 000 for every hour its buses were on the road.

We have been told by the Minister that free transport for students will cost in excess of \$7 million. However, we have some calculations that will be brought up by the shadow Minister to show that it will cost at least \$25 million. The Minister should be creating the circumstances in which the private sector has more opportunity to provide public transport at a lower cost. Why not have some competition in

the provision of these services and then we may have a greatly improved service to the public of South Australia?

The failure of this Government to initiate any significant improvement is testimony to its timidity, its lack of vision and to the fact that not one of its Ministers has had any experience in running a business. I would have thought that that was a prerequisite for any Minister responsible for controlling the amount of money spent in the various portfolios in running South Australia. However, we would not be surprised if the Minister of Transport wished to put private bus operators out of business. In his maiden speech he stated that he is an avowed socialist. He has not changed his outlook in the time he has been in this Parliament, but at least with this Minister we know where he stands as he is not afraid to express those views. He is prepared to run private bus operators out of South Australia and to continue running the STA from taxpayers' funds.

One of his colleagues, the Minister of Labour, said a year ago, in a speech that was extensively reported, that the public sector was doomed without reform. He said that Government employment would disappear unless the public sector became more efficient and more relevant. I agree with him and agreed with him at the time, but I ask him and his Government what significant reforms have been introduced to meet this challenge. The same Minister continues to preside over the inefficiencies of WorkCover. He supports the spending of \$1 200 of public funds per day to hire a consultant to improve occupational safety when all that this produces is a rising incidence of work-related injuries in the Department of Marine and Harbors.

The Minister has publicly defended the *Island Seaway* scandal, which is the epitome of a failed public enterprise scheme. During the last Parliament, the WorkCover scheme came in for considerable criticism, and the same Minister said that, as a result of representations from those people who did not have any claims, some changes would be made to the scheme. However, their priorities are not being looked at. All that will happen is an increase in levies without any decrease for those people with a good track record. There is no incentive for people to perform better.

At the last election, the Liberal Party put forward a series of public sector reforms. We detailed policies on productivity improvement, competitive tendering, deregulation and reducing Commonwealth/State duplication. We did so for one very good reason: to keep the lid on taxes. In addition, such policies would free up resources for additional spending in the areas of need and neglect under this Government, particularly education, health and the Police Force.

The Liberal Party recognises also that the great majority of public servants want to work in a challenging and competitive environment. However, under this Government, public servants find their work so lacking in challenge and satisfaction that many seek to avoid it. This is borne out by the rising incidence of sick leave and workers compensation claims from public servants. I do not hold public servants chiefly responsible for these disturbing trends. In the main, they are not the tea-sodden bureaucrats who bludge and have no respect for their work. I reject that tag. I know that they will respond to policies for better management and to incentives for advancement at all levels.

Such incentive should be provided by the Government. It was interesting to note the incompetence of the Public Service with respect to closing dental clinics at Penola and Keith last year. A unilateral decision was made by the then Minister of Health to close those clinics and force people in those areas to travel up to 100 miles so that their children could partake of the free dental scheme. The member for Murray-Mallee and I argued very strongly and stridently



that this was the wrong approach. At the end of the day, we were told that the only reason the clinics could not be kept open was that there were not any dentists available to work there. The positions had been advertised at length around Australia, with no result.

The School Dental Board, which meets once a month, comprises six members, all of whom are qualified dentists. However, none of them could find the time to go out to the country and relieve a chronic situation. The Minister lacks the desire and the management skills to make sure that everyone helps, especially when services are suspended while replacement staff are being sought. The Public Service should help make the system more efficient.

The State Government is this State's largest single employer. As such, it has a responsibility to set an example, and to rise to the challenge of encouraging more productivity and efficiency in our economy so that we can gear up for more exports. Australia's greatest single problem at present is its huge foreign debt, which is just over \$110 billion. It is being added to every day by a current account deficit swollen by our inability to export more than we import. The inability to address this problem has led to increased sales of Australian property to foreigners and higher interest rates. As the debt mounts, so does the bitter legacy that Labor is bequeathing to our children.

The present Government has consistently ducked the challenge to change economic direction. It has ignored its obligation to public servants and the wider community to maximise the quality of public services and job satisfaction to those who provide them. During the election campaign, the Premier hid behind selected extracts from the publication *Budgetary Stress* to claim that his Government was an efficient public sector manager. One major issue identified in that publication, which the Premier completely ignored, was the lack of priority in Government spending given to the maintenance and improvement of essential assets. The publication identified a trend in South Australia of allocating a steadily declining proportion of total outlays to capital spending with the result that service standards are deteriorating and State indebtedness is increasing to meet the shortfalls of previous years.

In other words, for many years there has not been any allowance for depreciation of assets within this State. The Public Accounts Committee has rendered Parliament a valuable service in identifying future liabilities to maintain and replace essential, ageing assets such as water pipes and sewers, roads and key public buildings such as schools. These warnings are now almost two years old but the Government has failed to identify a long-term plan to meet these massive financial commitments.

Modern government is complex: 20 years ago South Australia did not have a Department of Environment, a Department of Consumer Affairs, a Corporate Affairs Commission, an Equal Opportunities Commission or an Ethnic Affairs commission. Through the 1970s and 1980s, the growth of Government mushroomed. Over the past 20 years, State Government spending has increased more than twice the rate it did in the previous two decades. Labor seems to believe that this growth, the increasing complexity of government, is a good enough reason to keep those who are required to fund this growth—the taxpayers—in the dark. I have already nominated initiatives such as productivity improvement targets and much more extensive competitive tendering for public services to improve efficiency and contain costs.

These goals can be sought through a more open and accountable Government. My proposals include:

1. Comprehensive freedom of information, which my Party will seek to legislate for during this session of Parliament.

2. Strengthening the role of the Auditor-General, so that appointments to this office are subject to parliamentary ratification.

3. The provision to Parliament of a five-year financial plan forecasting major items of revenue, spending and debt.

4. All legislative proposals of a financial nature to be accompanied by five-year projections of their financial implications.

I should not need to remind the Premier that, more than seven years ago, his Government was committed to the introduction of freedom of information legislation. That we have yet to see the legislation typifies a Government completely out of touch with the interests of South Australians. Immediately after the debacle of Labor's last election campaign, the Premier promised flair and light. In the latest issue of the *Adelaide Review*, the Premier is quoted as saying, 'It is the task of political leaders to provide plans or visions.' I totally agree with that but I respond by saying that, after seven years, South Australia is still waiting.

My authority for saying that is no less than that of the Hon. John Cornwall. In his book of political recollections, which is compulsory reading, Dr Cornwall lamented at length about the lack of Labor leadership and vision. He complained that, 'Bold initiatives don't get far if there is no convincing leadership.' South Australia can now count the cost of lost leadership under Labor over the past 20 years, when Labor has been in Government for all but three of those years. In the past two decades, our share of Australia's population has declined from 9.2 per cent to 8.5 per cent.

Our share of the nation's unemployed and poor is higher than it has ever been—13 per cent of the unemployed and more than 11 per cent of the poor—and, on a per capita basis, much more than we should have. On the latest figures, our share of new fixed capital expenditure is only 5.3 per cent. This is an important investment indicator of future economic growth. It is not a healthy one for South Australia currently, and our share is the lowest it has been in more than a decade.

Twenty years ago we had 10.1 per cent of the nation's exports by value. Last financial year our share was only 5.6 per cent. In 1988-89, the number of new motor vehicles registered in our State was 3 416 fewer than 20 years ago in 1968-69. Our national share of new motor vehicle registrations is down to 7.1 per cent. These trends need not continue.

There are economic opportunities. We do have advantages associated with our location in relation to the rest of Australia and the Asian Pacific region. We must work to make sure of them and to make more of our advantages as the cross-roads of the nation and as a direct route through Northern Australia to Asia. We have tremendous food processing potential. It has already been stated in a document that has been released to the public that, if we follow some intensive agriculture policies that can be put in place and by using the land in that area to its fullest, we have the potential, in the South-East of South Australia alone, to attract an extra \$10 billion of income into this State in the next 10 years.

In addition, there is tremendous potential for mineral processing and further potential for mineral and petroleum products. There is potential for the manufacturing sector, because we have a skilled work force in South Australia. However, there are some economic obstacles in South Aus-

tralia. The Government lacks a clear sense of direction, purpose and consistent decision-making; there are increasing Government regulations and a lack of economic freedoms; and there are continuing uncertainties about the efficiency and cost of future electricity and water supplies. Further, there is a reluctance on the part of some in the business community to challenge Government policies and decisions which jeopardise their interests, and I call on them to stand up and be counted, to point out to the Government where they have been disadvantaged and to lobby very strongly to make sure that that is changed.

It is time for us all to do some plain thinking and plain speaking and to recognise the failures of the past and that we can do better for the future. We need Government policies which stimulate growth and establish comparative advantages for us in the national and world economies. Again, it is a matter of incentives. I keep hammering the issue of incentives all through this Address in Reply speech. If we do not have the incentives, people will not go out and get things done.

It would appear that, as a result of the election, the Premier has recognised one of his Government's greatest failures: to give leadership in the debate over what is environmentally desirable economic development. He has taken over responsibility for State development. I have supported this publicly and in this place. The issue now requires the authority of his position if it is to be dealt with effectively and efficiently. I look forward to this change and I hope that it is more than a token gesture. Developers must see that, as a result of these changes in administration, there will be more incentive and opportunity to invest in desirable development in our State. We cannot maintain or improve the quality of life and afford more environmental protection in those areas we must preserve for all time unless we create more wealth from which the whole State benefits.

I turn to the environment. I am a committed environmentalist. I want to preserve and manage efficiently as much of our State's land as possible, and to hold it in trust for future generations. On my own properties, I am attempting to do my share, and it is in no way a token gesture. But let us have a fair balance in this debate. My Party will give the Government an opportunity to demonstrate that the changes it has made in the administration of the development portfolio can work. However, we will not tolerate any further decision making which is based obviously on short-term expediency rather than on the longer term interests of all South Australians.

The Government has the responsibility to rectify its mistakes of the past for the sake of our future. Where it does this, it will have our unqualified support. We will also be interested to maintain a constant dialogue with developers and environmental groups so that we can be fully informed of their views in making our own objective decisions in this very sensitive area.

The Liberal Party has a proud record in land use management. It was the Hall Government which commissioned the Jordan report on our environment to provide the framework for many of the policies and actions taken during the 1970s and 1980s. It was the Tonkin Government which initiated the Torrens Linear Park and the O-Bahn Transport Corridor as further demonstrations of the Liberal commitment to our environment. While I am Leader of the Liberal Party, we will continue our balanced approach to ensure that the need to preserve does not compromise the necessity to progress.

I turn to industrial relations. Industrial relations is another issue we must address and, if it is addressed, it will improve our economic prospects. Today, too many businesses are

hamstrung by the rigidities of a system which discourages individual enterprise and locks the economy into automatic wage adjustments. We have too many union officials who seek to prevent workers doing what they want to do. I will not indulge in union bashing now and I will not in the future. I merely point out that, until some union officials demonstrate more commitment to the future of the nation as a whole, they cannot be counted as constructive participants in this debate. I do not urge that enterprise level agreements should be forced on employers and employees, but they should have the right to choose to go this way if they so desire—to enter into voluntary contracts independent of union and employer organisations—and, if they are allowed to do this, it will enhance both productivity and employment growth.

A program of other positive commitments to small business is vital to assist in the recovery from record interest rates. In South Australia, small business urgently needs an end to the escalation in land tax bills through reform of the system with a sensible single rate to avoid bracket creep and an urgent review of WorkCover to identify weaknesses, to improve its performance and, above all, to contain premiums. Management of claims should be opened up to private sector competition, and much greater priority should be given to the whole process of deregulation so it is speeded up. Business, local government and the public should be invited to participate in a joint approach to try to help speed up this deregulation. It is only when we agree to support private enterprise in this way that we will have the economic expansion necessary to provide more employment.

In this, my first major speech in this House as Leader, I have concentrated on the economy because the resolution of its problems is the most pressing issue we face. Under my leadership, the Liberal Party will exercise a responsibility to propose as well as to oppose. In my vision for our future, greater economic freedom and less Government control are central to the pursuit of more effective policies. After so long with a Labor landlord, the people have shown that they are now looking for Liberal leadership. It is my intention to deliver.

**THE SPEAKER:** Order! Before calling on the next speaker, I remind members that this is the honourable member's maiden speech, and ask that the usual courtesy be applied.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** Having heard each of my new colleagues speak on this side of the House, I now finally rise to support the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech, opening the first session of the forty-seventh Parliament. In so doing, I join other members in extending congratulations to you, Mr Speaker, on your election to the position over the life of this Parliament. I am confident that your previous experience in this House will enable you to perform the duties of the office with the impartiality and command that is needed in such a delicately balanced Parliament.

I also offer my congratulations to my new fellow MPs on this side of the House—the members for Hayward, Fisher, Newland and Adelaide—who have also been elected for the first time and will no doubt be here for many years to come. I consider it a great honour to have been elected to this Parliament, and for that honour I thank most sincerely the electors of Bright. In particular, I thank my wife Penny for her help and support during the campaign, a task made all the more difficult by having two very dependent young children to care for. Without her support, and that of the 180 or so friends and helpers working as part of my campaign team, I would not be here today. I thank those mem-

bers of my team and my supporters who have turned up today and are sitting in the upper and lower galleries.

I thank St John volunteers for their support and reinforce my commitment to ensuring that volunteers and volunteer organisations survive in this State. I also thank my parliamentary colleagues for their support, and in particular thank the Hon. Jamie Irwin, the Hon. Ted Chapman and Peter Lewis and their respective campaign teams in the electorates of Alexandra and Murray-Mallee. I pay tribute to John Olsen, whose tireless efforts contributed significantly to my election and the election of my four new colleagues. But for anomalies in the electorate boundaries, John Olsen would be Premier of South Australia. As this House has been told many times, with almost 52 per cent of the preferred vote, we in the Liberal Party can hold our heads high in the knowledge that we are the preferred team to govern in South Australia.

However, regrettably, in the meantime we and the rest of South Australia must endure the decision making processes of the present Government—decisions that have seen this State lead Australia in many areas, such as: unemployment, with the highest rate of mainland States; job creation rate, with the lowest of mainland States since 1982; population growth, with the lowest of mainland States since 1982; retail trade, with the lowest rate of growth in Australia; new motor vehicle registrations, again with the lowest rate of growth; savings deposit rates, with the lowest increase; export, with the lowest growth; financial institutions duty at the highest rate in Australia; and bankruptcies, where we have more than 17 per cent of the nation's total, yet we have only 8.5 per cent of Australia's population.

In 1987, 1 444 South Australian businesses went bankrupt, a record exceeding even the years of the Great Depression of the 1930s. In 1988, the number was only slightly less—1 403. Despite the hardships imposed on many of my constituents through the recent seven years hard Labor, they are at least fortunate enough to be able to forget their troubles by absorbing themselves in their picturesque surroundings.

The electorate of Brighton must surely comprise some of the most panoramic coastal and hills scenery in all of South Australia, and indeed in all of Australia. My electorate stretches from Hove, at its northern end, southward past the white sands of Brighton, Seacliff and Kingston Park, through the rugged coastal terrain at Marino and Hallett Cove, and finishes at the southern coastal suburb of O'Sullivan Beach. The electorate also stretches to the east to encompass the picturesque hills of Marino Rocks, Seacliff Park, Seaview Downs, Seacombe Heights and Darlington. However, the beauty of the electorate only temporarily lulls one into a false sense of tranquillity, for it is also an electorate in which dissatisfaction is rising as unresolved issues keep bubbling.

Brighton Road continues to choke under the daily congestion of heavy traffic with no relief now or in the foreseeable future in sight under the present Government. People in my electorate have witnessed consistent delays in the commencement of the third arterial road and have become fed up with the endless procrastination and hollow excuses for its non-eventuality. To add fuel to their anger, the State Government continues to rip 4.5c/litre petrol tax from their pockets, and puts only one third of this money into road construction and maintenance—the rest goes into general revenue.

Members would no doubt be aware that legislation was introduced to restrict the amount of petrol tax revenue going to roads to \$25.726 million from the 1983-84 financial year. As a result, there has been an alarming decline in the

proportion of State fuel tax proceeds allocated to the highways fund since the introduction of the existing legislation. Since 1983, the tax has generated more than \$324 million, but only \$154 million has been credited to the highways fund. The balance of \$170 million has been paid into general revenue, and in the meantime our roads continue to suffer. This decline in the proportion allocated to roads violates the original intention of the tax when it was introduced in 1979, that being to replace the earlier road maintenance tax for heavy vehicles with all of this revenue to go to roads. I urge this Government as a budgeting priority to commence redirecting a greater proportion of fuel tax revenue back to the highways fund. I submit that greater allocation to roads is vital to ensure that important road projects commence.

Two projects which must surely rate top spots on the agenda directly affect the electorate of Brighton. These projects are: first, the third arterial road, which has been deferred to 1993 because of funding constraints, and which is a vital project to assist in meeting the travel demands of the growing population in the southern metropolitan areas; and, secondly, major improvements to South Road at Darlington. I recognise that a decline in Federal funding in recent years has impacted adversely on the rate at which progress can be made on road improvements in South Australia. However, this can at least be partly redressed by the provision of a greater proportion of State fuel tax revenue to roads. I support the submission of the RAA that, above the current figure of \$25.726 million, additional allocations should be made of at least \$10 million per year for each of the third arterial road and Darlington Road improvement projects.

I now turn to the issue of council boundaries, for in Brighton the Brighton council continues to fight for its very existence while the State Government continues to muddle its way through numerous council boundary disputes. The people of Brighton are indeed privileged to be blessed with an efficient and financially viable council and made it quite clear through the ballot box that they wish to retain their council untouched by State Government interference. At a Brighton council funded poll held on 14 October 1989, a total of 7 049 ratepayers cast a vote for one of three options, those being: leave Brighton boundaries as they are; amalgamate Brighton and Glenelg councils; or amalgamate Marion, Brighton and Glenelg councils.

An overwhelming 95.6 per cent of voters cast their vote in favour of the first option, that is, to leave Brighton council boundaries as they are. I urge the Local Government Advisory Board and the Minister of Local Government to listen to the will of the people of Brighton when making their respective recommendation and decision regarding the future of the city of Brighton.

I turn now to development issues, as the people of Marino and Hallett Cove and surrounding suburbs continue to worry about the effect of the Westcliff Marina on their lifestyle, while battles continue over land ownership and development rights. The Government has not yet explained why it will not undertake an environmental impact statement for this project. I will continue to fight for the wish of the people in my electorate, that is, for an EIS to occur. The Westcliff Marino fiasco is a glaring example of Government mismanagement and failure to consult with the people it was elected to represent. Perhaps the Government would benefit significantly by adopting the Liberal Party approach to development in South Australia. Members have heard the Liberal Leader outline part of that approach, and I shall continue with a little more.

Our policy provided for the establishment of an Environment and Land Use Commission to undertake a Statewide

survey of all land and to prepare recommendations as to future land use in South Australia. The commission was to seek the cooperation of the Commonwealth, industry organisations and the private sector to assist in providing the intellectual resources necessary to complete efficiently the essential task inherent in its formation. Such cooperative effort is required to provide South Australia with quality development that gives due regard to our unique environment. Our State needs to be developed and our State needs to be preserved with positive action. These statements can become compatible, instead of remaining the base for a dispute, as at present.

Under the Liberal initiative, developers would know where they are going and environmentalists would know where they stand. That is the way it should be. There is no room, in a State in desperate need of investor confidence, in a State in desperate need of projects to keep it on the move, for weak government in the planning and development area. Developers both here and interstate are constantly telling us that they do not understand the processes and they do not comprehend the cancellation of some projects. They are wary of investing money here when they do not believe there are actual methods at work to properly assess development. It is crucial for the future of our State that we reverse this situation quickly.

I turn briefly to the provision of education in Hallett Cove and I note that parents in Hallett Cove are concerned about educational opportunities for their children. I will continue my fight to ensure that a new primary school is built on Quailo Avenue, to open in 1991, and that schooling is provided to year 12 at the Hallett Cove School, locally referred to as the R10 School.

In my speech at the declaration of the poll for Bright I indicated that I looked forward to the introduction of the interest rate relief package from 1 January 1990. However, it would appear that the Government had not costed this Liberal policy initiative as carefully as it was costed by my colleagues and placed within the Liberal budget framework. The Government has found it cannot afford the assistance it promised, so it reduced it. It has broken its promise to the electors of South Australia! The Government's Home Loan Interest Rate Relief Scheme has been exposed as nothing more than a cynical ploy. The big losers are at least 15 000 potential Homesure recipients who are now deemed ineligible by this Government. These people, many of whom live in my electorate, have been heartlessly conned and taken for a ride by the State Government.

During the election campaign the Premier promised \$20 a week interest relief to all first home buyers who had purchased their homes after April 1986. Now the scheme is limited to only those home buyers who pay more than 30 per cent of their income in home loan repayments. Thousands of first home buyers paying less than this figure—yet struggling with loan repayments—have missed out! Indeed, major lending institutions, including the State Bank, have confirmed that the number of people putting 30 per cent or more of their income into mortgage repayments would be comparatively small. This is simply because lending institutions usually refused loans to anyone who would have to commit more than 25 per cent of their income in mortgage repayments. The sham of this scheme is being revealed. The Government's interest rate relief scheme has been exposed!

The suburb of Hallett Cove is the largest mortgage concentration in my electorate. The most recent census data showed that Hallett Cove has one of the highest percentages of mortgaged homes in metropolitan Adelaide with approximately 74 per cent of homes being purchased. Many of

these people are now losing their homes on a tidal wave of high interest rates and broken State Government promises. These are only some of the many issues facing the people of Bright. I will do my best to help them through another term of State Labor Government.

I pay tribute to the efforts of my predecessor, Mr Robertson, who must have experienced a frustrating four years explaining away decisions of his Government to an increasingly disenfranchised electorate. I have no doubt that Mr Robertson worked to the best of his ability within the constraints imposed upon him.

I wish now to refer briefly to crime in South Australia, an issue that has attracted my close attention over the past few years, during which time I have assisted in the establishment of a number of Neighbourhood Watch programs and served on the State Executive of Neighbourhood Watch of South Australia. It is of concern to me that South Australia's break-in rate is twice that of the USA. A break-in occurs every 13 minutes and 32 motor vehicles are stolen every day in our State. Further, since 1982 in South Australia we have seen: the rate of violent crime increase by 107 per cent; the rate of serious assault increase by 123 per cent; rates of rape and attempted rape increase by 156 per cent; and the number of drug offences increased by 276 per cent. There are now 36 cannabis expiation notices issued by the police in this State every day. The number of cannabis offences has increased from 4 433 in 1982-83 (or 331 per 100 000 South Australians) to 13 131 in 1988-89 (or 927 offences per 100 000 South Australians).

On hearing this record one would reasonably expect that, given such dramatic increases in serious crime in our State, the number of offenders being punished would have proportionally increased. But no, not so. On the latest available figures, the number of offenders being punished has dropped by 33 per cent since 1982. Interestingly, the reconviction rate within five years of release of offenders who have served more than 12 months in gaol is 62 per cent. Some punishment! Is it any wonder that police morale in our State is at an all time low? This erosion of proper penalties in the courts, coupled with a new career and pay structure that disadvantages senior constables, plus delays in resolving outstanding issues on a police pension scheme, has seen a spate of resignations from our Police Force.

Further, the members of our Police Force are becoming increasingly frustrated at their ever expanding role as tax collectors. Members of this House may be interested to learn of a recent regulation change that was slipped quietly into action by the Government. Members would be aware that motor vehicle accidents must be reported to the police where total damage to all vehicles exceeds \$600. Under recent changes Police are now required to examine all accident reports and determine whether or not a traffic infringement has occurred and, if appropriate, issue an on-the-spot fine or, if the officer does not have the courage to issue the fine immediately, it can be posted to the alleged offender.

The interesting thing is that motorists involved in an accident report the accident based on their own assessment of the damage. A situation could therefore arise where the total damage to vehicles turns out to be less than \$600, so the accident need not have been reported in the first place, but the honest motorist has gone to the police and reported that accident. However, that unsuspecting motorist then finds that his or her honesty is rewarded with a fine for reporting the accident. This does nothing more than serve to discourage people involved in accidents from reporting them to the police. Is this the role that our fine Police Force is being reduced to—tax collecting and hitting out at honest

citizens? Certainly, I have been approached by a number of officers who are upset at this new imposition on their duties.

Many members may be aware that I bring to this House experience in systems analysis, specialising in the design of mainframe computer systems. In the past I have worked on both Commonwealth and State Government projects, and have been horrified, particularly at a State level, at the scant regard paid by department heads and Ministers to the technical advice they have been given. Computer technology has fast emerged as the largest single item of Government expenditure in this State, yet, it is being handled in an ignorant fashion that has resulted in the waste of multi-millions of taxpayers' dollars. During my time in this Parliament I will examine Government computer projects and endeavour to advise the Government when it is led astray.

In addition to experience in information technology, I believe I bring to this Parliament an understanding of life obtained from working hard to achieve my goals. In order to supplement my TEAS allowance to cover general living expenses while studying at Adelaide University, I undertook a variety of casual employment positions. Many of these were temporary positions that employers found difficult to fill because the work was either physically exhausting or too dirty. One such job that I undertook was working for the then Chrysler Motor Company during the factory shut-down. My job was to climb up the chimneys on the roof above the paint pits and scrape out the dry paint that had collected over the preceding 12 months. Further, many of the electors in Bright are aware of my extensive community activities and involvement in sporting clubs, particularly tennis. I believe that these past experiences, working with a variety of people in a variety of roles, has enabled me to develop an empathy with the diverse cross-section of people who live in the electorate of Bright.

I turn now to an incident which should never have occurred and indeed which should never have had to be raised in this Parliament. I refer to the condition of the offices and equipment of outgoing Labor members. I, too, share the concern of the member for Newland about deliberate acts of sabotage that occurred in the Parliamentary electorate offices of outgoing Labor members. As the incoming member for Bright, I inherited seven empty filing cabinets, a sabotaged computer complete with what appeared to be a virus occupying 100k of memory and a badly defaced office desk. Further, computer disks and manuals had been stolen from the office. Replacement computer manuals and disks for new Liberal members have cost the taxpayers almost \$3 000 to date. This does not include the cost of replacement manuals that are yet to arrive from the United States, nor does it include the cost of 24 hours labour to restore the electoral roll to four new members' computers, nor does it include the cost of hiring a micro-computer consultant to reinstall computer operating systems and/or word processing software in four offices. This House will be advised at a later date of further details of the cost of this sabotage.

I have written to numerous individuals and groups in my electorate advising them that none of the records held by the previous member have been made available to me and requesting them to forward copies of unfinalised matters that they wish me to pursue on their behalf. I have been encouraged by their response, and have noted their disgust at the childish antics to which my colleagues and I have been subjected.

On a positive note in relation to this problem, I wish to thank sincerely the staff of the Minister of Transport for their understanding in providing me with copies of my predecessor's letters to the Minister. I am pleased to see

that the Minister of Transport at least does not identify with this childish behaviour.

Despite the dismal failings and shortcomings of the present Government, South Australia is still a fine place in which to live and has tremendous potential. I have already outlined its development potential under the guidelines of the Liberal proposal for an Environmental and Land Use Commission. Our State is rich in natural mineral resources, agricultural products and academic achievement. With positive encouragement, through the provision of incentives, our State's true potential can be realised. Let us pray that the Government develops the courage to make some tough decisions in preference to the bureaucratic procrastination and fence sitting of the past and moves our State forward.

Instead of drawing up regulations or appointing committees when a problem is perceived, the role of government must become more goal oriented. Certainly Government can suggest goals, but the people best qualified in an appropriate field must be the ones who establish the most effective way of achieving the goals. Government's role must be to help us to grow, to develop and to expand individual opportunity. This State does not need a Government which penalises those who work hard and encourages individuals to avoid responsibilities or which fails to appropriately allocate tasks which can be accomplished more efficiently by others who are better qualified.

I look forward over the next four years not only to representing the interests of the people of Bright in this Parliament but also, as a member of the Opposition, to constructively keeping the Government in check to help advance South Australia, and to assisting in the formulation of the policies of the next Liberal Government. I thank you, Mr Speaker and honourable members for the traditional courtesy shown during my maiden speech.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** It gives me great pleasure to support the motion. It is the first time for seven years that I have been able to take part in the debate on the Address in Reply. I should like to comment briefly on the statements made by the member for Bright about sabotage and the way his office was left before he took possession of it. As the Minister responsible at that time, I can assure the member for Bright, and any other new members who might have gone into their offices and found them not to their liking, that that was not as a result of a directive from me as Minister. I am sure that the member for Bright was not making that allegation against me, but I should like to place that on the record.

I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your elevation and I also congratulate the member for Elizabeth on his obtaining the position of Chairman of Committees. I sincerely hope that the best wishes and good will extended over the past few days will continue. Sadly, if history is anything to go by, that will not last. It may be that I am a cynic, but I have heard it all said before. It was said to Speaker Gil Langley, to Speaker Terry McRae and to your predecessor, my colleague the member for Walsh. There was talk about the Speaker holding the highest office in the Parliament and upholding the best traditions of the Westminster system. It rolls off their tongues today just as it has rolled off their tongues over past years. But, given about six months, losing division after division, members will become frustrated and more than likely you, Sir, will be accused of being a stooge of this Government. But I know that you are not. I know that you are an impartial person and that you will survive and do the job very well. You will always be welcome to continue to come down to Edithburgh to visit me, but, in view of your elevated position, it will be scones and cap-

puccino coffee instead of the old Black and Gold that we have served you in the past.

Thankfully, Napier has always returned a strong Labor vote. It gave me much pleasure, after the recent election, to end up with the largest two-Party preferred vote on this side of politics in the metropolitan area. If I were not a modest man (and everyone knows me to be very modest) I could claim personal credit for this happening, but it is the electorate of Napier; the electors there continue to be renowned for their commonsense. They refuse consistently to be fooled by the Liberal Party. All the Liberal candidates put up against me have been seen by the electorate to be a joke. I have yet to establish details of those people who voted against me in my electorate, but I understand that in the next four years I shall be able to get that information.

I congratulate the member for Goyder on his elevation to the Opposition front bench. He deserves it for the work that he has put in. Since he has been in the Parliament, he has worked diligently on his responsibilities. I shall follow his progress with interest. I congratulate all members in the House. On this side I welcome them as old friends. I do not know much about the new members opposite, but I shall watch them with interest as the Parliament progresses.

I have heard members opposite, particularly new members, wax lyrical and with real enthusiasm about the powers and role of Parliament. All I can say to the new members opposite is that they have a lot to learn. They seem to think that the Executive has no place in the Parliament. It was my misfortune to spend three years on the Opposition benches in this place (I note that you, Mr Speaker, also spent some time on the Opposition benches) and I saw real abuse of Executive power by the then Tonkin Government, of which the member for Heysen, who is now sitting on the Opposition front bench, was a member.

It is the tradition in this House that maiden speeches be heard in silence, and so they should be. It is important for the House to know the views of new members on a variety of subjects and how they see the way in which they can best serve their electorates. Even though we might not agree with their views, we listen with a fair degree of interest.

I congratulate most of those members for making a concise speech and outlining the way in which they intend to proceed in this forty-seventh Parliament. Sadly, there is one exception: the member for Hayward chose to ignore conventions which have been built up over the years and used the majority of his allotted time to make smart alec comments about members on this side of the House.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** It was a very good speech, though.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The member for Heysen said that it was a very good speech, but I do not think that the electors of Hayward wanted to know whether the Government frontbench received Valentine cards. However, we have broad shoulders and long memories and have been insulted by experts, as the member for Heysen knows, and we will educate the member for Hayward over the next four years.

It would be remiss of me not to commiserate with the member for Hanson on being dumped by his Party following the last election. He has diligently and enthusiastically pursued his role as shadow spokesman for housing over the past four years. I, with officers of my old department and the South Australian Housing Trust, spent many hours briefing the member for Hanson and the Government has spent a fortune on his training—and it has all been for nought. The member for Hanson asked me, as Minister of Housing and Construction, 221 questions on notice, which I believe is a record. He asked very few questions without notice—I think it was one a year—but we all know that the

member for Hanson is a very shy lad and likes to hide his light under a bushel.

It has been estimated that it costs \$200 per question to research the answers inserted in *Hansard*. Answers to such questions must be factual, correct and proper. The 221 questions asked by the member for Hanson represents \$44 200 of the taxpayers' money which has gone down the drain. The member for Hanson deserves better treatment.

I would now like to say a few words about my colleagues who either have retired or were defeated. I refer to Terry McRae, Jack Slater, Roy Abbott, Gavin Keneally and Keith Plunkett, all of whom helped me in many ways during my career in this Parliament. Sadly, the place will not be quite the same without them. Their successors on this side of the House have spoken at length on their contributions to this Parliament and to the people of South Australia. Along with most people in this House I wish them many happy years of retirement.

I thank those members who were defeated—June Appleby, Di Gayler, Mike Duigan, Phil Tyler and Derek Robertson—for their friendship and their contributions during their time in this place. I shall miss them all very much. Without taking anything away from those members opposite who defeated them in the election, I merely add that my former colleagues represented the future of the Labor Party in this place. They had talent and dedication, and their defeat was a loss to this Party, not just in terms of the number of seats involved. I look forward to the possibility that the pendulum may swing and that in four years time we may have them back. It may be, on the other hand, that the members opposite recently elected are the sort of people who will work hard and build up support—as did my colleagues in the previous election—and return after the next election.

The election campaign itself deserves to be mentioned. I have been surprised to hear many comments about the margins of 52 per cent and 48 per cent, but very few comments have been made by members on either side of the House about the campaign itself. One is tempted to make certain assumptions based on the results of the election. I think it is fair to say that the role played by the South Australian Liberal Party—and, in particular, the former Leader of the Opposition—in getting so close to winning was, in the main, a minor role. Members may ask why and, as the member for Adelaide apparently wishes me to expand on that statement, I will do so.

It is common knowledge that Premier Greiner sent his dirty tricks team to South Australia to take over the orchestration of the whole affair. I understand that Nick Minchin was relegated to the sidelines to make the appropriate statements to the media. Whilst they will not admit it, certain members of the media—some more than others—decided at the outset that the Bannon Government should not have a walkover. It was well known by those members of the media who follow the parliamentary debates that during the past four years Her Majesty's Opposition was inept. So, the media took on this role and nearly succeeded.

At the start of the election the Liberal Party had a Leader who for seven years had been seen by the majority of people in South Australia as a carping whinger, a knocker who was negative about everything. During the four years of the previous Parliament, I do not think he said anything good about this Government or about the way in which the South Australian economy was run. In fact, everything he said about the economy was couched in terms of doom and gloom. He made innuendo an art form, but I will elaborate on that later. Quite happily, certain sections of the media took this man and presented him as an alternative Premier.



I do not have time to go through the whole of the Opposition's policies, but there was no question at all about their cost of implementation. At the last count, at the close of the election campaign, the Liberal Party had offered promises to the South Australian people costing \$630 million. All I can say, apart from the satisfaction of sitting on this side of the House, is, 'Thank God they did not win,' because they would have bankrupted the State.

The Opposition faithfully delivered to the people of South Australia a bad story a day concerning the Bannon Government. No matter how outrageous or how distorted, on the front page of either of our two daily newspapers, or on one of the television stations, we saw a story designed to throw the people of South Australia into confusion. Even the premature departure of the Leader of the Opposition raised no more than a passing comment. We all remember the furore that arose when Chris Hurford resigned and the media, along with the Liberal Party, castigated that man and the Labor Party.

One can only sympathise with the member for Custance on the position in which he now finds himself. He fell for the three card trick. The conservatives have played the member for Custance as a sucker—and his colleagues know that—yet not one voice has been raised in his defence. We have heard the platitudes of most members opposite who have said that the member for Custance deserves to be the Premier, but no-one has apologised in this House, or to the member for Custance, for the way in which he has been treated. I am sure that some of the longer serving members opposite would agree privately with me that the member for Custance was treated badly. The fact that he was inept or could not see it coming is irrelevant—he was dealt a blow.

I do not blame the present Leader of the Opposition because I think he played no major role in this matter; he was merely the person who would benefit from the big white car and all the trappings that go with the position. However, certain members opposite know that what I am saying is true—the member for Custance was treated badly.

As to the 48 per cent argument put by the Opposition, I did not realise that it had so many experts on electoral reform. They have all come in clutching Dean Jaensch's report and stood up as experts to say why the Liberal Party should be in Government and the Labor Party in Opposition. All I can say, and will continue to say, is that they lost, and they are bad losers.

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The member for Hartley says that they are born losers. I know that I should not reply to interjections, but they are bad losers and born losers. My advice is that four years is not too long if you work hard.

I pay tribute to the member for Coles (although it hurts me to do so), as she has a reputation for working hard. She has always worked hard and I am sure that in her position on the back bench (and she outlined her role as a back-bencher in her Address in Reply speech) she will continue to work hard. The Liberal Party is basically a lazy group of people and will fall back into its old ways.

The forty-sixth Parliament could well be described as a time when character assassination became an integral part of Liberal Party strategy. I would like to think that under the current leadership the forty-seventh Parliament would be free of those sorts of tactic, although I doubt that it will be. Some members in their maiden speeches quoted *Hansard* from a bygone era, and they quoted Sir Thomas Playford and Sir Robert Menzies. I urge them to read some of the more recent *Hansard* reports, for example, December

1988, page 1840, at which some comments are made by the member for Mitcham about the Minister for Environment and Planning. He called her 'an unprincipled slut'. He did not even have the decency to apologise, but tried to squirm out of it. All members on the front bench heard it and members on the back bench heard it as well, but that man refused to withdraw the comment. The member for Victoria, as he then was, also accused the developer of the Marino Rocks marina of murder.

**Mr Lewis:** Quote it.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** It was completely unsubstantiated, with no retraction. The member for Murray-Mallee asks me to quote it. With 11 minutes to go, I cannot, but I will do so in a further speech next week. We had no apology or retraction. In August 1989, at page 607 of *Hansard*, the member for Mitcham, in private members' time, made a vicious attack on John Dunnery of the Australian Workers' Union—on his actions not as a member of the Local Government Advisory Committee but as a trade unionist, based on an unsubstantiated document originating six years ago. We had a continued attack on Terry Cameron, the State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party, by all members opposite in both this place and the other place. The idea was not to uncover any misdemeanour of which Terry Cameron may or may not have been guilty but, rather, to discredit the man and this Party.

The worst aspect—which makes everything else pale into insignificance—has been the systematic attack on the Attorney-General over the past two years. The Liberal Party had a simple strategy: it started a whispering campaign and members came into their respective Houses and asked questions, hoping that the mud would stick. It was designed to destroy an honourable man, a man of the highest integrity, a man held in high regard both here and overseas. They almost succeeded once. One would think that, after the outcry and criticism of the people of South Australia, members opposite would refrain from making any further attack. But, no, the latest is the prostitutes and brothel saga. Members have again fed rumours to the media through the Attorney-General's political enemies and, to its discredit, the rumours have been pedalled by the ABC through its *7.30 Report*. The aim is to destroy the Attorney-General completely without worrying about how it affects him, his family and those near and dear to him.

Should the Labor Party retaliate? Up until now we never have. The Liberal Party knows that and, in fact, relies on it. I have news for the House! Times have changed and I well know that Liberal members opposite and in the other place react every time we mildly criticise them or their colleagues. To give an example, I referred once to the member for Light as the 'member for darkness'. He stood up, his cheeks were quivering, and he made a personal explanation and asked me to withdraw because I had insulted him and his electorate—simply because I had changed his name. Members opposite are very sensitive. What do we do about it?

The Liberal election policy gave me the idea. One part of the Liberal Party policy that I really appreciated was its code of practice. When pertinent questions were being asked, the member for Coles did say that the code of practice would deal not with past misdemeanours but only with current misdemeanours. That was the let-out. I will read from the press release of the late lamented Leader, John Olsen:

Somewhere in the popularity scale we sit near the bottom with journalists, used car salesmen and real estate salesmen, said Liberal Leader, John Olsen.

He further states:



In other words, parliamentarians don't appear any longer to be answerable to the people who elected them . . . the public.

We have to regain that trust, we have to show we recognise what is expected of us.

There's no point just promising to be good, worthy of our office or answerable to Parliament.

He went on (and this is the most pertinent part) to talk about members of Parliament and stated:

They must realise that their ethical obligations to the public do not end merely by the declaration of their own pecuniary interests. Some of the main points in the attached code of conduct, which will be the rule book of Olsen Government Ministers, include expectation of fidelity to family and an emphasis on the regulations concerning business interest, investments and conflict of interest.

That was quite good: there was a lot of merit in those sentiments. If that was the view of the Liberal Party then, what was good for them if elected to Government is good for them in Opposition. So, I will pick up that code of practice personally and follow it through over the next four years. I have set up myself as an ethics and standards committee to investigate and report to the Parliament any transgressions that members opposite have made, are making or are being accused of making. I will make those reports to the House on each and every occasion that the Liberal Party chooses to personally attack or engage in any smear campaign against anyone on this side. I say to the Liberal Party, 'Go for your life on policy matters, that is your role, but if you attack the person, I will respond.' If the Liberal Party acts responsibly, so will I.

I have numerous examples, and once I get going I am sure I will be inundated by members of either the media or the public. The message is crystal clear: if the Liberal Party lays off, so will I. I do not want to expose members opposite, but I will have no hesitation in doing so if I am forced to act. My advice to the Leader of the Opposition is for him to wipe clean the slate here and now and to ask the member for Bragg to apologise to the Minister of Recreation and Sport, the Hon. Kym Mayes, for the false allegation that he illegally profiteered from Grand Prix tickets.

I ask the Leader of the Opposition to direct the member for Morphett to apologise for falsely claiming in Parliament that the Premier improperly used a Government agency to repair a window at his private residence. He should apologise to the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr Sumner) for his campaign against him, including a whispering campaign to the effect that he was somehow involved in organised crime. Allegations made by the legal affairs spokesman (Hon. Mr Griffin) that the Attorney-General appointed people to the bench on the basis of contributions to political campaign funds should also be withdrawn.

The Leader of the Opposition should also withdraw the allegations made by a number of Liberal members of the Upper House that the Tourism Minister (Hon. Ms Wiese) divulged confidential information. The member for Victoria himself should publicly retract the allegation that a Victorian businessman (Mr Burlock) was implicated in the death of a close personal friend. There are many other examples of unsubstantiated allegations made by the Liberal Party, and those issues must be clarified by someone on the other side so that it will help me with my standards and ethics committee.

This is my last term as a member of Parliament, so retaliation by members opposite, if they want to trump up some allegations about me, would be counterproductive. I have made this decision seriously: I do not do it flippantly. We all have a private life but, in many instances over the past four years, the Liberal Party has attacked the man, not the ball, so enough is enough. It is entirely up to the Liberal Party—

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The member for Mount Gambier is getting very irate. He is an honourable man but what he must realise is that, as a member of the Liberal Party, he is as guilty as each individual transgressor. It is entirely up to members of the Liberal Party to act within the bounds of propriety. I urge them to do so or to take the consequences.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** Responding to what the member for Napier said, I point out to him and to members of the Government that there is a big difference between a code of conduct implemented and maintained by the Leader of a Party or Government and a self-appointed ethics and standard committee as suggested by the honourable member. I point out to the member for Napier that his threats—they are nothing more than that—will not in any way intimidate the Opposition and deter it from pursuing its constitutional role of scrutinising members of the Government. Where their private lives may be relevant to the conduct of Government business, that judgment will be made by the Opposition and that pursuit will be undertaken.

In speaking in this adjournment debate, I refer to an issue that was raised by the Governor in his speech. Sir Donald Dunstan said:

Planning for the long-term provision of the State's energy needs is becoming an increasingly complex process. My Government recognises the need to further develop an integrated response to such issues as ensuring the State's gas supply, controlling energy prices so they remain competitive with other States, and responding to calls for action to limit greenhouse gas emissions.

It is known from environment attitudinal surveys that the greenhouse effect is rated by many people as being the issue of major concern. In fact, in Harrison's *Market Research News* dated December 1989, it was revealed that the greenhouse effect is rated as the world's greatest environmental problem, according to the people of Adelaide, who also strongly oppose mining in the Antarctic and quarrying in the Adelaide Hills.

Another survey of community attitudes towards the environment and the implications for commerce and industry (conducted by H.M. Mattingley last year) showed that a significant proportion of Australians see people's attitudes in caring only for today as a major threat. The sense of collective and individual responsibility—of people, industry and Government for protection of the environment—is far stronger among Australians than it is in the UK or the USA. Approximately 75 per cent of people surveyed said that they had changed the way they lived and behaved or changed the products they bought over recent times.

Last week I had the privilege of addressing the annual general meeting of the Petroleum Exploration Society of Australia. At that meeting, I called on the South Australian Government to pursue with all possible speed and vigour the solar hydrogen economy. In my speech I outlined to the association a memo that a former Governor of South Australia and renowned physicist, Sir Mark Oliphant, sent to the Premier of this State in January last year. In that memo Sir Mark, who has no political affiliations and is concerned only for his State, his country and the world,

suggested that South Australia could play a major role in the development of the solar hydrogen economy, which is being vigorously pursued in Germany, Russia, Japan and the US.

Sir Mark urged the Government to do no more than send an open-minded scientist to those countries to assess the state of current research. He was not asking for the expenditure of vast amounts of money or for the Government, without proper planning, to embark on a course of action that could have profound economic and environmental consequences.

When I was interviewed by the ABC on the question of solar hydrogen, the Minister of Mines and Energy was also interviewed. The House may be interested in what the Minister said. Last Thursday, on the Carolyn Watts program, the Minister said that it was 'relatively silly' to put money into long-term research and development. He said that he would prefer research funds to go into projects that would bring results 'in the next year or two rather than the next year or twenty'. The Minister claimed that the Government did not have the funds, which I estimate would be \$10 000 at most, to send a scientist overseas to assess the current status of research and development into solar hydrogen. It is very hard to believe that a Government that can find millions of dollars for scrimber projects, for feeding dolphins and for a whole variety of projects of varying benefits to the State, could not find \$10 000 to send a scientist overseas to assess the state of solar research.

News items last week revealed that, at the University of New South Wales, Professor Martin Green's research team has had a significant breakthrough in research into solar hydrogen and a special silicon process to produce photovoltaic solar hydrogen modules to produce energy from the sun. We also know that South Australia which has traditionally laboured under the massive disadvantage of being the driest State in the driest continent could now turn this massive disadvantage to its major advantage simply because, within our borders, we have the desert and the sun shines virtually every day.

It has been assessed by experts, so it is not just my opinion that South Australia has the climatic and geographical conditions to produce solar hydrogen, not only for Australia's needs but also for the needs of the greater part of the world. Imagine for a moment what a Premier like Tom Playford would have done with that opportunity. I believe that he would have seized it with both hands. He would have seized it in just the same way as he recognised that, if South Australia was to develop and that it could do so only through the provision of energy and water, he needed to develop the Leigh Creek coal fields. He faced very stiff opposition, and he undertook a titanic struggle to nationalise the Adelaide Electric Supply Company in the face of the most bitter defiance and opposition from his own Party.

What kind of response did Sir Mark's memo receive from the Premier of South Australia? The reply that came back to Sir Mark on 5 March 1989 included a statement from the Office of Energy Planning as follows:

South Australia has inadequate resources available to take a leading role.

What a puny and feeble reply from the Premier of a State that is potentially one of the best placed States in the whole world to pursue the solar hydrogen economy! Nobody denies that the difficulties are immense, involving mathematics, thermodynamics, meteorology and engineering problems. Are they not the very same problems that are being addressed this very day, this very year and this very decade in our aerospace industry and in the submarine project? Should we, if we care at all for the environment, for the future of

agriculture and for the future of human health, not be investing at least equivalent sums to those invested by petroleum companies in the search for hydrocarbons and oil? Should we not at least be prepared to match that kind of investment for a project that stands to benefit this State and this Commonwealth and make them pre-eminent in the world?

I call on the Government to put aside its puny and penny-pinching attitude to these grand plans and to realise that nothing is impossible if we really care about our future and at least set to work to send a scientist overseas to pursue the effects of hydrogen on our economy.

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** During this adjournment debate I wish to inform the House of my support for the proposal, forwarded to the Children's Services Office from the Henley and Grange council, to establish a child-care centre at Grange. Over the years, I have said quite a deal about child-care, and it is with some pride that I am able to report to the House that in seven years we have gone from no child-care whatsoever to after school care, to a full day care centre and to holiday care for children in my electorate.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** I believe that I have had something to do with it. Without a doubt, child-care is a political issue. It concerns the distribution of power, resources and opportunities to families at large. Anyone who believes in the sharing of power and in equality needs to take the provision of child-care services very seriously indeed. One has to take into consideration not only the parents' needs but also the benefits that such a service offers to children. Children entering child-care have educational and developmental opportunities and are able to play with other children and learn to relate to adults outside the family. Some mothers feel that it is almost impossible for them to meet the demands of small children 24 hours a day, while also attending to other domestic chores.

Lack of space, particularly in home units, is a common problem. Many families live in small houses and flats, and they do not have gardens, nor easily accessible parks nearby. Other difficulties may be less obvious. Not all families can afford toys, books and games that some of us take for granted as a normal part of providing for childhood. In addition, it is sometimes taken for granted that there should be sandpits, paddling pools and swings—but these are not always available to small children. Child-care centres provide not only educational benefits but also opportunities for companionship, imaginative play, and loud or messy games, many of which could not be enjoyed by children at home.

It is with as much persuasion as I can muster that I urge the Children's Services Office to have a long and deep look into the possibility of building a long day care centre at Grange, in my electorate. The council office seems to be generous, far beyond what is normally offered by local government. The council is prepared to provide the land for the child-care centre; to waive payment of land rates for the first five years; to provide outside ground maintenance and a donation of \$2 000 for administration; and to take responsibility for the annual audit of the centre's books. Not only that, but the council is prepared to discuss further concessions the Children's Services Office may find necessary, if it is prepared to establish a long day care centre in this suburb.

The number of working mothers in this electorate, in common with that of most members' electorates, has continued to increase. Following the last census, we now know

that one in three mothers with children under school age is in the labour force, as are 56 per cent of mothers responsible for children at primary school age.

The tendency of most of us, when talking about the need for child-care in relation to women's employment, is to envisage families with only one child below school age. The reality is that many women go out to work even when they have two or more pre-school age children. I have never accepted the proposition that working wives work for pin money merely to provide additional luxuries for the family to enjoy. In this age of very high interest rates and second mortgages, it is essential that a working wife be available merely to provide shelter for the family.

Figures obtained from the 1986 Social Atlas indicate that Henley and Grange has eight pockets of single parent families, and the ABS figures show that, on the average, 88 per cent are female; of these, 52 per cent are not in the labour force. We have recently seen a drive by the Federal Government to retrain as many single parents as possible so that they can re-enter the work force. This has advantages for both parties, from the point of view of the elimination of payment of social security benefits on the one hand and the increases of family income on the other hand.

Vital to this proposition is the availability of adequate child-care. Statistics also reveal that the poorest people in our community are the single parent families, and child-care is one way in which society can help single parent families to climb out of the poverty circle. I have always been interested in the provision of child-care for the people of my electorate, and I undertook an overseas study on this subject.

I visited Israel to look at the child-care services within the kibbutzim and to compare the child-care services provided in those areas with those provided in the towns and cities of Israel. It was my deliberate intention to pick a culture where child-care was an integral part of the society. There is no doubt about it: the opportunities for a child in what we would consider the pre-school era (from nought to four or nought to five and, in fact, nought to six in some countries) in areas where specialised child-care is available are, to my way of thinking, absolutely undoubted.

Not only is child-care being provided but the child is being educated at the same time. In these circumstances the child learns to relate to other children and to adults. Not only that, but the gaining of education in a very simple way provides a pathway towards further schooling in years to come. Time does not permit me to provide the Parliament with the full views of the people in authority as to the advantage that children receive from the introduction of child-care at an early age. Suffice to say that there is a report available from the Library on this subject, and it has been established beyond doubt that a child, particularly from poorer areas, who has had the advantage of going to one of these establishments is much better off than a child who has not had that advantage.

There is no doubt that child-care is a political subject, and any local member worth his salt would try to see the establishment of properly supervised child-care centres within his electorate. I have no hesitation in doing this. I have nothing but praise for the Federal Government and, of course, for our own Children's Services Office for the amount of work which has taken place in the past few years in the provision of child-care services.

Certainly, dramatic changes have been made during my term of office in this Parliament. However, in my electorate and in most other electorates there is still plenty of room for the provision of child-care facilities. Not every parent who seeks child-care facilities finds that they are available

to him or her. I believe that the very generous offer that has been made by the Henley and Grange council is something that can be built upon by the Children's Services Office to provide benefits to my electorate.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** May I first regale the House with the rebuttal, if that is what it can be called, to a couple of the pieces of misinformation and political grubbiness to which we have been treated in this place in the past hour. In the first instance, if the member for Napier has appointed himself inquisitor, I invite him to do as he has suggested he would do. I remind him that, whilst I have never attacked him personally, in the unfortunate event that he chooses to play the man and not the ball, it will become necessary to make revelations about his life which might have influenced his conduct in his public duties.

In addition, I remind him of what is already on the record in *Hansard* in that regard: nothing to do with his personal and private life, but his public life as a Minister, when he misled this House over the cost of renovations and the fashion in which different courses of action were chosen in the process of those renovations to the Mypolonga Primary School. On not just one occasion as the issue was debated to and fro across the Chamber, but on several occasions I provided him with information privately and not on the floor of the Chamber, and he chose nonetheless to dispute that.

The second matter to which I wish to draw attention is not so serious in terms of its implications for the conduct of relations in this place between members but is one where the truth has been distorted by someone who must have been wearing rose coloured glasses at the time. The member for Henley Beach used the example of children put into child-care in kibbutzim in Israel as the basis on which he justifies his support, in the general case, for the introduction of such services in Australia. The honourable member must have ignored the bulk of evidence that has already been provided by researchers in Israel about the effect of taking children out of the care of their natural parents in a family setting, or the care of their foster or step-parents in a family setting, and putting them, for most of their waking hours each day, into an institutional setting.

That evidence in Israel shows that crime rates of various types for children, when they reach adulthood, who have been in institutional care are three to five times higher than for those children who were brought up in what we regard as the conventional nuclear family situation, or at least where step-parents are involved, and where the predominant family authority figure—the care-giver and nurturer—is a constant adult who is not paid to do the job but who accepts, in love for that child, the responsibility. That is an alarming omission from the honourable member's research and from the case as he represented it to the Chamber. It must be rectified at this point immediately.

I now go on to the other two matters to which I wish to draw attention. The Iron Duke iron ore mine in the Middleback Ranges of South Australia, west of Whyalla, will be opened on 27 February, that is, next week. That opening will highlight the long-term importance and benefits of indenture agreements. Recognition must be given to the foresight and wisdom of the Playford Government in ensuring the planned development of the iron ore deposits of the Middleback Ranges and the steel making and other associated manufacturing industries in Whyalla which ensued.

More than 30 years ago the Playford Government undertook hard-nosed negotiations with the mining proponents, the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd, and the result was the Broken Hill Proprietary Steel Works Indenture Act, which

was passed by this Parliament in 1958. That Act gave exploration rights on the Middleback Ranges for a period of 20 years and then some in terms of re-negotiation and renewal. This security of tenure ensured that the maximum profitability and benefit to the State could be derived from these resources. The Act allowed for the ongoing operation of the Iron Knob mine and ensured the continuation of the Iron Knob township.

It also contained a requirement that the Government provide the necessary infrastructure for the development of the mines and associated secondary industries in Whyalla, that is, housing, electricity, water, roads and railways. The ore deposits of the Middleback Ranges are not of a uniform type. If the various deposits had been simultaneously exploited by a number of different mining companies, the better quality ore deposits would have been depleted quickly. Most of the ore would have been exported from the State and not processed here. There would have been no value-adding.

The planned development allowed for the blending of different ore types, for example, ores from Iron Knob with those from Iron Baron and, significantly, this kept the quantity of wasted ore to a minimum. This has been a key factor in ensuring sustained profitable development of these iron ore deposits. Without this approach the birthplace of the Australian steel industry would by now be a ghost town, whereas its future is now secure well into the twenty-first century.

This model relationship and framework shows the profound foresight and wisdom that Sir Thomas Playford and his Ministers displayed in all they did. The opening of the Iron Duke mine next week is to their credit, not to the credit of the Bannon Government. The railway link to Iron Duke, which was completed last year, was an obligation of the present Government, or of any Government, under the 1958 indenture Act.

The Iron Duke mine is the third stage of a carefully planned development of the resource which has resulted in enormous wealth to the State of South Australia. The current production of iron ore from the Middleback Ranges deposits to the end of 1988, on the most recent figures available publicly, is 182 million tonnes, together with 8 million tonnes of scree (that is all that was lost).

The continued, systematic and sensible mining of this massive ore body and the development of industries that have grown up from it have occurred through a partnership between the State and the private enterprise components. That is something that the current Premier, to his credit, has advocated. It has produced great benefit to South Australia over a long time—as Sir Thomas Playford knew it would—and that is why the indenture agreement was developed in that way. Indeed, the mining of that huge ore body

and its processing through this single miner indenture agreement has been very efficient.

The opening up of this resource pulled South Australia out of its economic malaise just after the Second World War. The current value of the quantity of iron ore that has been taken from that mine since it began is \$4 billion. So far, these mines have contributed approximately \$40 million in royalties, straight into the South Australian Treasury coffers, and have provided not just South Australia but, indeed, Australia and Australian workers with raw materials for the past 70 years—including, of course, during the two world wars. These deposits have also been the catalyst for the establishment and maintenance of the steel industry in Australia, not only at Whyalla but at Newcastle and Port Kembla as well. The exploitation of these deposits has had a profound effect on the development of secondary industry in South Australia.

One of the main developments has been the establishment of Whyalla and all that it has contributed to the development of this State. It is important to recognise that this further development at Whyalla is a graphic illustration of how such indenture Acts, once carefully thought through, negotiated, and passed through this Chamber, should not be tampered with for the sake of political opportunism. This applies equally to the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act, which was so skilfully negotiated by former Liberal Government Ministers, Roger Goldsworthy, Jennifer Cashmore and David Wotton. As has happened in the case of the Ministers of the Playford Government, future generations will commend their foresight.

This afternoon the Minister, in answer to a question that I put to him, misled this place. As far as I can recollect, he said:

It is not true to say that I issued a directive to the Victorian Government. . . There were discussions at an officer level about this matter to try to resolve the situation in the best interests of both the education systems, and I believe the arrangements that have been reached are appropriate in the circumstances.

That is patently untrue. I have a letter, which has been photocopied and placed in the street in Murrayville, from the Ministry of Education, from Mr Hill, the Chief General Manager of the Minister's office in Victoria. It is addressed to a Mr Blair, who is the Principal of the Murrayville school. The letter points out clearly that the Minister (Hon. Greg Crafter, member for Norwood), the South Australian Director-General of Education (Dr Ken Boston) and the Minister in Victoria (Hon. Joan Kirner), agreed that no further children should come up.

Motion carried.

At 5.43 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 21 February at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 20 February 1990

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## LAND BROKERS

2. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs:

1. Is it intended to increase the liability of the auditor of a land broker's accounts when fraud and embezzlement and/or misappropriation of funds has been occurring over a large number of years and, if not, why not?

2. Will the Government protect land brokers' clients who are found to be unsecured because of fraud at the time of winding up the affairs of the land broker?

3. Will the Government make good the money lost by unsecured investors from the land brokers defaulters fund and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. The Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973 requires that the auditor of a trust account of a land broker must be a person registered as an auditor under the Companies (South Australia) Code. The code sets out the powers of the Companies Auditors and Liquidators Disciplinary Board in relation to a registered auditor who has failed to adequately or properly carry out the duties of an auditor or any duties or functions required by a law to be carried out or performed by a registered company auditor. However, there is no legislative provision either in the code or elsewhere regulating an auditor's liability for losses suffered as a result of fraud or embezzlement or misappropriation of funds by a land broker whose trust account has been audited.

It is the opinion of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs that if an auditor has been negligent in auditing a land broker's trust account in relation to which fraud or embezzlement or misappropriation of funds has occurred the auditor has a civil liability for the losses incurred as a result. The Commissioner's intention is that in such cases he would take all necessary action as would be necessary to recover the losses incurred from the auditor in such circumstances.

It is not the intention of the Government to legislate to regulate the liability of auditors in such cases. It is considered that there are ample regulatory powers under the Companies (South Australia) Code and civil recourse already in existence.

2. At present persons who suffer pecuniary loss as a result of fiduciary default by a land broker may claim compensation for their loss from the Agents Indemnity Fund. Fiduciary default is defined in the Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act as 'defalcation, misappropriation or misapplication of trust money occurring while the money is in the possession or control of:

(a) an agent;

(b) a firm of which an agent is a member.'

In this definition the term agent includes a land broker. However, unsecured creditors such as trade creditors are not entitled to claim compensation from the fund.

At the direction of the Minister of Consumer Affairs the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has been reviewing the protection afforded to persons who have engaged the services of a land broker to act as a mortgage financier and who have suffered loss as a result of the fraudulent actions of the broker while acting in that capacity. No decision has yet been made by the Government as to the protection that

should be afforded to investors in such cases. However, at present they are protected as persons who suffer pecuniary loss as a result of fiduciary default by a land broker and are entitled to claim compensation from the Agents Indemnity Fund.

3. There is no fund called the land brokers defaulters fund. I presume the fund referred to is the Agents Indemnity Fund. As mentioned above if an investor with a land broker suffers pecuniary loss, as defined in the Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act, through fiduciary default by a land broker that person will be entitled to claim compensation from the Agents Indemnity Fund. At present the total amount of compensation claimed from the Fund is vastly in excess of the amount of money in the Fund available to meet those claims. However, it is the Commissioner's intention that all persons having a valid claim for compensation will be paid in full although payment will have to be made by way of several instalments and will have to be made over a considerable period of time.

## LAND BROKERS

3. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs:

1. Does the Government intend to ban land brokers from lending money on first mortgage and, if not, why not?

2. What action is the Government taking to protect lenders from defaulting land brokers?

3. Will the government make 'roll over' money invested on mortgages illegal, so as to force the broker to payout the original capital when the mortgage falls due on each occasion and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. No decision has yet been made to ban land agents from lending money on first mortgages and the Government has not yet considered any formal proposal to ban the activity. Under the Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act a land agent or land broker who receives money from another person on the understanding that the money will be lent to a third person on the security of a mortgage is a mortgage financier.

At the direction of the Minister of Consumer Affairs the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has been reviewing the existing controls under the Act and regulations over mortgage financiers and mortgage financing. Industry representatives and other experts have been consulted in this review. The commissioner also intends to comprehensively review the whole Act and regulations.

2. Because of concern at the continued incidence of land brokers committing fiduciary default of trust moneys entrusted to them for mortgage financing purposes the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs instituted a concentrated effort of identifying the land agents and land brokers who are engaged in mortgage financing activities and targeting them for an urgent audit of their trust accounting records by examiners appointed pursuant to section 69 of the Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act.

In addition to the examiners employed in the Office of Fair Trading consultancy agreements have been entered into with an auditor formerly employed by the Law Society of South Australia and a large firm of public accountants to assist in:

(a) the development of a standard audit program; and

(b) the conduct of audits of trust accounting records of land agents and land brokers engaged in mortgage financing.

3. This proposal has not yet received consideration but will be referred to the officers conducting the review of the legislation for consideration.

#### BEER LABELS

7. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs: What action can the Government take to ensure clear labelling on beer cans and bottles to show in which State the beer is brewed?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: In the majority of cases the name and address of the brewing company appearing on the label of beer cans and bottles sold in South Australia does indicate the State in which the beer is brewed. There is no legislative requirement under either the Trade Standards Act 1979 or the Food Act for the State of brewing to be shown. The Government considers that individual breweries are keen to and do emphasise the origin of their beer and this, in combination with the required packaging information contained on the label, means that consumers are adequately informed.

#### SIR ROBERT HELPMANN

14. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Premier: Will the Government take action to install a tribute to the late Sir Robert Helpmann and, if so, will the citizens of South Australia be offered the opportunity to support such a tribute and, if no tribute is planned, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government is not currently considering the installation or commissioning of any further tributes to Sir Robert Helpmann, as he has been previously honoured in the naming of the Sir Robert Helpmann Theatre at Mount Gambier. In addition, there is a bust of Sir Robert by well-known South Australian artist John Dowie in the Festival Centre foyer. These are considered fitting recognitions of his important contribution to artistic life in South Australia.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE LIST

19. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen), on notice, asked the Premier: When was the last official Government Public Service List printed and why is the list no longer printed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: 1984. The statutory requirement to publish a Public Service List ceased with the repeal of the Public Service Act.

#### PRISONER'S LETTER

24. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Premier: Did the Premier receive a letter from Prisoner No. 26293 at Yatala Labour Prison dated 20 January 1990 and, if so, what was the response to this person's letter and submission and, if none to date, why not and when can a reply be expected?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A letter from Prisoner No. 26293 dated 17 January 1990 was received in my office on 6 February 1990. The letter has been forwarded to the Minister of Correctional Services for urgent advice and a reply will be sent as soon as possible.

#### HELPFUL HINTS ON RECYCLING

29. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Premier: 1. How many pamphlets *Helpful Hints on Recycling* were printed for the last State election, and to which electorates were they distributed and by whom?

2. What was the cost of printing and distributing the pamphlet?

3. Which department or authority paid for the pamphlets and upon which line was the provision made in the budget program performance documents?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. 400 000 pamphlets were printed consisting of 100 000 copies of four pamphlets, each providing a list of recycling depots in a sector of metropolitan Adelaide. The four sectors were:

- Central and Southern
- Central and Western
- Central and Northern
- Central and Eastern

All brochures were distributed by Progress Press, and every household in metropolitan Adelaide should have received a copy.

2. The cost of printing was \$16 813 and the cost of distribution was \$18 060.

3. The South Australian Waste Management Commission paid for the printing and distribution of the pamphlets. The budget line used was 'Public Relations and Education'.