

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 August 1990

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

## MARINE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION BILL

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

## PETITION: PHARMACEUTICAL BENEFITS SCHEME

A petition signed by 165 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose changes to the pharmaceutical benefits scheme was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

## PETITION: BREAST X-RAY SERVICE

A petition signed by eight residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to continue and expand the South Australian Breast X-ray Service was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

## PETITION: CARDIAC SURGERY UNIT

A petition signed by 69 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide a cardiac surgery unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

## PETITION: GLENGOWRIE HIGH SCHOOL

A petition signed by 1 349 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to maintain Glengowrie High School as a secondary educational facility was presented by Mr Oswald.

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 and 6.

## OUTBACK AREAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRUST

Mr **BECKER** (Hanson), on notice, asked the Premier: What is the remuneration received by the members of the Outback Areas Community Development Trust?

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The remuneration received by the members of the Outback Areas Community Development Trust is \$1 535 per annum.

## MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr **BECKER** (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What Government business was being carried out by the driver of the motor vehicle registered UQJ 259 on the public holiday Monday, 21 May 1990, on Unley Road, travelling north towards Pulteney Street, who was the male passenger and was a passenger authorised to travel at that time?

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: Motor vehicle registered number UQJ 259 was a Department of Lands vehicle. The Department of Lands cancelled the registration of the vehicle in February 1990 and the vehicle was sent to salvage where the number plates were destroyed. The vehicle was then sold to a private citizen by way of auction on 14 February 1990.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—  
Judges of the Supreme Court of South Australia—Report, 1989.

By the Minister of Finance (Hon. Frank Blevins)—  
Superannuation Act 1988—Regulations—Non-cash remuneration.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—  
Crown Lands Act 1929—  
Return of Cancellation of Closer Settlement Land, 1989-90.

Return of Surrenders Declined, 1989-90.  
Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act 1934—Disposal of Surplus Land—Return, 1989-90.

By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—

Firearms Act, 1977—Regulations—Fees

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—  
Disciplinary Appeals Tribunal—Report, 1989-90.

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

Local Government Finance Authority Act 1983—Regulation—Jallarah Homes Incorporated.

Corporation of Port Lincoln—By-law—No. 23—

District Council By-law—

Lacepede—No. 8—Animals and Birds.

Morgan—

No. 2—Caravans and Camping.

No. 3—Camping Reserves.

No. 4—Permits and Penalties.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST

The **Hon. S.M. LENEHAN** (Minister for Environment and Planning): I seek leave to make a statement.  
Leave granted.

The **Hon. S.M. LENEHAN**: Last Thursday, I introduced a notice of motion to the House to transfer allotments 93, 97 and 98 at Oodnadatta from the Department for Family and Community Services to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I apologise to the House for not providing an explanatory note with that notice of motion. As I believe it is important that the House be advised of the details, I would now like

to provide that information. Those lots were gazetted as reserves dedicated for the purposes of the Department for Family and Community Services on 8 March 1973. A hostel for up to 50 Aboriginal children is located on lots 97 and 98 and the Dunjiba Community Council expressed interest early in 1988 in obtaining title to those properties.

As the land was surplus to requirements of the Department of Community Welfare, the Minister agreed on 13 December 1989 that action be taken to transfer the land to the Aboriginal Lands Trust, which would then underlease the properties to the local Dunjiba Community Council Incorporated. To give effect to the transfer, it is required that proclamation be made by the Governor, subject to the recommendation of both Houses of Parliament, to transfer allotments 93, 97 and 98, town of Oodnadatta, to the Aboriginal Lands Trust for an estate in fee simple, these actions being carried out pursuant to section 16 of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 1966-1975.

## QUESTION TIME

### ILLEGAL GAMBLING

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Minister of Emergency Services. In view of a raid on 4 August which has stopped an interstate illegal gambling operation worth \$1.5 million, and the belief of senior police that within six months they could have completely broken the back of the illegal gambling industry in South Australia, who ordered an end to the Operation Gantry exercise; why; was the Minister consulted about or involved in this decision; and, if he cannot provide answers to these questions now, will he undertake to report back to the House by tomorrow at the latest?

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I have some information for members. The situation, as I understand it, is that a task force of suburban detectives and uniformed members was set up about 12 months ago for the purpose of providing intelligence to support regional commanders in policing vice, gaming and licensing offences throughout the State. Its main role involved covert type work. The task force also effected arrests if the circumstances required it. Operation Gantry was a special operation designed to police gaming offences identified at a particular time and was manned by the task force that I have just mentioned. In December 1989 Operation Patriot was established to police vice matters and this involved a task force of selected officers.

Both of these operations were terminated on 8 August this year and a new composite task force, code-named Patriot II, was formed. Whilst the new task force has a primary task of investigating vice matters, it will investigate the identified gaming targets in conjunction with local metropolitan detectives. The utilisation of personnel to the best effect requires constant review and adjustment to cope with varying demands and strategies. What might have been the implication or interpretation of the article this morning, that is, that a particular gaming operation had been stopped, is not correct; there has been a reallocation or reorganisation of resources to deal with the problems.

### COUNTRY DOCTORS

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Can the Minister of Health advise the House whether there is a problem in attracting general practitioners to country areas and, if so, what pro-

grams are being initiated by the Government to address the problem?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I suppose I could start by referring the honourable member and the House to the letter to the Editor in this morning's *Advertiser* from the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, which set out some of the initiatives that have been taken by that body with some degree of success in recent years. However, the matter is broader than that, because this is not the only body that is concerned about this problem: the South Australian Government and the AMA certainly are concerned. We have seen this as part of a more general problem about the role of the general practitioner in our health system and in the community.

Some members would know that for some time there has been a review of general practice under the chair of Dr David Gill. Dr Joseph represents the AMA; Dr Allan represents the College of General Practitioners; Dr Filby represents the Health Commission; and Dr Buttfield, from the University of Adelaide, is a consultant to the review. Already there have been two reports. The first came out in September 1988 and identified problems and issues in general practice. The second was on education and training for general medical practice, and we are doing considerable extra detailed work on that.

The third task of this committee is to look at general medical practice in the country, involving the attraction and retention of people, professional status, problems of social isolation and all those sorts of things. The review team has already made a number of visits to country areas and a number are still to come. There will be a report of the findings of this committee in early 1991. In addition, the Country Health Division of the Health Commission has arranged for a Dr Livingstone to come to South Australia for a week to discuss country general practice issues with doctors on Eyre Peninsula and in the Mid North, as well as to have discussions with members of the review team. Dr Livingstone is widely recognised by the medical community for his successful training scheme in general practice in Queensland. There are a number of factors and I have referred to them in passing: isolation, problems of employment for the spouse, problems of education for children—those sorts of things.

One thing with which the issue appears not to be associated is the change of role in country hospitals. I have had drawn to my attention that the member for Adelaide has sought to link the problems of attracting GPs to the country to changes of role in country hospitals. I am only too happy to educate the honourable member and his colleagues on this matter. This is the least of our problems in terms of attracting general practitioners to country areas. Perhaps I can point to an obvious example of this. In the past few years this Government has changed the role of three country hospitals in circumstances that brought a great deal of publicity to those actions. Of course, I refer to the Laura and Blyth hospitals and the Lower Murray District Hospital at Tailem Bend. At Laura and Blyth there has been no loss of doctors and at Tailem Bend two extra doctors have been attracted since that change of role. I think in the best of Euclidean traditions we might say 'QED'.

### ILLEGAL GAMBLING

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** My question is directed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. In view of his statement to the House on 11 August 1988 that 'law enforcement agencies must have significant manpower to carry out the

work of apprehending offenders' involved in illegal SP bookmaking and the fact that these activities continue to grow in South Australia, as shown by the level of bets laid with licensed bookmakers reaching their lowest level since bookmakers were first licensed in 1933, is he satisfied with the new arrangements that reduce the resources to tackle this illegal gambling? If not, will the Minister call for a review of the new arrangement?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I think that the honourable member's question should have been more appropriately directed to the Minister of Emergency Services, as it concerns one of his resource areas, especially in view of the resource allocation that the Minister just indicated to the House. I am concerned about SP bookmaking in this State.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Buttercup speaks again! It is important that we look at what resources are being allocated. I do not purport to be an expert in the area of police manning or resources; that is left to the police and the Minister to manage. At appropriate times I have been briefed by the Commissioner or his officers on this issue, and when the police believe it is appropriate—

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** He is trying to save himself; he won't be here after Christmas. We are obviously concerned about SP bookmaking. The Minister and I have worked together closely. Those resources are his responsibility, and I accept that the police make those judgments. Given the past and continued success of the police, I think it is appropriate for us to continue to allow the experts in this field to make those judgments.

Certainly, I will continue to cooperate closely with the Minister of Emergency Services. Obviously, we will continue to work to stamp out SP operators in this State. Of the many measures which might have been implemented, one would be the introduction of fixed-odds betting. I think this would have had a significant impact on the SP operators but, unfortunately, the Opposition opposed that. I believe that, if the Opposition had had the foresight to see over the hill, it might have assisted not only in bringing more money into the racing industry but also in prohibiting these illegal operations so that we did not have to worry the police and those resources could be devoted to other activities within the community.

### LONG DISTANCE RUNNING

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** In view of the tragic deaths of three athletes who competed in last Sunday's annual 14 kilometre City to Surf charity run in Sydney, will the Minister of Recreation and Sport, in concert with the long distance run organisers, investigate whether additional preventive measures may be required to avoid the occurrence of this sort of tragedy in South Australia?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** The member for Bragg asked me when I am going to give up running. I have never claimed to be a runner; I am more of a staggerer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I will be interested to see the honourable member's times in the Corporate Cup. I will put a few bob on my getting home before he does.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** What price?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I will give reasonable odds.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to return to his answer.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** It is a serious issue and one which I know the running clubs in this State are particularly concerned about. I give credit to those clubs that organise fun runs in this State, in particular, the South Australian Roadrunners Club. It has an excellent track record in relation to all the events it supports. In fact, it provides warnings, first-aid stations, very good monitors and a whole range of information; it gets support not only from the public but from the police.

It is tragic that a situation such as occurred in the City to Surf on Sunday should happen, with the death of three people exercising in that way. Over the years, I think six of about 400 000 competitors have died. There is a message there for all of us: we must run within our capacity and rely on our bodies to give us that message. Organisers of these types of events must adopt basic safety strategies. Those that have been adopted by the South Australian Road Runners Association and other clubs, including the Flinders University Athletics Club, are very important.

The basic safety strategies that all runners need to take note of are properly publicised when South Australian clubs conduct these events. Among the matters a person must consider are: if you are not fit, don't run; if it is a warm day, drink plenty of fluids; if you feel ill or in pain, stop and contact a St John Ambulance officer; don't push yourself beyond your limit or what you know you are capable of. If people intend to enter the City to Bay run and treat it as a fun run, they should go out at least three to four weeks beforehand as a minimum, and start to build up their stamina, so that they can at least complete the distance. If they cannot run it, they should walk it; if they cannot walk it, they should sit down, rest and ask for assistance.

I am happy to take up with all fun run organisers the matter of safety warnings and have them included on all brochures, programs and entry forms so that people constantly get the message and do not over commit themselves in the distances they attempt. As anyone knows who has run a half marathon, a 30 kilometre run or a full marathon, some funny things happen to your body along the way. If you have not attempted it previously, you really do not know what you are getting into.

You can commit yourself beyond your reasonable capacity and, in so doing, cause your body long-term damage. I stress that our running clubs, such as Road Runners and Flinders University, have shown us the way to go and the policy to follow, and I will be writing to all clubs that organise such fun runs and asking them to advertise those warnings on all their literature.

### BENEFICIAL FINANCE CORPORATION

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier. I refer to the statement yesterday by the Chairman of the State Bank Group, Mr Simmons, explaining the financial result of Beneficial Finance Corporation:

Management was also too aggressive at a time when the property market was showing signs of weakening.

Does that mean that company management made major investment decisions without the knowledge or approval of the board and that the company has major unsecured property exposures? Will the Premier reveal the nature of those decisions and exposures? If he cannot give a full answer today, will he undertake to make a full statement to the Parliament tomorrow after consultation with the company board, so that this House and the taxpayers can have this important issue adequately explained?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** First, let me say that the taxpayer and this House are not directly involved in the affairs of Beneficial Finance or its organisation. Certainly as a subsidiary of the State Bank, obviously its successful performance contributes to the performance of the State Bank, as it has done over the past few years. If it is not making profits, that obviously affects the profit of the State Bank. It is a publicly listed company and is not under the control or direction of either the Government or this House. Therefore, in that sense I am in no different position than the Leader of the Opposition in terms of requesting briefings and information on the sort of detail that he wishes.

Indeed, if any employee of the State Bank decided to provide such a briefing without a number of conditions, he would be in breach of the State Bank Act. I suggest that the best and easiest way to handle this matter would be for the Leader of the Opposition to seek such a briefing. I know that the Chairman would be delighted to make it available to him. To the extent that such information can be given commercially, I would have thought that that was the appropriate direction for his question.

### BUS CONVERSIONS

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I direct my question to the Minister of Transport. Can the Minister inform the House whether Sagasco Holdings Limited is conducting a feasibility study into the conversion of the Adelaide bus fleet from diesel to gas? The *Sun Herald* of 8 July 1990, at page 44, states that Sagasco Holdings Limited is currently conducting a feasibility study for the conversion of Adelaide's bus fleet to gas from diesel.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question and, indeed, I congratulate him on the assiduous way he reads interstate newspapers. I would have thought that page 44 of the *Sun Herald* was a somewhat obscure source, but each to his own. As indicated by the member for Henley Beach, a natural gas (CNG) bus demonstration program of 10 buses converted to natural gas is currently being undertaken by the State Transport Authority (STA) in conjunction with Sagasco Holdings and Techsearch Incorporated. Research funds are being provided by the National Energy Research Development and Demonstration Council (NERDDC) and the State Energy Research Advisory Council (SENAC). Sagasco is not undertaking any other independent feasibility study for the conversion of Adelaide's bus fleet to gas from diesel.

All members would know that CNG causes far less air pollution than diesel, and we are very keen to see whether it is feasible to convert all buses to it, but first we have to do the pilot. The buses are being converted from diesel to CNG at the Regency Park workshops of the STA. The first one should be ready to go on the road at the end of this month, with one a month being converted from then. I understand that conversion is quite an extensive job.

Last year we had a pilot program entailing liquid petroleum gas (LPG), which involved six buses. The pilot scheme outcome was not very successful in the sense that the STA has decided not to race out and convert all its buses to LPG. Although LPG was cost-benefit neutral, its performance was not as good as diesel in some respects. Of course, it was cleaner, but not as clean as CNG. The CNG project is particularly exciting, but it is only one part of what the STA is doing to make public transport more environmentally sensitive, at the behest of the Government.

I could give an extensive list of programs in which the STA is involved in pursuance of that objective, but suffice

to say that I did announce some time ago in the electorate of Albert Park, if my memory proves me right—I seem to spend half my life there, announcing things—that the STA was planting 240 000 trees with the object of neutralising the exhaust fumes contributed to the atmosphere by STA buses and trains. Somebody from the media asked me how I worked that out, and I gave him the formula, although I noted that it did not appear as a 15-second grab on the evening news.

Suffice to say that the STA is very aware that the environment is something for which we all have to care, including the STA. I do congratulate it, Sagasco Holdings and the various funding agencies for assisting us in this pilot program. We do hope it will be successful and, of course, if it is, we will consider converting all the fleet over to CNG.

### BENEFICIAL FINANCE CORPORATION

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** My question is directed to the Premier. What proportion of Beneficial Finance Corporation's exposure to property and tourism developments is in other States and overseas, what proportion is unsecured, and when was he first consulted about these lending practices, which are major issues concerning the State Bank group?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Beneficial Finance is a national company and has always conducted a considerable amount of its business outside the State. In fact, I think about 80 per cent of its activities is accounted for out of South Australia.

As members may recall, Beneficial Finance was acquired by the State Bank in 1984 to strengthen its overall financial range of services and its earning ability. For most of its history, which goes back 30 years, it has operated as a national finance company and, therefore, was not seen as a State purchase in that sense but as another way of ensuring that a headquarters financial institution could be retained here in South Australia.

The contribution to the State Bank's profits from Beneficial Finance in the time that it has been part of the State Bank group totals some \$70 million. I think that that is worth putting in perspective, given the current problems that the company is facing. As has been noted in the results announced today, the State Bank will be covering effectively a loss from Beneficial Finance interests of some \$8 million as a result of this year's figures. Set against that extremely strong profit performance, which included a \$30 million contribution in 1988-89, I think that the member can see the real value of having such an organisation as part of the group. But, as has been very fully explained by the Chairman, a number of major problems must be worked through in the coming year. The board and the management of Beneficial Finance are tackling that very vigorously indeed, and I give the board every encouragement to do so.

In respect of being kept informed, as I have said to the House before, it is not my function or my right to be involved in the detailed transactions and day-to-day operations, particularly of subsidiaries, of the State Bank group. However, on a regular basis I meet with the Chairman and the Managing Director, in company with the Under-Treasurer, to get an update on what is happening. Those meetings occur every four to six weeks. At the last meeting—which was probably the week before Parliament reconvened—I was told that, for a start, the State Bank's profit would be down and that would, of course, have an impact on what we would receive from the State Bank and on our forward projections, which are of immediate interest to me; and, in

the case of Beneficial Finance, an intensive study of its debt problems was being undertaken, and the results have, of course, been announced publicly.

### MULGUNYA

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs please inform the House as to what measures are being taken in the metropolitan area to assist Aboriginal people under the influence of alcohol?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in this area. Of course, all members would appreciate the devastating effect that alcohol can have on Aboriginal communities and, of course, earlier this year the House legislated in this regard in relation to Aboriginal Lands Trust communities. However, the State Government has initiated two new programs aimed at providing an alternative to detention for intoxicated Aborigines in the city area. The most recent initiative was the purchase of Mulgunya hostel on South Terrace for a much needed day/night shelter to be run by the Aboriginal Sobriety Group, which is well known in the Aboriginal community for its assistance. The ASG's mobile assistance patrol is expected to be an integral part of the new shelter. That patrol, which was initiated before Christmas, is available throughout the metropolitan area to transport Aboriginal people under the influence of alcohol or drugs to a suitable care facility. Certainly, I am pleased to inform the House that in its first six months of operation the patrol has assisted 800 Aboriginal people.

These people have a choice of being transported by either the Mobile Assistance Patrol or the police to the ASG's own care facility, other State Government-funded 'dry-out' centres or a hospital. The Muirhead Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody identified a high proportion of custodial deaths as being related to short terms of confinement for drunkenness. We are confident that this new Mulgunya facility will be an effective part of the Government's and the Aboriginal community's commitment to eliminating Aboriginal deaths in custody.

The State Government has purchased this property on South Terrace for \$320 000 and will vest the facility's title with the Aboriginal Lands Trust. It is expected that the shelter will have a 20-bed capacity and will be operating before the end of the year. The State Government will also develop a State-wide strategy to prevent alcohol abuse and better provide support services for Aboriginal people in South Australia. We have to stress that drunkenness cannot just be seen as a medical or as a pathology problem. It is about society and family structures. The development of the strategic plan will ensure that there is coordination and consistency in developing a strategy for tackling these problems.

### BENEFICIAL FINANCE CORPORATION

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** In the light of yesterday's statement by Beneficial Finance Corporation and the fact that the Premier now knows these figures, because he has announced the extent of the State Bank group's reduced contribution to the State budget for last financial year, will he now reveal the State Bank group's total provisions for bad and doubtful debts as at 30 June 1990 and also say whether the group believes that these provisions are likely to be significantly increased again during this financial year?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That information will obviously be contained in the State Bank's reports and results when they are released, which should be fairly shortly.

### RIVERLAND CITRUS GROWERS

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Will the Minister of Agriculture permit Riverland citrus growers to sell directly to the public?

**Mr S.J. Baker:** Recycled orange juice.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the member for his important question, because it appears to be a point of contention between various sections within the citrus industry and between the citrus industry and the Citrus Board. It is true that at this moment, or until last weekend, there had been some illegal sales under the terms of regulations administered by the Citrus Board of South Australia, those sales being direct to the public. I have been very concerned about the fact that those illegal sales have been taking place and have indicated that. I have been very concerned because I believe that the growers who were doing that were putting at risk those areas of appropriate regulation—not those areas of unnecessary regulation—in the citrus legislation which are there for the maintenance of the health of this industry, which is an export contributor to South Australia's income. If they continue to do that they will put those regulations at such risk that they might in the end disappear altogether and we could end up with a disorderly marketing situation such as that which existed in the 1960s.

What I have been saying separately from that is that there is, however, an opportunity for growers to have an orderly marketing situation with direct access to the public. I shall be discussing with representatives of the Growers Unity Action Group on Thursday, when they come to see me, how such a mechanism could be structured. I do not believe that there should be a blocking of the right of access from growers to the public if it is done in an orderly way which maintains rather than destroys the industry.

The Growers Unity Action Group will also want to talk to me about the minimum pricing situation. Indeed, the member for Chaffey has already brought a deputation, made up of the Murray Citrus Growers Federation, to see me regarding that same point. I am aware that there is a difference of opinion between what the Government has stated in the White Paper and that organisation and the Growers Unity Action Group, although the action proposed by the Government in the White Paper is supported by the United Farmers and Stockowners. I have listened to the point made by the Murray Citrus Growers Federation and we have looked at the figures that it has presented to us for a reconsideration of the matter.

I indicate that we do not believe there is a need to move away from the decision announced in the White Paper that we will do away with minimum pricing with respect to processed fruit by mid-1992 and with respect to whole fruit as soon as the legislation is passed. The reason is that the fears of the growers about doing away with minimum pricing do not take into account the benefit that the indicative price announced by the board will have.

The board, which will continue to exist, will still be obliged to report to the industry on prevailing international and domestic price trends. On receiving that information, growers can decide whether or not they will sell their produce to any processor or any source at a price being offered. That is very important. One of the things being said to me

by some citrus growers was that they would be taken advantage of by processors who would manipulate the marketplace in the absence of full information being available to growers, and that a grower may end up selling oranges at a 50 per cent discount. They were the sorts of figures being quoted by the Murray Citrus Growers Federation. However, if indicative pricing is being announced by the board, if it is providing a mechanism of reporting what prices are being obtained around the place, that information will be available to growers, who will know whether or not they should be accepting a discount situation.

If they do not want to accept a discount situation, it is up to them to make that decision. They can at least make that decision in the presence of all the information about prevailing market trends, internationally and domestically. That is the second issue that I will be discussing with the Growers Unity Action Group on Thursday. As to the growers market, I hope we can see a situation develop where an orderly marketing situation for direct access to the public by growers may be possible.

### STATE BANK

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** My question is to the Treasurer. How much of the \$17.2 million State Bank contribution to the State budget in 1989-90 was a payment in lieu of Federal income tax and how much was a return on the Government's capital held in the bank? Will the State Bank be making a further contribution to the State's finances in 1989-90 through SAFA and, if so, can the Premier advise the House how much that will be?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I do not have that information immediately to hand, but I will obtain it for the honourable member.

### CONSUMPTION TAX

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** My question is to the Minister of Finance. As the Leader of the Opposition recently suggested in this House that a consumption tax be introduced by a South Australian Government, can the Minister advise the House of the effects a consumption tax would have on the ordinary working people of this State?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Mitchell for his question. I could hardly believe my ears when I heard the Leader of the Opposition (I think it was last Thursday) advocating in this place the imposition of a consumption tax. I could not believe it. I asked myself what possible reason he could have to do that. The only thing I could think of related to his colleagues in the Federal Liberal Party, John Hewson and particularly Ian McLachlan (the National Farmers Federation connection), who have been advocating a consumption tax with about 15 provisos to ensure that hardly any of them ever pay it. That was the only thing that occurred to me as the connection. Then I thought of the mentor of the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Ren DeGaris, who had some funny ideas on taxes when he was in this Parliament; he was always a very strong advocate of a State income tax. I can only assume that, having got nowhere with that, he is advising the Leader of the Opposition now to branch out into the consumption tax area, which is another area that, I suggest, would be absolutely devastating for the ordinary working people of this State.

One of the reasons for that is the inability of State Governments to compensate those people who would be partic-

ularly hard hit. One could put up an argument that, if a consumption tax were imposed federally, some mechanisms are available whereby the Federal Government could compensate those people who would be paying additional significant costs on their basic necessities. They could be compensated then through various mechanisms, whether through negative income tax, social security payments, child endowment and things of that nature. So, there is a possibility that federally that could be done. I am certainly not advocating it, because I still think the minuses far outweigh the pluses.

What mechanisms exist in the State? If a State income tax is imposed, it applies on all basic commodities—bread, milk and everything else—at a flat rate, so it is regressive. There is no way that the State Government could compensate those people who would face an enormous increase in their cost of living and did not have the financial ability to meet that cost.

I was surprised when I read *Hansard*—and I must admit that I did not listen to the whole of the Leader of the Opposition's speech—because I thought that surely the Leader would have addressed the question of compensation, as it is central to the question of a consumption tax. But, there was not one word on compensation. I do not believe that that matter has even been considered by the Leader of the Opposition or by the Hon. Ren DeGaris.

I would ask that any member opposite or any adviser to members opposite who wants to put forward views—and it is quite legitimate that they should—in the taxation area put forward views that are well thought through so that they do not impact on ordinary working-class people, ordinary wage and salary earners and those in receipt of small fixed incomes, whether superannuation or social security. I ask that people consider those particular aspects. I can only repeat: State income tax would be quite disastrous for the ordinary working people of this State for the reasons I have just mentioned.

### DOMINGUEZ BARRY SAMUEL MONTAGU

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. Does the Government still retain the Sydney banker and broker, Dominguez Barry Samuel Montagu, to provide advice on economic and financial matters according to arrangements previously advised by the Minister to the parliamentary Estimates Committees? If so, has DBSM provided recent advice on the Government's current shareholdings in Sagasco Holdings? What was that advice and is this investment currently under review in light of the statement the Premier made to this House on 14 April 1987 that the Government had 'not closed the door at some stage on . . . selling or diluting some of our holdings'?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The answer to the first of the number of questions asked by the honourable member is 'No'. The following questions are therefore irrelevant.

### RESIDENTIAL LAND

**Mr HERON (Peake):** I direct my question to the Minister of Lands. Is the author of the article which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 15 June 1990 and which begins with the statement, 'Adelaide will suffer escalating land prices and residential land shortages in the next five years unless land supply problems are overcome', correct to make such a prediction?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** The short answer to that question is 'No'; I do not believe it is accurate to make such a prediction, and I will clearly explain why. The production of allotments for private use in metropolitan Adelaide will be about 5 400 for 1989-90. This will broadly balance the expected usage of some 5 250 allotments for new housing construction. Between the September quarter of 1988 and the September quarter of 1989 the average sale price of vacant allotments in the fringe areas rose from some \$29 290 to \$30 870, an increase in that 12 month period of about 5.4 per cent. The preliminary average price for the March quarter of this year was \$29 687; in fact, that represented a decrease of some 3.9 per cent over the September quarter of the preceding year.

It is important to make some comparisons with other fringe areas interstate. These prices compare with \$34 700 in Perth in March 1990; \$35 000 in Brisbane in March 1990; and \$65 000 in Sydney in February this year. The metropolitan development program provides for the progressive release of further broadacre land to the north and south of the metropolitan area where land is already zoned for residential development. I do not have to remind this House of the vital and important role which the South Australian Urban Land Trust and the South Australian Housing Trust play, have played and will continue to play in the Munno Para and Seaford areas.

The Government's urban consolidation program is certainly providing for the redevelopment of existing sites in those areas, particularly in areas which need to be redeveloped and rejuvenated. Therefore, we do not have the problems of land speculation and land availability which exist in other capital cities. Our land prices are among the lowest and, indeed, the most stable of any of the capital cities in Australia.

#### ADELAIDE CASINO

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** My question is directed to the Premier. In view of the commitment given to this House by the member for Hartley on behalf of the Premier on 11 May 1983 that, after parliamentary approval of the legislation to establish a casino, 'appropriate sums' of Government money 'will be expended on research into the effects of gambling on the community', why has the Government so far failed to honour this commitment, and will it now undertake this promised research before the casino introduces 800 video gambling machines, which are expected to increase spending by gamblers at the casino by \$250 million a year; and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I do not recall the commitment made on my behalf by the member for Hartley some seven years ago but certainly the Government—indeed, the community—needs to monitor and be concerned about the impact of gambling generally and, I guess, about gambling in the casino in particular. The honourable member might recall some of the very dire predictions made at the time of that debate about the appalling social effects and other things that would occur. She would have to agree that there has been very little evidence of that. That is not to say that there have not been some unfortunate individuals who have come to grief through the casino. Whether they might have done so through some other form of gambling, one never knows but, certainly, there could be some examples.

However, the net and overall social benefit of the casino has been very great indeed. I am not just talking about the immediate benefit to 1 000 people who have jobs but who would not have them if it did not exist. Nor am I talking

about the sum of \$12 million, part of which is allocated to the Housing Trust and the rest of which goes into very essential Government services in the community. If that money had not been spent, one wonders what would have been the down side of that. In other words, this has to be put into a total perspective. There is no question that tourism in South Australia and the flow-on of jobs from it have benefited enormously from the casino. Any of these social effects have to be balanced against that overall benefit to the community which, it must be agreed, has been overwhelmingly in favour of this city's having such a facility. I am not aware of any specific studies that have been commissioned, and I will certainly make some inquiries in relation to that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Reference is made to the statement of the member for Hartley in 1983 in *Hansard*—

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Certainly, I will be interested to look at it. I thank the honourable member for her concern. I can assure her that, in looking at any reasonable, legitimate extension to the casino's activities, the overall benefits to the State will be considered.

#### RABBIT POPULATION

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister advise the House of progress on work being conducted by departmental officers in Spain, involving methods that might be used to control rabbit numbers in the State's far north? I understand that one method involves the Spanish flea.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Before proceeding on this question, I will just clarify any misunderstanding; it is Spanish flea that is being talked about, not Spanish fly. Dr Brian Cooke and Ms Faele Bartholomeuz have been working in Spain on two areas of possible assistance for the control of the rabbit population in South Australia. The first of them, which seemed the more promising, was viral haemorrhagic fever. This disease is causing devastation to rabbits overseas and, I must say, the Spanish have been somewhat bemused that we have sent officers across eager to find out about this disease killing rabbits, because they are actually very distressed about the rabbits that are dying, and they are busy trying to find vaccines for it. Indeed, I understand they have now found a vaccine for domestic rabbits, which is a great shame, from our point of view.

This disease, which has only relatively recently been identified (I understand it was identified in 1984 in China) killed 32 million rabbits in Italy after it went there, and has devastated the Spanish rabbit population since 1988. We are, therefore, very interested in the prospect for South Australia. Although, the benefit of this disease is that it would result in the killing of large numbers of rabbits, particularly in the pastoral areas, there would need to be extensive quarantine work done on this before it was introduced in Australia, lest it should cause any problems for native species. My early advice from Federal authorities on this matter is that it is not looking too promising in that respect.

The second area, which looks more promising, is with respect to the Spanish flea. This particular kind of flea, for which I do not know the exact zoological name, is a flea

that does not live on the rabbit; it lives in the sand nearby, and every so often it will hop on the rabbit for a takeaway meal, and will then go back into the sand. In the process, it will come in contact with a large number of rabbits, thereby having the capacity to be a vector for myxomatosis. It therefore offers the promise of this being done in the pastoral areas, where, up to date, we have not found any successful vectors for myxomatosis. The prospect is, again, rather promising, and some of these fleas have now been brought back into Australia for introduction into the quarantine situation, where we hope that, after the process of time spent on proving that they will not cause any other problems for the Australian environment, they can then be released into the rabbit population and, it is hoped, spread myxomatosis in an area where we presently have enormous difficulty spreading myxomatosis.

### RECYCLED PAPER

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Will you take immediate action to ensure that recycled paper is made available as an alternative to that which is already supplied, so that this Parliament is quite appropriately acknowledged to be setting an example to the South Australian community on this vitally important issue?

**The SPEAKER:** Knowing that it is the honourable member's birthday, I suppose he felt he needed to ask a question of the Chair on this matter, and perhaps a recycled birthday card would help. The honourable member's question is very relevant in today's climate of environmental concerns and recycling. As he and all members are aware, the House—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House does not buy direct paper stationery and supplies into its own stores; it is obtained from the State Supply Division. However, I will certainly take up the point with that division and query its capacity to supply recycled paper.

### COUNTRY RAIL SERVICES

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** I direct my question to the Minister of Transport. Can the Minister tell the House what is the current position with regard to country rail services and state the Government's view on this matter?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Stuart for her question. Noting, Sir, you do not often get a question from the Opposition. I can only say that neither do I, so I especially thank the member for Stuart for facilitating my giving the Government's position on this.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Stuart for her question. Noting, Sir, you do not often get a question from the Opposition. I can only say that neither do I, so I especially thank the member for Stuart for facilitating my giving the Government's position on this. The issue is very serious because, particularly in the South-East and, more particularly, in the upper Spencer Gulf (formerly known as the Iron Triangle; it has had its name changed), it would be a very sad day if we lost our passenger rail service. It would also be sad if we lost the service between Broken Hill and Adelaide. Again, there has always been a very strong connection between the city of Broken Hill and the city of Adelaide. In fact, I believe that that connection is much stronger than the connection between Broken Hill and Sydney. So, again, it would be a great pity if we were to lose those services.

Apart from acting in relation to the Blue Lake service to Mount Gambier, there is not a great deal that the State Government can do because the Iron Triangle service unfortunately was instigated by Australian National long after the transfer of the country rail service to the Federal Government. A similar position prevails in relation to the Silver City service to Adelaide. There is doubt that we have any legal right at all to protest against the closure of that line. Not that that would stop us protesting but, I fear, the protest would not be terribly effective. It is completely different with the Blue Lake service because we do have some legal rights in that area. I can assure the House that we will be exercising those legal rights to ensure, as much as we are able, that the Blue Lake service continues. It will not be easy to do that because if Australian National is determined to close down these lines, we do have the right eventually to take the issue of the Mount Gambier line to arbitration. Nevertheless, I would not be terribly confident. In relation to the Silver City service and the Iron Triangle service continuing, our success will depend on our powers of persuasion with the Federal Government and I am not sure how far that will get us.

Comments made by the Leader of the Opposition have made it much more difficult for the South Australian Government to save the Blue Lake service. I read the comments some time ago and chose not to bring them up in the House until I heard the member for Mount Gambier say, during the past week, what a dreadful thing it would be and how, at all costs, the line has to be saved. I thought that that was a very reasonable statement from the member for Mount Gambier. However I do not know whether the honourable member reads the *Narcoorte Herald*, as I do, or whether he does not speak to the Leader of the Opposition. I do not know whether the reason why the honourable member is on the back bench is that he cannot tolerate this type of rubbish. I will read to the House the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition and reported in the *Naracoorte Herald* on 26 February 1990. The article states:

State Opposition Leader Mr Dale Baker told the *Herald* that while the closure of the service would be a 'tragedy', it appeared a foregone conclusion. 'The closure is inevitable', he said on Friday. Mr Baker said people could not expect new rolling stock costing more than \$1 million to be bought for the service when they were not using it. 'It is all a case of patronage', he said. The patronage does not warrant the renewal of the rolling stock. 'Do we want the taxpayer to pay for it? That is the question we have to ask', Mr Baker said.

Immediately the State Government attempts to take this issue to arbitration that will be one of the first exhibits given to the arbitrator by the Federal Government. The member for Mount Gambier may have some rights and appear personally, but, when confronted with what his own Leader has said, what chance do the people of the South-East have? They have no chance whatsoever. The Leader of the Opposition has sabotaged the Blue Lake service.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, those matters are not relevant to the question that was asked. I believe that the Minister is wasting time.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has made his point. The honourable member for Bright.

### RECYCLED PAPER

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** In view of the earlier question to the Speaker from the member for Heysen, will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise this House what



special provisions have been negotiated with the suppliers of Government office equipment regarding warranties, and also what efforts she has undertaken to encourage the manufacture of office quality recycled paper in South Australia? Many manufacturers of photocopiers and laser printers for computers advise that the warranty on their equipment is invalidated if recycled paper, such as the Re-Write brand, is used in their equipment. This seems to be the type of paper that is used by the Minister, the Premier and the Minister of Transport, to name but a few.

The reason for the stance of one manufacturer is quite simple. During the recycling process the fibres of the paper are shortened, and when recycled paper passes through a photocopier or laser printer, it is heated and the fibres are shortened further. Through this process some types of recycled paper produce a much greater amount of abrasive paper dust than other types of paper. This dust abrades the workings of the machinery, causing it to break down. It is therefore important that an office quality recycled paper is made available to meet the request to the Speaker by the member for Heysen.

**The SPEAKER:** It seems to me that the honourable member might have answered his own question. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question, and I also thank the member for Heysen for raising this matter in the House, because it is a matter about which I have been concerned for some time. In fact, as the honourable member pointed out, I use recycled paper in my ministerial office. I would also point out that not only do I do that, but we use recycled envelopes. From the Department of Lands we use old discarded maps which are made into envelopes and which have been quite a talking point in the community and in the halls of Government.

**Mr Lewis:** More gimmicks!

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I must make a comment about the interjection that they are gimmicks. I do not believe that they are gimmicks. The disused maps, which are now out of date, would be thrown away and become part of landfill and disused paper. I should have thought that the member for Murray-Mallee—it is interesting that he is the shadow Minister of Lands—might have acknowledged and welcomed the exciting initiative taken some time ago by the Department of Lands of using recycled envelopes.

The question specifically relates to what I have done with respect to encouraging the use of recycled materials in Government. I have done quite a large amount. I am in the process of having discussions and negotiations with my ministerial colleagues about this matter, because, rather than adopt a piecemeal department by department approach, I think we should be looking at an overall approach, and that will be my thrust in this direction in the future.

I have also taken the opportunity to visit the A & M plant at Dry Creek to see for myself the issues, the problems and the successes relating to the production of office paper in South Australia. I am very much aware of the recycling process, having recently visited a recycling plant at Shotton in Wales. I understand the issues that the honourable member has raised and the concerns of industry in terms of being able to produce a recycled office paper that can be used for photocopying and a good quality office paper that addresses the issues and concerns of manufacturers of things like fax machines, photocopiers, and so on. I do not believe that there is an easy and simple answer to this, because we are literally changing the community's thinking about the

use of our natural resources and the reuse of what was considered as waste some years ago. I am certainly working as hard as I can in this area, and I believe that the Government is committed to ensuring that we move to a recycling mode in South Australia as quickly and economically as possible.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Call on the business of the day.

---

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 9 August. Page 198.)

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I support the Address in Reply. I want to take this opportunity, along with other colleagues, to welcome to this Chamber the new member for Custance. I am sure that the honourable member will make a significant contribution to this House, and the wide knowledge that he has in a number of areas will be of great importance to future debate in this place. Also, I want to take the opportunity to commend once again the contribution that His Excellency the Governor and Lady Dunstan have made to South Australia and to the South Australian community. Along with many other members in this place I am disappointed that this was the Governor's last opportunity to open the Parliament. The Governor and Lady Dunstan have made a significant impact on the people of this State. They have served South Australia well indeed. They have been totally committed in their work and totally loyal to Her Majesty the Queen. I take this opportunity to wish both the Governor and Lady Dunstan well in their well earned retirement.

In the first instance, I want to discuss a number of issues that are raised in the Governor's speech. Of course, members realise that the speech is in fact prepared by the Premier on behalf of his Government. The first matter to which I refer is the multifunction polis (MFP). The speech indicates that it is important for the long-term future of this State that Adelaide has been selected as the site for the development of the MFP in Australia. Certainly, I support the concept, but a significant number of questions need to be answered and a number of matters need to be addressed.

I raised in the House the other day the question of whether an indenture would be brought down by the Government, as has been the case with both Golden Grove and West Lakes. It would seem appropriate that that should be the case, so providing an ideal opportunity for this Parliament to have a significant input into the future of that project. The Premier was not able to indicate then whether that indenture would be introduced and, along with many other questions, we need to have some of these issues addressed in the near future.

Mention is also made in the opening speech about the work of the planning review, which again I support strongly. On a number of occasions the Leader of the Opposition has referred to the bipartisan support that we have given the review. I have had a close involvement with people who are taking part and who hold an important position in ensuring that the review is a success. As has been said on a number of occasions, I hope that the review has a positive conclusion. It concerns me that it will take two years. A number of organisations and individuals have expressed that same concern but, provided the outcome is positive

and constructive and is what is needed to ensure that South Australia has positive planning laws and regulations, it will be worthwhile.

I hope that the planning review is not being used by the present Government to take planning off the agenda for the next two years. It is a very complex area. Certainly, as a previous Minister responsible for that portfolio, I recognise the complexities and the need to get planning right. I will be most interested to follow that review closely. At this stage a document known as *Vision 2020*, which sets out the major issues that will be considered, has been published. That excellent document is well prepared and written. The document is easily understood and, if it is an example of what we have to look forward to in respect of the review, it will be positive indeed.

We also learned through the Governor's speech that provision is to be made in waterworks and sewerage legislation for a new and more equitable rating system and for a more commercial approach to charging. It is stated that this is likely to result in the majority of South Australian households paying the same or less in real terms for these services. On a future occasion I would like to take the opportunity to speak on this subject in more depth. Now that we have only a limited time for the Address in Reply, one of the problems we have is determining priorities in respect of what members speak about. Certainly, there are a number of topics that I would like to address today and others that I will have to follow up on a future occasion, and that is certainly one such topic.

Reference is also made in the speech to the introduction of the Marine Environment Protection Bill by the Minister for Environment and Planning. It is not appropriate for me to speak about that Bill, because we all know that Standing Orders have been suspended to enable that legislation to be introduced. At the appropriate time I will speak to that measure. However, let me just say, as the House will be aware, I gave notice some two weeks ago (on the opening day of Parliament) that on behalf of the Opposition I would be introducing a private member's Bill to deal with this very important issue of marine environment protection. The Minister has now been forced into introducing Government legislation, and that will be dealt with in the appropriate way.

Another topic in the speech refers to the retention of native bushland on private land through the Native Vegetation Management Act. That is an area that I have followed closely. I was delighted to read recently in an article that more than \$18 million has been paid out for heritage agreements, and that there are now 350 heritage agreements in South Australia covering over 140 000 hectares of scrub. The Department of Environment and Planning released those figures this month. The figures show that 197 agreements have been signed and 113 are pending finalisation under the Native Vegetation Management Act, and a further 153 heritage agreements have been entered into under the Heritage Act. I am particularly interested in that because that was one of the measures that I introduced as a Minister. It has been a very positive measure.

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I introduced the heritage agreement system in 1982. The legislation to which the Deputy Premier now refers came out of that concept, which was the first in Australia. It is expected that by 30 June the total area under heritage agreements will exceed 200 000 hectares, and that is recognised as being by far the most cooperative and extensive off-park native vegetation management program under way in Australia. So, I am particularly pleased to be able to support that as well.

One matter to which I want to refer briefly concerns the number of reviews that are being undertaken in the departments which are the responsibility of the Minister for Environment and Planning, the Minister of Water Resources and the Minister of Lands. In particular I doubt whether there is anything not presently under review in the Department of Environment and Planning. I have already referred to, and expressed my support for, the planning review, which I think is essential, but significant reviews are also being undertaken in regard to heritage, pollution control and national parks. And one could go on.

In fact, we learnt recently that a review of the national parks legislation is under way. That is very much overdue. The first attempt to review that legislation began in the early 1980s, and we have yet to see the result of the work that has already been carried out. Significant areas of that department are currently under review and, while in some cases that is a good thing, I suggest that in other cases much of that work might have already been done. It concerns me that we have a system where so many reports that have been prepared by Government departments and authorities are pigeonholed to gather dust and that no action is taken concerning the many recommendations; they are forgotten and later further attempts are made to consider the same matter.

Another important matter to which I referred by way of a question in this House today concerns recycling or the minimisation of waste. It is of concern to me that this Government has been long on recycling rhetoric but very short on action. We know that a strategy was released recently for public consultation, and I understand that. The feedback has been very successful and positive. We hope that, because of the importance of the issue and because of the general enthusiasm in the community, some action will be taken by the Government in the near future.

I say 'enthusiasm' because I believe that, as a result of some excellent television programs that were shown earlier this year, there has been significant enthusiasm for recycling on the part of young people in particular. I would be sorry if that enthusiasm were lost. I am sure that many members have had the opportunity to visit schools to learn of the recycling programs they have begun. I have visited a number of schools which began programs to collect paper, plastic and so on, but these programs had to be cancelled because there was no plant at the end to cater for these recycled products. It would concern me if that enthusiasm, which was evident in the past, was lost because of inaction by this Government.

I now refer to a matter which is of significant importance to this State and which is receiving much attention—that is, land degradation. We are all aware, and I am sure all very supportive, of Land Care and the work of people in this very important area. Recently one of my friends did some background work on this and provided me with information that I found most interesting. We have to learn from the experience of other parts of the world that have the same climate and soil conditions as our country before the impact of the developing human race can be recognised. Europeans have been in South Australia for only 150 years or so, and we seem to be achieving in 150 years what took 3 000-plus years to achieve in the Middle East.

In the Mediterranean area, before the human race proliferated and became dominant, the forests in Israel, Egypt, Lybia, Algeria and so on continued down to the sea. There was a classic Mediterranean climate of cool wet winters and hot dry summers. There are drawings of the pharaohs hunting leopards in the forests of Egypt. I repeat the 'forests' of

Egypt. Israel was the land of milk and honey where the hills around Jerusalem were covered in Lebanon cedar forests. By Christ's time these had become the barren hills of Judea that we read about in the New Testament. Today, Egypt, apart from the Nile irrigation area, is semi-desert, shading into true shifting sand desert. All along the southern coast the situation is the same. The grain growing lands of the Roman Empire were in what is now Lybia. The process of land degradation seems to have gone through various well defined stages.

At first the open spaces in the forests were used for grazing animals. In fact, the domestication of animals was the key factor in the whole process. The use of wood for cooking was a factor, but the real villains were the sheep, goats, cattle and camels. The animals, as they became more numerous with the expanding human population, ate all the seedling trees, and the old trees became aged and eventually died out as there were no young ones to take their place.

The next stage was what has been called generally the 'grasslands phase'. The grasses that originally grew in the open spaces took over and the trees were nearly all gone, surviving only in the high country of the mountains of Syria and Lebanon and the Atlas Mountains in the west of the region.

During the 'grasslands phase' the land was at its most useful to the human inhabitants. There was plenty of grass for the domestic stock to eat and no trees in the way of farmers growing cereal crops. But slowly the areas heated up without their insulating cover of trees, and in years when the hot Mediterranean summer lingered on the land became bare and erosion started when the winter rains came.

The eroded areas were then bare all the time and the grasslands slowly began to shrink. At this stage the winter rains began not to arrive on time and eventually, slowly, considerable rainfall loss occurred. The end result today is that land that was pleasant Mediterranean forest interspersed with grassy glades has become the semi-arid harsh landscape of the Middle East. To put it in a trendy sentence, the forests of the pharaohs became the wheat fields of the Romans, which became the sandy wastes where the tank battles of World War II took place.

South Australia's productive regions had a Mediterranean climate, with considerable tree cover, shading inland to semi-arid lands in the interior—just like the Middle East. In the 150 years during which we Europeans have been here, we have introduced millions of European livestock and have, in more recent times, mechanically cleared vast areas of forest and scrub. The result of all this is that we are now in the full flush of the grassland phase where the landscape is in its most useful state to us.

The object of this exercise is to avoid the decline into semi-aridity that occurred in the Middle East. I believe that we can learn from history; we must learn from history; and we must practise sustainable agriculture. That is why I support so strongly many of the efforts being made now through organisations such as Land Care. I recognise the magnificent work being carried out by the vast majority of landowners in this State who recognise their responsibility and who are accepting it very well indeed. Talking about history, I point out that my colleague, the Deputy Premier—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** —that is, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, made available to me a copy of *The Willochran*, the newsletter for the Diocese of Willochra, dated 1 July 1935. I was interested to read the letter of the Bishop of that time who, under the heading 'Disappearance of trees', wrote:

In my last letter I referred to the alarming rate at which timber is disappearing in the northern regions of South Australia. I am

told that the matter is now receiving serious consideration in several influential quarters, and I hope that the problem will be dealt with quickly by competent authorities. One newspaper a few weeks ago stated that in the United States of America a belt of trees one thousand miles long and a hundred miles wide had been planted to deal with the drift of soil which is only of quite recent occurrence in that land.

There are thousands of men idle in our large towns and cities. It ought to be possible to mobilise them and employ them in the work of restoring vegetation to the interior of Australia, and save our land from drift which every year is pushing its way into the more or less settled areas.

I am delighted with much of what is being done now in this State to help overcome those significant problems. I will cite one example, because I am enthusiastic about the work that is being done particularly by young people in this important area. I was interested to read that students from Prince Alfred College in South Australia and the Trees for Life organisation are combining in a unique revegetation project. Last summer, 85 students and staff grew 42 500 seedlings at their homes, and the seedlings were ready for planting in April or May at Lake Bonney in the Riverland.

I have learnt that a housemaster at Prince Alfred's senior school, Mr Nigel Croser (whom I know personally and for whom I have considerable respect) said that, as well, students and staff would collect seeds at a site near Morgan and organise and manage a Trees for Life distribution centre at the college's Kent Town property. Propagation kits and seeds to grow about 65 000 seedlings will be distributed. The school community will also work with students from other schools, especially in the Riverland, as part of a joint project, to enable college students to learn about the Riverland first-hand and develop a heightened awareness of natural seasons. I guess I could refer to dozens and dozens of similar examples in South Australia where our students are becoming involved in such programs, and they are to be commended for the responsible attitude they are adopting in these areas.

In Australia today, and in South Australia in particular, we have what sometimes appears to be a conflict that we have difficulty coming to terms with, that is, a conflict between environmental protection on the one hand and the need to produce and develop on the other hand. We all know that our national debt situation, the balance of payment problems and the general economic decline make it imperative that we get the most we can from land use, but examples of over-use and land degradation abound. To put it bluntly, we have to succeed on both scores. We have to be clever enough to practise sustainable agriculture and maximise earnings. The cold hard facts are that we just do not have any choice. There is no room for argument. We have to win on both fronts, and I am pleased that this is generally being recognised.

The argument which has been going on for some time and which, to some extent, is still with us between what are generally referred to as the two categories—greenies and developers—is unacceptable. The situation that we now face is far too serious for stupid conflict. The only answer is to get together and work out a way ahead that is both sustainable and profitable. If we are looking for catch words, I suggest they are the two words: 'profitable' and 'sustainable'. I am confident that there is sufficient motivation in our community to achieve this two-way goal. As an example, I believe there must be some personal benefit for farmers and graziers to undertake land care measures. The tax benefits system worked so well in terms of land clearance in the past that the time has now come to put the system in reverse so that we can re-establish the appropriate cover of our landscape.

*Our Common Future*, a document put out under the auspices of the World Commission on Environment and Development 1987, states:

The environment is where we all live; and development is what we all do in attempting to improve our lot within that abode. The two are inseparable.

Overwhelmingly, I believe that we want to be part of a strong, prosperous and free society. We must all recognise the inescapable demand for a more sensitive approach to the environmental consequences of our actions where Governments, businesses, corporations, individuals or local communities are involved.

I take this opportunity to commend all those voluntary organisations and individuals in South Australia who accept that as one of their major goals and who are playing their part in encouraging all of us to care for our environment, because each one of us has an important part to play in recognising the limits of our earth's resources. I repeat: they are our earth's resources. It is imperative that we all act now to ensure that we leave a world that will sustain and support future generations. It is important that we recognise that not only can development and conservation be compatible: it is a matter of fact that they have to be compatible. Sustainable development depends on our globally, nationally and locally recognising the limits of our earth and our responsibility to future generations to ensure that their world will sustain and support them.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In so doing, I sincerely thank His Excellency for the manner in which he presented his address but, more particularly, I make special mention of the outstanding service he has given to this State. I certainly wish him and Lady Dunstan all the very best in their retirement. I make that special mention because, in recent years, as all members would know, Eyre Peninsula has undergone a very difficult period with four and, in some cases, five successive years of drought and the people of Eyre Peninsula were pleased indeed that His Excellency took a personal interest in the grave concerns being expressed by them.

His Excellency visited the peninsula, where he met with a number of producer organisations but, more particularly, with some of those most directly affected. I think that that very visit took him and Lady Dunstan to the hearts of Eyre Peninsula people, and I am sure I can say quite confidently that the door is always open for Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan to visit Eyre Peninsula at any time. I might add in passing that His Excellency has visited Eyre Peninsula on many occasions, unofficially. He is an avid fisherman and he probably knows more about the rock and coastal fishing spots on Eyre Peninsula than do many of the Eyre Peninsula residents themselves. To that end, I wish him well, and we would like to see him back there on many future occasions.

I would like to welcome the member for Culance to this House and say that he issued me with a bit of a challenge in his opening address. He wanted to talk about amalgamation, a matter which I am only too pleased to take up at some future date. I do point out, however, that that matter has been put to me on numerous occasions and, not being one to accept issues at face value, I decided to do some home-work of my own. I studied every House of Assembly contest, going right back 50 years to the time of single members, and I was rather interested to find that when it was a two-way contest—whenever, in other words, an amalgamated conservative Party opposed a Labor Party candidate—that amalgamated (or single) Party candidate beat a sitting Labor member only on very few occasions.

Conversely, the number of times a Labor candidate was able to beat a sitting Liberal (or LCL, as it was then) member was four times as great; so there must be a message in that. If the honourable member is serious, we must look carefully at what has happened in the past 25 years and consider how many times he has had the opportunity of voting for a successful conservative Government in his lifetime. I know full well that it is not many times; therefore, it must be looked at more seriously than it has been in the past. Be that as it may, I will take up that matter at some future date.

In his address, His Excellency referred to the rural crisis and made various references to the opening of this season. I think it is appropriate that I should add to what I have previously said in this House and point out that we are really only part-way through the rural crisis that hit us as a result of successive droughts, because it will take time to work through the changes in population. A different type of farmer is taking over: in many cases, it is the young married person who leaves the land and is most able to find outside work. So, we are left with either an older generation remaining on the land or a young, inexperienced person coming in and, therefore, a new set of training schemes is necessary and the resultant problems arise.

His Excellency mentioned that we had a good season last year and we would all agree with that, because it really saved a great many people from disaster. At the beginning of this year, when most farmers presented their annual budgets and saw their financial institutions, they found that they could possibly see a light at the end of the tunnel. What has happened over the past six months has been more than devastating, because of unforeseen circumstances where we have seen a drop in the floor price of wool from 870c per kilogram to 700c per kilogram. Further, with the addition of 18 per cent tax and lowering of demand for wool, in many cases farmers' gross wool cheque will be about 45 per cent less than last year's. Also, in the past month, there have been indications of a drop of \$40 a tonne in the price of wheat on the world market and we could conceivably say that farmers' gross returns on a mixed wheat/sheep farm could well be only half what it was only 12 months ago.

That will bring phenomenal problems to Government agencies, individuals, financial institutions and everyone else concerned. I do not believe that anyone has seriously considered what we are now confronting. It is only those persons who have sold their wool at the last wool sale in the past week who will start to realise just how much they have been personally affected as a result of the happenings of the past few months.

If there was a demand on Eyre Peninsula on Government resources and the Rural Industries Assistance Branch during the peak of the drought period, we could well be forewarned that that demand will become very critical. There will probably be an increase in the number of farmers who have reached the point of no return and who will opt out, and it may well be that we will have a number of forced sales on our hands. I see that as having detrimental effects on all concerned.

Having said that, I think it is necessary that I should again remind Governments, both State and Federal, of the community's dependence on the agricultural sector. There has been a belief over the past few years that we are no longer dependent on the agricultural community for the State's income. Only last week, figures were released for the top 500 exporters of this nation. It might interest members to know that out of the top 50, 46 were directly involved in agricultural pursuits, mining or fishing; so, the primary industries of this nation account for 46 of the top 50 export

earnings. If we take that one step further and consider the top 100 exporters, we find that 83 of them in this nation are primary industry oriented: that is, agriculture, mining or fishing. I do not think this nation is in a position to forget that, because, if any industry has the ability to rebound, given any sort of a fair go, those industries—and, in particular, the agricultural industry—have that ability. No other industry that I am aware of has the ability to recover, rebound and help our State and nation back into some form of reality.

That brings us to the overall gross debt of the nation, and I for one am quite petrified at the massive amounts of debt that we have accrued; it has now reached about \$154 billion, and when we work that out on a per capita basis it becomes a horrific burden that will have to be borne not only by us but by the next generation. That is the unfair part about it, that the people who will have to carry the bulk of the responsibilities of our present indebtedness will be the ones who will have to help us work our way out of it. If it were the present Government that had to carry that burden itself, whether or not we are responsible, at least we would have to work that out, but to blow that out on the next generation is not right, and it is certainly unfair on the next leaders of our nation.

I would like to raise one further major issue in this Address in Reply debate. It relates to country health services, what has happened to them, where they are going and whether we can do anything about the situation. I was interested to note the question asked of the Minister of Health today. The Minister was obviously responding to a weekend press article about the ability to attract doctors to country areas. I have been reasonably closely associated with health services on Eyre Peninsula for many years and, prior to my involvement in politics, my family was involved as board members, and my grandfather was involved before that. So, we have had some inkling of what is involved in the provision of country services. My grandmother worked tirelessly for the Cummins Hospital and in reward she was asked to lay the foundation stone for the hospital when it was built 40-odd years ago.

I think the real crunch is: where are we now? At what point are we? And are we any better off as a result of the restructuring of the Health Commission? The Elliston Hospital has attracted a lot of press attention recently because its board and the Elliston community believe that they are under attack. That belief is well substantiated because there is a lack of commitment from the Health Commission to give ongoing support to the Elliston community. I understand, and I certainly appreciate, that the Minister of Health has given an undertaking that he will receive a deputation from the hospital board and the District Council of Elliston. I therefore do not wish to become too picky on the problems involved. However, I would like to point out some of the anomalies in the argument thus far.

It should be pointed out that Elliston, which is situated between Streaky Bay and Port Lincoln—accessible over a 310 kilometre stretch of road—is relatively isolated, yet it serves a community that has the ability to produce wealth for this State. It was one of the earlier areas on the peninsula to be opened up. In fact, if we look at the history of Elliston, recounted in a book entitled *Across the Bar to Waterloo Bay*, we find that medical services started at Elliston more than 100 years ago. Moves were made 97 years ago for the first hospital to be established. It is interesting to note the number of doctors, matrons and boards involved since that time. It is also interesting to note that the Hon. Don Banfield opened the hospital some years ago, and that generally there has been support from Governments of the day for

those services. It is fair to say that the Chairman of the Health Commission, Dr McCoy, and many of his officers have indicated on earlier occasions when there has been debate about other hospitals that Elliston will be all right because it has the isolation factor on its side.

We could argue those points forever, but I would like to paint some scenarios of what would happen should the Elliston Hospital close. The nearest hospital is at Wudinna, which involves travelling on a dirt road that currently is impassable. So, if we are talking about access for a medical practitioner, chief executive officer or joint director of nursing, it becomes an impractical and impossible position. I do not believe that any Government should consider that as a possible option unless the road is sealed and, even at 310 kilometres, we are talking about a three-hour round trip for those officers to service the area. Who will pay for the loss of time and the cost of travel?

The next closest place is Streaky Bay, which is 131 kilometres away. If we were to transfer a patient by ambulance, it would take an hour and a half to travel from Elliston to Streaky Bay, and if that patient had to be on-transferred to Adelaide, after travelling an hour and a half away from Adelaide, that person would have to travel an extra hour back towards Adelaide. So, the logical extension of that is quite ridiculous; it is an impractical position and, in any event, there is only one general practitioner, so there is always the chance that it would be impossible to get the patient there. There is not an all-night strip at Elliston, and it is not possible for the larger of the St John Ambulance planes to land there. In fact, on one occasion when a transfer was made from the Elliston Hospital the air ambulance in the air directed the local people to take the patient back to Streaky Bay rather than down to Port Lincoln, which would have been the logical place to consider, because it is that much closer to Adelaide.

That is only part of it. The next place, and probably the most logical, would be Port Lincoln, involving a 2½-hour round trip, assuming that the ambulance officers start at Elliston. This is where the problem lies. Using the Health Commission figures of last year and dividing that by, say, five (which is the average bed stay) we calculate that 161 transfers from hospital to hospital, or from district to the hospital, would be required. That is over and above the existing transfers that currently take place. If the acute services are not maintained at Elliston and we have to rely therefore on a district nurse, we find that that district nurse, not being able to make a medical judgment, must err on the side of caution and, therefore, there would be additional transfers by ambulance. Conservatively, we are therefore looking at 200 transfers per annum, or four per week, that would be required through the services of volunteers. The volunteers at the moment are two farmers, the hospital cook, the doctor, one retired person and one business person in Elliston. With a volunteer crew like that it is impossible to suggest that that could be done.

Let us look at the next alternative. Using a St John crew from Port Lincoln, we are now talking about a four-hour trip to send a professional crew from Port Lincoln to Elliston, make a retrieval and get the patient back to Port Lincoln. In turn, that raises the question of the manning of the paid ambulance officers at Port Lincoln. Those people could not handle that option. A little mental arithmetic would tell us that just the cost of doing that, assuming that the ambulance services were manned by volunteers, would be in the vicinity of \$66 000, because the cost is \$407 per trip to Port Lincoln. This raises another query: if there is no hospital at Elliston, the transfers by ambulance from Elliston to the hospital are at the expense of the individual,

whereas now, if the transfer is from hospital to hospital, the cost is picked up by the Health Commission.

This is not really a matter of providing better health services; it is a matter of shifting the financial onus away from the Health Commission, either back onto the individual or onto other services. Part of the reason for a lot of this rethinking in relation to the health services is to shift the financial responsibilities from the Health Commission to other ancillary services. It has often been stated that the Health Commission could provide district nurses, or that other services could be provided. I think it is fair to say that the community is not particularly interested in other services if that were the choice. They believe that a resident doctor, with acute care services, can provide all those other ancillary services at the primary location and, if it is necessary for specialist treatment from then on, then the patient should be transferred out.

I have just talked about one particular aspect, involving the ambulance service. Mention has been made of joint chief executive officers between the two closest hospitals, involving a distance of 110 kilometres. I do not think any of us on this side of the gulf—the Adelaide side—would seriously suggest that that would be contemplated at all. Who would think of having a joint chief executive officer running between Adelaide and Coonalpyn? It is not on. Or between Adelaide and Crystal Brook? It is not on to have a joint chief executive officer running two hospitals, especially when the road in question is currently impassable. That is an impractical situation. It has also been suggested that there should be a joint director of nursing. I do not know who made that suggestion, but I know that it has come up on a few occasions. I think that if one checks with the Nurses Board one will find that under no circumstances will that be contemplated because it does not come under its charter at all. It would be impossible for any health institution to be run with a director of nursing having to travel 110 kilometres over a dirt road.

I could go on and mention many of the inequalities that have been suggested just in relation to Elliston Hospital. I am concerned that a number of letters have gone out to some of my constituents—and to constituents all over the State, I might add. I have been sent copies of many of the letters forwarded to the Minister, and we all sympathise with the sentiments expressed in those letters. I do not believe that it is practical for the Health Commission to come forward with an alternative other than to provide acute services and a resident doctor at Elliston.

Other points must be taken into account. In replies compiled by the Health Commission (and others, in some instances under the hand of the Minister), a parallel has been drawn between the community at Elliston and the community at Roxby Downs. The community at Elliston has an aged component. They have a number of disadvantaged citizens. From discussions with the doctor in that area, I understand that 75 per cent of patients at Elliston are bulk billed. That indicates that they are persons who do not have their own private health insurance and are therefore in the lower socio-economic scale if we are to quantify that.

To draw a parallel between Elliston and Roxby Downs is quite wrong. First, there are no aged people at Roxby Downs; secondly, everyone has to be fit to get employment in that area; and, thirdly, the clinic that the company would have at Roxby Downs would be on a par with any small country hospital in this State, and the evacuation services would be infinitely better than anything that is available at Elliston. Therefore, it is wrong that that parallel should be drawn. I am pleased to note that the Minister has referred to the

appointment of a Queensland doctor (Dr Livingstone, I believe) to review the situation. I hope that recognition will be given to the problems of isolation. It has been said that for any area beyond 100 km a level one facility is required. That is an obvious statement in our view.

Recognition should also be given to the Elliston community and the support that it has been given by way of donations of money and community support at every level. I commend to the Minister and the Health Commission the section on medical care in the history of the Elliston community across the bar to Waterloo Bay because it gives greater detail on the effort that has gone into the provision and the building up of the services that that community deemed it necessary to have. I have read the charter of the Health Commission. If all people in this State are to be treated equally, the Health Commission has a responsibility to provide those services. A fine reading indicates that that should be its charter.

It concerns me that the cost per bed patient is the criterion used. If we used that same judgment on the public transport system in Adelaide, massive changes would have to be made. If we use that judgment on a cost per bed patient basis, obviously that flies in the face of any suggestion of either regionalisation or decentralisation, because the very effect of using that is a centralist policy. If we take it to the extreme, we would have everybody living in the metropolitan area with no services outside that area. Therefore, it becomes an issue with which the Government must grapple and it must determine to what extent it is prepared to treat all people equally and provide those basic services.

We are not looking for the out-of-reach services, because, if country people want specialist services, almost invariably they have to go to Adelaide, and that incurs personal cost. Although there is support through the Patients Assistance Travel Scheme, not everyone qualifies for that. The Minister will be aware of the many letters that I have sent to him asking for support for disadvantaged people who do not have the ability to pay for the specialist services which are required by themselves or by members of their family. That is a real problem. However, country people tend to accept that that is part of living. In the event of a minor accident, where concussion might be suspected, there is a qualified person within reasonable reach who can provide the medical service required. These people are not so interested in services such as podiatry, although it would be nice, if we had plenty of money, to provide those services. That is not the case.

Reference has been made to the parallel with the Lock Community Health and Welfare Centre. I admit that that centre is brilliantly run, for two reasons. One is that the sister in charge, Lynn Clyde, is one in a million. The community respects her. She bends over backwards to help any member of the community. The real success of the Lock Community Health and Welfare Centre is, first, the staff and, secondly, the access to four, possibly five, general practitioners within an hour and a quarter's drive. Without those doctors—three of them provide a weekly consultation at Lock—the Lock Community Health and Welfare Centre would not work. The Elliston doctor assists at Lock. If it is suggested that Elliston should be run on a similar basis, I do not think that we could expect the Cleve doctors to go to Elliston on a daily or a once or twice a week basis; we could not expect the Wudinna doctor to do likewise; we could not expect Streaky Bay doctors to do the same; and we could not expect the Port Lincoln doctors to do that. However, that is the choice that we have. Effectively we are adding 100 km to the situation that occurs at Lock. That in itself is a wrong assumption to make, yet the

Chairman of the Health Commission and the Minister have put to me in writing that there is a very good service. I am the first to agree that it is an excellent service, but we cannot shift an excellent service 100 km away and expect it to serve the community in the same way.

His Excellency referred to a number of issues relating to small business, and they will be taken up later through legislation. I am concerned about shop trading hours. I hope that the Minister will incorporate red meat trading in any extension of shop trading hours because, if ever there were a need to get greater exposure to the red meat market, it is now. However, I can see political implications in that. I think that only time will tell whether the Government is prepared to accept it as part of the rationalisation of shop trading hours. The extension of shop trading hours is a cost that the community cannot afford to bear, because it will mean higher costs for the consumer. Convenience is one thing, but what price should we be prepared to pay for that convenience?

A number of other matters are mentioned in the Governor's speech. In paragraph 41 reference is made to the Commonwealth Games. I am pleased that Adelaide has won the bid to be Australia's nominee for those games. I trust that we will all pull together—and I see no problem with that—in an effort to ensure that Adelaide is the host city for the Commonwealth Games. I support the motion.

**Mr GROOM (Hartley):** I support the motion. I congratulate the Governor on his excellent speech and the Government on its excellent administration of South Australia. I congratulate the new member for Custance on his election to this Parliament. His maiden speech was a disappointing contribution. I understand that he was not the choice of the Liberal Party hierarchy, but no doubt he will be here for some time because of the nature of his electorate. In any event, anyone who delivers rocks to other members after an Address in Reply debate needs to be looked at.

**Mr Trainer:** Maybe he has rocks in his head!

**Mr GROOM:** I do not know what he has got. I think I should draw attention to the Governor's speech. In paragraph 2 he said:

South Australia is entering one of the most innovative phases of its development, and in the immediate future we should all witness advances which will set this State on an exciting course. However, these initiatives must be set against a pattern of difficult national and international economic conditions.

There is no doubt that South Australia is better placed than other States. South Australia has had successful and successive Labor Administrations since 1982, and this Government has been a very successful manager of South Australia's finances and its economy. In summary, South Australia has more jobs, lower unemployment and a lower cost of living. Further, a real increase has taken place in household incomes, there are fewer strikes and industrial disputes, and we have a much stronger manufacturing base.

*Mr Matthew interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** The honourable member can debate that on another occasion. I know that it is painful for him to hear of the success of a Labor Administration in this State. The fact is that South Australia is well governed. It has a sound economy and, as the Governor said in his speech, South Australia is entering one of the most innovative phases of its development. Also, I want to congratulate the Premier on obtaining the multifunction polis for this State.

There is no doubt that this is a significant coup for South Australia. The MFP is a high technology city of the future—a multi-billion dollar project. As its three main themes it has, first, the local environment, the regeneration of an area and the resultant living environment surrounded by water,

open fields and forests. The second theme of technology is for high technology communications and information processing, which will be key elements in the design of the development and the settlement.

In education, the third theme, the MFP will be a focal point for a world university, which will provide a research base for international scholars, new research centres and a link to existing institutions and industry. Certainly, other States would have liked this development, and members should make no mistake about that. It is a great thing for South Australia to have pulled off this development. In many ways it was natural for South Australia to be selected for a multi-country development such as this project, because South Australia has a much longer tradition of multiculturalism, I think, than any other State in Australia and probably any other State in the world. South Australia is a very tolerant community thanks to an innovative Labor Government in the mid-1960s—the Dunstan Labor Government.

In 1966, as members may recall, the Racial Discrimination Act was passed in this State. It was passed amid great controversy at that time. The Racial Discrimination Act prohibited discrimination on racial, ethnic or religious grounds. In other words, it became part of the law of South Australia that each ethnic, religious or cultural group has the right to the preservation of its language, lifestyle, religion and culture. Following the passage of that legislation, amid great controversy, South Australia was hailed in the United Nations as being the first State in any country in the world to pass such legislation.

When we look at the development of projects such as the multifunction polis, we have to make a connection with South Australia's tradition of enlightened government, which has played an important role. That initiative of the mid-1960s was carried on in the 1970s, again by the Dunstan Government, which continued to foster policies designed to ensure the recognition and acceptance of a multicultural society not only in South Australia but also in the whole of Australia. The Dunstan Government was a pacesetter in the area of multiculturalism and the composition and nature of Australian society.

Policies were initiated encouraging the language, culture and lifestyle of migrants, and encouraging us to understand tolerance and democracy in relation to the preservation of the lifestyle, language and culture of other groupings. The Dunstan Government also sought to implement policies—successfully—to overcome special difficulties and problems encountered by many migrant groups. The Ethnic Affairs Branch, established in the mid 1970s, was responsible for policy and the coordination of Government policies in multiculturalism. A State Interpreter Service was developed and we had a system of welfare department grants to migrant groups. Yet this was at the same time as the Fraser Liberal Government was abolishing the Australian Assistance Plan.

Had the State Labor Government not stepped in at that time, migrant organisations would have lost funding and their progress turned backwards. Further, it was the Dunstan Government that was helping to fund ethnic radio at the same time as the Federal Liberal Government was closing down such stations in Australia. In education—

*Mr Matthew interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I know that the member for Bright might yawn about multiculturalism and might not be interested in multiculturalism, but that was the same attitude that was displayed in the 1960s when the conservative forces in this State were represented by the predecessors of members opposite who set out to oppose the racial discrimination legislation. I urge the honourable member to take a far

greater interest in multiculturalism because our traditions and commitment to multiculturalism have played an important part in securing a multi-country development in South Australia.

Education is a particularly important area, because attitudes can be laid down to younger children and ideas can be formed which are quite wrong about Australian society and tolerance of other groups. Education is an important area. Again, the Dunstan Labor Government established migrant advisory councils. It established the Ethnic Students in Secondary School Committees to consider the problems of migrants in secondary schools. There was an annual Child Migrant Survey, and these were programs to provide special teachers to teach English to migrant children. The Government was innovative in the teaching of community and ethnic languages and embarked upon policies designed to increase the availability of languages other than English being taught in South Australian schools.

An Italian bilingual project commenced in the 1970s in what is now my electorate at the Trinity Gardens and St Morris Primary Schools, which had high Italian composition. There were other programs, including a special program for teaching the Pitjantjatjara language. There was the 10 schools project, which had as its principal objective a concentration on changing attitudes of staff and students towards migrants, and establishing migrant-oriented curricula. The 10 schools project was designed to ensure that schools with a substantial number of students with ethnic background were given special assistance. Part of that objective was designed to reject assimilation as a policy. What was taking place in South Australia in the 1960s and 1970s—well in advance of other States and, I suspect, well in advance of other countries in the world—was a great change in the attitude towards the language, lifestyle and culture of ethnic groups.

The South Australian Government was providing an important lead in changing assimilationist attitudes of previous decades. We were building a multicultural society. Of course, in the process South Australians were learning that people had the right to express their own identity, personality and lifestyle—an expression of democratic choice and tolerance, because culture is the identity of self-respect that has with it a belief in the attitudes of mind and a way of life passed on by ancestors. It is also a state of mind, a respect for others, a tolerance, a democratic principle, a tolerance of choice and a rejection of assimilationist policies. Let us not forget that this work has been continued on in the 1980s by another Labor Government.

It has been the traditions of Labor Governments in South Australia that has led to a change in community attitudes, and South Australia has been leading the world in this—but not without some trauma. We often forget that only a few years ago Howard commenced his 'one Australia' policy, which was an attempt to turn the clock back to an assimilationist era. However one might want to clothe that, that was nothing more than a racist slogan designed to promote conflict in the community, and I know that a number of members opposite had caught up by this stage and rejected the Howard conservative philosophy about a 'one Australia' policy.

We can even turn the clock back further than that to when Michael Hodgman was the Federal Opposition spokesman on immigration. When Labor Governments were seeking to promote a multicultural society in Australia and immigration from other countries, Michael Hodgman said that the Federal Labor Government in about 1984, if I remember correctly, was taking on an anti-British attitude. However, he soon saw the danger in instigating this type of

debate in society, because we have the Professor Blainey and Bruce Ruxtons who spread nothing more than racist propaganda in Australia and attempt to turn back the clock to an era that has just simply gone.

In South Australia the present Bannon Labor Government has been continuing with the policies and objectives set in the 1960s and 1970s—and very successfully. The multifunction polis is an indication of that degree of success. Even now in ethnic affairs we have set up an anti-racism policy and program to assist in the development and implementation of anti-racism strategies, because we certainly saw in the last round of debates the sorts of policies that the Howard conservative forces sought to introduce into Australia again; we saw the sorts of debates that could be generated as a consequence of that type of assimilationist stance.

The anti-racism objectives of the Government are essential, and I know that the Minister of Education has recently announced such a policy in relation to schools designed to ensure that teachers do not promote racism ideas to students in schools and that we promote a multicultural society. There is another objective, another policy stance—

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I hope that the honourable member continues to carry out that stance and to argue for a multicultural society, as I know he will. But, the honourable member wants to remember that inside the Liberal Party are some extremist elements when it comes to racism. Every now and again they come to the surface.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** The ALP has not adopted a racist policy, as the Howard conservative forces did. What do members think the 'one Australia' policy was about? It generated enormous debate amongst the various ethnic organisations in Australia, because it was nothing more than disguised racism. It was an attempt to generate a racist debate in Australia, to turn the clock—

*Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** Well, members opposite soon had to get rid of that, because it was rejected by at least 30 per cent to 40 per cent of Australia's population. They are the people who were not born here and had migrated to Australia or who were the children of people who had migrated to Australia. That sort of philosophy was rejected, and Howard got a shock because of the way in which it was actually treated by the vast majority of Australians.

*Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** Members opposite can cry foul if they want to, but it was their Party that brought down a 'one Australia' policy. Maybe members, in this debate, can get up and explain what the 'one Australia' policy was all about. Why was it not a multicultural Australia policy? What was it all about? It was nothing more than an attempt to promote an issue for divisive purposes, to split Australian society and to promote the Bruce Ruxtons and the Professor Blainey in Australian society and put racism on the front page.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** Well, it was soundly rejected. Had the Opposition gone to the election with that sort of policy it would soon have felt the wrath of the Australian electorate, because it would have been rejected. It was this Government that commenced equal employment opportunity. Successive Labor Governments, including this Government, have continued the ground work and have brought about an equal employment opportunity management planning working party, which is designed to promote equal employment opportunity across the public sector and assist Government agencies to plan in that regard, because there are still prob-



lems in the public sector. This Government is continuing the work laid down in the 1960s, 1970s and the 1980s, and it is a blueprint for how society in Australia should operate in the 1990s.

The Ethnic Schools Advisory Committee advises the Minister of Education on future directions for ethnic schools in South Australia, in particular with regard to the registration and funding of ethnic schools and the professional development of ethnic school teachers and curriculum development. This committee was established in 1985 by the then Minister of Education, the member for Ramsay, and is another successful strategy of the State Government.

There is support for the Chinese business community because, as members know, the Chinese Chamber of Commerce was recently inaugurated in South Australia. The objectives of support for the Chinese business community, apart from the establishment of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce, are to assist Chinese speaking people who are business migrants or who are involved in business in the promotion of trade development in South Australia, to assist the Chinese business community to promote good relations between its members and other communities, and, indeed, to assist the Chinese community generally in South Australia. That is another innovative objective of a Labor Government.

The Commonwealth-State Council on Non-English Speaking Background Women's Issues has been established. I will not go through all the objectives of the council, but they are basically to promote equitable access to Government services for women, to provide more effective services and structures to identify particular barriers and other problems, and to propose specific strategies. Although its objectives are always couched in objective terms, it is an important mechanism for ensuring equal opportunity in Australia.

The objective of the establishment of community and neighbourhood houses is to encourage community and neighbourhood houses to make their services more accessible to people. The office is represented on the Community and Neighbourhood Houses Association Management Committee and a close liaison is maintained between that office and the association's ethnic community worker. In 1989 a cultural awareness seminar was conducted by the office for 50 staff and management committee members of the neighbourhood houses network in South Australia. As a result of the commission's work in this area, some eight neighbourhood houses applied for funding from the commission's ethnic grants scheme for the development of projects. I understand that for 1989-90 a total of \$31 100 was provided to neighbourhood houses to develop programs in this area.

Another policy objective has involved ethnic people with disabilities, the objective being to sensitise service providers to the needs of people with disabilities and to promote full participation of people with disabilities in the programs and activities of mainstream services to ensure that ethnic people with disabilities are not forgotten. Again, it has become an important part of our multicultural policies.

We must not forget that we have to ensure that we have policies and objectives designed to meet the special problems encountered by the ethnic aged, and the objectives are to promote ethnic representation in participation and decision making processes in relation to services for the aged; to advise on the development of policies for planning implementation and evaluation of services for the ethnic aged; to encourage the development of and support for ethnic aged self-help systems; to stimulate the notion of cultural relevance in services affecting the ethnic aged population; and to respond to any issues relevant to the needs of the ethnic aged.

Again, it is a very important part of the State Government's armour and policy objectives to ensure that all sections of our multicultural society are not forgotten. The Labor Government has been very active in the area of overseas qualifications because one of the problems encountered by people who migrate to Australia and who have distinctive professional skills, often skills that are equal or far superior to those possessed by Australians, is obtaining recognition of those skills or degrees. Highly qualified people are often simply denied membership of various professional bodies and associations and are therefore unable to contribute their skills.

A major factor is that South Australia's economic health depends upon increasing our productivity. We increase productivity when we ensure that the community has a sufficient level of skills. If people with those particular skills come to Australia and if they are not being used to the best economic advantage in Australia, that is, if those people are not able to contribute those skills, our productivity takes a bit of a dive. Apart from the social and moral issues involved with regard to overseas qualifications, there is the economic issue that recognition ensures an increase in our living standards and contributes to our economic health.

The objectives of the overseas qualifications network are to act as a formal support mechanism for people working in the area of overseas qualifications; to act as a forum for the coordination of dissemination of information; to create a network list of persons and bodies working in the area of overseas qualifications; to stimulate an increased awareness in the community of issues concerning overseas qualifications; and to provide a forum for discussion of major issues concerning the recognition of overseas qualifications, because we have to provide the cradle and create the awareness and consciousness that there is a problem with regard to the recognition of overseas qualifications.

This has led to bridging courses. For example, there may be gaps in relation to qualifications in medicine, law or any other field, and short-term bridging courses have been run by tertiary institutions, in both Australia and South Australia, so that people with overseas qualifications do not have to embark on a new degree but can simply undertake a bridging course to ensure that their qualifications are recognised. Without these bridging courses, and without the support from the Government, these skills would not be utilised for the economic good of Australia. So, bridging courses are a very important method of ensuring that people with overseas qualifications ultimately gain membership of various professional and other associations to enable them to practise their professions here in Australia. We need to ensure that people do not diverge. We need umbrella organisations. The Minister of Ethnic Affairs informed the House last week of the existence of the ethnic umbrella organisations office. I will not go into the objectives of ethnic umbrella organisations but they certainly bring together all the various groups to ensure that there is a degree of harmony, fairness and balance with regard to the many ethnic and cultural groups in Australia.

The Government also recognises the role of volunteers in ethnic affairs. The Volunteer Ethnic Information Network has established in local, metropolitan and country areas regional networks of trained volunteer bilingual information officers. The network ensures that volunteers are recognised within ethnic groupings so that there is a correct balance between volunteers and governmental intervention in this area, not only Government participation.

More recently, the Government has announced a corporate plan for the Ethnic Affairs Commission. I will not go through it, except to say that the plan identifies five goals

of the commission, and these will have to be addressed over the next three years. They include community relations, social justice, participation, immigration and settlement, and services. Again the Government has not been prepared to rest on its record, because it is an innovative Government and meets the challenges. One of the reasons why this Government has been electorally successful is that it is innovative and in tune with current community thinking. In fact, it is probably ahead of community thinking in many ways, but it is certainly in tune, and that is reflected in the electoral successes of the Labor Government in South Australia in 1982, 1985 and again last year.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** It does not matter how much you win by. Even if you win by one vote, you still win. It is no good praising the former member for Custance. The fact is that he was a loser politically, in so far as the Liberal Party was concerned. He might have been a very good member in other respects but, as a Leader, he was a loser. Surely, the objective of a political Party is to win government. To be successful, a Party must have policies that appeal to the electorate. It must also take advantage of the economic opportunities. The Tonkin Government lost office in 1982 because it brought South Australia to its knees economically. It took \$100 million out of capital works, as members know, and brought South Australia to its knees. That is the fact of the matter. If \$100 million is taken out of capital works, no development takes place. When this Government came to office in 1982, there were no cranes on the skyline of South Australia, because \$100 million had been taken out of the economy. There was nothing to plough back in capital works, so to speak.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** They only spent \$10 million on the capital vote for health.

**Mr GROOM:** Yes. Again, that is an example of the way in which members opposite have not been in tune with community thinking. The Tonkin Liberal Government had the opportunity and it fumbled the ball. Not only did it take \$100 million out of capital works and induce a recession in South Australia but also it ran up a budget deficit of \$63 million. However, this Government adopted very sound economic planning and was prepared to make the hard decisions regarding the FID tax, for example. Members opposite opposed it for political advantage, but it has stood the test of time and is now one of the most important planks in the taxation base of this State.

It has enabled us to continue the sorts of policies which ensure that South Australia, in the words of the Governor 'is entering one of the most innovative phases of its development, and in the immediate future we should all witness advances which will set this State on an exciting course'. The foundations for that were laid in the hard decisions taken in 1983-84 to get this State back on the rails. It has been a very difficult time because of the way in which the Tonkin Liberal Government managed South Australia's finances. We have weathered both the good times and the bad times and have still held onto office, and we will hold onto office in the future.

One of the reasons why we obtained the multifunction polis in this State was the success of this Government and, make no mistake, in many ways South Australia was the natural selection for a multi-country venture. Because of our policies, because of our successful Labor Governments, because of our history and because of our traditions of multiculturalism, we in South Australia have a far greater chance of success and a far greater likelihood of community support and acceptance for the multifunction polis than elsewhere.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I support the motion currently before the Chair. Opening day was the first time in the 20-odd years in which I have been a member of the House and in 26 openings of Parliament that I have not actually participated. However, I have followed the course of actions which took place on that day, and a little later I will refer to some of the controversy which surrounded the opening. However, I place on record my sincere gratitude, on behalf of the people whom I represent and, I believe, the people throughout the State, for the continuing work of Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan in the very humane and practical way in which they are meeting the people and carrying out their role in this State in a most sincere and responsible fashion. It is a great misfortune that with the passage of time the couple will not be with us in an official capacity at the next opening of Parliament, but I am sure that everybody in the State will wish them well in their forthcoming retirement.

I record that the opening of Parliament saw the absence of the former member for Custance, the now Senator Olsen, and I record my appreciation of the tremendous amount of work that he did for the State of South Australia and, more particularly, for the Party he led for a considerable period. I welcome to the House the new member for Custance and trust that his time here will be long and productive and that he will be able to contribute, on behalf of a very important part of the State of South Australia, a great deal of information relative to agricultural needs and, indeed, the needs of all people whom he represents.

I also take the opportunity to mention briefly the death, albeit during the last parliamentary session but not one that was recorded either in the Governor's address or in a practical way by comment from the floor of the House, of Jack Hull, a former Clerk Assistant of this House, Clerk of Parliaments and the Clerk of the Upper House. I rattled the door of the said Jack Hull approximately one week before he passed away. It was the lead-up to the most recent Federal election. Quite unknown to me, the door that I knocked on happened to be Jack's. He came out and told me he had had a very enjoyable afternoon at the Adelaide Oval watching the cricket, and he pointed out one or two of the aspects of the area in which he lived and where a colleague of his, Gordon Coombe, former Clerk of this House and former Ombudsman, lived.

I was not aware that that would be the last occasion on which I would see Jack. I recall him particularly for his fairly blunt introduction to parliamentary procedures, as far as new members were concerned and, more than that, for some of the experiences I enjoyed with him on a select committee relating to the Health Commission. We broke new ground, as it transpired and, although Jack had a particularly set mind on where he wanted to go with the report—the final form was different from that which he had envisaged—we lost nothing in friendship as a result.

The controversy to which I referred was that which was prominent in the press in the days surrounding the opening of Parliament and relating to the manner in which the Opening address by His Excellency the Governor has been politicised. We are fortunate in this Parliament—and, indeed, other Parliaments may laud the opportunities that are made available to them by various members of staff—in relation to the material that is made known to us or offered to us by the Parliamentary Library. It just so happens that in the week of the opening of Parliament one of the articles on offer to the members was from *Parliamentary Government*, volume 8 (4), summer 1989, pages 16 to 18. The title of the article was 'Depoliticising the Speech from the Throne' and was presented by Mitchell Sharp, Privy Councillor and a

former Minister of Finance and Secretary of State for External Affairs in the Canadian Parliament.

He makes a number of quite important points, which I will pick up on this occasion, because I genuinely believe that the more we seek to cut corners and the more advantages we seek to take with what is laid down and recognised as traditional procedure, the greater disrepute Parliament will have. We are in a position where members on both sides have often referred to the fact that the political scene is despised by the public at large. It has been suggested quite widely that, in both State and Federal elections, the reason for the emergence of the vote that is transmitted to smaller groups is a direct result of the public's lack of appreciation of the parliamentary system. Indeed, at our own peril, we are party to a series of dilutions and diminutions of responsibility in the parliamentary system, and the manner in which the speech opening Parliament has been politicised is yet another example of the disrespect that we draw upon ourselves.

I have indicated that the article is relative to Canada, but it is equally applicable to the Australian scene. In the opening paragraph of this article, Mitchell Sharp states:

The speech from the throne delivered by the Governor-General at the opening of each session of Parliament and by the Lieutenant-Governors at the opening of each session of provisional Legislatures has been converted from its original purpose into a vehicle of Government propaganda, except in Quebec. This is an abuse of the office of the Queen's representative.

It is quite clear from the information available to me and from reading the document which we have before us and which is the subject of the motion this afternoon that that position prevails in South Australia at present.

Reference has been made to it continually over recent years, more so even than in the Dunstan years. Notwithstanding the changes to the system and to the tradition that took place in the Dunstan years, never was the parliamentary speech presented in the form we have seen in more recent years. Mitchell Sharp goes on to state:

It should not be put in the mouth of the Queen's representative who, as a political neutral, has to read words like these with as little emotion as possible, thus robbing them of any inspirational impact.

He then goes on to make an analysis of some of the speeches that have been made and the length of those speeches, and gives an indication of how Quebec came out in front because of the short and practical manner in which the speech was given, in comparison with those that came from Canada's national Government and provinces. He goes on to make this comment:

The speech from the throne should be brief and factual. Recent speeches, on the contrary, have been long and argumentative and, to be frank, tedious.

Certainly, that situation applies equally in South Australia. There is no regard at all for the person who is neutral and who is responsible to present the speech on behalf of the Government. Most definitely, we are in the position where we are cutting corners and we are doing so to the detriment of the parliamentary system in South Australia.

I cite two final comments from the article by Mitchell Sharp:

The principal reason, I suggest, is that the speech from the throne is one of the few opportunities that Governments have to present their views in an orderly, consecutive, uninterrupted format. The setting is ideal. The formalities are impressive. The Queen's representative is not heckled. The speech can be printed in advance and distributed widely.

They are not excuses enough to allow a Government to continue along the lines that the present Government is pursuing. I make the final point:

The Queen's representatives are appointed, not elected, and, being neutral, cannot and should not assume the responsibilities of their Ministers or engage in partisan debate.

In the years ahead, may I see before I finally retire a return to the proper thrust and proper purpose of the speech opening Parliament. There is nothing to bar a comment relating to the affairs of the year or of the day, or to the importance of the legislation that is coming forward and so on, but it should be in neutral terms, rather than in the congratulatory fashion that we heard most recently from our colleague, the member for Hartley, who stood up here in this debate for the purpose of lauding the virtues of this Government and the one preceding it.

We have come to understand the role of the member for Hartley in getting the Government off the hook and lauding its virtues. Not everything the Government has done has been wrong. I have been man enough to say that as have other colleagues. However, let us be quite frank about it: the present Government, which through the member for Hartley lauds itself as being so mighty, is a minority Government. It is a Government that should not be in office. It is a Government which since 1982 has been quite happy to ride on the coat-tails of some very important Liberal initiatives such as Roxby Downs, the O-Bahn, and initial work in relation to the Grand Prix undertaken by the Hon. Michael Wilson and, although that project was not at the stage of being up and running, it was in the pipeline before this Government and the Government that preceded it came to power. Where do we get any recognition or acceptance of the important part that those initiatives played?

The member for Hartley quite rightly drew the attention of the House to the importance of the MFP and the Commonwealth Games, among other initiatives. What about the MFP and the Commonwealth Games? They have bipartisan acceptance and appreciation. However, that does not reduce in any way the responsibility of the Opposition to question aspects of the MFP, which at present has not been fleshed out. That proposal is something of a moving feast as to how big it may be; where it may be; how important various aspects of technological change will be; how important it is to provide a focus for people from overseas to come and live and participate in the life of this State. It is right that an Opposition should question the various aspects of those particular projects even if at the same time it is prepared to accept a bipartisan approach to them in principle.

We have also had the member for Hartley getting up and talking about extremist groups in the Liberal Party. I would like to know from the honourable member what was the special meeting in Canberra last Sunday. Would he call the people involved in that meeting an extremist group? Some of the utterances that we get from Mr John Scott and others are a pretty fair indication of how extreme certain members of the Labor Party are. I suggest that the honourable member do not throw stones at glasshouses because, very clearly, that was what he was seeking to do.

The measure before us is a chronicle of expected legislation and a commentary upon activities and particular events and circumstances over the recent past. I believe that this Parliament, particularly this session, will be noted not so much for considering the content of the address before us as for measures introduced in this place and in another place during private members' time. I have seen some quite interesting initiatives to be transmitted between the two Houses by members from both sides. There are initiatives which are long overdue and which have the likelihood of being passed only when a Parliament is almost hung. It is a situation we never witnessed, for example, during the previous Bannon Government, which had such a majority that it was able to ride roughshod over not only the mem-

bers of the Opposition but also over the parliamentary system itself. There has been a noticeable—and, in fact, I would go one step further and say a very fortunate—change in attitude on the part of the ministry in many cases towards the parliamentary system. It is not yet good enough when it comes to Question Time, but at least there is an improvement in the general attitude towards the business of the House because the Government is dependent upon every vote in the House and it does not know where some of those votes will go on particular issues.

It has been my experience in the 20 years that I have been here that the best Government for the people has been on those occasions when the numbers on the floor of the House have been close. I refer members to the periods 1975-77, 1979-82 and, again, to the position in which we have found ourselves since 1989. The people of the State benefit because there is the opportunity for all points of view to be put and the likelihood, on certain occasions, that the views being expressed on either side of the House will be the views that will eventually be embodied in legislation. I look forward to the debate that will follow not so much on the matters referred to in the Governor's speech as on those in the fast-filling document that is the daily Notice Paper.

I refer here to the significant increase in the number of select committees. Select committees can be of tremendous value to the end product. There have been many occasions when there has been almost an equality of numbers of members on the floor of the House, and that has produced some very useful pieces of legislation. Not everything has been right: I mentioned earlier the Health Commission legislation and the entirely different document that finally came out of this Parliament from that which the Government had proposed. The Electricity Trust legislation, which the member for Kavel and I represented on this side of the House some three or four years ago, has had its problems, but it is far better and more rational than was the original draft. Certainly, there were problems with the firearms measure, which has not yet been proclaimed (and goodness only knows if and when it will be). There were reasons for that—and those reasons were spelt out on the floor of the House at the time the Government rode roughshod over the weight of evidence that was available. There was a considerable improvement on the original document presented to the House after the Bill had been considered by a select committee.

I am pleased to see that a number of items, not directly related in the first instance to legislation, will be the subject of a full inquiry. The effectiveness of all the committees in question will depend on the ability of the parliamentary system to provide secretarial and research assistance and, indeed, on the commitment of members to attend those meetings. It is extremely important that, if we are going to have a host of committees, we need to consider other ancillary requirements, such as *Hansard* having access to relief staff. I make those points not in criticism of where we are going but as an indication of the importance of the issues that we should be looking at before we get to that point.

I referred briefly to the Firearms Act, which has not yet been proclaimed, there being no indication of when it will be proclaimed. That is not surprising. The committee and the Parliament were told at the time that the Bill was introduced that insufficient consideration had been given to the manning needed to administer that measure. I do not think one would have to be Mandrake to realise why it is not in place. That manning has not been available, given all the other demands that have been made on the police.

I laud the idea that the Government is looking at making use of the expertise of a number of people in the community

to bring people back into the force on a part-time basis—that aspect of the subject has been in the press in the past 48 or 72 hours—particularly with the large volume of that resource being married women who withdrew from the Police Force to have their families and who have not had an opportunity, until now, of getting back into the system. I believe that the Police Force can make use of that training and those resources in a practical way, as indeed has occurred in the education system over many years. There are not only women but others who, for a variety of reasons, left the force and now desire to come back and provide a service to the community. Obviously there will have to be a screening process and an updating of their current knowledge of the law, but anything that we can do to assist the police on the beat and on the road and to make the public of South Australia feel safer and more comfortable in their homes is the sort of action that this Parliament should be addressing, and that is good.

As regards legislation, whether it be firearms or any other piece of legislation, the Government (whether of the present persuasion or another) should not seek to put before the House legislation which is not capable of being policed or serviced properly. We should not clutter up our law books with legislation which has no earthly hope of being effectively policed (in the broader sense of that word). I hope that in the legislation that is brought before us during this session those matters will be properly observed and researched.

I notice from the information which has been given to the House that vital legislation on tertiary education in this State will be brought forward. I acknowledge an involvement as the president of one of the tertiary institutions. I am aware that, with the budgetary debate that is to follow, the Estimates Committees and all the other activities directly associated with the budget, it will not be practicable to debate those vital issues until late in October or even into November. In view of the action that is to be taken for the commencement of those new universities or university formats from 1 January 1991, it is imperative that the legislation be put out for proper consultation now so that, when we get around to the debate in late October or early November, there is a broad understanding of what is sought to be achieved and of the fact that there will be a fine tuning or refinement of the proposed legislation if it can be demonstrated to the public that there are inherent difficulties in what it is intended to do. It is imperative for our tertiary system that there be adequate legislation and that it is proclaimed as soon as possible, or that the necessary subordinate legislation, which is a vital part of the legislation, is not delayed thereby, in turn, delaying the full application of the new structure involved in each of these new universities.

I refer briefly to an article which has been made available to members, the *Australian Institute of Administrative Law Newsletter*, No. 1 of 1989. The title of the paper is, 'When should rules be made in primary, rather than subordinate, legislation', and it is by Geoff Kolts. This issue has been abroad for some time. Members have questioned whether certain action should be taken by proclamation or by regulation or whether it should be in the body of the Bill. In one extract, Mr Kolts says:

Whether a particular matter should be dealt with by an Act or by regulations or other subordinate instruments under the Act is a question about which in theory some general principles can be enunciated . . . There is nothing more annoying than being forced to look at a subordinate instrument to ascertain the time for compliance with a requirement contained in an Act. All relevant requirements in relation to a particular matter should, so far as practicable, be contained in the one place for the convenience of the user of the statute.

I agree with that sentiment. We should make sure that the application of the law is made more simple by virtue of all the tools available being made available to those who have to live or work by the law. The article goes on:

Another point is that, not only is it irritating to have to look at more than one instrument, but subordinate legislation is not always readily accessible.

I make the point that a large number of people in the business world are as yet unaware of the procedure whereby they can obtain regulations. They take the thrust of the Act but are unable to find the regulations and are left in limbo as a result. Mr Kolts says:

In summary, the matters for prescription by regulation are minor procedural matters and forms and other matters that need frequent change but procedural matters that are of major importance, such as those affecting individual liberty, should be contained in primary legislation.

I will give one example which follows from the action which has been taken by the Commissioner of Statutes. Quite a number of changes to the legislation are being taken away from parliamentary scrutiny. That is not a criticism of the people doing this; that is the method that applies. The Commissioner of Statutes is fine-tuning the legislation to bring it up to scratch, to get rid of material that ought not to be there, and so on. We had the occasion once during the last session where, by changing a penalty from a fine to a fine and/or imprisonment, the Commissioner was markedly changing the previous decision of the Parliament, which was that the particular action or the felony rated only a fine. We must make sure that we do not allow short-cuts which take away from Parliament the responsibility of making those important deliberate decisions.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** I support the motion and express my loyalty to the Queen. I congratulate Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan on the manner in which they have fulfilled their duties as the Queen's representatives during Sir Donald's term as Governor of South Australia. Both have been thoroughly diligent in fulfilling those obligations. They have endeared themselves to South Australians, and I think it is appropriate that we should express our gratitude to them.

I also congratulate my new colleague the member for Culance on his election to Parliament. I wish him a long and successful term representing that most beautiful region of South Australia—the Mid North. I feel sure that his maiden speech, in the form of his Address in Reply contribution, is a taste of things to come in terms of vigorous representation. I would like to endorse fully his remarks about the Morgan to Burra Road and draw the Government's attention to the urgent need to upgrade that road.

In speaking of colleagues on both sides of the House, I would also like to say how pleasant it has been for me this year to have for the first time during my term of nearly 13 years in Parliament a woman colleague on this side of the House. I do not mind admitting that it was a lonely 12½ years, and to have the member for Newland as a colleague in the Party room and in the Parliament has been very rewarding for me. It has been wonderful to have a woman colleague, and the support that goes with it. At the same time I would like to acknowledge the contribution made to the deliberations of Parliament by the member for Stuart. When she speaks, which is not very often, she is always worth listening to, and I commend her contributions to her colleagues, particularly in terms of the issues that she raises and policy development. The same also applies in respect of the member for Newland.

Since we last met there have been profound changes in Australia and the world. During the maiden speeches of

new members following the State election, several of them—the member for Spence, if I recall correctly, was the first—made reference to the profound changes occurring in Eastern Europe and South Africa. At that stage we were full of optimism and we were enjoying what was in retrospect almost a state of euphoria at the unaccustomed peace and easing of tensions in the world.

Today we meet in South Australia and in Australia in a state of what seems to most of us to be the calm before what could be a truly terrible storm. All the portents appear to us to indicate that the times ahead are difficult indeed. The crisis in the Middle East, if it erupts into a full-scale war, as it appears it well might, will affect the rest of the world for years to come. I refer to the economic, social and political effects that will flow through to Australia. Indeed, they have already affected Australia in a most profound way. To know that our sailors are already on their way to the Middle East is something that causes everyone of us profound distress and concern. We can only hope that our sailors come back safely and quickly. But in a personal sense I would suggest that that is a vain hope.

On that very issue—the reason that we sent troops to the Middle East—I want to raise a matter directly related to that, that is, South Australia's energy supplies, our potential energy supplies and the opportunities that conflict or tension in the Middle East could and do present to this State. I commend members to the *Advertiser* editorial of Friday 10 August in which the writer drew attention to the dependence of the west on the Middle East for its supply of energy, particularly petroleum products. The editorial makes this point:

... we have to consider also how much this situation is our own fault for getting hooked on the drug that fuels Iraq's power—oil.

Japan got the world's biggest shock in the last oil crisis, a decade ago. Since then it has cut its dependence on oil for total energy from 75 per cent to 58 per cent, largely through a program of nuclear power. Still it was hit hard this week and has launched a major drive to save energy.

The editorial goes on to state:

The gas-guzzling United States learnt fewer lessons, it may take more than Mr Bush's television appeal to cut petrol consumption.

Certainly, that was my observation on a recent visit to the United States during which I took the opportunity to meet energy officials in the State Department of Energy and also members of Senate committees dealing with energy matters. My personal observation as a visitor to the United States is that action initiated as a result of the energy crisis of the mid-1970s, whilst it resulted in the enactment of legislation designed to encourage alternative sources of energy and to reduce energy consumption, virtually tailed away with the tailing away of the crisis. Of course, that also happened in Australia.

How quickly we forget and how little we learn! This time I suspect that the impetus given to renewable energy as a result of the crisis in the Middle East will be more lasting. We cannot lurch from crisis to crisis every decade, or thereabouts, without learning that we must become independent of nations that cannot be relied upon in the sense of their political stability.

In the United States I asked what were the factors assisting the transfer to renewable energy, and what were the factors impeding such transfer. The first factor assisting the transfer of resources to the development of renewable energy is concern about global warming. That factor is part of a wider concern about environmental issues generally. A third factor in the United States was the rising level of oil imports, which now stand at 43 per cent. The fourth factor assisting in the development of alternative energy sources is the constraint on capacity in many regions.

I was told that utilities are reluctant to build new power plants on the grounds of the huge investment required and because of local opposition to such plants. I was told that no new nuclear power stations will be built in the United States and that existing plants will not be renewed. On the other side of the coin I was told in July this year, that one issue impeding the transfer to renewable energy options was the then low energy prices. How quickly that situation will be transformed! I was told of the unwillingness of industry to change to any energy efficient technology, and I was told of resistance by vested interests, namely, the producers, to any assistance or encouragement that the Government might choose to give to renewable sources of energy.

As a result of the last oil crisis, the United States enacted the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act 1978, which required utilities to buy power from qualifying facilities. At the time no-one expected the results of that Act to amount to much. Certainly, when the crisis was relieved it was thought that that Act would not have much impact on energy production, distribution and consumption in the United States. However, contrary to expectations there was a flood of development in admittedly small-scale renewable energy facilities.

It was pointed out that it is as hard to site renewables as it is to site conventional power plants. However, there was a great push to demand-side measures and people did indicate a desire to use the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act, admittedly mostly in respect of fossil fuel fired cogeneration but also for small hydro-electric plants, wind and solar plants and biomass plants.

I give that by way of background to what I propose should be done in South Australia. We know from comments by the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Premier, and indeed from comments at the national level, that there is no comprehensive program in this country for the transfer to renewable or alternative energy sources.

There is a fair bit of rhetoric when it suits the Government, but there is no effective action. In fact, even modest action was dismissed by the Minister of Mines and Energy earlier this year in an ABC interview when I called on him to at least obtain an accurate summary, a consolidation, a register of the research that has already been undertaken in the rest of the world. I urged that not only for the environmental benefits that would come to South Australia, to Australia and indeed to the world from the development of renewable energy in this State but also for the enormous economic benefits. When one considers the so-called development debate in South Australia, one can see that there is an apparent conflict between those who want to preserve the environment in the most beneficial way possible and those who want to pursue development in order to ensure economic prosperity.

There seems to be a very superficial understanding of what is meant by 'development'. People seem not to be able to look beyond bricks and mortar, buildings, tourist resorts and marinas. They fail to understand that the development of the solar hydrogen economy in this State would dwarf any other previous form of economic development that has been undertaken. It could bring untold prosperity to South Australia, not only prosperity relating directly to the production, marketing and consumption of solar energy—and in using the word 'solar' I encompass everything from wind, hydrogen and biomass energy—but also prosperity through the attention that would be focused on this State and the economic benefits consequential on that.

The technology that we would develop as a result, and the tremendous boost it would give to aspects of education, noticeably in mathematical sciences, would be of enormous

benefit and would sit very well with the support for a technology-based economy which has been demonstrated and indicated by both the major political Parties. How are we going to do it? When this question was put to the Minister of Mines and Energy by an ABC interviewer earlier this year, he said that he was disinclined to invest any money in research, that he wanted results in a year or two and not in a year or 20. It is that kind of myopic thinking and lack of vision that has reduced this State to what it is—behind practically every other when it comes to economic development and missing out on opportunities at every turn.

I call on the Government, on the Premier and in particular on the Minister of Mines and Energy. If they refuse to spend the paltry sum of a few thousand dollars to send a scientist overseas to obtain an up-to-date register of all current research and development, let them at least do something—let them at least undertake what I believe would be an act which would bring great credit to the Government and which would be surrounded by a certain amount of prestige.

As I say, the Bannon Government has been almost apathetic in pursuing the economic and environmental opportunities which this State has to be a world leader in the production of energy from renewable sources. The Middle East crisis should force us into making major strides towards energy alternatives—and we could do it. Let the first step simply be Government sponsorship of a scientific meeting to inform the media and the community of the options that are available to us, and of the opportunities resulting from those options. This is not a lot to ask, and it is not costly. It is essentially a responsible exercise in communication. It is worth noting what we could lose if we do not do it and what we could gain if we could do it.

Earlier today I asked the Parliamentary Library to provide me with answers to some of these basic resource questions in respect of what we may lose as a result of the Middle East conflict. I asked: what volume of oil is imported into South Australia and Australia as a whole? To what extent are we dependent upon oil imports? What is the use to which imported oil is put? What is the monetary value (in terms of revenue) from what we produce? In what form do we import our oil and from what sources does it come?

The answer in simple terms is that Australia produces 519 000 barrels of oil a day, which is 68 per cent of our total needs. We import 32 per cent—167 000 barrels—of oil per day. Petroleum products and related materials imported into Australia amount to \$2 billion annually. As far as South Australia is concerned—and these figures come from the Australian Bureau of Statistics—for 1988-89 we imported (in round figures) \$170 million worth of petroleum and petroleum products. In respect of the consumption of oil products by State marketing areas, the *Petroleum Gazette* of 1989 (page 19) shows that South Australia consumes exactly 8 per cent of the oil imported into this country, and that is broken down into various products—liquified petroleum, aviation gasoline, petrol, aviation turbine fuel, lighting and power, kerosene, heating oil, fuel oil, lubricants, bitumen, and so forth.

The key question in this month of this year—August 1990, when the headlines on a daily basis shriek of the risk that the Middle East could blow up and that oil imports will be consequently severely affected—is the source of Australia's petroleum imports. The Department of Primary Industries and Energy data obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics indicates that, for 1987-88, the primary source of Australia's oil imports was Indonesia with 20.56 per cent, and after that the next biggest source was Saudi

Arabia with 19.17 per cent. When you add to Saudi Arabia the 8.63 per cent that comes from Kuwait and the 11.48 per cent that comes from the United Arab Emirates, you have a situation where we are potentially very vulnerable indeed.

So, Australia imports 32 per cent of its total petroleum needs, 20 per cent of that coming from Saudi Arabia, and another 20 per cent in round terms coming from the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait combined. It is imperative, given those figures, that South Australia, which is better placed than almost any other State in the world except some of the Arab States themselves in respect of potential for solar energy, take the lead because we are most suited to pioneering the solar hydrogen economy. We must stop dithering while countries such as Russia, Japan and Germany, which have comparatively little sunlight and must go beyond their borders to develop any capacity to produce solar hydrogen, make headway. We must resolve to make headway ourselves.

I commend the notion of a scientific meeting sponsored by the Government to inform the media and the public of the enormous economic and environmental benefits to be gained by taking a lead in this field. If I were a shareholder in the Luz International solar thermal power plant at Kramer Junction, California, at this moment I would be watching the value of my shares soar. The Luz plant is now producing 274 megawatts of power in Southern California—and will reach almost 680 megawatts by 1994. That is enough to meet the residential needs of a city the size of San Francisco or Phoenix. Meanwhile, this Government talks about extending a three phase powerline to a small tourist resort in the Flinders Ranges where the sun shines virtually every day of the year and where the potential for a solar plant to meet the needs not only of that comparatively little settlement but of all settlements further north could readily be established. The technology is available.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I do not think any of the alternative energy options should necessarily be rejected or discredited. In California alone, there are nearly 16 000 wind turbines generating nearly 2 billion kilowatt hours each year, as much energy as a medium size nuclear plant generates. It is the maturing of the technology that is driving the solar programs and, in contrast to conventional energy systems, these technologies are generally not resource limited. We cannot see an end to the sunshine which shines on us or, indeed, to the wind which blows around us, and we are not dependent upon some unstable dictator in a far off country to determine whether our energy needs can be met. We would be masters and mistresses of our own destiny if only we recognised the opportunities and got to work on them.

I will conclude by making a brief reference to the situation of the State Bank. Members may recall that, last year, as economic spokesperson for the Liberal Party, I questioned the Premier on several occasions and made several speeches about the State Bank. On 6 September 1989, following the tabling of the annual report, I made a speech, which is reported on page 782 of *Hansard* and in which I attempted to analyse the way in which the bank was operating. I suggested that a market driven policy rather than a prudential policy had governed the bank's lending. It was with no satisfaction whatsoever that I read in this morning's paper, under the heading 'Beneficial slumps to \$21.5 million loss', an article referring to Beneficial Finance, a subsidiary of the State Bank. I was particularly interested in comments by Mr Simmons, Chairman of Beneficial Finance, who said:

... management ... was too aggressive ... at a time when the property market was weakening.

There has been some criticism of the Opposition for continuing to raise questions about the State Bank. No apology whatsoever should be given or expected when it comes to matters of profound economic importance to the State for which the State Government is responsible and where the State Opposition has a constitutional obligation to fulfil when questioning is required. The circumstances in Western Australia and Victoria need only be examined for us all to realise that, without such parliamentary scrutiny, the terrible debt and damage could have been much worse had it been able to run on for much longer unchecked by parliamentary scrutiny.

The Parliament deserves some kind of explanation from the Premier as to the full extent of Government guarantees. We understand (and have been told many times) and the Act states that the State Bank is guaranteed by the Government of South Australia. Last year I questioned the Premier and drew forth an answer confirming that to be the case. However, it is one thing for the Government to guarantee the deposits and the loans of South Australians; it is quite another for the Government to guarantee the full sums resulting from borrowings by the State Bank, much of which is done overseas. I believe there should be a clarification by the Premier as to the extent of the guarantee, and the extent of that guarantee should be well understood by every member in this place.

The manner in which borrowings have been undertaken overseas—and those borrowings are referred to in my speech of 6 September 1989 and in an earlier set of questions on 10 August 1989 (page 208)—needs to be examined. The whole question of the extent of borrowings and loans needs to be examined. It is simply no use the Premier's hiding under the cloak of alleged commercial confidentiality and what he describes as his arm's length responsibility. In the final analysis, if the Government is the guarantor, the buck, or the lack of, stops with the Government. The Premier has to be frank with this Parliament when he is questioned. That is the most responsible course for him to take, and that is the way he can allay any concerns if indeed there are no concerns.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** I support the motion and, to the remarks of members on both sides of the House, I add my congratulations to the Governor and Lady Dunstan for the excellent manner in which they have carried out their many and varied duties. As many people know, in public life it is always a duo that is involved. If it is the wife who is in politics or public life, the husband must also attend, and vice versa. Coming from a political family, I know what both my parents had to go through in politics. It is a dual job in public life, so I therefore give due regard also to Lady Dunstan, and to the assistance she has given her husband in the carrying out of their duties.

This evening I would like to refer to several topics which have caused me concern and which, I believe, are of concern in the community. The first matter to which I would like to refer is a sporting matter, not just because I am a Norwood supporter but because I am concerned about the activities of the Port Adelaide Football Club in the changing face of football in South Australia.

I believe that most people in South Australia are sick and tired of the VFL (before it became the AFL) poaching our best players over the past 20 years to make its own competition stronger at the expense of that in the other States. The SANFL has been a strong guiding force in football in South Australia and has made sure that, despite all those

poachings and interferences from Victoria, we still have a solid and strong competition in this State. One can only hope that Port Adelaide will see the error of its ways and put its shoulder to the wheel with the rest of the SANFL to ensure that, if and when South Australia enters a national competition, we do so together—unified—to ensure that all South Australian league clubs can continue to grow and provide a strong competition, unlike the Western Australian experience.

The position in the Middle East has all Australians alarmed and apprehensive as to the course of events that could quite easily develop—alarmed, because the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq comes at a time when most people around the world have been breathing a collective sigh of relief over the events in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in the past 8 to 12 months. The Eastern Bloc countries have been freed up, democratic elections are taking place in some countries for the first time in 40 years, and that great symbol of tension, the Berlin wall, has been brought down. The two superpowers, the USA and the USSR, have agreed to reduce the effective size and the lethal capacity of their armed forces.

I think that most people had thought that the madness of the arms build-up had peaked and that, through a mixture of economic necessity and commonsense, the world could have looked forward to a prolonged period of world peace. But now, through an unpredictable act of aggression, the USA has mobilised its biggest force since Vietnam, and other nations of the world, including Australia, have committed forces to that blockade. One can only hope that a lasting, peaceful solution can be found quickly and that Australia's troops can return home safely.

One of the other events that caused me much sadness, along with, I think, many members of this House and the general public, occurred at the Easter racing carnival at Oakbank this year. Along with everybody else who attended, I was shocked to see that the champion hurdler, River Amos, broke a leg after a collision with another horse during the running of the Great Eastern Steeplechase. I cannot understand why jockey clubs still persist in staging hurdling events at race meetings. As far as I can tell, most horses that are entered in hurdle races are failed horses on the flat; they are usually much older than the racehorses in the flat races and at the end of their racing days. If jockey clubs are to persist in running hurdling events, stringent guidelines should be imposed, such as gauging the ability of horses to jump hurdles; not forcing them to enter because the owners have realised that the horse is not fast enough for the flat races; and imposing sensible age limits, not allowing owners and trainers to squeeze another few years out of the horse just because it is getting too old and, therefore, too slow for flat races.

Like all members on this side of the House, I was both saddened and horrified by the savage and merciless attack on Mr and Mrs Koop, as referred to by the member for Bright. No member on either side or in either Chamber would condone such useless and senseless behaviour. I also found the behaviour of the member for Bright, by implying that the attack was somehow the fault of the Government, equally disturbing. I always get worried when somebody enjoys taking cheap political shots as a result of the misfortunes of other people.

**An honourable member:** Those are the only ones they make.

**Mr McKEE:** Yes, you are correct. Once again, it is time to place on record for the benefit of members opposite, but particularly for the benefit of the member for Bright, this Government's record in relation to combating crime. First, I must point out that the attack took place approximately

100 metres from a police station, a police station established by this Government in November 1987 in Bank Street. Perhaps the member for Bright would like to see police stations every 10 yards.

South Australia has tended to spend more per head of population on protecting its community than has any other State. We have increased spending on police by over \$100 million since 1982; retained the best police-to-population ratio of any State in Australia; and increased to 17 the number of metropolitan police stations open 24 hours a day. Penalties were increased under the Summary Offences Act for more than 50 offences, including indecent behaviour, soliciting for prostitution, fraud, unlawful possession of stolen property and wilful damage. In relation to lenient sentences, the Attorney-General has instituted numerous Crown appeals against sentences and non-parole periods considered lenient and out of step with community standards. As at October 1989, 140 appeals had been lodged by the Attorney-General, since the Bannon Government was elected to office.

**Mr Matthew:** How many were successful?

**Mr McKEE:** I will just give an example; I am glad you came in. The sentence for murder was increased from 24 years to 36 years; for rape it was increased from three to eight years; and for armed robbery it was increased from three to nine years. The previous Liberal Government launched only 17 appeals in the space of two years. That is amazing.

In relation to the victims of crime, the South Australian Government became the first Australian jurisdiction formally to recognise the rights of victims when it took steps towards implementing the United Nations declaration. This Government has introduced a number of reforms to assist victims, including financial compensation; a declaration of victims' rights, emphasising the right to be informed of the progress of investigations, court proceedings and results, sentencing and the date of the offender's release from custody; and the establishment of a criminal injuries compensation fund, which receives money from a proportion of fines, from a levy on criminal activity and from the confiscation of profits, to increase the amount of compensation that can be made available to those injured by criminal activity.

In relation to that senseless attack to which I referred, a six point plan for the Adelaide business district has been implemented. This includes the immediate establishment of a Business Watch, Safety Shop scheme; the commissioning of a \$25 000 assessment of the physical design of Hindley Street, Rundle Mall and Rundle Street to reduce opportunities for crime, lessen conflict over the use of space and improve public feelings of safety; the development, in association with police, traders, relevant agencies and young people, of a set of minimum rules of behaviour in the inner city; the employment of additional support personnel to provide a friendly but authoritative presence in the inner city; and the provision of safety spaces for people of all ages, where street workers and others can advise and provide assistance, including support for victims. It goes on to include financial and organisational support for the Inner City Cooperative Action Group, a group comprising representatives of victims of crime, police, city traders, youth workers, the Adelaide City Council, residents and other relevant interests. This Government has demonstrated very clearly its commitment to the protection of the public. Instead of being negative, members opposite should get behind the initiatives of this Government and the Police Force because everyone knows its job is difficult enough.



I was very glad to have a visit to my electorate of Gilles by the Premier and his wife, Angela, during the recess. Together we visited the Gilles Plains Primary School and the Child Health Care Centre to talk with teachers, community welfare workers and Education Department area representatives. We also visited Windsor Gardens High School to participate in Arbor Day celebrations and to check progress on the amalgamation with Strathmont High School.

The electorate of Gilles will become increasingly important in the light of the Government's successful bid to be Australia's host for the Commonwealth Games, which was announced over the weekend. I congratulate the Premier, the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the member for Hanson for the assistance that he gave. If we are successful in 1992 with our bid to hold the Commonwealth Games, a large part of the electorate of Gilles will be utilised for housing athletes from all around the world. Therefore, a lot of development will take place in the electorate. I look forward to that and to having negotiations with the Ministers involved to ensure the smooth transition of those developments in the Northfield area. I am happy to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

*[Sitting suspended from 5.53 to 7.30 p.m.]*

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech opening the second session of the Forty-Seventh Parliament. I would also like to express my appreciation for the outstanding service given to our State by His Excellency the Governor Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan and wish them well in the future. I take this opportunity to welcome our new Liberal colleague, the member for Custance, to this place and look forward to what I am sure will be his worthy contributions.

In May of this year I was pleased to present a submission to the Department of Environment and Planning calling for Haines Memorial Park at Tea Tree Gully to be nominated for inclusion on the register of State heritage items under the South Australian Heritage Act 1978. The village of Steventon, which was later to become Tea Tree Gully, was established and subdivided by John Stevens in 1854 and was centred around the triangle of land which in 1909 was named Haines Memorial Park. Concern over the development within this historical township at Tea Tree Gully and proposed car parking facilities that follow such development had caused residents to register their concerns with me. Therefore, in the interests of preserving the integrity of the park and this historic area, I put together the submission for State heritage registration. Only last Thursday I had the pleasure of addressing the Tea Tree Gully Primary School students, staff and parents at a special assembly and open day to celebrate Book Week. Haines Memorial Park and Tea Tree Gully School are significantly interlinked historically. It was also my pleasure to present a copy of the State heritage nomination in book form to the Deputy Principal, Mr Kerslake, for inclusion in the school's library, which already has an extensive historical data collection within its archives.

The essence and physical shape of the original township has been maintained through the years by concerned citizens and the Tea Tree Gully council. I would like to place on the record my appreciation and thanks to the Tea Tree Gully Library and the Tea Tree Gully council for assisting with the provision of research material necessary to complete the submission. I thank the mayor of Tea Tree Gully, Mr Tom Milton, for his support. In the interests of promoting tourism, I extend an invitation to all members of

this place to take a leisurely weekend drive with their family to my electorate of Newland to see for themselves the attributes of our historical village setting at Tea Tree Gully.

During 1988 the Minister for Social Security imposed a freeze on a system that directed social security pension payments to the Housing Trust so that rent could be deducted and the balance deposited into the tenant's bank account. This scheme referred to as the Pension Warrant Deduction Scheme, was introduced in 1975 with the cooperation of the Department of Social Security. Due to the change in 1988, the Housing Trust can no longer add new clients to the system, except for those clients of Aboriginal descent. The freezing of this scheme has caused some hardship to recipients of social security pensions residing in Housing Trust homes. In particular, the aged and infirm are forced to go to extraordinary lengths to make their rental payments on the due date. Many community organisations have continued to lobby to have the system reinstated. I believe that the State Government has supported this move and in March this year was discussing with the Department of Social Security the introduction of a new, but similar, scheme.

The pensioners who have contacted my office supporting the reintroduction of the previous scheme are anxious to learn from the Minister of Housing and Construction whether a new scheme will be introduced and when it will be implemented. During a recent period of public agitation it was most heartening to see community spirit and generosity come to the fore. Certain members of my community relinquished their ownership of flu vaccine scripts in favour of those in greater need.

Over a period of some weeks earlier this year many aged and infirm South Australians were frightened that their lives and those of their loved ones could be at risk from an influenza strain promoted as 'killer flu'. This appears to have occurred for two reasons: first, the highly emotive terminology embodied in the description of this influenza strain classed as 'killer flu'; and, secondly, the inability of the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories to provide the necessary numbers of doses of vaccine requested by pharmacists to meet the demand.

I believe that the serum production takes three months from egg to supply. As strains of flu change, cultures are developed and recipes are provided for these strains by the World Health Organisation. These recipes are received from the WHO each November when production begins and continues until February. At that time a decision on further needs is then made.

In the previous year the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories increased their production level to a high of 800 000 doses. This year the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories again increased production by 50 per cent, to 1.2 million doses. I also believe that the private firm of May and Baker in Melbourne imported approximately 300 000 doses of serum, apparently intended only for those 'at risk' categories. The overall total of available doses of serum was a very substantial 1.5 million—almost double the amount of doses available from the previous year.

Now this raises certain questions. Why did football clubs and other sporting bodies gain access to vaccines before those at greater risk? Why did some large employers have access to vaccines to enable them to immunise their employees ahead of the more needy in the community? Why was the massive increase in available doses still less than the demand? Further, was the demand for the vaccine falsely created to offload what could have been a massive surplus? Was the emotive tag 'killer flu' created to ensure demand for such a surplus? I urge the Minister of Health to call

upon the Federal Minister to investigate all aspects of these questions.

The Minister of Finance, speaking on the urgency motion debate on the first day of Parliament for this session, presented a theme—a theme to be used by this Government as its strategy—which undoubtedly will be used throughout this budget session. What was that theme? It appears to go like this: what you are paying for is what you get. I believe I can predictably say that the theme will be reiterated at public functions and will be enunciated by media presenters. This theme will be marketed throughout the State, and I would not be surprised if it became a television commercial. They may even write a jingle on it. By the time the television commercial is regularly appearing on prime time TV and the jingle is being sung by students in the schools, the people of South Australia will be convinced and subdued, and will thoroughly accept that what we are paying for is what we get.

The Minister warned Opposition members that he intends to keep a list of our requests and publish the cost of those requests. I reject this blatant form of intimidation, which is designed to suppress the proper and correct democratic right of each member of this Parliament to present the needs of South Australians without fear or favour. I for one will not abrogate my duty as a representative voice for the residents of my electorate and, indeed, for the people of South Australia. I am quite happy for the Minister to keep recording his list as it identifies the needs of our community, and in any efficient structure of budgeting those needs, once identified, should be considered in all seriousness by a responsible Government. But there is another list. This is the list that the Minister will not table in this House, will not market extensively and will not write a jingle about. This is the list of taxpayers' funds mismanaged by this Government—a list of millions of dollars of wastage.

So, how does that theme go—the theme for intimidating parliamentary members and subduing the South Australian public's rightful expectation: what you are paying for is what you get. The South Australian taxpayer paid for the South Australian Timber Company, and what did we get—a massive loss of \$20 million. We invested \$50 million in the Scrimber Company, and what did we get—several pieces of timber. The South Australian taxpayer will meet Samcor's losses of \$2 million; the *Island Seaway's* \$10 million loss; Marineland's loss of \$7.6 million; the Justice Information System's \$20 million blowout; the Motor Vehicle Registration Department's \$9.5 million blowout—and that is the abbreviated list.

Unfortunately, the list goes on. I say 'unfortunately' because my constituents and the taxpayers of South Australia are the ones who suffer by reductions in necessary and basic service delivery and by this Government's inept business ventures, which should be left for private enterprise investment. These lost millions would have provided funds with which to properly and efficiently provide, maintain and increase service needs as demands grow. This is what we have paid for. The Minister of Finance can keep his list, but be assured that the Minister and his Government will answer to the public of South Australia for the disgraceful and unacceptable mismanaged waste of millions of dollars detailed on the other list.

In May of this year the first hospice service in the north-eastern suburbs opened at the Modbury Hospital, and it is gratifying that the need for this service has at last been recognised. The six-bed ward, which has received \$400 000 funding from the South Australian Health Commission, will cater for terminally ill people previously catered for in their own homes. The allocation of six beds to cater for the

north-eastern region is the most minimal acceptance by this Government that such important services are required.

Until this time last week, the hospice service was unsure whether it would be given funding for the coming year. The plight of the terminally ill has been sadly neglected by this Government. If those of us in the north-eastern suburbs were now asked the question, 'Do we have hospice facilities?', we could readily answer, 'Yes', and thereby ease the conscience of the policy makers of the Labor Party. The Health Commission could pat itself on the back for providing another service to the people, and the Government could add another dimension to its compassionate facade, but how much substance is there in our overall health care?

During the past few months I have been contacted by a multitude of constituents concerned by the long delays experienced by themselves or their families in admission to the public hospital system. Entering hospital for any type of treatment or surgical procedure can be a traumatic experience for the individual concerned. Consider the increased trauma for those who finally receive a date of admission but are then advised to telephone the hospital before leaving home to see whether a bed is still available. The answer to that inquiry depends upon whether the beds have been filled with emergency admissions during the night. This situation can recur several times before admission is actually gained. What level of induced trauma does this represent in health care terms to the individuals? My constituents and the people of South Australia have the right to ask: does anyone really care?

The major hospital for my region is, of course, Modbury Hospital, and at this point I would like to state quite categorically that I hold the utmost admiration for both staff and administrators of Modbury Hospital. The hospital's services are run efficiently within the constraints of its allocated budget to maintain a high level of quality and care.

The major concern for most people with medical and surgical problems is getting into the system to receive those services. The public hospital system is overloaded and therefore is not meeting the needs of the public. The Ministers of Health, both State and Federal, must look at radically changing Medicare, as this situation can only worsen.

Modbury Hospital first opened its services some 18 years ago with 226 beds; 18 years later Modbury Hospital operates with 229 beds—an increase of three additional beds. In 1975, in another place the then Minister of Health (Hon. D.H.L. Banfield) was asked a question on the future development of Modbury Hospital. He replied, as follows:

Regarding future development of Modbury Hospital, I approved the appointment of a building development planning team for Modbury Hospital in 1974, and a program for progressive development has been drawn up for implementation, subject to finance, over the next five years. This will include various additional facilities as well as the completion of the existing structure to provide approximately 450 in-patient beds.

Clearly, 450 beds at that time in 1975 was the projected requirement to service this region. At this time in 1990 our population is three times greater than that in 1975. Well, we certainly have the structure but over an 18 year period we have come full circle—plus three, that is, 229 beds to accommodate the needs of a catchment area population of over 200 000 and growing.

Despite the growing demands for surgery by people in pain and in need of life saving operations, this Government has closed 461 public hospital beds in the last six years. In the February 1990 issue of the *South Australian Medical Review*, waiting times for surgery from the surgical booking lists of major public hospitals were published by the South Australian Health Commission. These raw statistics show

the true direction of the dissipation of our health services and identify the pain and suffering endured by thousands in this State. For example, in excess of 7 400 people were awaiting surgery in November 1989. Of these, 1 746 people could expect to wait an average of over seven months for orthopaedic surgery.

For ear, nose and throat, the number was 1 721, waiting over six months; for ophthalmology, the number was 507, waiting over five months. For plastic surgery, the number was 602, waiting over five months. For urology, the number was 562, waiting over three months. For general surgery, the number was 1 243, waiting three months. There lies the true picture of neglect.

To attempt to press home the seriousness of the present situation and for those who still do not accept that our hospitals are in a financial crisis mode, I state that one of the budgetary measures assumed by Modbury Hospital to protect its own integrity and quality service within its allocated budget is to close down the surgical ward over Christmas and New Year—a period which could extend from a month to six weeks. What a scandalous situation: if this is a solution, it sounds like the final solution.

Budget restrictions have meant reductions in service provisions from childrens services across the range to the elderly. No cataract operations are performed at Modbury; in fact, there are no eye facility provisions. Ear, nose and throat are only minimally provided, as waiting lists indicate. Orthopaedic surgery takes place once a week, and a recent reduction in the maternity section reduced available beds by almost 50 per cent.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** This is a teaching hospital, isn't it?

**Mrs KOTZ:** It is a teaching hospital. Of course, one should make sure that surgery is not required at Christmas or the New Year, because the hospital has to close its surgical ward to stay within budget. We need realistic solutions to combat this crisis in health servicing; the present situation is untenable. The continued deterioration will mean that Medicare will increasingly overload, waiting lists will lengthen and, the bottom line, South Australians will be deprived of basic health care.

While I am on the subject of health, I wish to comment on our new health service facility for women. The amalgamation of the Queen Victoria Hospital and the Adelaide Children's Hospital into the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children is beginning to appear to be as creative an illusion as the multifunction polis. It would also appear that the women of South Australia have again been conned by this Labor Government into believing that, like other States, the women of South Australia would have a hospital dedicated to women's health.

The election rhetoric surrounding those promises of a proposed centre of excellence in the Adelaide Children's Hospital site is now only a distant echo. It is suggested that some of the services now available at the Queen Victoria Hospital will not be available at the AMCWC. To compound that outrageous possibility, it is also suggested that other services will in fact be diluted by the higher profile surgery demands of the Adelaide Children's Hospital.

I call upon the women of this State to indicate whether or not they will accept that gynaecological services may not be maintained. South Australian women and the Queen Victoria Hospital staff were promised a first-class facility. I do not believe it will be delivered by this Government. The whole project has been put at risk due to the inevitable funding cutbacks, and I say 'inevitable' because of the mounting catalogued and mismanaged economic ventures by this Government. It may well be appropriate to scrap

the amalgamation and, instead, use the money to upgrade the Queen Victoria Hospital, because the least this current project will provide is second-class health care for women.

In my area, north and north-east of Adelaide, there is considerable concentration of light industry and small business, all of which are experiencing the effects of our present economy and struggling to survive the continual onslaught of State taxes, charges and ever increasing WorkCover levies and high interest rates. This is a scenario of which I am sure all members are aware. I have continual contact with business owners and managers whose major decision these days is whether to close down their companies, pay off their employees, cut their losses and retire.

In recent months several large industries in the northern suburbs have retrenched employees. Industries such as Bonaire Pyrox retrenched 18 personnel and AWA Defence Industries, which is a Government enterprise, retrenched 32 personnel. I point out that this State's unemployment rate is now at an unacceptable level of 7.4 per cent. The recent spate of retrenchments could indicate a trend that may push unemployment even higher.

Amid this calamitous demise of industry and rising unemployment, we have a Premier presenting the face of positive encouragement for Australian-made products and support for local goods but, if we look on the other side of that positive face, we find a very different face. We find that our Premier has allowed South Australian industries to miss out on millions of dollars worth of Government contracts. Last year State Government purchasing amounted to over \$800 million, but some Government purchasers refuse to buy Australian-made products and, in particular, South Australian goods.

To illustrate that point, a South Australian manufacturing company within my electorate of Newland specialises in laminated sandwich panels, having perfected the technique in curtain wall products. The quality of this product is evident in the construction of the Botanical Gardens Conservatory (the name of the company is Bondor Pty Ltd).

The Government called tenders for the Southern Science Park project at the beginning of this year, and recently awarded the contract to a New South Wales based company, overlooking our local manufacturer, Bondor. On 12 June I sent a letter to the Premier seeking an explanation of this apparent contradictory approach to Government support for local business. On 25 June I received a letter of acknowledgment of receipt of my letter stating an answer will be forthcoming. That is the current status.

However, in between the two dates I have just mentioned, on 22 June, an article in the *Advertiser* entitled 'Public Sector Fails to Back South Australian Industry' stated:

In an unprecedented attack on Public Service purchasing policies, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, Mr Arnold, has slammed public sector 'middle management' for its failure to support local industry. He said yesterday the refusal of some Government purchasers to buy Australian made products—particularly South Australian goods—had led to a damaging bureaucratic 'mind-set' which was costing local companies millions of dollars in lost business and jobs.

The Government was concerned that, despite efforts to change the attitude of Public Service purchasing officers, some still lacked confidence in Australian products. This had led to perhaps millions of dollars being spent outside the State and often outside the country when local products could have met the Bill... In 1987, the Premier, Mr Bannon, issued a memorandum to Government departments emphasising that the purchase of Australian made products was 'critical' for the country's economic success and encouraging strengthened support for local goods.

What unmitigated gall. Where does the buck-passing stop? Where does responsibility start? The Minister slams middle management of the public sector. Why middle management? Because, I suspect, even the Minister would have

problems if he tried to levy public admonishment upon the upper echelons of the Public Service, and when you want to find a scapegoat you do not pick one that will kick back.

Secondly, the Minister admits to millions of dollars being spent outside the State and overseas when local products would have been acceptable. Thirdly, the Premier, over three years ago, issued his own edict to Government departments stating it was 'critical' for the country's economic success to support local business. This article is a public acknowledgement that neither the Premier nor the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology—therefore the Government—have control over the public sector. Or, could it be that even the public sector questions whether 48 per cent makes a Government. When the Premier and a Minister of the Crown admit by public announcement that they are incapable of directing the business of our State, it is surely time for them to resign.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I acknowledge the long service that Sir Donald Dunstan has given this State as Governor, and I commend the way in which Lady Dunstan has carried out her duties and responsibilities. I commend the late Jack Hull, who served in this Chamber and the other place for many years, for the service he gave not only to this Parliament but also to the community as a whole. The member for Light has made the point that Mr Hull was a great sportsman and keen on sport, particularly cricket. He also served in his local community on various bodies, including the Mitcham council. He was prepared to do that, even though he was a busy man. So, I record my appreciation for the work he performed in this place and for the service he gave to the community in general. His family can be proud to have had a member who contributed so much to society. In saying that, I realise that his family would have had to carry some load. Those of us in public life know that the spouse and those at home carry quite a burden which is not recognised or perhaps known by the general community.

I intended to speak mainly about the deficiencies of the south and the way it is neglected. However, a pamphlet entitled 'MFP—Adelaide, South Australia', which came out today, really inspired me to put a bit more bite into it, because I now know how the people in the south really feel. My first thought was to wonder who would produce such a pamphlet and what was its purpose, because it has a lot of flowery words but no facts, and that is the problem with the MFP at this stage—there is nothing factual, nothing to hang your hat on and say: this will be it.

I actually wrote to Mr Neave at one stage, and also the Premier, because I did not know what a multifunction polis was. I am not ashamed of that, because I found, in talking to people, that nobody else knew, either. I knew what 'multi' meant; I knew what 'function' meant; but 'polis' had me whacked. I found out that it means 'city', so we were to create a multifunction city. Then I wondered what Adelaide was. Adelaide was a multi-function city. It has every type of function, including universities, institutes of technology, Technology Park, colleges, and market gardens, all within the metropolitan area. I considered these and wondered what was different about this place? So I wrote and asked. To date I still have not had a reply from either gentleman as to what it really is. Therefore, I assume either they have not been told by those who want it, or they do not know exactly how to interpret what they have been told it is likely to be.

This pamphlet would make interesting reading by anyone in the south, and no doubt they will receive a copy of it and it will make their Christmas dinner seem nice by the

time they can absorb what is written there. On the first page—and I will refer only to part of it—it asks: what is an MFP? It states that it is a development in which twenty-first century industries can flourish, urban forms suitable for the twenty-first century can be created, and new and improved education, community service and leisure facilities can be established. This area will apparently have improved education. I suppose that suggests that the rest of metropolitan Adelaide and South Australia will not have improved education. The inference is that it will be a twenty-first century project, and I take it that the rest of the place will be forgotten.

Nothing would cheer up the southern suburbs more than the establishment of recreation, leisure and community facilities. They cannot get a hockey field, and they have a swimming pool at Noarlunga only because of the initiative of the Noarlunga council. There is no major sporting complex, although there are some in the north, the north-west and the west, so people in the south would read this brochure and think that the south has been forgotten again. The pamphlet states:

Our proposal involves all of Adelaide.

So, the proposal for the multifunction polis is not just at Gillman; it is for the whole of Adelaide. No-one has told me exactly how that will happen, or whether it means we will have technology developed here that will help us financially. I believe that we developed a thing called the Sarich engine; we developed a shearing machine that would help to revolutionise the shearing industry and save many workers compensation claims for bad backs. Shearing is hard work, and it would have made that job easier. But we cannot even find the money to keep that here.

We make developments within a university in the field of chemical research, and we have to sell them overseas for chemical companies to develop and market. We cannot even look after the things we already have. The pamphlet goes on to say:

The Gillman region will provide opportunities for the development of new environmentally sensitive industries which, in turn, will benefit Adelaide . . .

Nothing would please the southern suburbs more than to have a few environmentally sensitive industries. That would really cheer them up. Just give them one and they would be happy to have it, because they get nothing down there. They are not even provided with incentives through Government agencies telling groups to go south. One reason is that the roads are so bad and so cluttered that there is no benefit to industry in going down there.

You could virtually have your breakfast, shave, do your hair and so on on the way to work—you will have plenty of time to do that while sitting in the queues. Those are the sorts of delays that occur. Now we have Seaford going ahead, with no provision for major upgrading of roads. We will just have a big funnel pouring into a narrow neck and then having nowhere to go. And we expect the people to accept a multifunction polis that will have futuristic transport, with all the mod cons of an environment in one area, with nothing in the south—not even a proposition coming forward to take away the long delays in traffic. A short section of a third arterial road means nothing—it means picking people up at one spot, racing them up to another, and pouring them into a narrow neck with nowhere to go.

But does anyone care? This Government has governed for 22 years of the past 25, and it cannot blame anyone else—and it knows that. There was a Liberal Government for a three-year term, and it started the north-east project, the O-Bahn. It took on one of the challenges, since that was also a forgotten area. In that three-year period, it got it off

the ground. We now have a group that has been in Government all these years and has done nothing about the forgotten south. The pamphlet about the multifunction polis goes on to say:

The urban design of the area includes a mosaic of villages or settlements separated by parks, forests, lakes and gardens linked with each other and the metropolis of Adelaide by state of the art communications and transport systems.

What a lot of fancy words! Some people in the south would be happy with a decent bus shelter, or to have their car parks done up at the railway stations—Coromandel Valley, for example, Blackwood and even further south in the electorates of the member for Bright and the member for Fisher.

The Minister (Ms Lenehan), in her electorate of Mawson and the Deputy Premier (Dr Hopgood), in his electorate of Baudin, must have people complaining, but the numbers game is such that they cannot lose in those electorates. Those people can be ignored. That is the approach that this Government takes. The pamphlet continues, talking about the villages:

For example, one could be the headquarters for a new communications centre . . .

Members should speak to the people in the south. They would love to have a communications centre down there. If we have the expertise here or if we can bring it in from overseas, what is wrong with having it down there?

The other fear we must recognise is that that is not the only place in Australia where it can be built; it can be built in any other State. To think that, just because someone said that they would like to invest some money here, some other State will not look at that project is quite foolish. But at least the south could have been considered. We are building another technology park near Flinders University. The pamphlet goes on to say in relation to the villages:

. . . and another have a number of environmental management stations and research institutes. A third could contain the headquarters of a world university.

I do not object to the establishment of a world university in Adelaide, if it can be established here, but I would hate to think that our existing two universities, and the third one that is to be created, would suffer even greater financial constraints than they presently face because we are to put some money into a fourth university. Are we saying that these people from overseas will pour their money into a world university here and still let our people attend that university, or will they bring their own people from their own land, whether it be France, Germany, Japan or wherever, to be the students in that university? Perhaps in the long term they will have the opportunity to obtain permanent residency in this country by what some people might call a backdoor method when other people cannot obtain residency for some members of their family to reunite their family here?

Every member in this House, if they were worth a pinch of salt, would know of people who are in that category, people who have been to their electorate offices to say that they have not been successful in reuniting their family. Talk of a fourth university, when we have only just decided to establish a third, with each of our existing universities now struggling for money, is absurd. Every member here knows that. Are we playing with words or are we fair dinkum? The pamphlet goes on:

We will further develop our ability to talk, trade, learn, live and work with people from many countries.

Will a multifunction polis achieve that? Is someone saying to me that the only way we can learn to live, talk, work and trade with people of other lands is to build a multifunction polis? I thought that we were already doing that.

We heard an attack this afternoon by the member for Hartley against a statement made by Mr Howard a few years ago. The Labor Party and the news media—that rat-pack from Canberra—interpreted the statement so as to denigrate the man and the Party for political purposes.

We all know that virtually every country in the world has learnt to talk, trade and deal with others, except perhaps for one country—Iraq. We all know that. And we all know—and if we do not know, we should—that the vast majority of countries have now made English a compulsory subject in secondary schools. The people in some other countries say that their language is not precise enough—and God help us if English is precise. People write contracts in English and German, because they are the two languages in which it is easiest to write contracts in a precise or a binding manner.

We tell our people to learn the language of the countries with which we trade but, by the time our children learn those languages, the children in those other countries, who have since grown up to be adults in professional fields, such as diplomats and trade representatives, will speak English as well as, or in some cases even better than, our students. So why put that sort of trite comment on the bottom of a document to try to promote a particular project? The pamphlet further states:

. . . the Gillman region, an international approach to living, cultural pursuits and leisure. The development will require investment by corporations in Japan, Europe, the United States and elsewhere. For the MFP to be successful, it must be truly an international place.

When we consider the areas where international companies own interests, factories and businesses here, we see that this is an international trading place, although maybe not as big as we would like to be.

I return to my first theme, that is the southern area of metropolitan Adelaide. I believe that some of the complaints and concerns of these people would apply equally to most of the country areas. They are the forgotten areas. The health facilities in the south, compared with those in central, north and western Adelaide, and particularly north-western Adelaide, are lacking in relation to the ratio of population to beds available. Southern Adelaide suffers drastically in the area of provision of hospital beds. In some areas, public transport is virtually non-existent. I have already covered the spending of money on roads. School facilities are overtaxed by the number of children attending.

On 5 August 1990 the Premier attacked members of the Liberal Party, saying that Liberal Party members in Opposition were irresponsible because they were pointing out to the public where the Government has wasted money or where they believe the Government should make some cuts, more particularly saying that the Government is a bad manager. The Premier comes out with this list and says that it is irresponsible of members of Parliament to raise on behalf of their constituents, or the State as a whole, areas of concern, and to request that consideration be given. First, what is the role of a member of Parliament? Members of Parliament are elected to represent an electorate. The main avenue for constituents of that electorate to get their point of view to the Government—if they have failed through approaches to departments—is through their local member of Parliament. There are no ifs or buts about that. If a member of Parliament said to his or her constituent, 'Sorry, I will not ask the Government to consider that,' what would the Government's attitude be if that constituent then approached one of its members, say the Minister of Transport—given the sort of attacks that he makes on individuals? What would the response be? The first response would

be an attack on that member for not carrying out his or her duty.

I was mentioned only twice on the sheet. The Government could not have spent much time on it. I am a bit disappointed. I will have to go back and apologise to my electorate. The list indicates that I stated in the debate on the Supply Bill, 27 February 1990, that Neighbourhood Watch needed to be established in all metropolitan areas involving a cost of \$900 000. What sort of scurrilous attack is that? What sort of mind does the Premier have? He claims to be a fair Premier. When a member says that Neighbourhood Watch should be established in every area, is the Premier suggesting that one community should have it and another should not, regardless of the crime rate? Perhaps I should mention for the benefit of southerners one other comment that was made in the MFP pamphlet, because I believe it is important in relation to the problems they face. The pamphlet states:

The new development in the Gillman region will be human in its scale—not sprawling or crowded, but with an urban form which encourages community spirit and ensures a secure and safe place for families, visitors and people of all ages.

So, on the one hand, the Premier must have authorised the pamphlet, or had something to do with it—and I would like to know who printed it, which agency got the dough for doing it (we will find that out later)—and, on the other hand, when a member says that all areas of metropolitan Adelaide, or South Australia, should be included in Neighbourhood Watch to give the citizens security in their home and community, that member is condemned.

Nothing would please the people of the south more than to have a secure community so that they could walk at night or even during the day through railway station underpasses without fear of being mugged or robbed or so that they would not fear having their homes burgled. Nothing would please them more than not to have to build 6 foot high walls around their homes, to keep dogs and to spend thousands of dollars on security locks and security systems. Nothing would please them more than not to have to go to that expense. It appears that people in the multifunction polis will not have to spend that kind of money, because they will be given all the guaranteed securities according to that pamphlet. Or is that pamphlet just a mass of fancy words to con people? Members, of course, know the answer to that, and so does anyone else who reads it.

Another matter that I raised referred to photopoints for photographic licences—\$600 000. We were asking at the time whether there could be more than one or two spots where people could have photographs taken for driving licences. The Minister threw that into the hat for \$600 000. However, nobody on the Government side admitted that there were so many bad photographs on driving licences that they had to take them back and do a second run. How much did that cost? Whose fault was that? Was it the Opposition's? Of course not. It is bad management by the Government. If that happened in private enterprise, somebody would take the rap, but it is just forgotten about. It will be interesting to know how much that error cost and how much taxpayers' money went down the drain.

I want to make a quick comment about another matter. On 7 January 1984 I wrote to the Minister of Health about a family's problem with one of its members who was on drugs. I never received an answer, and I believe my secretary made a couple of phone calls, so we wrote again on 5 June 1986. We thought that a bit over two years was a reasonable time to get a response to a letter. We drew the Minister's attention to the fact that he had had a letter two years before. That was all right. We got an acknowledgment, but nothing else. So I wrote again on 16 June 1988—two years

later again—and nothing had happened by January this year and I am still waiting for a reply. The trouble is that the Minister has changed a few times. However, I hope that the letters are still there. I do not know how many more years I shall be here, but I hope that I will get a reply on behalf of the family before I leave this place, because six years is a long time to wait for an answer from a Minister. There are many other examples, but not as long as that one. However, I thought I should tell the House about that one.

I want briefly to refer to a firm, without mentioning its name, which got severely hit with the WorkCover levy. It had an increase and it had two claims. The WorkCover levy to 31 December 1989 was \$58 958, and at 31 May 1990 it was \$76 121. The pay-out for the claims amounted to \$64 494 for the first one and \$88 612 for the second. Therefore, the pay-out was higher than the premiums, and that was on a 4.5 per cent levy rate. But suddenly WorkCover says that it will jump the levy rate to 9.4 per cent. If it does that, the firm will have to pay \$160 000 in one year, which is almost double any claim it has had in any one year. That does not read right; it is unreasonable. The firm said:

We do not know how we can pay this enormous increase in levy as our company profit last year was \$6 000. We estimate our increase in levy to be approximately \$30 000 per annum. Up to June 1990 the industry levy rate has been 4.5 per cent on all payments to fence erectors, truck drivers, workshop and sales staff and office personnel, including levy on superannuation.

This levy has now been increased to 7.5 per cent and an additional penalty has been added of 1.87 per cent and a registration fee of 0.06 per cent, making a total of 9.43 per cent.

This company's turnover for 1989-90 will be approximately \$1 450 000 so we are certainly not in the 'big business' league. However, our estimated Workcover levy at 9.43 per cent will be approximately \$60 000 for 1990-91.

The letter continues:

It seems difficult to understand that when private workers compensation was in force we paid levy or premiums on workers, varying from 1 per cent for office staff to a maximum of 10 per cent for fence erectors, averaging at 6.2 per cent of wage payment, with no levy on superannuation payment, no levy on directors fees, no payment for the first week of disability, no penalty on claims and a bonus for low claims if applicable.

Subsequently, the company received a letter from the Southern Regional Unit which states:

I am writing to introduce to you Mr. . . . [I will refer to him as Joe] who is a client of the Commonwealth Rehabilitation Service.

Joe is currently actively seeking employment. In May 1989, he injured his right foot—

I will not say how he did this. The letter continues:

He has recently completed an intensive treatment program including 3 surgical operations on [a part of his body]. Medical experts have cleared him for a return to work on full duties so long as he wears safety boots to help support . . .

The Southern Regional Unit wrote to this company requesting that it employ this man and give him a go—a reasonable request. The letter continues:

I would also like to draw your attention to some advantages we could offer your organisation should you consider employing him. In order to enable you to assess his ability to meet the job requirements, we can offer you an on-the-job trial for a period of up to two months. There would be no cost to you and full compensation cover would be provided. If some retraining was preferable, this could be negotiated. In addition, if you were to employ him WorkCover looks favourably on this and may lower your levy rates.

What sort of an organisation are we dealing with? The letter concludes:

If you would like to discuss further any aspects of the work-training scheme for my client, please contact me on the above number.

The company wrote back to WorkCover saying:

We have received a letter from Southern Regional Unit Rehabilitation asking us to give consideration to employ-

ing... Unfortunately, we have no opening which would be suitable. On reading the letter, we note that the rehabilitation counsellor points out that if we were able to help with this employment, WorkCover would look favourably on this and may lower our levy rate.

We understand this situation, but it also brings to mind that we have cooperated in the past with WorkCover, limiting payments by employing Mr... on a part-time basis to aid in his rehabilitation in the hope that he may be able to work full time. Unfortunately, this has not been the case as he seems to have recurring trouble with his knee, which was the original cause of the claim.

We thought it may help to point out to you our cooperation in this matter...

This is an example of a firm that is prepared to cooperate, but because they initiated something from their own end there was no help from WorkCover. There is no doubt that WorkCover has gone mad and it is worrying a lot of people.

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

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** It gives me great pleasure tonight to support the motion before the House and to say, first, that I along with other members recognise the valiant service that the Governor has given to South Australia. In many respects, it is a tribute to the Governor that he has been able to fulfil his duties over the past nearly seven years now with great dignity. I go on to say that, although I have only been a member of this place for some nine months, my contact with the Governor indicates to me that he has at all times played that regal role in South Australia with a great deal of intelligence and, at the same time, he has played it fairly and squarely in all respects.

While recognising the services of the Governor, a few other people also need to be mentioned. Sadly, there is one person whom many of my colleagues on this side and some members on the other side have not mentioned. Indeed, they have let an event go by without giving it much recognition at all. It concerns the first member of the class of 1989 who has moved down to the front bench on the Opposition side. I see that the member for Adelaide is here tonight to receive the praise that I am going to give him.

As he is showing, he is a good performer and, in the outfit to which he belongs, he may progress further along the front bench during the term of this Government, or he may go backwards. It depends how it goes. From my point of view, I am sure that the member for Adelaide will make an excellent contribution and may even be able to lift the level of contributions of some of his colleagues. In saying that to my Government colleagues, and especially the member for Napier, I must chastise the member for Adelaide for getting at least one part of his homework wrong.

There was a suggestion last week in this place that I had not submitted my photograph to be duly hung in the rogues gallery of this House. My wife will assure and testify that any time a camera is present I am one of the first blokes to flash my teeth and smile. I did so on many occasions, and in one instance I clearly remember having my photograph taken for one of those oval-shaped frames. I presented that photograph to the Clerk, and I was concerned when I was named in this House last week as being the member who had held up the hanging of the photographs of all the other members of the class of 1989.

We may have been waiting for the new member for Custance to come in as well. However, that was not the case, so I inquired of the Clerk concerned. He assured me that he still had my photograph, even though he had had it for six months. It is still in his care and the photograph will be duly hung soon. In fact, I was so concerned when I was looking around that I noticed that I had a namesake

who was hung many years ago. Some may argue that he should have been hung years before that, but the reality is that he was a member of Parliament who sat on both sides of the House—in Opposition and in Government—and he sat in the middle.

I must say that Mr Quirke, whom I never met but who was a distant relative, had the pleasure to represent the area now represented by the member for Custance. I must say that I welcome the member for Custance. I will not go on any further and pour a bit of water over the honourable member, other than to say, 'Welcome to the House.' I will leave it at that but say that I hope that the family seat is in good hands. I hope that the member for Custance will be able to bring representation which means that, on those occasions when he knows that the Government is right, he will have the courage that Bill Quirke had on several occasions and cross the red line. I hope that the honourable member will come over to this side of the Chamber and support us in those circumstances. We have yet to see how that unfolds.

Leaving the Opposition where it belongs, that is, opposite, I would like to refer to the Governor's speech. A couple of the elements of His Excellency's speech need to be brought out. The first matter relates to the present circumstances in which we find ourselves in South Australia. The core of the problem is this: over a number of years, in all the States, the amount of Commonwealth revenue that has been made available in grants and loans has steadily decreased.

That puts us in an extremely difficult position. We are in that difficult position because, at the end of the day, we are the service providers. A number of members in this place have stood up today and said, 'We understand the situation; we know that things are difficult. There is a great deal of incompetency, but everything will be better if my pet project of the hospital is looked after. We do not have enough doctors or hospitals there. We know that the Government is making a mess of it everywhere else but it will be much better in my electorate if we can just get a few quid to look after my pet project. While you are at it, the bloke next to me who voted for me might be looked after as well.'

The reality is this: the Commonwealth outlays the money. One can argue about the precise figures. That argument has been presented here and no doubt will continue for the entirety of the financial year and for many years to come. However, in percentage terms, some eight years ago the States received 35 per cent of Commonwealth outlays and they now receive 25 per cent. Arguably, it is not quite as naked as that, because the size of the cake has increased greatly. In fact, in real terms, in relation to the size of the cake, in order to reach about the same figure, we would now be looking at a share across all the States of about 29 per cent to achieve the same dollar terms that we were receiving in the early 1980s.

The reality is that we have not reached anywhere near those sorts of figures. We have to look very seriously at all questions of Government necessity, Government priority and Government projects. We have to reduce waste. I do not think that any honourable member on this side of the House would not be dedicated to the job of making Government efficient and effective in this State. Sadly, there is no doubt that many State charges, which by their very nature (and I will come back to this topic in a moment) are regressive charges, fall upon all sections of the community, despite their ability to pay on the same level.

This was illustrated very clearly this afternoon by the Minister of Finance when he was discussing the impact of a State consumption tax. I remember very clearly the debates

about option C, which was fully explored and examined at the Commonwealth level some years ago. In 1985 in relation to option C, even though the Commonwealth has the ability through social security and all sorts of measures to compensate people for the impact of a consumption tax, there was a degree of dissatisfaction that it would be impossible for the Commonwealth, despite its control in those areas, to deal fairly with the problem of compensation.

It would have a great deal more success in that particular exercise than could we as a State. I understand that, in option C, some 96 per cent of low income earners were clearly identified and compensable but, for one reason or another (and those reasons are beyond the scope of my speech tonight), it was not possible to look after 4 per cent. The State has little control or influence in relation to social welfare, social security and a whole range of other matters, so our ability to compensate people for a State-based consumption tax would be very seriously circumscribed. As a consequence, it is with alarm that we find that the proposal is beginning to germinate on the conservative side of politics in South Australia and in fact nationally. The question of safeguards has to be addressed, and addressed properly.

The other thing to which we need to draw attention in our present situation was clearly expressed in the quarterly economic report of the State Bank of South Australia which, under the heading 'The South Australian Economy—An Overview', stated:

Economic activity in South Australia slowed in the March and June quarters, with a subsequent slowing in the employment growth. The outlook is for economic activity to slow further through the second half of this year.

They are somewhat ominous remarks. It continued:

The slowing in activity has not been uniform across the economy, with some sectors continuing to perform well and offsetting declines in other sectors.

It goes on to address that in much more precise terms. Towards the end of that article, which I think is necessary for us all to look at, in summing up the whole South Australian economy, it stated:

Overall, the South Australian economy continues to better withstand the impact of high interest rates and slowing domestic demand than it has in the past. In the main this reflects a broadening of the economic base of the South Australian economy during the 1980s. There is a greater variety in the manufacturing sector, and service industries such as tourism are making a greater contribution to economic growth and employment. There is also much stronger activity in areas such as non-residential building construction than in the past.

Those comments are important because South Australia, over many years, has had a problem in not being able to match rates of growth averaged across all States.

In many respects South Australia has suffered more when the Eastern States have had a slow down. I think that in the 1980s (and this is clearly recognised in this report), the South Australian economy has become more international, and we have obviously weathered the situation to date much better than many of us would have expected some six to eight months ago. However, there is little doubt that there will be a slowing of the national economy, and that that will have an impact in South Australia over the next 12 months. I believe that that will result in a declining State revenue base which, on top of a declining share of the Commonwealth cake in real terms, will mean that we will have to batten down the hatches and make responsible choices about the direction in which the South Australian economy needs to go.

The next 12 months will be particularly difficult for us to adjust to these changes. The challenge for the Government will be to be both responsive and responsible in making choices of priority. I look forward to seeing the

precise terms of the budget and to seeing the way in which the Government intends to take us through these difficult times. I also look forward to seeing the future direction in relation to the other aspect of the Governor's speech, that is, the fact that we are at a curious crossroads and that one of those roads leads to a much brighter future where a number of things offer a great deal of promise to South Australia.

On the other hand, if we forget fiscal restraint, if we decide to look at all the projects put forward by some members and do not get to the nitty-gritty of government, the decline that we have managed to withstand much better than at any time in the past will soon be upon us, and much more severely than we would have expected.

A couple of key national questions are coming up which will impact greatly on South Australia's future. The world will be greatly changed in 10 or 15 years by much of the technology that we are only starting to take for granted now. There is virtually no doubt that, in terms of telecommunications (and I do not wish to enter into the debate as to which direction the Federal Government should move on that question), what will happen in the next 10 years will be quite astounding. In fact, it will probably be the decade when the greatest changes will take place since the invention of the telephone. Telephonic communication now is from point to point. There is no doubt that the growing cellular network, the person to person telecommunications network, will grow, whichever way the Federal Government moves.

There is also no doubt in my mind that cable television and better satellite translations of material than currently applies will have a very big impact in the workplace and at home. I am also of the view that fibre optics and a whole range of other developments will bring national and international communications to us at an unprecedented level and much cheaper than ever before. In that instance, we in South Australia must ensure that we have our say in what takes place. We want to make sure that South Australia will not be disadvantaged in whatever happens in the overall parameters of telecommunications. I say that because, as of 1990, approximately 70 per cent of the population of Australia resides in Brisbane, on the Gold Coast, and in Sydney and Melbourne.

The cross-subsidy arguments, which were always a feature of National Party politics, may well become the politics of small States such as South Australia in 10 or 15 years. There is no greater way to be exempt from the whole telecommunications debate than not to join in and understand that problem. If we were to go down the road that the Thatcher Government has gone in Britain in terms of telecommunications, it would be a distinct possibility that a private player would be interested only in the major part of the market, and that applies in all areas of communication.

The argument about micro-economic reform, of which telecommunications is only a part, also has a very big impact in South Australia. Members on this side in particular understand that we have only a couple of years to ensure that we can export and import goods across the wharves efficiently and economically. If we do not do that, the entry point of many, if not most, goods will be the Eastern States, and they will be either trucked or railed to South Australia.

Railway reform will be one of the key elements of the next couple of years. I say that because rail has not only had to pay for its own rolling stock in terms of its charges but it has also reflected the cost of the infrastructure—the rails upon which it travels. This has meant that, in any comparison with road transport, rail necessarily is very much more costly in economic terms. In social terms, the



railway network will be absolutely essential for us. We must get it right, and South Australia has to play its part in that great national change that will occur.

There is no doubt that, if we allow the current situation to develop, with huge subsidies being paid by many State Governments and the Federal Government for the railway infrastructure, for the ports, for the shipping, for the handling and, at the same time, for the road networks that are damaged by the presence of much larger numbers of trucks than should be the case, the taxpayers of Australia will be subsidising an extremely inefficient system. At the core of the question that the Prime Minister has raised on federalism and the States is the question of the railways and the way in which they will be reformed and made efficient, long distance heavy goods carriers in this country and, in fact, the ultimate long distance heavy goods carriers in all States. It is my view that we need to bite the bullet on that and make that very firmly one of our objectives over the next decade.

In other areas of federalism we had the question of the level of Commonwealth Government service to the community in its many different ways; the level of service that we as a State Government provide; and the level of service which is increasingly being supplied by local government authorities, although I must say that some councils are moving much more aggressively into this area than others. I have some trepidation about that move, and I will come back to that in a moment.

On the question of Commonwealth-State relations, it is absolutely essential that we enter into meaningful discussions in a whole range of areas. There is little doubt that there are many areas in which the State Government can provide services to the community on a much better and a much more effective basis than is done at Commonwealth level. Equally, a good argument could be made that the Federal Government should, over the years, take a much greater role on the question of the environment.

Many of the Bills that we will pass through this Parliament will mirror legislation in other States and at a Federal level. Over the past seven to eight years, the Federal Government has taken a leading role on many environmental questions. That is a good thing and is a trend that needs to be encouraged. My view is that, in industrial relations and other areas, the Commonwealth Government is increasingly taking over responsibility. Again, we are not six colonies and two territories: we are Australians, and we need to recognise that a national perspective on those questions is lacking, and the movement to greater Federal control in those areas is very useful.

I turn now to education, community services and health. There is no doubt that there is a role for State and Federal Governments in respect of health. In community services there is a role for both, but we need to ensure that that role is much more clearly defined than is currently the case. Duplication of services in areas that are currently costing the Commonwealth purse over \$20 billion and the State purse over \$1 billion in this State alone is a great waste of taxpayers' money.

The Commonwealth, in the past 20 years, has taken over most of the responsibility for tertiary education. In recent years it has also taken a much greater interest in what is happening in secondary and primary schools. Whilst some of that attention and activity is welcome, we must recognise—and this is something the Federal Government also must realise—that, whilst we are all Australians, there is a separate culture in each of the different States which, in many respects, is reflected in the education system, and that, whilst the Federal Government may have some legit-

imate concerns about the overall standards and outcome of education services, they are best delivered at State level.

I mentioned before that I would return to local government. In Australia, particularly in the past 15 years, local government has been moving into areas where, in fact, State and Federal Governments have long been present and, in fact, provide maybe not an adequate level of service but certainly a great level of service. I think one of the fears is that, if local government moves further into this area, we will see a triplicity of many services out there which will be paid for by the taxpayers of Australia.

Both State and Federal Governments need to be congratulated for addressing these concerns in this our last decade before the 100th anniversary of federalism. I think the Prime Minister is correct: the problems of attempting to redraw a Constitution will be enormous and it is better to concentrate, in the next decade, on necessary and important Federal and State reforms.

I turn now to the question of South Australia and its future with two particular projects in mind. First, in one respect the multifunction polis is perhaps one of the great projects of the past two decades. I say that because we have talked in this place and elsewhere about the submarine project and defence systems of one kind or another. When the last submarine and the last frigate is screwed together, a lot of those industries in many ways will struggle to adapt, change and continue their levels of economic activity and employment.

The multifunction polis is a challenge to all of us; a challenge to define and sharpen the focus of that particular project and, in fact, to show the community of South Australia what we have in mind. Earlier, the member for Davenport read out a pamphlet. I do not know what he expected from a short production such as that, but I think the multifunction polis, certainly in the information that has been sent to my electorate office, is an extremely exciting and promising prospect for South Australia which will see us continue the role that we have developed in respect of technology over the past seven years.

The other project which I think is well worthy of mention here is the Commonwealth Games proposal. There is no doubt that the 1962 Commonwealth Games in Perth was a great event that placed that city on the map. In 1962 Perth was smaller than Adelaide in levels of economic activity and population. Much of the impetus that gave Perth its extraordinary development, with growth levels of 3.5 per cent to 4 per cent when the rest of us were struggling with 2 per cent through the 1970s and into the 1980s, is attributable to the fact that Perth was the host city for the Commonwealth Games in 1962 and, accordingly, the international focus has been on Perth in the past three decades.

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

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I have pleasure in supporting the Address in Reply and pay my personal tribute to the Governor and his lady for their sterling efforts in South Australia. It was another one of those very good decisions of the Tonkin Liberal Government when we recommended to the Queen that Sir Donald should be appointed and, indeed, he was. As I said, he has been an outstanding Governor. I know that the public generally would agree that Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan have done a magnificent job in the viceregal office held by the Governor with the support of Lady Dunstan. The Governor ranks amongst the best we have ever had in South Australia.

Those who are interested in the office of Governor will no doubt recall quite a number of Governors and Sir Don-

ald, with Lady Dunstan, has been amongst the very best and most successful incumbents of the vice-regal office in South Australia. I know I am speaking not only for myself but on behalf of all South Australians who still value our link with the monarchy and who are not rabid republicans when I pay tribute to the Governor.

I have looked through the Governor's speech—written of course, by the Government—and it is a fairly unremarkable document. The Premier has already been taken to task for his assertion that he has been short-changed by Canberra to the tune of \$180 million. Of course, the fact is that his revenues are falling away because expenditure has tended to balloon, the number of people on the public payroll has not diminished and he had a shortfall in terms of expected revenue. However, to try to hoodwink the public with figures that do not add up is not worthy of him.

The Government now seems to be pinning its hopes on the multifunction polis. It seems to be the big deal that will excite us all for the next two decades. It is all part of a new phenomenon of modern politics. We are in the sort of image age, I guess, of politics when we are dealing with the ephemeral a lot of the time. We grab hold of ideas; we get excited; and we think we are making some wonderful progress. I am certainly not knocking this polis, but I do not know what it is about, I am not sure what we will have there, and I am not sure how big it will be. I will watch with great interest. There is nothing that I would like better than to see that marshland down near the coast turned into a thriving multifunction polis, whatever that may happen to mean.

There was nothing particularly remarkable in the Governor's speech. Of course, the in-thing is sustainable economic development. The Government now has the multifunction polis and all that it can offer to South Australia, however it happens to turn out. We are all supposed to get excited about the polis and the hope is that the public will vote for the Government on the strength of this imagery. But the Government is now also about sustainable economic development. That is the phrase. We have this continuing debate of development versus the environment.

Some fairly sensible things have been said in the past few months about sustainable economic development. One of the most sensible things I have read this year was by Stan Wallis, whom I met through his chairmanship of the Santos board. I understand that he is also chairman of Amcor, a large Australian company. However, he is also chairman of the business council's task force on the environment. As I said, Mr Wallis is the Managing Director of Amcor. I have been impressed by his intelligence and his business acumen. In November 1989 he said some pretty sensible things about the environment.

Members of Parliament received today a business council bulletin in which the comments that Stan Wallis made in November 1989 are reflected. I think that it would pay all members to read the bulletin. Mr Wallis was developing the theme of sustainable development. So, it is not a brand new idea, but thank goodness the Government has cottoned on to something in relation to this continuing debate between those who advocate no economic growth or development and those who are accused of wishing to see unbridled development. Some years ago I was accused of taking the latter view. At one of the Labor Party conferences, when I was Minister of Mines, it was suggested that Goldsworthy would dig up North Terrace to mine the minerals there.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** West Terrace; the cemetery.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not think it was the cemetery. I was into mining.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** For the gold teeth.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** For the gold teeth—oh, golly. I knew I got a favorable mention at one of the Labor Party conferences, because I was supposed to be the rabid spokesman for unbridled development. Anyway, we are on about sustainable development. Then, as usual, the agriculture sector gets a mention in the speech. There are to be some controls in relation to pesticides and stock disease. We are to have amendments to the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act. Judging from the correspondence and telephone calls that I get, we shall need something in that area.

There is mention of the fact that the South Australian Institute of Technology is to merge and we are to have a bigger and better university. I have a few questions about that. This has been forced on the State by Dawkins, who has the idea that big is beautiful and efficient. I have never found that to be the case. I have always found that the bigger the structure becomes, the less efficient it often tends to be. I hope that this new institution fulfils at least that arm which is dealing with technical and technological education and proves as useful as the South Australian Institute of Technology has been. What was formerly the old School of Mines in the South Australian Institute of Technology made an enormous contribution to the development of South Australia. The graduates of that institution have been sought after by employers in industry and mining because the education that they had had a somewhat different slant from normal university education in that it was more practical in its application and less theoretical. Many employers have found that to be particularly useful.

Law and order gets a mention. There is to be a broadening of eligibility for home detention. What people are demanding, but not getting, are increased police resources so that they can come to terms with the lack of law and order in this State. The police have pretty well given up on theft. Two members of my immediate family have had their home broken into in the past four months. The police have literally given up on this sort of theft. I am told it is a daily occurrence to support drug habits and the like. The fact is that it is completely out of control and the police hardly bother to investigate. Indeed, they do not have the resources to investigate. That is a major problem facing the community. Most of this crime goes unsolved and we pick up the tab in terms of increased insurance premiums to cover the losses created by these daily occurrences.

We are told that provision will be made in the Waterworks and Sewerage Acts for a new rating system. I read with great interest the Hudson paper, which the Government has adopted, and I did not think much of it. I have always been interested in the deliberations of the former Minister of Education, Mines and other portfolios, the Hon. Hugh Hudson. He was running the affairs of the Cooper Basin for a while, until the Hon. Ron Payne had the good sense to shoot him off the scene and off he went to Canberra to do a job in education. I read with interest what Mr Hudson was recommending and I was interested to see that the Government seized on it with alacrity.

The assertion is made that this enhances the principle of 'the user pays'. On looking at the scheme, we find that a minimal amount of water will be supplied at the going price and any consumption above the minimal supply will be charged at the excess water price. However, on top of that, for every \$1 000 in excess of a value of \$100 000, there will be a tax for nothing; there will be no water for it. I suggest there are a lot of domestic properties valued in excess of \$100 000 and, of course, with inflation that number will increase rapidly. For the Government, it is a moveable feast. It is really a return to land tax on residential properties

where, for the privilege of owning property, the owner pays a tax. In this case, the tax is not paid directly to the Government but, via the back door, to the E&WS Department. This rate may be struck wherever the Government of the day may choose—it is a moveable feast.

I, for one, reject totally the notion that 'the user pays'; the property owner is paying—and he is paying for no additional water. The Hon. Hugh Hudson then goes through the political exercise of working out the number of people likely to pay less and the number likely to pay more. No doubt it would be interesting to do a survey of the electorates of Adelaide to work out the political impact: that is what the exercise really is. He comes to the conclusion that more people will be better off and some will be worse off but, because the number of people who will be worse off is not significant at present, it does not matter much.

**Mr S.G. Evans:** In some cases, it is those with the biggest mortgages who pay the tax on their mortgage.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, I know. The assertion that this is a move towards 'the user pays' principle is absurd. This is a new tax. It is a mini-wealth tax; the more valuable the property, the more the owner pays for no return. The Government suggests that this is more equitable and is in line with its criteria. It may line up with one criterion, that is, the Government's social justice program, which aims to take money away from those who are supposed to be better off because they have more valuable houses. That is about the only criterion that it would meet. I, for one, totally reject this new concept of water rating. I am saying that now and, when the Bill comes before the House, I will have a bit more to say about it.

I was very interested to read an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* Magazine section a week ago. I had not read it, but it was drawn to my attention. In this article the Premier was feted and lionised as the best Premier we had ever seen in South Australia. I thought this was interesting, and when someone pointed out the article out to me I scanned it. We are all advised never to attack the media because the journalists always have the last say. I remember that advice very well and I remember the former Minister of Marine (Mr Abbott) suggesting that the *News* was a grubby little journal. Boy, did he get the treatment. He took on the whole newspaper.

It is poor policy. I have been advised during the 20 years in which I have been a member not to attack journalists because they always have the last say. I have been on the receiving end of a couple of journalists in this town—and only a couple—over the past 20 years and my hide has become fairly thick in that time. So, I just shrug it off and do not take a lot of notice of it. However, I admit that I get a little perplexed when, from time to time, people try to rewrite history because they have some sort of political agenda.

I remember the series on the ABC that dealt with the Menzies years in Australia. I believe a deliberate attempt was made to rewrite history and downgrade the efforts of Menzies who served as Prime Minister of Australia for many years. That program went to air on the ABC and it was suggested that it should be sent to all schools in the nation so that children could learn a little about history.

The only problem was that people who had an intimate knowledge of those years started writing to some of the major journals around Australia pointing out that this was an attempt to rewrite history and that it would be better if the producers of that program stuck to the facts. From time to time we get writers who have an agenda that is apparently political and they never let the facts stand in the way of a story or an image.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** That's like your style.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** No way. I did glance at the article that suggested that the Premier was the best we had every had. I thought, 'Good Lord, who is writing this?' I was interested to read that, now that we have a sound economic base for the State, we can go for a few of the circuses because we have the bread fixed up. There was the assertion again that we had the Premier to thank for everything economic that had happened in this State during the whole of his reign, that he was responsible. Let me deal with a couple of the areas with which I am familiar.

These matters came to fruition during the life of the Liberal Government, which the Premier constantly despises and talks down. However, the facts are that the achievements of that Liberal Government from 1979 to 1982 were remarkable. The article even asserted that we had the Premier to thank for the oil scheme from the Cooper Basin as well as the Roxby Downs development. These were two projects with which I was intimately involved. I do not know whether or not this is an attempt to rewrite history, but that assertion was made before. It was made in one of the Labor Party's election advertisements; it was said that Labor was responsible for these developments. This has been repeated in articles which seek to assert that the Premier is the greatest thing that we have ever had.

My view, for what it is worth, is that the Premier is a very nice fellow, but he is about the most timid leader that one could wish for in terms of making decisions and trail-blazing. Let us get the facts straight concerning those two developments. The oil scheme from the Cooper Basin was negotiated, put to Parliament and passed totally by the Liberal Government. The Labor Party's contribution to that debate was that we were going too fast. The matter was negotiated from scratch. Negotiations were started, and signed, sealed and delivered, legislation was drawn up, the select committee was held, and there it was. Now it is one of the Premier's projects! That was the biggest on-shore project and involved the fastest expenditure of money in Australia's history. The whole project started and ended during the life of the Liberal Government.

Now we hear that the Premier is responsible for Roxby Downs. Let me refresh some members' memories with the facts. We should not let the facts get in the way of a good story! If people wish to lionise someone, they forget the facts. The fact is that in 1980 in the House of Assembly one of the enormous battles of this decade was the battle to win Roxby Downs. I refer to the following *Hansard* report (4 June 1980):

**Mr Gunn:** The honourable member says he does not support it [Roxby Downs].

**Mr Bannon:** No.

**Mr Ferguson:** A mirage in the desert!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, mirage in the desert. I forgot about that—that is coming. We still get the assertion in official Labor Party advertisements, 'The Labor Party is responsible . . . for Roxby Downs.' One has to keep returning to the facts. We got it again a week ago. The *Hansard* report continues, as follows:

**Mr Gunn:** He is in total opposition to the Mayor and the City Council of Port Pirie?

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** They keep regurgitating these canards. We have to put the record straight. Regarding the total opposition to the enlightened Mayor Bill Jones, the *Hansard* report continues:

**Mr Bannon:** Yes.

**Mr Gunn:** As Premier, you would stop that project?

**Mr Bannon:** I am opposed to it.

I have no hesitation in saying that, if we had not forced the issue, Roxby Downs would never have got off the ground.

Members should look at the Premier's attitude when confronted with a problem. He shuts the door and looks for the easy way out. He could not even solve the Canegrass Swamp problem, when he shut the door and it went on for months. If he had to convince the Labor Party that he was in favour of the project, what hope would it have had? Let me refresh memories a little more. I even wrote a history of it to try and let people know when the Premier went up there to open the project. I did that to put the record straight. Those who were rewriting history lay low for a while, but then they reappeared again. This is what he said on 15 May 1981:

In Roxby Downs in South Australia we are looking at a project which will not be coming on-stream for another 10 years or so.

This is 1981. He has already been up there and opened it. On that date he also stated:

The French nuclear program will have been scaled down by then and we might find there will be no market for any uranium from Roxby Downs. This virtually leaves Japan as the only market for uranium. The implications for Roxby Downs are enormous.

'The implications for Roxby Downs are enormous', said our pacesetter Premier, who apparently is the best we have ever had! What else did he have to say? There are pages of it and I will just cite a few selections. An article in the *Port Pirie Recorder* of 23 November 1981 stated:

Leader of the Opposition, Mr John Bannon, dismissed the future of the Roxby Downs mining operation when he met with a delegation of Port Pirie Friends of the Earth members recently. The proposed gold, copper and uranium mining operation was dismissed by Mr Bannon on the grounds that depressed prices for these minerals were making the project unrealistic.

A report in the *Advertiser* of 27 November 1981 stated:

The State Development Council strategy for South Australia provided absolutely no support for the Tonkin Government's vision of Roxby Downs as the answer to South Australia's economic problems, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, said yesterday.

A report in the *Weekend Australian* stated:

In his fresh claims, Mr Bannon said an assured and sufficient water supply for Roxby Downs was an area where there were still 'far more questions than answers'. Six to seven million litres of domestic water would be required for a proposed town of about 9 000 people, and about five times that amount for mining and milling. Underground water was not suitable for domestic use. 'There was a suggestion that the mine operators themselves might be willing to meet the cost of extending the pipeline that provides Murray water for Woomera', he said. 'However, there is some question whether this could be too large a drain on the Murray.'

He then goes on to blast the Radiation Protection Control Bill. Another report in the *Advertiser* of 9 December 1981 stated:

For according to John Bannon, it is just as likely his Party would be obstructing the indenture Bill if the Roxby Downs site promised no more than copper, gold and rare earths.

I cannot find the reference to the mirage in the desert—but he did say it! The quotable quotes continue.

As I said, it is absurd for writers to seek to rewrite history and say that we can thank the Premier for Roxby Downs, when he talked it down for three years and voted against it in this very House. He stood up in this House and voted against it and his Party voted against it. In his inimitable style he would never have confronted the issue had he not been forced to do so and, if Norm Foster in the Upper House had not had the guts because he was a member of the AWU to say, 'I have never voted to put people out of work yet and I am not starting now', the project would never have got off the ground. As I said, some people attempted to rewrite history, to denigrate Menzies' efforts over the years, and the ABC put that to air. So, there is an

attempt to rewrite history now and lionise the Premier as the greatest thing that we have had in this State since sliced bread. It is an absurd assertion.

The thing that has distinguished the Premier—and the keynote of his leadership to date has been his timidity. Having managed to get the indenture through, the Government had to either change policies or lose an election. It scraped through by going off to the conference. It knew what was about to happen. Over three years we had convinced the public that this project was good for South Australia, so the Labor Party bobbed up with an incomprehensible policy that said uranium could be mined if it was mined with other minerals. Suddenly, that uranium became sanitised. The reason why the Labor Party voted against it was because it could be used in bombs. The Hon. Ron Payne, then in Opposition, and the Hon. Don Hopgood, the now Deputy Premier, voted against it. They both gave dissenting reports as to why uranium should not be mined; they said that it would be used for bombs. Suddenly, because it would be dug up with gold and copper, this uranium was okay.

So, if it is dug up with other minerals it is okay, it is suddenly safe and sanitised—but all other uranium is no go. The first thing the Labor Party did was change to this incomprehensible, illogical policy which the left wing, to its credit, denigrated. The Minister on the front bench would still be opposed to the mine because basically the left wing has not changed its mind on uranium.

Suddenly uranium became acceptable, and when the Labor Party came to Government it closed down Honeymoon and Beverley, which were ready to start and where there was no underground mining. They were sacrificed; uranium enrichment was sacrificed; and so it goes on. To suggest that the Premier was responsible for the development of the oil field is plainly absurd. As I said, the Labor Party did not need to change its policy on that because that matter had already been negotiated, put before Parliament by the Liberal Government and was law. All the Labor Party did was say that we went too fast. So, this attempt to lionise the Premier left me pretty cold.

This morning I had my third ride on the O-Bahn; I came to work on it. People come from overseas to look at the O-Bahn because it is the longest such track in the world, I am told. It is one of the achievements of the Liberal Government.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It was.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** You only talked about it.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We not only talked about it, we started it. The Labor Government took it up and finished the last section, but the Liberal Government conceived it and started it: it was our achievement. The O-Bahn from Modbury along linear park is a lovely drive, and that was dreamt up by Peter Arnold, a former Minister of Water Resources. We hear a lot about tourism in South Australia. The International Airport has probably done as much for tourism as anything else in trying to get overseas visitors—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** A Liberal Government achievement. The list of Liberal Government achievements goes on: the Roxby Downs project and the oil scheme (which were my portfolio areas); the O-Bahn; the International Airport; linear park; and Technology Park, the Liberal Government having bought the land and starting the development although you hear a lot about Technology Park's being a Labor Party achievement. Other Liberal Government achievements include: the pacesetter radiation con-

trol legislation which the Labor Party denigrated but now uses; the setting up of the Ethnic Affairs Commission; the museum rebuilding project; starting the History Trust; introducing performance budgeting with a tighter rein on Government expenditure; and the water filtration program. To suggest that all these things were started by the Labor Government is plain nonsense.

**Mr Venning:** The Festival Theatre.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Festival Theatre goes back to Steele Hall's day, and Premier Dunstan fed off that for a long time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** All those things happened under three years of Liberal Government. Look at what has happened under Bannon, Mr 47 per cent. If you scratch your head, you are hard pressed to find out what he has done for the past eight years. We have the Grand Prix, which has lost several million dollars over the years. I am hard pressed to find any significant achievements for this Government, but we do know that when Premier Dunstan was here he screamed like a stuck pig when he got 51 per cent of the vote and did not win Government. He said that we had to have one-vote one-value. At the last State election the Liberal Party gained 52-plus per cent of the vote but did not win—

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

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I support the motion and congratulate the member for Kavel on his contribution. One thing you have to say for him is that he is consistent. The speech he just gave I heard last year, the year before that and the year before that. History will judge the member for Kavel as someone who plays the same record time and time again.

I intend to canvass in this debate some of the inequalities that exist within our present parliamentary system and the threat that those inequalities pose to all of us. While some of the propositions I intend to pursue (and perhaps the possible solutions) may surprise and perhaps not meet with the approval of my colleagues on this side of the House, they need to be stated and acted upon if democracy is to survive and prosper within South Australia.

It does not need me to tell members of this House that, for any democratic system to work, the Government of the day needs a strong, vibrant Opposition, an Opposition that is able to probe, question and exploit any weakness in the Government of the day, and to do so consistently and well. Also, an Opposition needs to be able to present itself at all times, not just during the election campaign, as a credible alternative Government to the community. I ask the obvious question of all members here tonight: is that the case? If all members searched their conscience and freed themselves of any form of political bias, the answer would have to be a resounding 'No'. That is certainly the view of most responsible political journalists who have no axe to grind, no reason to seek or curry any favour from the Government but who simply reflect on parliamentary life as they see it.

Some interesting comments have been made over the past week or so by responsible journalists about the state of our parliamentary system. First, I refer to an article headed 'Head-butting misses the mark' in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 4 August, as follows:

John Bannon was told about 12.45 p.m. on Thursday that the Opposition was demanding an urgency debate on the economy when Parliament resumed for the budget session at 2.15 p.m.

The Premier promptly put on his suit jacket and took his wife Angela and his staff to Rigonis restaurant for lunch.

He left the restaurant at 1.55 p.m. and spent five minutes preparing notes for his first parliamentary head-to-head debate with the Opposition Leader, Dale Baker.

He could have stayed for the port.

Mr Baker's initial attack on Mr Bannon's economic credibility was a fizzer . . . But the harsh truth is it is Mr Baker and the Opposition who are on notice to perform. Mr Bannon and the Government have won three elections in a row and the Premier's popularity still bobs around the high 60 per cent mark. Their record stands.

Mr Baker must prove to the public he is a strong and credible leader and his party is a strong and credible alternative government. Most important, he must convince his own members that he is the man for the top job. The Liberal Party does not tolerate losers, although it must be getting the hang of it now.

In the past eight State elections the Liberals have won one. In the past twenty-one years the Liberals have governed for three. By the 1993 election they will have governed for three out of the past 24 years. Mr Baker has been charged with the responsibility of ending Labor's run. He won't do it if last Thursday is any indication.

**The Hon. J.P. Trainer:** And this is written by a former Opposition staff member?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** It certainly is. If you think they are harsh words, listen to what appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of 5 August, under the heading, 'All words, no action':

No sooner had the Governor piled into the back of the Rolls to be driven 200 m home on Thursday, than the Fabulous Baker Boys were demanding ordinary sittings of the House be suspended so they could move an urgency motion against the Government. Bannon, said Baker the Minor, had been telling 'pork pies' about the level of cutbacks at this year's Premiers' Conference. So, the Bakers sent off a motion to Speaker, Norm Peterson. They managed to spell his name incorrectly, got the date wrong, and draft a resolution which Peterson decided improperly reflected on the Governor.

Still, the Baker Boys got their chance to launch into the Government. What happened was a mauling so severe that, after just two speeches, the Bakers withdrew the motion. Baker the Minor—Stephen, the Deputy Leader—is unlikely to last the year in his present job. He has already been dumped from the health portfolio and one can't seem him making any better fist of Treasury. It is to be hoped that the Liberals don't have the deputy Baker on electoral reform committees because he doesn't seem to be able to remember where recent by-elections have been held. Ivan Venning, the new member for Custance, John Olsen's old seat, was sworn in on Thursday. Baker made two references to the by-election in his speech—one as 'the Goyder by-election', the other as 'the Norwood by-election'. Baker, the Major, Dale, isn't living up to expectations, either. Opinion polls taken as recently as last month indicate 50 per cent or more of the population can't name him unprompted. Since he has been in the job since early this year that is hardly a good sign.

It gets worse. In this week's *City Messenger*, a former press secretary of the previous Leader of the Opposition had this to say, under the headline 'Opposition gone fishin'':

Politics is not all like real life. In politics when you threaten to kick someone's head in, you're supposed to follow through. There's no respect if you instead sit back and tickle the enemy with a feather duster. After all, politicians, especially Government Ministers, are masters at going underground—

with the exception, Sir, of my colleague the Minister of Finance—

So, when they stick their heads up for a kick, the Opposition is supposed to take aim and deliver one straight between the eyes. A missed kick in politics is a score never recovered. Yet, in Parliament last week the Bannon Government stuck its head up and all it got was swatted by hot air. The Liberals must be regretting the day they ever likened Opposition to a game of footy.

For, back from time in the change rooms, they appear to have been unable to find their game plan, and should be investigating immediately who put the sedatives in their much-needed oranges. Their tackling has been lacklustre, and their eyes certainly haven't been on the ball.

In fact for much of the week they even went fishing instead, throwing out the line with some very obscure questions about the State Bank. There was none of the head-kicking 'we're putting this Government on notice' stuff that everyone was waiting to hear, and which the media was saying loudly in the galleries it had been promised would most definitely be delivered. Question

Time was basically mindnumbing in its dullness—embarrassing in inability to hit a target.

I suppose that if one were not prepared to face up to the harsh realities of life, one could say that that is just the view of three reporters. If that is the case, let us look at some of this polling that was mentioned in the *Sunday Mail*. On the day on which Parliament resumed this year, Keith Conlon had a Tony Goldsworthy, State Manager of Reark Research, to talk on his program. The dialogue commences:

Conlon: Well, the sense of the question is, how many people know who the Leader of the Opposition is in South Australia?

Goldsworthy: Well, back in January when we first ran the . . . the metropolitan-wide survey including adults 18 years of age and over, we ended up with 32 per cent recognition factor. This has improved, I won't say dramatically, but it has improved to 35 per cent in . . . in July when we ran it again.

Conlon: So, the good news for Mr Baker is that he's . . . he's going up. But would that be in your area of expectation after six months, a 3 per cent improvement?

Goldsworthy: Well I would've thought myself that it should have been higher than that. Three per cent isn't what I would regard as a significant increase at all.

Conlon: What about the . . . the don't knows, the people who are unaware? Is that stable or where they have gone, all the rest of these people?

Goldsworthy: Well, the interesting feature is that given the fact that Mr Baker took over from John Olsen and we conducted our first poll fairly shortly after that, 20 per cent of the original sample that we ran back in January gave Mr Olsen a nod as the Opposition Leader. Now that has been eroded of course down to 8 per cent who still think Mr Olsen is the Opposition Leader.

Conlon: That's still a lot of people in South Australia think that Mr Olsen hasn't left yet.

Goldsworthy: Well, it is in many respects, and if you translate that to weighted population figures, it works out to still around about 60 000 adults.

I point out that 60 000 people is the equivalent of three metropolitan electorates. Three metropolitan electorates do not even know who the Leader of the Opposition is. That is one of the things that has worried me as an individual member of this Parliament, because, if that is the case, democracy is not surviving well in this State. The transcript continues:

Goldsworthy: However, a lot of those people who initially mentioned Mr Olsen have gone over to the don't know category, such that now we have 50 per cent of adults in the metropolitan area of Adelaide just responding don't know to the question when it's put to them in the survey.

Conlon: So, compared with January there are actually more people who just don't have a clue?

Goldsworthy: Sure. Well they've gone from Mr Olsen—

Conlon: Which was wrong.

Goldsworthy: —to the 'don't know' category.

Conlon: Right. So half of the adult population, all of whom get a vote, don't know who the Leader of the Opposition is.

I could go on with that program, which highlights the concern that a lot of people in this State have about the way that democracy is going here. To be quite honest, that kind of political reporting and polling may be in the short term, or even in the long term, good for the Labor Party in this State, but is it good for democracy in South Australia? The answer has got to be, again, a resounding 'No'. What I have outlined up to now is what I call the disease, the illness. Let us look at the symptoms of that disease and what the remedies are, if any.

First, I refer to the symptoms. Sadly, they are many but can be summed up in one phrase: lack of talent. The leadership has no depth or vision, and it proves, once again, that just because one is a successful businessman, one is not necessarily a successful Leader. I do not take anything away from the Leader of the Opposition; he is a very successful businessman and, indeed, I understand, has been so all his life. I understand, too, that he has made a lot of money, and I do not take that away from him. In fact, I admire and respect him. But, having those attributes, taking

away vision, depth and the ability to understand the problems that we face today, it does not necessarily make him a successful Leader.

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMING:** The member for Bragg may be dutifully protecting his Leader, but I am sure that privately he agrees with me. I refer now to the deputy leadership. The least said about that person the better. Since his elevation to the position of Deputy Leader, what have we seen from the member for Mitcham?

**Mr Trainer:** A new double breasted suit.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMING:** We have seen two new suits and a gold watch. That is all we have, apart from a complete inability to handle the most simple tasks allocated to him. Members will recall that last week the Deputy Leader could not even frame a simple substantive motion, despite repeated help from you, Sir, in your position as Speaker of the House.

I am not saying that there is no talent on the Liberal backbench, but for various reasons, which only the Liberal Party can answer, they just are not being used effectively. One should look at the years of experience of those in the Liberal Party. However, because certain people do not (and dare I use the word) 'toady' to the current leadership, that talent is locked away on the back bench. We now have a situation where five former Ministers are sitting on the back bench being given nothing to do. I refer to the members for Alexandra, Mount Gambier, Coles and Chaffey, as well as the member for Kavel, who gave us a brilliant speech just a while ago. That represents 84 years experience in this House and then, if one takes the member for Light, a former Opposition Leader who has been spokesman for every portfolio under the sun, including some that he has invented himself, as well as the members for Eyre, Hanson and Davenport, it represents a further 82 years experience, making a grand total of 166 years locked away on the back bench—166 years left to wither on the vine.

The Liberal Party also has chronic problems with its preselection system, but only the Liberal Party can remedy that. Let us look at the latest arrival in the House from their side of politics. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the new member for Custance and wish him a long and healthy stay in this place. I hope it meets with all the expectations that he expressed in his maiden speech. However, he has a problem. The honourable member's Leader campaigned against him so, with the usual problems to which I will refer now, the member for Custance, no matter whether he has any degree of talent, will, because he incurred the wrath of his Leader in the preselection process, be left on the back bench, unable to offer anything to his Party and to the people of South Australia.

Another symptom which is crippling the Opposition is the cronyism that is so rife in the Liberal Party. All too often, cronyism banishes to the wilderness any talent that exists. I do not like to prophesy on anything but I suggest to the member for Bragg that, if he makes his ambitions too naked, he will be joining the member for Mount Gambier, who was sent to the back bench a couple of weeks ago.

I have outlined the disease, the illness and the symptoms. Let us look at some of the solutions that we could follow. Let us look at some of the remedies and how we can put it all together to make it work for the Liberal Party. How do we, as a democratic society, play our part to cure this malaise from which the Liberal Party has been suffering for something like 10 years and from which it has been unable to get out of itself? Some of the things that could lead the Liberal Party back to a reasonable degree of credibility are within its own capabilities, and it cannot expect me to

outline all the solutions or the Government to come to its assistance. There are certain things that the members of the Liberal Party must do themselves.

First, they have to get some fire in their bellies; they must get a fanatical will to win. That is just not there. One does not just dress the front bench up in new suits, sit them there and expect the goodies to fall from the sky. It just does not happen. Those members must do something themselves.

Prior to our coming back into Parliament, I thought that the Liberal Party was getting its act together, because there was a very strong rumour circulating that it had recently spent \$50 000 on new equipment and staff. I understand that that was paid for by the Leader himself. That represents a hell of a lot of cut flowers in the market place to try to revive the Party. If that is true, the Party was short-changed and it has been taken to the cleaners because since that money has been spent the Liberal Party's performance in this House has nosedived to an incredible low.

I am pleased that the Minister of Finance is absent from the Chamber and that the Deputy Premier is here, because the Deputy Premier is a softer person than the Minister of Finance. What can—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** In using the term 'soft' I mean that the Deputy Premier is compassionate. What can the Government do to help? It is here, Sir, that I may incur the wrath of my own colleagues, but as everyone knows this is my last term—I am not seeking preselection again—so I can say the courageous things that need to be said to help the Liberal Party. The Government must pick up the challenge to help those members opposite to start looking like an Opposition. I suggest a couple of things. First, ministerial advisers could write the Opposition's questions with an undertaking being given to the Leader that they will be framed in such a way as to put Ministers on their mettle. In fact, instead of calling them Dorothy Dixers we could call them 'Dorothy Kotzers'. That would give an indication of how it was all going. This could be done without—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is very close to reflecting on another member.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Sir. I do apologise. I am sure the member for Newland takes it all in good fun.

**Mr INGERSON:** On a point of order, I think the honourable member should withdraw his statement, because I believe he was reflecting on a member.

**The SPEAKER:** The point was raised by the Chair about the member's being very close to reflecting. I ask that the honourable member be very careful.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I unreservedly apologise to the member for Newland. I am sure she realised that I was speaking tongue in cheek. This could be done without any increase in cost to the taxpayer. That is what the Liberal Party is all about: it does not want any waste of Government money. It could create the impression in the community that the Opposition knows what it is on about. I am sure that my colleagues in the Ministry would have no problems with that whatsoever.

Secondly, on major Bills which affect the direction of the State, such as the environment, development or State services, again, not only could there be intense briefings by Ministers, but speeches could be provided to ensure that the Opposition is seen to know what it is all about when debates are in progress. We could even allocate half of our press secretaries to go over there and occasionally write something that we know would get through the stringent

requirements of our daily newspapers. With those two measures, the Government could lift the morale of the Opposition. Who knows, if Opposition members are quick to learn, the Government could eventually wean them off this assistance and nursing and they would be able to operate by themselves. That could quite easily happen.

Finally—I thought long and hard about this aspect—I am prepared to make the supreme sacrifice. If my Premier feels it is necessary, I am prepared to join the Opposition in order to give it some backbone and to organise the existing rabble into some semblance of order. It is not a decision that I have made lightly. Some of the things that I have mentioned tonight have been said with a certain degree of sadness, but they have needed to be said. We need to lay the truth on the table to inform members opposite where their problems are. As I said, I am prepared, in my final term, to do as much as I can. It could be that my wife will divorce me, but I am prepared to take that risk. It is often said that one cannot turn a sow's ear into a silk purse, but the Liberal Party is in crisis and, with due modesty, I feel that I have the expertise and experience to turn it around for the good of Parliament and of South Australia.

**Mr INGERSON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** I move: That the House do now adjourn.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** On 12 July I attended a meeting in Griffith, New South Wales, as the guest of the New South Wales Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Ian Armstrong). The purpose of that meeting was to try to bring together the States of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia to determine a means by which we could have uniformity in the wine grape price setting for the three States.

I received an invitation from the New South Wales Minister, as did the Governments of Victoria and South Australia. My concern is that the Government of South Australia, represented by the Minister of Agriculture, declined to attend or to send a representative of the South Australian Department of Agriculture. That was disappointing for the people, the grape growers and the wine industry of South Australia, because, if ever there was a need for the three major wine-producing States to get together and try to resolve the problem of wine grape pricing and get some uniformity, there was a golden opportunity. Unfortunately, it was boycotted by the Government of South Australia.

A further meeting called by the New South Wales Minister is to be held in Mildura this coming Friday. I will attend once again in the hope that a solution can be found to the wine grape pricing problem. I know that an invitation has been extended to the South Australian Government and I hope and trust that on this occasion it will respond favourably by sending a representative to assist the winemaking and wine grape growing industries not only of South Australia but of the three main wine-producing States of Australia.

The wine industry is extremely important in Australia. Our wines receive wide recognition overseas. A significant export market has been developed, particularly in the Northern Hemisphere where the Scandinavian countries have shown great interest in our quality wines. It is essential that we get the wine grape growing and winemaking industries on a sound and permanent footing so that on a regular

basis we can service the markets that have opened up to us. These markets have opened up to us because we have the ability to produce extremely high quality wines. This has been borne out by the steady growth in the market in the Northern Hemisphere.

I regard the meeting to be held next Friday in Mildura as very important indeed, and I trust and hope that the South Australian Government will respond favourably on this occasion and act in the best interests of the South Australian wine industry and, in particular, the wine grape growers of this State. The object of the exercise is to achieve uniformity in the irrigated wine grape growing areas between the Murrumbidgee irrigation area in New South Wales, the Mildura area in Victoria and the Riverland in South Australia. As far as the industry is concerned, a great deal of stability can be achieved if there is mutual goodwill on behalf of all concerned. The meeting will be attended by wine grape grower representatives from the three States along with representatives from the Governments of Victoria and New South Wales and, hopefully, on this occasion, we will see a favourable response from the South Australian Government.

When I attended the meeting in Griffith I took the opportunity to continue my journey down to Narrandera to visit the John Lake Centre. Many members would be aware that, many years ago, John Lake established the inland fisheries research station at Narrandera. That research station has done a great deal of very valuable work as far as research into inland fisheries is concerned. The main purpose of my visit was to meet with officers of the research station and discuss with them the feasibility of restocking the Murray River in South Australia with, principally, Murray cod and callop, the two main native fish of interest to professional and recreational fishermen in this State.

I visited the station because, as members will recall, a year or so ago the Government decided to ban the taking of Murray cod from the Murray River in South Australia and the use of recreational drum nets by amateurs. I have lived on the river all my life and my family has lived along the Murray River for four generations, and, after consultation and discussion with many people living on the Murray, most people are of the view that, if there is a problem with fish stocks in the Murray in South Australia, it would be far better to try to treat the cause of the problem and restock the river than just banning people from taking the fish that are there.

Prohibition has never resolved any problems that I know of, whether in Australia or overseas. The Government could have retained the right of recreational fishermen to have a drum net. It could have put a licence fee on that drum net of about \$40 or \$50, thus enabling a family to have a licence for one drum net. It could have applied heavy penalties on any families involved in selling fish—the drum net would have been simply to meet their own needs for catching fish. The revenue derived from that licence fee could have been used to purchase fingerlings from hatcheries.

Many commercial hatcheries exist, particularly in New South Wales. The John Lake Centre gave me a list of commercial hatcheries. If the Minister of Fisheries does not have that list, I am happy to make it available to him. If the moneys collected from recreational fishing through drum net licences in South Australia was put into buying fingerlings from commercial hatcheries and releasing them in the river in South Australia over five years, we could then reassess the situation at the end of that period to determine whether or not the procedure had been a success or a failure. Certainly, we will never know unless we try it.

To ban recreational drum netting and for the Government and the department to believe that they have eliminated recreational drum netting from the river is absolutely ludicrous. The drum nets are still there, although they might have changed in style. Once upon a time the fisheries inspectors were able to detect the drum nets by using metal detectors. They will now find that many of these recreational drum nets in a river are made of plastic and can no longer be detected.

So, the Government and the department believe that they are resolving a problem that they perceive to exist, but in reality they are not doing so. If it at least attempted a restocking program for five years and then reassessed the situation and determined whether or not it was successful, the Government would be doing something positive. The direction in which the Government has gone will prove to be of little success and will not build up the fish numbers in South Australia, as the Government believes it will. I suggest strongly that the Government attempt to introduce a restocking program.

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** In this debate I wish to canvas the idea of a cooling-off period in respect of the sale of used motor vehicles. I refer to correspondence that was sent on 19 May 1990 to the editor of the *Advertiser* from Mr Malcolm Penn, an adviser to the Legal Services Commission of South Australia, as follows:

Dear Editor, the recent call by Legal Services Commission for a cooling-off period in respect of purchasing motor vehicles has regrettably met with cries from the motor industry that such a law is not needed. The dozens of people who ring our office with complaints that the car salesman has misled them, has pressurised them and often has bludgeoned them into purchasing a vehicle, and the callers views that clutter talk-back radio would suggest that the motor industry is not the Garden of Eden that the industry chiefs suggest it is.

Consumer Affairs attitude is totally surprising for they also receive complaints which are generally forwarded to the commission, dealing with unscrupulous dealers who use any tactic to get a sale.

The industry has good salesmen. We do not have complaints with them. I would have thought the industry would be glad to clean out the shonks and give itself a better image. A cooling-off period is just one way of helping that process.

It seems to me that the proposition as outlined by Mr Malcolm Penn is worthy of further consideration.

When one studies the Victorian legislation, it is very difficult to see the reason why people in the motor industry would be so adamant that this form of consumer protection should not be adhered to. First, I must praise the Victorian legislation inasmuch as the copies which were sent to me have been couched in plain language. The Victorian legislation gives the purchaser a clear ability to be able to terminate the agreement by giving to or serving on the motor car trader or an agent of the motor car trader notice in writing to the effect that the purchaser terminates that agreement. However, in my view, as far as the motor traders are concerned, the saving grace is section 43 (2) of the Act, which provides:

Subsection (1) ceases to apply if the purchaser immediately before accepting delivery signs the prescribed form acknowledging that the right to terminate the agreement no longer applies.

It seems to me that this subsection gives the motor trader all the protection he is seeking. As far as I can ascertain, the cooling-off period does not necessarily mean that the motor trader is obliged to allow the buyer to take away the vehicle.

If the buyer does take away the vehicle, then, by agreement, he can sign a paper in accordance with subsection (2), which would then negate the need for a cooling-off



period. In addition, the purchaser has to pay a fee to the motor trader. Subsection (4) provides:

- (a) The vendor under the agreement—
  - (i) must pay to the purchaser all money received by the vendor under the agreement less the sum of \$100 or 1 per centum of the purchase price under the agreement (whichever is the greater); and
  - (ii) must return to the purchaser any used motor car given in satisfaction of any part of the purchase price; and
- (b) any collateral credit agreement is discharged to the extent that it was entered into for the purposes of the payment for the motor car supplied or to be supplied under the agreement; and
- (c) any security interest in the motor car arising under the collateral credit agreement is extinguished to the extent that it secures the payment of a debt or other pecuniary obligation or performance of any other obligation under the collateral credit agreement; and
- (d) a purchaser who has accepted delivery of the motor car before the agreement was terminated—
  - (i) is liable to the motor car trader for any damage (other than fair wear and tear) occurring to the motor car while it was in the purchaser's possession; and
  - (ii) subject to subsection (5), must return the motor car to the motor car trader.

So the purchaser of the vehicle does not get off scot-free if he takes the opportunity of cancelling the contract. There is \$100 to be paid, or 1 per cent of the purchase price, whichever is the greater.

It seemed to me to be most unlikely that a salesman would be paid more than \$100 per day, so the management of the motor car trader will be paid for the effort it has taken and for the time the salesman has put into the sale, which eventually has possibly fallen through. This seems to be a fair way for motor traders to be looked after and, as I understand it, the Victorian legislation has not created any difficulties in that situation.

Mr Penn has stated that people are often bludgeoned into buying a motor car and some unscrupulous dealers are pushing people towards bankruptcy. In the *Advertiser* he is quoted as follows:

But in the cold light of day, when people realise they can't afford it, it is too late.

Mr Penn has stated that a three-day cooling-off period applied in Victoria, although a person could choose to waive their right by taking delivery of the car immediately. Mr Penn continues:

The pressures brought to bear on people in car yards is overpowering, particularly when car salesmen are dependent on commission sales and when times are hard. We hear regularly that would-be purchasers do not understand the nature of the contract, particularly when finance is to be obtained.

In relation to finance contracts, I am indebted to the article on adult literacy of the December 1989 issue of the *Institute of Family Studies*, the first paragraph of which states:

We too often assume that all people have an adequate level of literacy. It is therefore not surprising that many people with inadequate literacy skills hide their inability, and that the resulting costs for themselves and for society are high.

The article further states (page 31):

The implications of the lack of literacy (and numeracy) skills are cumulative. The very lack of skills which produced the original problem (for example, getting into a contract which was not properly understood) means that the opportunities for turning the situation around are restricted. People who can't read don't have access to written information and advice about how they might get out of the situation, such as information about mortgage relief schemes, delayed payment schemes, concessions and special allowances. The institute has carried out a major study on families who have bought houses under the capital indexed loan scheme and found that brochures often were not understood by people in the scheme.

If we add to this the difficulty of reading a finance contract for borrowing money—and I would be so bold as to suggest that there are many members in this House who would not understand at first glance a contract for finance from a finance company—I am sure that members can understand there is some merit in following the Victorian scheme.

I acknowledge that our present Attorney-General has enacted some good legislation in relation to finance companies, including the size of type and what they are obliged to include—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Morphett.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** This evening I will address my remarks specifically to the Premier (Hon. John Bannon) and the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr Crafter). My remarks concern the proposed amalgamation of the Mitchell Park High School and the Glengowrie High School, and the renaming of the new school as the Hamilton Secondary School. The residents of Glenelg, Glengowrie and other suburbs that are adjacent to the Glengowrie High School have been betrayed. The Government, at a time when student numbers in both the Mitchell Park and Glengowrie High Schools were so low as to be nearly unacceptable to allow options to be developed in year 12, engineered a meeting of the school councils and convinced them that amalgamation was the only way to go.

Having extracted from the school councils an agreement that, in principle, they should amalgamate, an internal committee of inquiry recommended the closure of Glengowrie High School. It is relevant in this debate in the public arena that the Glengowrie High School representatives at no stage wanted Glengowrie High School closed; they only agreed in principle that an amalgamation should take place. On the strength of this, the Education Department has set in train its decision to close Glengowrie High School and amalgamate that school with the campus at Mitchell Park under the new name of Hamilton Secondary School. This afternoon I presented to the House a petition which was signed by 1 349 signatories and which stated:

The humble petition of the undersigned sheweth—that there is a requirement to maintain Glengowrie High School as a secondary educational facility and calls upon the State Government to reverse its decision; the proposed new Hamilton Secondary School is in close proximity to Marion High School; the noise and hazards posed by traffic with a projected increase in volume and congestion at the proposed Hamilton Secondary School site are unacceptable; another disruption to the education of students from the now closed Vermont High School is unacceptable.

Your petitioners therefore pray that the honourable House will maintain Glengowrie High School as a secondary educational facility and calls upon the State Government to reverse its decision, and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Initially I said that the school community has been betrayed. It has been betrayed on another count in that, in the late 1980s, when the student numbers at Vermont High were reduced so that the school became untenable with respect to its admissions and options for classes in the latter school years, a decision was taken to close that school. At the time of that decision, public meetings were held and addressed by officers of the Education Department, and the parents of students who were leaving to go to Glengowrie High School were given assurances by the department that those students would not be relocated again while they were at Glengowrie High School. Now, we find that those students who moved to Glengowrie High School who have been there for a short time and are still half way through their high school career, are to be moved again. Those parents, and a large number of other parents in the district, have been betrayed.

Further, they have been betrayed on a third count. People who have moved into the district around the Glengowrie High School and who have made contact with the staff (which is their wont when determining what school their children would attend) were given assurances by the staff that places for those students would be guaranteed. The staff did this in good faith because they had every reason to believe that Glengowrie High School would not be closed. If there is any doubt in anyone's mind about the promise made to those students at Vermont High School that, if they moved to Glengowrie High School their position would be secure, let that doubt be put to rest by a series of statutory declarations which I received today and which I will pass on to Mr Greg Crafter, Minister of Education, tomorrow. The first declaration, from Mr Richard Brokensha, states:

I do solemnly and sincerely declare that in the later part of 1987 I rang the Southern Region Office of the Department of Education, to find out if Glengowrie High School was to be closed, as I didn't wish to send my children there if it was. I was assured that Glengowrie High School was not going to close before the end of 1993 and that there would be a review of the situation in 1992.

It is duly signed and witnessed. Another, from Margaret Walsh, states:

... that at a public meeting held at Vermont High School, held between the parents of VHS and officers from the Southern Area Education Office, the statement below was made:

Any student relocated in another high school, on the closure of Vermont High School, will not have his/her education disrupted by the closure of another school.

The statement, substantially as above, was made by an officer of the South Australian Education Department.

That was signed, as I said, by Margaret Walsh, the former Secretary of Vermont High School. I would say that she was a fairly credible witness. Another statutory declaration comes from a Gregory Laurence Storr who says:

In 1988 I was a member of the Vermont High School Council, and the Action Committee of Vermont High School formed to try and keep Vermont High School open. I attended many meetings and remember that as a concerned parent I was informed that no more high schools would be closed for a period of time into the future. I am unsure of the exact wording, due to time, but two points come to mind with the same meaning for both: that no student having to be relocated from the high school would be affected by any future school closures, or that no more schools in the area/region would be closed for five years.

Due to time I am unsure whether this was stated or written. I believe that the statement regarding school closures was a statement made also at the 'Newberry meetings'. In addition to this being stated at meetings, I am aware of teaching staff who were not in the South-western Region at the time of the Vermont High School closure but are aware of this statement having been made. Another statutory declaration comes from David William Gould, who states:

At a meeting concerning the closure of Vermont High School and in answer to a question from the floor to a representative of the Education Department, it was stated that the students involved in the closure would not be subjected to a further move in their high school years. Further, that the department understood the trauma for students of changing high schools, offered counselling to them and insisted the students were their prime concern.

I have another statutory declaration which, I believe, is one of the most important as it is signed by Richard Walsh, the former Principal of Vermont High School—once again, a very credible witness, I should think. He states:

At a public meeting held between the parents of Vermont High School and the Southern Area education officers, the statement below was made.

No student relocated on the closure of Vermont High School will have his or her further education disrupted by another school closure.

The statement, substantially as above, was made by a South Australian Education Department officer, and probably by J.C. Cusack, the then Southern Area Director.

Time will not allow me to read the rest, but I have two other statutory declarations that, I assure the House, follow the same theme as those I have already submitted. It is my belief that the Education Department has made a grave error in this decision to close Glengowrie High School. It is a decision that will be regretted in the future.

Already, the numbers look extremely doubtful for the new school, and our great concern is that we will end up losing both schools. My final concern is that the Glengowrie High School site, which is a major site for junior sport in the district, is now under threat. I can assure the House that, after school and on weekends, that site is heavily used, and we do not want to see it lost to the district.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Motion carried.

At 10.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 15 August at 2 p.m.