

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 15 August 1990

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

PETITION: LAW AND ORDER

A petition signed by 831 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to devote greater resources to the maintenance of law and order was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND HARBORS AND SACON

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. R.J. GREGORY**: This morning a stop work meeting of employees in the Department of Marine and Harbors and Sacon was held. This meeting was held to allow union officials to report back on the progress in negotiations regarding the dispute over the implementation of corporate plans in the two departments. We have not been formally advised by the United Trades and Labor Council as to the outcome of this meeting. It is understood that the only resolutions for industrial action passed by the meeting was a motion for a half-day strike in both Sacon and Marine and Harbors. This is despite, we understand, the acceptance by Sacon workers of the proposals put forward in respect of that department. I understand the matter of the use of Sacon vehicles in a subsequent demonstration is being investigated.

My advice is, however, that fewer than 30 Sacon workers were involved in that action and that the vast majority of Sacon employees ignored the strike resolution. The half day strike in Marine and Harbors has been more widespread but has not affected any of the department's regional ports in any way. The only port affected by today's action has been the port of Adelaide. No ships have been affected in any way and no delays have been experienced by shippers. This dispute remains before the State Industrial Commission.

During the past three weeks, under the commission's moratorium, management in the Department of Marine and Harbors and Sacon have been in continual negotiation with the United Trades and Labor Council. While the Sacon issues appear to be largely resolved, outstanding matters remain in relation to Marine and Harbors. The 'sticking point' appears to be the development of appropriate consultative mechanisms within the department.

The department has offered to set up a departmental consultative committee with further divisional committees, with equal numbers of employees and management on these committees. This appears to have been rejected by the work force. At this stage the matter is listed to return before Commissioner Perry on Monday 27 August. However, the department remains open to further negotiations prior to that date.

The department is attempting to organise further meetings with the United Trades and Labor Council to take place as soon as possible. I can assure the House that the Government will not abandon its plan to make Marine and

Harbors even more efficient. The corporate plan, which was first released in October last year, has largely been implemented by the department and has been welcomed by the shipping community. It is seeing the department become leaner, reducing both white and blue collar numbers, and more efficient.

Our ports are in direct competition with ports interstate, especially in Melbourne and Fremantle. The Government is determined to see our ports provide the fastest and most cost effective route to international markets for our exporters and importers. This Government is at the forefront of the micro-economic reform of Australia's waterfront. We cannot afford to stop this program, and we will not.

QUESTION TIME

BENEFICIAL FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr **D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**: In view of the fact that property exposures have been given as the major reason for the turnaround in the performance of Beneficial Finance Corporation, is the Premier concerned that the company is paying an estimated \$8 million a year in holding charges on the East End market site, for which final development plans remain uncertain, yet has refused an offer by Price Waterhouse for the sale of a section of the site next to the Stag Hotel on which Price Waterhouse proposed an office development, on the grounds that Beneficial Finance wants to build its own head office on this site—a plan which is hardly prudent given the company's statement on Monday—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable Leader will be careful about comment in the question.

Mr **D.S. BAKER**: Yes, Mr Speaker—that its performance is unlikely to 'show any significant improvement' this financial year?

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: It is true that Beneficial Finance is involved in the East End market project and that it must obviously be incurring holding costs in relation to that site, but I refer the honourable member to an announcement that was made some weeks ago by Beneficial Finance in relation to plans to proceed with the development on that site. I understand that activity will be undertaken in conjunction with Kinhill Engineers, and it is a very important first step in what will be a very exciting and significant project for this city.

It has to be remembered that the East End market project provides enormous potential for both development and return from development. There is no question about the long-term value and potential of that site. I point out that it was action in part encouraged by this Government that saw the old wholesale market moved out to its new premises, which have been very efficient, up to date and very welcome, in order to ensure that a total site could be developed.

Equally, considerable care has been taken in relation to the heritage buildings on that site and heritage conservation. If there had not been, I am sure that the site would have been razed and a massive commercial development already accomplished, Beneficial Finance would no doubt have been declaring large profits on it, and the Leader of the Opposition would have been congratulating it on its success. But that would have been at quite a considerable price to the amenity of this city and the preservation of its heritage buildings.

The planning that has gone into that site has been very carefully done. It has ensured maximum conservation and

preservation. It has had to go through procedures in the Adelaide City Council and through the City of Adelaide Planning Commission. All that takes time, and in that time holding costs are definitely incurred. The market at the moment is not the best for these sorts of developments, but the commitment has been made that some work will take place on the site, and I should have thought that all of us would welcome that.

An honourable member: When?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At the soonest possible time.

ADELAIDE MEDICAL CENTRE FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is to the Minister of Family and Community Services. Is it true that the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children is facing a crisis, as reported in today's *News*?

The SPEAKER: I draw the honourable member's attention to Standing Orders (I will refer to the exact Standing Order in a moment) because of his reference to a newspaper report. The honourable member might like to come forward with his question and perhaps rephrase it. I call on the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): My question is to the Premier. In his regular briefings with the Chairman and Managing Director of the State Bank group, have they discussed the group's exposures to the following property deals for which receivers have been appointed since the beginning of this year: the Holiday Inn development in Cairns being built by the Girvan Group, which collapsed in January; the Boardwalk Retail Centre in Brisbane being developed by Citisite Holdings Limited, on which the State Bank group has appointed a 'receiver of rents'; the Wilson Group construction company in Queensland, which collapsed recently with an estimated \$250 million worth of building projects under construction; and the Eden Melbourne project in the Melbourne central business district, which was being developed by the collapsed Interwest Limited for which the State Bank group provided a \$44.8 million discounted bill facility?

What advice has the State Bank group given on the impact these exposures will have on the group's future provisions for bad and doubtful debts and, therefore, the contributions the group will make to the State budget?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am sure that in the case of all those projects adequate provisions will be made. That is the whole point of the result that has been declared. The question was purely a pretext, I guess, to get on the record a list of projects that Beneficial Finance was involved in. I am sure there are many more. I know the one list we will not hear about is the list of successful developments and the list of profit-making projects.

Certainly, nothing will be said about that, nor will there be reference to the fact that Beneficial Finance has paid into the State Bank some \$70 million worth of profits over the past few years, which must be set against the result in this particularly difficult year. In relation to the detailed operations of an organisation such as Beneficial Finance, it is not my practice to go through each and every investment and discuss it. That would be contrary to the Act and certainly contrary to the authority that is bestowed upon the board of directors and the management.

ADELAIDE MEDICAL CENTRE FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister of Family and Community Services advise the House whether the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children is facing a crisis?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I can only assume that the honourable member is referring to an article in the *News* of today's date. Perhaps if Standing Orders had been other than they were, he might have been so bold as to give it some mention. As that is not possible, I just mention that perhaps that is where it comes from, because I can find no other source for this piece of misinformation. As a matter of fact, the Director of Surgery and the Deputy Chief Executive Officer of the hospital visited the Chairman of the Health Commission yesterday when they were asked (incidentally to the purpose of their visit) how things were going at the hospital. They said that they were pretty busy, and that at this time of the year lots of kids get flu and viruses and that kind of thing. They said, 'By and large, we are coping very well.' So, they were very surprised when they saw this article in the *News* today, obviously coming from someone at the hospital who must be disgruntled about something and who has done his institution no good at all by speaking out of turn in the way that he has. They therefore volunteered to the commission the statement which I will now read to the House and which forms the gravamen of my reply, as follows:

The Adelaide Children's Hospital is experiencing a normal seasonal increase in the need for inpatient beds resulting from an expected rise in the number of children who experience respiratory illness. Over the past four or so weeks this has resulted in the hospital being at or near capacity. This level of activity is always expected over the winter months, however this year it has occurred later than normal and the hospital has been able to deal with the problem more effectively following the Government's commitment to increase by 20 beds the hospital's capacity in November 1989. Despite high inpatient levels no elective surgery has been cancelled and some 748 additional surgical procedures have been performed since the addition of 20 beds against the same period during 1988-89. In addition, no patient has been denied access to treatment as an inpatient for a medical condition. The hospital closely monitors its activity and bed capacity, however at this stage there are no plans to reduce elective admissions.

That letter is signed by James Birch, the Deputy Chief Executive Officer of the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children.

BENEFICIAL FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I address my question to the Premier. Why did the Treasurer mislead Parliament yesterday and say he would not answer questions about Beneficial Finance because it is 'a publicly listed company' when the Australian Stock Exchange says that it is not since Beneficial Finance is a wholly owned subsidiary of the State Bank group with no shares, debentures or other securities publicly listed on the Stock Exchange?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a growing tendency for comments in questions. I ask all members to look at the question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The rules are very clear on comments in questions. I ask all members to look at the questions to make sure that they are accurate before they ask them. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member is picking straws, really making a quibble. He suggests that I am misleading the Parliament. I note that he asked the Premier whether the Treasurer had misled the Parliament.

Very smart! It is a nice little touch for the honourable member. The fact is that Beneficial Finance is an incorporated public company. It has the same reporting requirements as any other company under the Companies Code, and that is a point that was being made. Its annual reports conform to all the detail that is required under those regulations. That is a fact.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach.

WATER CHARGES

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Water Resources explain the ramifications of the user-pays principle for water charges?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It seems that there has been some misunderstanding and/or misinformation both from the Opposition benches and from a very small section of the community. I think it is important I clear up this matter with respect to the allegations that have been made about a user-pays system. If we were to have a user-pays system in its true meaning, what we would be talking about is a full user-pays system. However, it seems to me that the Opposition has been talking only about a charge for the water used. If we were to move to a complete user-pays system, the price of water would have to rise to something like \$1 per kilolitre. If we were to raise the same amount of money that we presently raise, all legitimate industrial users of water would pay more, as indeed would 75 per cent of all residential users.

The user-pays principle implies that a user pays not only for the usage but also for having water available in sufficient quantities at the relevant times to enable water to be used for such measures as firefighting, gardens and swimming pools.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is interesting that the Opposition does not seem to want to know the facts. However, because my colleague is interested in my answer, I will continue. It is important that the House clearly understand that all modern reticulation systems have enough capacity to be able to provide for adequate firefighting anywhere in the system, and that I believe is vitally important. Under the Act the Minister is required to ensure that the pipes are suitably charged with water at all times so that the appropriate firefighting response can be provided. I remind members that without this characteristic fire insurance premiums would be much higher. Let me ask the rhetorical question: who would pay, other than the potential users, for this excess capacity? Surely, the greater the property value, the greater the potential benefit for having a system which carries this excess capacity.

Furthermore, in residential suburbs, the cost of providing a reticulated system is affected additionally by the length of the frontages, the height above sea level and the nature of the terrain. On average, capital costs per household are higher in those suburbs of Adelaide with higher property values, and that is the reality. Rather than entertaining the Opposition's attempts to promulgate a whole lot of misinformation throughout the community, we should recognise that a true user-pays system must reflect all these particular costs. It is interesting that, when we talk about a user-pays system, in fact we are talking about the cost of the water, the infrastructure costs and such things as the capacity for firefighting. I believe that the system proposed by Mr Hudson in his report involves not only a user-pays principle but also a social justice principle and, as I would have thought—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Opposition's ignorance obviously knows no bounds: it is quite amazing to me. The final principle that this proposal contains is a fundamental conservation philosophy. I would have thought that some members of the Opposition at least would support a move to a new system which I believe very sensitively picks up those fundamental principles and translates them into a very fair, simple and equitable system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind honourable members that it is their Question Time. The honourable member for Heysen.

BENEFICIAL FINANCE CORPORATION

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Now that the Treasurer has admitted that Beneficial Finance is not a publicly listed company and therefore his reason for not responding to questions is invalid, and given that in the 1988-89 annual report of the State Bank's wholly owned subsidiary, Beneficial Finance, Beneficial's board clearly endorses the company's record asset growth and the creation of a Structured Finance and Project Division under Mr Erich Reichert to act as a major equity partner in interstate property deals, will the Treasurer now say what the differences of opinion between Mr John Baker and the board were over the direction and performance of Beneficial, when these differences first arose and when the Treasurer was first informed about them?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member can refer that question to the board, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Once again, I must warn members about comment in questions. The Chair cannot accept comment in questions. The honourable member for Walsh.

SOLAR ENERGY

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Is the Minister of Mines and Energy aware of the solar energy proposals of Professor David Faiman of the Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel? These proposals were brought to my attention by a constituent who wrote to the *Advertiser* a week ago. My constituent commented adversely in that letter to the Editor, published on 8 August, on what he perceived as being the lack of an ETSA response to the remarks of Professor Faiman. A report in the *Advertiser* of 11 June stated:

One of the world's foremost solar energy scientists says South Australia ought to be drawing its total summer electricity supplies from the sun.

Professor Faiman was reported as saying:

A 'judicious mix' of three proven solar power technologies would meet 100 per cent of the Electricity Trust of South Australia's peak summer demand and 60 per cent of the overall annual demand.

The report continues:

He said much of South Australia had the same climate, conditions and latitude as Israel, and could duplicate easily Israel's famous solar power stations. Israel's Luz corporation had sold eight of its large-scale parabolic concentrator systems to California in the past five years. 'Twenty of those would go a long way to supplying the electricity needs of South Australia.'

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question and I thank him indeed for giving me a couple of days notice of the fact that he intended to ask it, so that I was able to get a reply for him. I read the same newspaper article as did the honourable member, and certainly there are some things there that are worthy of consideration. In this regard, I am pleased to advise the House that Professor Faiman visited ETSA on 8 June 1990 and delivered a presentation dealing with the current status, as he sees it, of solar technology.

In developing his scenario for meeting the summer power requirements of South Australia, the Professor has used the predicted performance data of the 80 MWe Luz SEGS-VIII plant, and the actual performance data of the 5 MWe Bet Haaravah solar pond. However, he did not nominate costs associated with either of these proposals. I am advised that in the case of 'parabolic trough technology' the cost would be three times ETSA's current levelised energy costs.

Thus, solar electricity generation is not yet a viable option for ETSA (that is, connection to the power grid) due to the higher costs than those of the conventional technologies currently employed for base and peak power load. However, the use of photovoltaics has been shown to be cost effective in remote areas and is currently being utilised for microwave repeater stations and other communications systems. Additionally, PASA uses photovoltaics extensively—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Indeed we do. PASA uses it extensively for dealing with corrosion on the pipeline. As regards solar pond electricity generation, the Australian experience unfortunately has not been a happy one.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: A great deal of work (for the benefit of the member for Coles) has been done at Alice Springs by Australian Solar Ponds Pty Ltd.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: We have a really intelligent comment here, from the honourable member.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that Standing Orders require the answer to be specific.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was trying to be, until I was interrupted. The company built its first salt-gradient solar pond of 2 000 square metres in 1981 for supplying energy to drive an organic rankine cycle (ORC) engine for generating electricity. This plant, rated as 25 kWe capacity, ran for a short period before encountering problems, including major heat losses from the pond after unusually heavy rains saturated the surrounding coarse-grained sandy soil; pond leakage and excessive evaporation; and fouling of pond by wind-blown deposits and algae growth.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I have previously made complaints to this House about relevance and about getting the answers down to a reasonable length. If the Minister had the wit, he would have made a ministerial statement to the Parliament.

The SPEAKER: I would ask the Minister to conclude his comments.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will do so, but at the cost of not being able to answer the question fully. All I can indicate in that case is that the overall experience has been that the cost of these various kinds of power supply are much higher than the cost of supplying power conventionally.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Minister of Correctional Services report to the House on the Department of Correctional Services' response to reports by three officers relating to incidents alleged to have occurred on 22 June this year, and will he allay concerns of correctional services staff at the Adelaide Remand Centre that the department is trying to sweep under the carpet complaints that a senior officer had been drunk on duty?

I have in my possession copies of official reports by a senior correctional officer and two correctional officers relating to these incidents. The reports commonly allege that an acting chief correctional officer named in the reports was drunk on duty on the afternoon of 22 June. I refer in particular to the report by the senior correctional officer which alleges that his superior officer was:

Extremely intoxicated, he staggered and lurched to the first landing. When attempting to continue he stumbled and almost toppled over. He lurched to one side and grabbed a handrail, righted himself and continued.

It is further alleged that inmates of the Remand Centre saw some of this behaviour. The Opposition has been further advised that three senior correctional officers have regular drinking sessions in the Remand Centre on Friday afternoons. One of them crashed a departmental car while affected by alcohol and then gave a false name and address to the police. The Opposition has been asked to raise this matter in Parliament because of the concern by other correctional officers that the department is not prepared to deal effectively with the problem.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Hanson for his question, and I mean that sincerely. The question of whether a report—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is an important question. Obviously, the Opposition wants the answer. I ask members to pay due respect to the Minister's response.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Hanson knows that any reports in the Department of Correctional Services are available to any members of Parliament. Members are free to examine them. I will certainly send him any information that I get from the Department of Correctional Services on or any other issue. That has always been the case and the member for Hanson knows that. I cannot say more than that.

INTERACTIVE VIDEO TECHNOLOGY

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise the House what strategies are being developed to ensure that rural people have access to further education in line with the Government's commitment to access and equity?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the member for Stuart for her question, which is important to all members, particularly those representing rural areas. Members will be aware that earlier this year we announced a national pilot scheme for interactive video technology linking the Adelaide College of TAFE with the Nuriootpa, Clare and Gawler Colleges of TAFE. This technology enables students from those campuses to access specialist lecturers from the Adelaide College of TAFE. That means that at Clare 26 courses not previously available are now available to students. It is a very important improvement for rural students. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition is nodding in agreement with my comments. Of course, the new technology will

mean an explosion of services for rural students not only in the TAFE sector but also from the universities.

I am very pleased to announce to the House today that the Spencer Gulf TAFE Colleges will next year be linked into a new interactive video network following the completion of this successful national pilot of interactive video conferencing linking the Barossa and Clare campuses with the Adelaide College. The project is attracting attention from both TAFE systems and universities interstate.

Through video conferencing we can link a lecturer at one college with groups of students at multiple locations. It is not simply a case of beaming in lectures—it is a real educational environment and an interactive approach to education in which students and teachers can interact with each other.

I also announce today that I am pleased that Flinders University is keen to utilise the interactive video technology being utilised by TAFE. Indeed, Flinders has negotiated with TAFE to offer first year university courses through the Port Pirie TAFE. I am sure that that will be of enormous interest to the member for Stuart. Rather than students having to come from Port Pirie to the city and leave their homes, they will be able to undertake, from Port Pirie, the first year of courses at Flinders University.

Indeed, it is not just Port Pirie—Flinders University is very interested in doing the same with the South-East College of TAFE. I am sure that is of interest to the Leader of the Opposition: that Flinders is interested in offering first year courses through the Mount Gambier TAFE system. I think it is also of interest that the new university—to be named the University of South Australia—is very keen to explore links using interactive video technology with the Riverland College of TAFE. So, at both the TAFE level and at university level in South Australia we are leading the nation in new distance education technology, which will be of benefit to rural students.

Of course, we are not talking about just students at colleges and campuses, because negotiations are proceeding with BHP Long Products Division at Whyalla about the prospect of establishing the interactive video system to assist on-the-job training in the workplace. This would certainly be a very exciting step forward, both educationally and industrially. Of course, in addition, the creation of South Australia's newest university will mean that Whyalla will truly become a university city, with South Australia's only university campus outside Adelaide. Whyalla students will have access to a wider range of course offerings. An important step was made in this direction in June when the member for Whyalla opened the new School of Nursing, which will give the Whyalla campus a new focus in health services. These are very exciting developments and I can see that members opposite are very interested in terms of their rural constituents.

MARINE AND HARBORS DEPARTMENT

Mr VENNING (Custance): I direct my question to the Minister of Marine. What further reduction does the Government intend to make in the Department of Marine and Harbors' blue collar work force this financial year?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: At this stage, the Department of Marine and Harbors has produced a plan for the efficiency of the department. It will be reorganised into business units that will more effectively deliver services to the ports of South Australia, the shippers and the importers. The plan

indicates that there should be a reduction in the white collar work force of approximately 25 per cent and in the blue collar work force of approximately the same amount. The plan was the overhead study plan sought by the department from a consultant, and unions were advised of that in about October last year. As a result of that advice to the unions, a three-day seminar was held in the latter part of last year. During that seminar the content of the plan and also the corporate reorganisation of the department was outlined to the trade union movement. A series of discussions and negotiations with unions have been undertaken over that—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Murray-Mallee is interjecting, Mr Speaker, and trying to advise the member for Custance on how many more. I understand that the honourable member asked how many. The number of people who work for the department is available in the annual report. I am sure that members opposite can work out what 25 per cent means.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Members on the other side are very rude this afternoon. The member for Bragg is not game to ask a question on this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will answer the question.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The department will reform, because the waterfront industry in South Australia, and indeed in the whole of Australia, is undertaking reform. As I have explained to this House before, the reform has been in three areas: the waterfront itself, with the exchange of cargo at wharf level; at the sea-going level; and at the port authority level. I believe that our port authority, which covers all of the ports in South Australia, is at the forefront of this reform. I would appreciate it if the Leader of the Opposition would come clean with the public of South Australia on just what he would do with the blue collar work force.

Mr Lewis: How many are you going to cut back?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I would appreciate it if he would come clean, because his statements about what he would do in the sale of the bulk loading plants would mean a further considerable reduction in the work force and a reduction in community assets which have been built up over the years.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the question was: how many will be cut back? That has not been addressed by the Minister in all the time that he has been speaking.

The SPEAKER: The Chair has no power at all under the Standing Orders that members have provided it with to control the answer of a Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thought that 25 per cent was very clear. I would have thought that the annual reports, which are delivered to this House and subsequently published, clearly set out the numbers, and I would have thought that members would not need my advice on exactly how many people there are. I am of the view that they are smart enough to work out what 25 per cent is. If not, perhaps the member for Kavel ought to go back to school and teach them how to do it.

TREE PLANTING

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House whether the Department of Road Transport still has a tree replanting program for coun-

try roadside areas; and what coordination there is between the Departments of Road Transport and Local Government, particularly involving local country councils?

Dr Armitage: What was the cost?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: What was the cost? You want all that detail, too?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Albert Park for his question, which is very important, because the Department of Road Transport is seen as a department which is primarily concerned with the construction and maintenance of roads, but in the 1980s and 1990s it is much more than that; it is a department which has very significant concern for the environment.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order. I draw the Minister back to the question and the answer.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am trying, Sir. Over the past 10 years the Department of Road Transport has more than doubled the number of people who are involved in landscaping the road reserves, and so on. The people involved have skills ranging over landscape architecture, horticulture, botany, ecology, national parks and wildlife, and tree culture, so there are very extensive skills in the department.

The question of cost was raised by the member for Adelaide. I happen to have an extensive table which outlines the costs of the various methods of planting. I was not going to go through it but, as the member for Adelaide expressly asked me, it would be rude not to do so. This table goes back 13 years, so the member for Adelaide will certainly have full value for his interjection.

In 1977 the cost of direct planting seedlings was about \$15 per plant. That was reduced in 1978 to \$2.75 and, by 1989, with inflation, it had grown to around \$8 per plant average. Most of these are contract grown and planted, while some are planted by councils and by the Highways Department. We are now up to 1978. In 1978 the landscape section began to develop its direct seeding theory, and by 1982 the first seed was in the ground. This involves, first, an ecological study of the area to be replanted and an understanding of the diversity of species present. A collection of seed is made from all woody species in the area in the proportion in which they occur naturally. For example, for a 200 kilometre section of the Dukes Highway, 300 kilograms of seed was collected, all from the local area.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, we have discussed the matter of brevity in answers to questions in this House so often, but the Minister has taken four minutes to get to 1978. It is a disgraceful waste of Question Time.

The SPEAKER: It appears that questions and answers are getting a little out of hand, with comment in the questions and long drawn out answers. I have raised the point before that, if there is to be a long answer, surely a ministerial statement is the best way to deal with it. I ask the Minister to abbreviate his answer and make it as short as possible and perhaps we can get on with more questions.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Speaker. I can assure you and the House that the answer will be as brief as possible, consistent with my giving a full answer to the honourable member, and particularly to the member for Adelaide. If I can correct the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—I was not up to 1978: I was up to 1982. I was also up to indicating that, for a 200 km section of the Dukes Highway, 300 kg of seed was collected from the local area. This was done by contractors. The department presently has on hand \$35 000 worth of seed.

An optimum germination is around 10 000 seedlings per hectare. Total costs involved in direct sowing are approximately \$2 000 per ha (and I wonder whether the honourable member is taking this down) plus \$1 000 per ha over the subsequent year—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the Minister has answered the question. If further information is required, if it is in graph form, I am sure that permission can be granted for its insertion in *Hansard*. If members are interested, they can obtain the information themselves. The member for Goyder.

WASTE ELIMINATION

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Why has the Minister of Agriculture allowed wasteful duplication to occur between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State Services, and what action will he take to eliminate such waste? The State Chemistry Laboratories, under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, and the State Forensic Science Laboratory, under the direction of the Department of State Services, both are located at 21 Divett Place in the city. Formerly, they also used the same computers, software, procedures and staff. However, I am informed that during the past year, because of a disagreement between the two directors of the respective sections, a partition has been erected dividing the complex into two. Extra staff have been employed, new computers installed, new software, which duplicated the existing software, purchased and overall a duplication of facilities and staff has occurred. But the two laboratories still perform the same services as before.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question and can advise that the decision that the State Chemistry Laboratories be located with the Department of Agriculture, where it previously was with the Department of State Services, was made as a result of a review where it should be best located. That review determined that, because 50 per cent of the work of the State Chemistry Laboratories was agriculture related, it was best under the aegis of that department. In fact, it will be moving out to the Waite campus site, as other facilities of the Department of Agriculture move to that site. While I cannot comment on the remarks made by the honourable member about a wall (which I will have further investigated), it is the plan that the laboratories will move away from that site to the Waite campus with the other sections of the Department of Agriculture. I might also say that it is the plan for the State Chemistry Laboratories—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I would like to finish the reply, Mr Speaker, because the honourable member has raised a matter that needs canvassing in this place. The State Chemistry Laboratories will be going off budget, so to speak, in the sense that that organisation will be expected to recoup its own costs by fees that it charges for its services, and it will be doing that in a marketplace that has high private sector competitors for some of the services it provides. It will be doing that in a competitive environment. That will create a very efficient operation out of the State Chemistry Laboratories, which does have considerable expertise that is not duplicated elsewhere in South Australia. It should be available both to Government departments and to the private sector, which it also services.

SIREX WASP

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Can the Minister of Forests provide the House with an update on the biological control program

launched some years ago to combat the siren wasp attacks that threatened to severely damage the State's pine forests?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am very pleased to have been asked this question by the honourable member, and I thank him for it. I am pleased to announce to the House that there has been a very low level of siren wasp attacks in the main forests of the south-eastern part of the State. Members will probably recall that in 1987 attacks killed about 2.5 million trees and posed a real threat to the future of the industry in the South-East.

However, there is now clear evidence that the nematodes, which have been used to inoculate trees, are in fact sterilising the female wasp at a rate which appears to have levelled off and indeed decreased the number of attacks that are taking place. A very good campaign was organised and coordinated by the Woods and Forests Department with the cooperation and full support of CSR Softwoods, SEAS Sapfor and the Victorian Department of Conservation to inoculate 147 000 trees in 1987 and a further 72 000 trees in 1988.

These programs have now been closely monitored and the results have been analysed by the department with the assistance of Dr Dennis Haugen from the Waite Institute. Dr Haugen has reported that the large siren population in itself has led to a large increase in the nematode population which has, therefore, been able to affect the siren levels. The department's estimate was that if in 1987 no action had been taken there could have been a doubling of the number of deaths of trees in the following year.

The siren wasp's effect is now declining in the South-East, and the number of inoculations is declining because the problem appears to be under control. Inoculation levels are being maintained in the central and northern forests where there is still some siren activity. I would like to take this opportunity to urge the owners of pine plantations in the Adelaide Hills to check for dying pine trees and, if any are found, to seek as soon as possible technical advice from the nearest Department of Woods and Forests office.

SAGASCO

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Is it true, and, if so, does the Premier agree, that the Government is 'waiting for the right price' before it reduces its shareholding in Sagasco holdings, as stated by the Minister of Mines and Energy on the Channel 7 news last night?

The SPEAKER: This question is in the same vein as the question asked previously by the member for Playford requesting information on the accuracy of a report in the media, which question, therefore, is out of order.

Mr LEWIS: A point of order, Mr Speaker. I simply asked whether or not the Minister's statement made publicly on camera to the people of South Australia on Channel 7 was true.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair believes that it is in the same vein as the previous question, and I rule it out of order. If the honorable member has a problem, I suggest that he approach the Chair and we will examine it.

HEALTH PROFESSIONALS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Is the Minister of Health aware of the very great difficulties faced by country health units in attracting allied health professionals? If so, has the Government considered providing package deals and incen-

tives in order to encourage allied health professionals to locate in country areas?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I guess that this question is somewhat ancillary to the question asked of me a day or so ago by the honourable member about general practice in the country. Certainly, it is a problem. I guess it is exacerbated by the fact that the Medicare agreement, for the most part, does not extend to some of the allied health professions in relation to the rebates that one obtains. One need only refer to physiotherapy as an example of that. So, the tendency is that, unless we are talking in terms of salaried people in the public hospitals system, it is very difficult to get these sorts of professionals to locate in country towns because, for the most part, people cannot afford these services. I will certainly take the honourable member's suggestion on board and get a considered report on it.

COMMUNICATIONS TOWER

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of the very strong opposition being expressed by residents of the Adelaide Hills in relation to the construction of a 61 metre communications tower which is in the hills face zone and which has not been approved by the East Torrens council? Has the Minister or her department received any representations from the person constructing this tower or from anyone else? Does she intend to intervene in the matter?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question and his obvious concern for this issue, which has been raised publicly. I have received some information about the matter and would be delighted to share it with the honourable member. The gentleman concerned, Mr Venning, lodged an application for a 61 metre high communications tower and equipment shelter room on 18 May this year. This type of development is a prohibited use in the hills face zone, as the honourable member would be aware, and requires the approval of the South Australian Planning Commission and concurrence in the approval from both the East Torrens council and myself as Minister for Environment and Planning. As it involves a prohibited use, public notification of the proposal must be given and this was commenced on 1 August this year. The public consultation period concludes today.

At the same time a number of Government agencies and experts in the field of communications are being contacted for their advice, including StateLink, the S.A. Taxi Association, the South Australian Health Commission, the South Australian Police, and the Federal Departments of Transport and Communications. It will be some four to six weeks before these agencies comment and, until they have done so, the matter is unlikely to be dealt with by the South Australian Planning Commission.

The Department of Environment and Planning carried out investigations as to whether Mr Venning's activities are illegal and concluded that, before work started on the footings of the proposed communications tower, he had not undertaken development, apart from the erection of a retaining wall, which had breached planning regulations or requirements. Now that he has poured footings for the tower structure, however, the department considers that he has not complied with planning requirements and has recommended that the South Australian Planning Commission join with the council to have a court order issued preventing further illegal development of the site. The simple answer is that my department has fully and thoroughly investigated the matter, has in fact suggested legal action and, I assure the honourable member, we will be taking such action.

GREENPEACE FACT SHEET

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Has the Minister for Environment and Planning had time to consider the contents of the fact sheet distributed by Greenpeace entitled, in part, 'A Guide to Toxics in the Home' in which alternatives to the use of paints, thinners, insect sprays, cleaners, solvents, aerosols and polishes are suggested? Recently, copies of this fact sheet were given to me by a Semaphore Park resident who requested that I bring it to the Minister's attention for her consideration.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. He shows an incredible amount of support for environmental issues, both in this Parliament and in his electorate and the wider community. I have had the Greenpeace fact sheet brought to my attention. Its full title is 'Stepping Lightly on the Earth—A Guide to Toxics in the Home'. It is a practical guide for people who want to take care of the environment, under the adage that we are all starting to look at and embrace, namely, that we should be thinking globally and acting locally.

The fact sheet contains practical hints on what we should do about reducing the amount of packaging we use and looking at the kinds of household cleaners and polishes we use. If we had to summarise some of the hints, it is back to our grandmother's day where very basic components such as ammonia and water were used as opposed to the types of toxic chemicals that we now find on the shelves of our supermarkets. As well as looking at a whole range of cleaning processes, it picks up the general question of how we control pests in our garden and prevent them from destroying our plants, vegetables, flowers, and so on.

The other aspect of this publication is the controlling of indoor pests. I remind the House of some of the problems encountered in a number of areas, including schools, where inappropriate pest control methods have been applied with very serious consequences to young children in particular. I commend Greenpeace on this publication. It is not something that everyone in the community may choose to follow, but it provides a guide for those people who really want to interpret care for the environment in a very personal way in their own lives, in their homes and in their back gardens. I thank the honourable member for raising the matter and bringing it to my attention, and I commend this very interesting publication to all members of the House.

RAILWAY STATION MURAL

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. What action has the STA taken against members of the Painters and Decorators Union employed by the authority who, without management permission, obliterated a mural at the Albert Park Railway Station painted by an unemployed youth group, Spray Grafix, with the permission of the STA as part of a pilot program to reduce railway station vandalism, and will the authority consider forcing those employees responsible to reimburse the authority for the cost of their unauthorised action?

The STA gave permission to Spray Grafix to paint this mural as the first pilot program aimed at stopping vandalism on railway stations. Members of the group spent two days on the mural, and I believe that it was reported in the media. However, it has now been obliterated by members of the Painters and Decorators Union employed by the STA without management permission. The union Secretary, Mr John McGirr, says the project would take away employment from his members.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I know nothing of this particular incident, but I will make inquiries for the honourable member.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education tell the House why the new university was not named in honour of a prominent South Australian? The new university is formed from the amalgamation of the South Australian Institute of Technology with the Magill, Salisbury and Underdale campuses of the South Australian College of Advanced Education. A number of names, some honouring prominent South Australians, were proposed.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for that question, which has been raised in a number of forums in recent weeks and has been promoting some controversy. Just to recap, South Australia's newest university will begin operations on 1 January next year as a result of the amalgamation of the S.A. Institute of Technology and the SACAE campuses of Magill, Underdale and Salisbury. There was widespread agreement within the college and the institute that the best name for the new institution is the University of South Australia. The councils of both tertiary institutions strongly supported this.

I agree with the two institutions that the name has obvious merits. It carries the name of the State (as do both SACAE and SAIT) and as such fits in well with interstate traditions (the University of New South Wales, the University of Queensland, the University of Western Australia and the University of Tasmania). There are other reasons why University of South Australia is particularly appropriate (and these follow on from the question asked earlier in Question Time): because the scope of our newest university will extend far beyond the boundaries of the Adelaide metropolitan area. It will not be simply an Adelaide institution. It will be a South Australian institution with a special focus on outreach to South Australia's rural communities and to distance education.

I have already mentioned that it will have a regional campus at Whyalla, and negotiations have already begun to link institutions with new forms of technology. Also, the new university will have the strongest commitment to Aboriginal studies of any university in Australia. Indeed, I hope that will be written into the legislation. It will also vigorously encourage overseas students to enrol in courses. The name will fit in well with associating the new university with South Australia's overseas marketing drive.

I am afraid I have had to disappoint members in not naming the university after the member for Mawson, the member for Florey or the member for Playford, or distinguished South Australians of the past. Obviously, all those names have merit. Someone suggested Henley Beach and Napier as well, but we decided to take the strong advice of the institutions concerned and to emphasise the particularly South Australian component of this new university. It will have rural outreach and a very distinguished role in doing so. I am sure that, while this will be a new university in South Australia, it will also draw on more than a century of experience, as both SACAE and the South Australian Institute of Technology have a history and tradition that go back more than 100 years.

WORKER'S LIENS ACT 1893

Mr GROOM (Hartley) brought up the report of the select committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

SELF-DEFENCE

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY (Minister of Education): I move:

That a select committee be appointed to consider the adequacy of the laws and rights of citizens in the area of self-defence and to—

- (a) consider the state of the law in relation to the rights of any citizen to exercise force in the protection of persons or property;
- (b) consider whether the current state of the law satisfactorily enables the occupiers of homes to protect themselves or their property against intruders; and
- (c) make recommendations for the reform of the law as considered necessary or desirable.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 9 August. Page 198.)

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I thank you, Mr Speaker, for this opportunity to address the House on the subject of the Address in Reply, and I express on behalf of myself and the electors of Hayward the loyalty that we have to His Excellency the Governor and to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: And to her heirs and successors in law, as was so rightly pointed out by members of the Opposition. I come here today somewhat reluctantly, but I feel that I owe it to the electors who have placed me in this Chamber and all members of this House, because, if we look at what this House is, it is a Parliament. It is a place where the people are supposed to have their voices raised and heard by the Government and by all members sitting here, so that we who are elected to govern may govern in their best interests.

That is exactly what the Premier promised us after the last election. After the last election, in which the Premier failed to achieve a majority of votes, he said on television that he would give South Australia a period of light and flair, that he had learnt the message of the people of South Australia and that he would translate that message into action.

Despite the fact that I am not feeling well, I came here today to express my disappointment, along with every other member of the Opposition, that this Premier and this Government have not yet translated that promise into action. We have yet to see the flair and light which was promised so long ago and which has so far miserably failed to ignite. We heard very little in the Governor's speech other than hollow rhetoric. It is the tardy legislative program that we have come to expect from this Government. As I said, the speech showed very little flair and light. Since then, there have been a number of important statements for which we must congratulate the Government. The selection of Adelaide as the preferred Australian city for the Commonwealth Games is an excellent achievement and one which has always had bipartisan support and which I am sure the

Liberal Party, when in Government, will continue to support.

In addition, the announcement by the Minister at the table about the reform of the law and discussion papers concerning the law is to be absolutely applauded by all members of this House, by all practitioners in the legal profession and every citizen of South Australia. Whilst I realise that it would not have been possible to include the statement about the Commonwealth Games in the Governor's speech, I am forced to ask why an important statement about a complete investigation of the law as it applies to South Australia could not have been made at that stage rather than being rushed out in a public statement two weeks later. The whole matter is a reflection on this Government's attitude towards this House.

I would like to refer to a matter that I heard about in hospital. My colleagues phoned me because they wanted me to hear about the member for Albert Park's comment on remarks made by the member for Bright in this Chamber in relation to law and order. I know that the member for Albert Park has long been a champion of law and order—he tells us so almost daily. However, I was somewhat flummoxed to hear his statements about the member for Bright. It is true that no Government can be held responsible for a State's lawbreakers. I believe that is the point made by the member for Albert Park. However, it is also true that, when any Government has been in charge of a State for almost two decades continually, has control of its schools, Police Force and gaols, and provides the legislation that should guide the courts, it can be held to have some responsibility for law and order. So, for the member for Albert Park to berate the member for Bright about his attitude to law and order and about how young and immature he is, I think, reflects only upon the member who made that statement.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I am sure I will. I think it is time that we on this side of the Chamber clearly defined that we are here for South Australia and for good Government; we are not here for the arrogance, bullying and childish tactics of members on the Government benches. I say 'members on the Government benches' because most of the Ministers, when they are acting like Ministers, act a little above the rabble that sits on some of the back benches.

Parliament is supposed to be a forum, a place, where people are listened to and debate occurs. But it appears that with this Government there is no debate. There is the Government's attitude, and solely the Government's attitude. What happens outside the Government's attitude must, by definition, be wrong, because no wisdom, no light, no understanding can ever occur unless it is on the Government benches. That is a little sad for those electors who, unfortunately, have chosen to elect Opposition members, because it means that we are wasting our time, and that is the attitude of virtually every member of the Government.

The only reason why I am here is that I believe in democracy. I always have and I always will. Members opposite can chirp until the bells ring in hell, but I will continue, so long as my electors keep me here, to speak in this place for what I believe is right. When my electors decide that I am no longer fit to be their representative, I shall leave this place, not because of the churlish chirping of members opposite but because my electors will have told me that I am no longer good enough to do the job. That is what I believe this Parliament is about and that is what every member of the Opposition believes this Parliament is about. Members opposite can bleat and carry on as they like. I wish that the people of South Australia could come in here

and see how this Government carries on, because there may then be a change of Government much more quickly in South Australia.

I should like to refer to a statement which was put out by the Premier on this same subject—that parliamentary representation in this place is not equal. If members of the Opposition dare to ask for legitimate boons of the Government for their electors, they are criticised, they are added up and told that they are financially irresponsible. I have a document which lists what I have asked for since my election, which lists what other members of the Opposition have asked for since the election, but which does not mention you, Mr Speaker, as asking for anything or any member of the Government as asking for anything. I would not reflect on you, Sir, nor would I suggest that you would not have asked for legitimate things for your electorate. I am sure you would. I therefore ask why the Premier is so selective in his documentation that he ignores the Speaker of this House, why he ignores all the members on the Government benches in their legitimate requests, yet lists every request of Opposition members on the grounds that they are not legitimate.

Even what is listed is remarkable. I point out that in my case I am credited with asking for phase 3 of Brighton High School, which I am now told will cost \$2.25 million. I believe that somebody—not the Minister, because the Minister did not come in and speak about Brighton High School, but one of the members on the Government back benches answered on its behalf—supposedly said that it would be another \$6 million, but now it is down to \$2.25 million. So we are to congratulate the Government, I suppose, on its prudence and hope that it will spend that \$2.25 million.

Some phone lines which I asked the Minister about—not in this House but in private correspondence—I am told will cost \$135 000. If that is what it costs and if that is a financial decision for the Minister to make, I look to and call upon the Minister at the table to make that decision, because I believe that those schools in my electorate deserve and need those phones. Therefore, I request the Minister, again publicly, to provide them, as I request the Minister, again publicly, to provide phase 3 of Brighton High School.

Let us look at what else I asked for. Apparently I asked for the Sturt River car park to be converted into a national park. Whoever made up this list deserves to be hauled before this House almost for contempt. At no stage did I ask for the Sturt River car park to be converted to a national park. I moved a motion in this House that, over the course of time, the Sturt Creek should be converted into a linear park. I spoke on that matter for 40 minutes in this House, and the Government cannot even get that right.

The Government does not even know what a legitimately-elected member of this Legislature has asked in this Legislature, and it puts out a statement like this, saying that I asked for the conversion of a car park. If the Government cannot get its business right in this House, I think it is legitimate for the people of South Australia to ask where it can get its business right. I note that that completes my list of requests.

I should point out that this list completely ignores a most important matter which I raised during the parliamentary break, and that was the safety of the Darlington Primary School, which I alleged was not sufficiently resistant to earthquake, and for that I was taken to task in the Messenger Press. I shall take that up with the appropriate Minister, because the Chief Structural Engineer of Sacon subsequently admitted, at a public meeting at the Darlington Primary School, that that school did not meet current earthquake standards. I asked for that to be investigated; it was inves-

tigated; and it is to the credit of the Minister of Education and of the Minister of Housing and Construction that it is being attended to in this financial year. I raised a legitimate problem, I asked a series of questions and something was done about it, yet it does not appear here because I suppose it was legitimate and the Government wants it to go away. It will not go away, and there are many other schools like the Darlington Primary School which this Government needs to look at very seriously and quickly.

I have dealt with the important function of this place. It is as a forum for the people. I hope that, so long as I am here and so long as members on this side of the House are here, it continues to be so. I continue to express my disappointment that the Government treats it less fairly than it deserves to be treated. It so derides an ancient and honourable institution that our press constantly almost ignores this State Legislature, treats it as something of a joke and derides its members of Parliament. In that context, I note that today on the radio the member for Labour was not forthcoming—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Members on the Government benches today are very good at picking up syntax. I noticed earlier one of them picking up things. I might not be functioning well, but I am functioning as best I can. I apologise. *Hansard* corrects all mistakes. Some gentlemen, notably people from the port authority, do not agree with one of the things that the Minister of Labour is doing. I believe they marched to the steps of Parliament House. It was reported in the press that you, Sir, as Speaker of this House, were there to greet them, as was the Leader of the Opposition, which I think is right and proper. But I would register my disgust at the number of times, when people come here with legitimate complaint, to the very place where they have a right to voice their complaint, that members of this Government continue to ignore them. Today was not the first time that a Minister, knowing that a large delegation of people would be here, has been absent. I had the unfortunate experience of standing outside this place, just before I was elected, and hearing people regarding the Marineland fiasco. There were a thousand of them gathered on the steps of this place, which was dark, dank and locked, and one of the principal speakers said, 'God knows what goes on in there.' I was disgusted; I continue to be disgusted; and I will always remain disgusted, because those people own this place—not members opposite and not members on this side. We are all here as their servants and as their elected representatives. The Government, which has been here for 20 years, has come to believe that it has some divine right to rule.

In some sense members of the Government are the Marie Antoinettes of Adelaide. What do we have? We do not have basic good government: we have cake served up all the time. I remind Government members that in the end Marie Antoinette lost her head.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Some look like losing their head and not their hair. In the past the Government has performed some useful service for the people of South Australia. However, I believe that the time came before the last election, and it is certainly now long overdue, for this Government to resign. The Government has within its power at any time to hand its commission back to the Governor and to give government to people who can really carry on the work of this State and carry the State forward. I believe that in all honesty and quite clearly it can be demonstrated that this Government has failed and is failing in its task, and certainly that it is not likely to do any better. Therefore, in view of the Governor's speech, I take the only possible

course open to me on behalf of the electors of Hayward and I call for the immediate resignation of the Premier and this Government.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I support the motion and, in doing so, I express my appreciation for the work done for our State by Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan. I know personally of the excellent work that has been done by them in representing Her Majesty the Queen on many occasions in our State. There have been many social and cultural occasions, in both the city and the country, in respect of which members of the community and I know of their superb representation. At many formal parades, opening events and, in particular, sporting events I have had the personal pleasure of being in the presence of Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan. The State will miss their presence and will miss the work that they have done so excellently on our behalf.

I would also like to take the opportunity this afternoon to welcome the new member for Custance, Mr Ivan Venning. Ivan is a farmer and I am sure that he will bring a new interest into the Parliament and give the Opposition a much broader range of ideas to put before the Parliament. At the same time, I wish John Olsen, the previous Leader of our Party and the Leader of the Opposition in this State, the best of luck and many opportunities in his new role as a Senator for South Australia. I had the privilege of working with John for about seven years, and I know that he will represent adequately the points of view of all South Australians in his new job.

I want now to comment, since I am described as the biggest spending member on this side, on the ridiculous document of Opposition requests for projects put out by the Premier in a news release last Sunday week. In that press release the Premier referred to several statements which I made and which were, I believe, of significant benefit to the community of South Australia in respect of any road safety programs. One of the concepts that I put to the Government was that, if South Australia was to be serious about road safety, we needed to progress towards a twin highway system. Because I was suggesting that we should at least adopt a concept of putting in these dual highways, I have now been billed to the extent of \$1.4 billion in this ridiculous document. That is an absurd proposition.

Anyone who is involved in the transport portfolio would know that long-term planning in relation to our major highways is required, and it is that, at every opportunity, the Government should put in dual highways on our major routes. While I have been given this tag for demanding spending of \$1.4 billion, the introduction of dual highways is a principle that I believe should be adhered to, recognising that it could be a 50 year program. Any Government that turns its back on this proposition and says that it is nonsense has no concept of road safety, because there is no doubt that the state of our roads is one of the major factors in contributing to the terrible number of road deaths.

I noted in the Governor's speech that there was mention of a project called a 'multifunction polis'. I would like to put on record that I welcome this concept. I want to make very clear that, as a concept, this project that needs significant explanation. I have to say from the outset that anyone who dreamt up that name obviously came bottom or second bottom in their marketing or public relations course, because 'multifunction polis' would have to be the worst name given to any project at State or any level—

Mr Hamilton: What would you call it?

Mr INGERSON: Since tempted by an honourable member opposite to put a name on it, I believe that we should be talking about technological development in our State and

the future direction of our State. I do not think that it needs a name. Because of the name itself, there has been much concern.

About two or three months ago I had the opportunity to visit Nice in France. At Nice is the development called 'Sophia Antipolis', which was started about 20 years ago by Senator Lafayette, who named the project after his wife Sophia. The word 'antipolis' means the city outside the main city, that is, Antibes. The development comprises 3 500 acres in a hills environment, a magnificent environment for any technological development site. It is similar to the Adelaide Hills here in South Australia. On that site there are about 150 companies, ranging from computer companies—IBM and Decca are involved—to pharmaceutical companies, such as the international companies Roche and Roussel. There are at least half a dozen significant telecommunications companies; Telecom (as it is called in France) has set up its major research centre on this site. Also involved are defence and research development companies and, finally, finance companies that are operating as the world centre for many finance companies in the world.

As I said, that development involving about 150 companies started 20 years ago. The concept of technology parks or the development of sections of a city has been evolving around the world for about 20 years. Sophia Antipolis involves the University of Nice and its students, about 10 000 of whom are employed in post-graduate and pre-graduate work.

Several countries are involved. Obviously, France is involved, Italy is now moving and Germany, Britain and the United States of America are directly part of this project. So, the concept of the multifunction polis that has been put before us has been in operation in France for about 20 years. This to me is a very important point.

It is also very important, in looking at this futuristic concept, that we remember that in the early 1950s Sir Thomas Playford and Alex Ramsey stood at Cavan and said that should to build the town of Elizabeth. In the 1970s the Premier, Donald Dunstan, stood in the city and said that we would have another satellite town near Murray Bridge called Monarto. One has been successful and one has been a failure. Given the failure that we all remember so well it is important that we look properly at this development of a multifunction polis.

Having put clearly on the record my interest and my desire to look at the whole project in a positive way, I believe that as a community we need a lot more information about what is going on. Communications from the Government have been extremely poor and vague. Yesterday I received a brochure on the MFP Adelaide. At least the Government got rid of the name 'multifunction polis'. It got down to three letters, which may have more meaning for the people of Adelaide. It is the first official publication, to my knowledge, that explains simply the concept that may become reality in the City of Adelaide. I am cognisant of the fact that several major documents have been sent out to us as members of Parliament, but I understand that this is the first document that will go out to the public. At last the Government has produced a document that anybody in the community can understand.

On the issue of ownership of land, the Government should be coming out early in the project and making a clear statement that there is no intention that the land, wherever the MFP might be sited, be owned by other than the Australian community, or in particular the South Australian community. That is one of the major issues about which the community is currently concerned: they want to know who will own the property. Are we to sell off our State or

not? I call on the Government to make clear quickly that it does not intend to allow the heritage of our State to be sold off in any development of this kind.

Racism is something that I abhor. The Government must address this issue quickly and explain clearly to the community now this sort of development has occurred in Sophia Antipolis; it must show the community of South Australia how an integrated community, working for the technological advancement of the State, can easily be achieved and copied, as has been the case in Nice, France.

I support the concept as an opportunity for us to develop the waste land of the proposed site. Who knows whether in the next 20 years that will be the final site. It is an excellent opportunity for us to do that and we all need to remember that some 15 years ago West Lakes was swampland. I am told by people directly involved in that development that it was in a worse condition than is the Gillman site. There are a couple of exceptions: there were no chemical waste deposits at West Lakes as there are at Gillman, but if we look at the technological opportunities we as a community should be able to solve the problems. Unless the problems are outlined by the Government and discussed, the community will get hung up, over these issues. People will say that we cannot do it, instead of asking, 'What is the problem and how can we solve it?' The concept also provides an exciting opportunity for the future of our children. It gives us as a community an opportunity to do some innovative planning for our city and further to expand our existing agricultural, manufacturing, defence, communications and tourism industries by way of technological change.

The Government made a very important decision in taking the opportunity to expand our defence industries over the next 25 years, and it is such an important matter that it needs our full support. However, questions need to be answered quickly by the Government in this and other projections because, if it does not, what seems to be a reasonably long-term project could easily be harmed by those who wish to scuttle any development in our State.

The Governor's speech also mentioned workers rehabilitation and compensation. I am glad that the Government has at last recognised that there are problems in this area—problems with the Act and with the administration of it by WorkCover—and that it intends, in the next few days, supporting the setting up of a select committee. There is no doubt that the levy, bonus and payment systems are of major concern to this State's business community. In the next 12 months some \$60 million, over and above that taken by way of previous premiums, will be removed from the business community at a time when it is suffering very difficult economic hardships.

Since I have been in business there is no doubt that the past 12 months has been the most difficult period experienced by the small businessman in this State. During this period we have had a massive increase in the workers compensation levy. There are questions about the claims management area and the overall funding of the scheme and the benefits, and I am sure that in the next few days, when we discuss the setting up of the select committee, all those issues will be further expanded.

I was fascinated that the Governor's speech mentioned that the Government supported small business—although only in one sentence; it was a very quick mention—because I believe that this Government has walked away from its responsibilities to small business. I do not believe that the statistics being used by the Government show the true position and the problems of business in this State. Hundreds of businessmen—small and medium—are just hanging in there, and they are too proud to complain. During the past

12 months many of my friends who have been in business for years are finding difficulties for the first time in their business careers, and it is due principally to interest rates, Government charges and statutory authority charges.

I have yet to find any retail business owners who in the past 12 months have increased their business by the inflation figure—in other words, by about 7 per cent. Last week I spoke to the General Manager of one of the large retail stores in Rundle Mall, who said, 'I can't understand what these stats are all about because they never add up to our figures.' What is questioned is the collection method of ABS, but that is an issue that we should perhaps go into at some other time.

Last week I went to General Motors-Holden's at Elizabeth and was advised that because of the growing stockpile of vehicles manufacturing was to be reduced. If one looks around Adelaide one will see the large amount of office space available—and we are told that South Australia is doing all right! I do not believe that the statistics reflect the true position. I believe that small business in this State could crumble in the next 12 months because, in the past two to three years, they have had these massive interest rates imposed by Keating and Hawke in the Federal arena and, more importantly, agreed to and supported by the Bannon Government. Over the past seven years the Premier has been involved with EPAC (the group that advises the Federal Government on economic matters), and he has been the President of the ALP for at least four years, but hardly at all have I heard him talk about the interest rate problems for small business.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I have heard him talk about them in the past two or three weeks, but he has been deafeningly quiet in his concern about small business in this State up until then. As I said earlier, only one sentence in the Governor's speech mentioned small business, and it seems to me that that is a measure of this Government's concern for the problems of small business in this State.

Interest rates are killing small businesses, and members opposite know that full well. They know, through their union friends and through their connections in small business, that we need only a minor problem in the next six months and many small businesses will topple because of Keating's mismanagement of the economy, which has been supported by the Bannon Government, by keeping interest rates at such a high level. No-one opposite cares. They are silent about it because they do not have the guts to say that they know that Keating, Hawke and Bannon have got interest rates wrong. There is absolute silence because they know that what I am saying is right. I am very concerned that our Premier is not prepared to get stuck into Hawke and Keating and tell them that enough is enough.

It is all very well to have macro-economic policies which bring under control our macro-economic conditions but in the meantime kill off all the productive businesses in this country. It is all very well to have these rules, but if you are killing off the country there is nowhere to go. No unionists will be employed in this country if we do not very quickly reduce interest rates. It upsets me to think that our Premier, has said not a single thing about the biggest issue ruining the economy of our State, and the economy of our State is small business. Members opposite know it, but nothing has been done about the situation, and that is what really concerns me.

As well as the promise the Premier made at the last two State elections that charges would not increase any more than the CPI, we now have this new thing—cost recovery. Cost recovery is nonsense if the departments cannot effi-

ciently make cost recovery mechanisms work. We need to make departments efficient and then talk about cost recovery—not the other way around.

While referring to the CPI, not one business that I know offsets its costs at a fixed amount for the following year, but that is what this Government does. Every year it includes the CPI amount, and every year the Government's costs rise by the CPI amount, so it is like a dog chasing its tail. Every single time it does this, up goes inflation along with all other costs because the Government has not recognised that it must trim its costs. If they were less than the CPI amount, that would be in the best interests of the community, but, if it happened to be more than the CPI, the Government should wear that also.

Let us get ourselves efficient and not have built-in regulators that include CPI as a minimum. That is the most ridiculous policy that any Government could have. If a department could be reduced to a situation where its costs were less than CPI but it was still efficient, should we not encourage that to occur? Every other business is told by the Government to cut its cloth, but this Government says it will cut its cloth by adding on 8 per cent every year. There has been no attempt by this Government to cut its costs.

In relation to statutory Government charges, WorkCover will have taken \$60 million profit out of the business community in this State over the next 12 months, because the Government did not have the gumption to admit that the system it introduced is a fiasco. It has happened because the Government has allowed that statutory authority to run wild. It is absurd that small and large businesses are keeling over because of these statutory Government charges.

Now this new E&WS flimsy policy fiasco has been introduced. It is a reintroduction of land tax into the broader community. But, again, the business community will pay. It is the business community that employs people in this State, and we need to look after them, because the Government does not care. I believe that the Bannon Government is attempting to con small businesses. It has done so for seven years.

When I became shadow Minister of Industrial Relations, I was told that South Australia was free of any problems and that we had an excellent industrial relations system. We have a reasonable system, but it is not free of problems. I wish to talk about a couple of thugs that we have out in the industrial arena—people running around, putting pressure on small business, and telling them, if they do not sign up their families and their work force with the union, they will be closed down. I did not believe that this still happened in the 1980s and early 1990s. I thought that members opposite, who have been involved in unions, had cleaned up that sort of thuggery. But, no, one Victorian has come over to straighten out the furniture union. He has lined up all small businesses and said that, if their staff did not join up with the union, they will be closed down.

However, fortunately, in recent times two small business have not been prepared to tolerate that behaviour: first, a young man and his family at Christies Beach; and last week a glass operator in the Burnside area. Those people have run good businesses and have been prepared to do the right thing when employing their staff. It just so happens that their staff do not want to join the union, but that does not sit comfortably with this thug from Victoria. He just wants to come over here and stand over every small businessman and say, 'You will play the rules the way we want you to play.' I do not think that is good enough, so I have written to the Minister asking him to do something about it. I will be very interested in his reply, because their attitude is totally against the rights that I believe Government mem-

bers support. They believe that there should be unions and union membership, and I support that but, if people do not want to join, they should not be forced to do so. I despise closed shops. I also despise being told that I cannot do something I want to do, and I believe that the community has the same attitude. When thugs come over from Victoria, this Government ought to stand up to them and do something about it. I look forward to the Minister's reply.

Recently the member for Peake spoke about shearers. In the couple of minutes I have left, I will not be able to speak in detail about that matter, so I will refer to it in a future grievance debate and correct some of the nonsense we heard from him. I do say, however, that when people trespass on property, whether they are union leaders or individuals in the community, someone must have some rights. Mr Deputy Speaker, if you trespassed on my property, I would expect to be able to do something about it, as a private person. If I owned a business, I would expect the same rights. Nobody in this country, whether they be a union official or an individual on the street, is above the law. It needs to be pointed out fairly clearly that some of the union officials on the day in question were in fact trespassing. It is a tragedy that the police did not enforce the law as I believe they should have done. I support the rightful role of unions and their leaders, but I do not support that sort of behaviour.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and to offer a few comments in relation to His Excellency's speech and to matters generally, either from the Governor's speech or matters directly relating to this State. At the outset, I wish to sincerely thank Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan for the way in which they have carried out their duties during their time in office. It has been a pleasure for me as a member of Parliament to have served during the time that Sir Donald has been Governor of this State. I join with other members of this House in wishing him and Lady Dunstan all the very best in their future years.

I welcome the new member for Custance to this House. All members would be well aware, having heard his maiden speech, that he has a lot to offer this Parliament. His background in the area of agriculture and rural affairs generally has been extensive; that was certainly brought out in his maiden speech, and I know he will make many significant contributions to this House. I am very pleased that he is one of the members in this Parliament who will support me in the work that I have to do as shadow Minister of Agriculture. I am very pleased that he has been able to follow his father, and it is great to have him representing a district adjoining my electorate of Goyder. I know that we share a lot of common territory in that area.

I was interested to compare the Governor's speech with his speech earlier this year when it was stated that, during the previous session of Parliament, the Government intended to introduce two Bills relating to the rural sector. They were to be the Stock Bill and the State and Northern Territory Rural Adjustment Bill. As members would well know, those two Bills were not introduced in the last session. It was with no great surprise that I noticed that one of them was mentioned in His Excellency's speech as coming up this session. In that regard members will be aware that the Rural Industry Adjustment (Ratification of Agreement) Bill was introduced last week. Perhaps I should not offer any comment as to why they were not introduced earlier. I guess we can raise that in the appropriate debate. Certainly, it is pleasing that at least some legislation relating to the rural sector will be introduced this session. We did not have any

in the last session and, for an industry that produces almost half the State's monetary turnover—namely, some \$2 billion—I think agriculture needs a much higher place in this Parliament and the State. In other words, it needs a much higher recognition than it currently receives.

As I mentioned in a personal explanation which, unfortunately, I was unable to complete, I was very disappointed that the Premier of this State attacked the Liberal Party—the Opposition—for not being responsible in respect of a wide variety of items that it had requested. I received an honourable mention in two areas. First, in relation to the upgrading of the Port Wakefield Road—the road between Port Wakefield and the Copper Triangle. I explained some of that in my personal explanation. The ironical thing was that, whilst the Premier said the Opposition was irresponsible—and I read out the appropriate letter earlier—the acting Premier had sent me a letter saying that the Government agreed with my requests. It acknowledged that the road needed upgrading and said that funds would be made available—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: No, but the Premier had the audacity to attack the Opposition as being irresponsible. I think it is a sign that perhaps the Premier no longer has stock of the situation. Obviously, he feels very insecure and unsafe in the position he currently occupies. The question that the Opposition is constantly asking itself is: when will the Premier (Hon. John Bannon) step down? It will not be far away. We have seen what happened in Western Australia, and last week it was Cain's turn. The question is whether John Bannon will step down before the end of this year or whether he will decide to continue over the Christmas period.

Of course, the much more interesting question is: who will succeed the Premier after he is gone? I know that it has been an embarrassment to the Government—and many Opposition members have brought this up—that the Premier was way off target in trying to criticise Opposition members for bringing up electoral concerns. It has been an even greater embarrassment to the Government that not one member of the Government has asked for anything in relation to his or her electorate, according to this statement. I think that voters in Government members' electorates should be aware of that fact. I looked through *Hansard* and found that, on every occasion, it was an Opposition member who asked for something. I think it is disgraceful that Government members are showing complete irresponsibility towards their own electorates.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: They are treating their own electorates with contempt.

Mr MEIER: They are treating their own electorates with contempt; well said by the member for Chaffey. The second matter I want to highlight here is that I also made a request for some assistance for a community-run broadcasting station to service the Gawler, Balaklava, Gulf St Vincent and Barossa Valley areas. I wrote to the Premier setting out the details that had been put forward to me by Mr Jungfer, the Chairman of Outer Northern and Educational Broadcasters. In typical fashion, I received a no-answer letter stating the obvious to me, which I passed on to Mr Jungfer. Again, I think he must have been wondering what was happening with this Government. Again, it was signed by the Acting Premier, so the Premier must have been away for some time.

The Acting Premier set out the details that a regional station must go through before it could receive any support. The people at the community station knew that full well—they had done their homework. They were simply asking

the Government, 'Are you prepared to help a regional community?' The Government's answer to that—the bottom line—was, 'No; you go and look after yourselves; do not ask us; if it is out of the metropolitan area, please do not come troubling us.'

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The cost that the Premier put down for that was \$10 000. I do not regard that as an excessive amount, especially when one looks at the millions of dollars of Government wastage, for example, in Marineland, forests, and so on. In fact, earlier today I highlighted in this very House the duplication between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State Services, and the Minister did a very fast quickstep on that issue and tried to justify the unjustifiable.

Mr Groom: How much was that road?

Mr MEIER: The road was to be \$3 million. If we are talking about roads, we can certainly go back to the fact that, for the better part of its 20-odd years, this Government has been irresponsible in allocating less and less money towards roads. The Federal Government has been even worse and the question is: how will we improve the state of our country roads? I know the member for Stuart takes a particular interest in rural matters, because she serves her rural area well. I know she endorses me fully in saying that our transport system is in a chaotic state and the Government will have to reconsider its priorities, and reconsider them very soon.

I had the privilege during the parliamentary recess to spend a brief period in the United States of America where I looked at areas particularly related to agriculture, fisheries and some marine. However, it was mainly in the area of agriculture that I undertook some studies, particularly in the States of Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi and Louisiana. As a result of that visit, I can see very clearly that greater encouragement must be given to family farming here in South Australia.

Family farm agriculture is certainly not a relic to be discarded, but a productive, creative human resource to be called on for new economic growth. In fact, if one opens any cupboard door in any kitchen in any home in any city it would be bare if it were not for the man on the land and, under most circumstances, the family farmer. Yet, the present State and Federal Governments' position is that, if a family farmer cannot survive without tariffs or tax protection, he should get off the farm. Or, we could perhaps say, 'If you cannot stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.' It is a very worrying situation for family farmers, the people of South Australia and the rural sector generally.

My visit to the southern States of the US has made me acutely aware that the Government of South Australia has stopped looking at the human side of agriculture and that it seems to be interested in only the economic aspect. We need to look at our agriculture very carefully. It is fine to say that we must stand on our own two feet. I have no argument with that at all, but we are kidding ourselves if we think that the United States of America will suddenly abolish protection schemes for its agriculture commodities. I was uncertain how the system worked in all facets and, as a result of various discussions, I asked questions such as, 'How much is a farmer entitled to receive from the subsidy scheme?' The answer was, 'Up to \$50 000.'

I said, 'All right, what would a small farmer, for example, a rice growing farmer with, say, 200 acres be eligible to receive?' We were in a rice-growing area at the time. The answer to my question was, 'Up to \$50 000.' I then asked what a large corporation would get and, again, the answer was, 'Up to \$50 000.' I then asked what a rice farmer

cultivating 200 acres could expect to receive if there were not a great market for his crop, and the answer was, '\$50 000.' On top of that, if the crop cannot be marketed, the farmer not only receives the \$50 000 but also he is able to sell his crop to the best of his ability. In other words, he can sell it on the free market if he can get a price for it. As the Department of Agriculture official said, it is certain that the farmer will be able to sell the crop, but the question is, 'At what price?' In other words, \$50 000 is the base, minimum income in many cases and the farmer can earn a lot more than that by selling what he has anyway.

It would be impossible for Australia and South Australia even to contemplate any program that offered that sort of subsidy; we would break ourselves overnight. I do not advocate that for one moment. But we must appreciate that the United States farmers will not allow their Government to abolish such a subsidy overnight. It may decrease; in fact, it is quite possible that, over time, it may even disappear. However, in the immediate future there will continue to be appropriate subsidies for United States farmers—that is, the farmers with whom we must compete on the world market. Therefore, we need to consider how to combat this situation. The US is considering how to combat it as well. In particular, it is looking at revitalising its agricultural sector. We in South Australia need to follow the same course. I believe that the Government can help lead the way in this respect. I believe that economic development can best be achieved by nurturing the thousands of small or home-grown enterprises. To do this, extensive diversification in the agricultural arena is essential.

I will give the House the example of a cattle rancher whom I visited in Waco, Texas. This cattle rancher runs some 800 cattle on a property of 2 000 acres. However, he has also turned part of his property over to the production of watermelons. In fact, he annually devotes some 100 to 200 acres to this product to offset the production of cattle and to complement it. At the time I was there he also baled a lot of Bermuda grass hay and has a small stud of 60 Brahman cattle.

In Texas special loans of up to \$100 000 are available for farmers who wish to diversify into the production of rabbits, ostriches, llamas, Silesian donkeys, herbs, crawfish, aquaculture, Christmas trees, cut flowers and even, if they wish, emus. American farmers are being encouraged to produce Australia's own emus. What are we doing here in this State? In simple terms: nothing. I was very surprised that the United States is leading South Australia with our own product; a product that we could be developing.

Members may recall that in the past six months I gave a dissertation on the benefits of emu farming in this State. I remind members that there is a market for some 100 000 emu skins annually. Emu leather is keenly sought after for the making of fabric for women's clothes; the leg leather is used for ornaments; the meat apparently has a similar taste to beef; the oil is used for cosmetic creams and moisturisers; and there also seems to be some use for the oil in the treatment of arthritis. There is also a great demand for emu eggs: carved emu eggs can bring up to \$600 each. The feathers are certainly sought after for craftwork and, in fact, current demand cannot be met.

I have taken up this issue with the Minister and received the same old reply, 'We cannot do anything at this stage. Some consideration is being given to amending the National Parks and Wildlife Act so that emus can be kept for commercial production and slaughter.' I wish the Government would hurry up and not let Western Australia start up an industry and get ahead of us. It appears that Queensland and, I believe, New South Wales and Victoria also are

interested. We are missing out on an opportunity and one which farmers in the United States are certainly not discounting either; in fact, they are going much further.

I could also mention the Government's lack of action in other areas. I cite the case of Aussie Flowers, a flower-growing firm in the Virginia area. In January of this year I wrote to the Premier asking for some assistance, particularly with respect to the provision of water and the allocation of an extra water allowance. There have been several phone calls between my office and the Premier's office in the past six months and I still have not received a reply. In other words, it is quite clear that the Government is not interested in rural activities, in helping to promote a diversification in agricultural commodities and in helping this State.

It interested me that Louisiana guarantees up to \$10 million or offers direct loans of up to \$500 000 to help individuals and companies establish agricultural processing, storage or marketing plants. I cite the case in Louisiana where crawfish are grown—they are very similar to our yabbies. Louisiana was a little later on the scene than was the State of Mississippi and some other States, but the commissioner of Agriculture realised Louisiana needed a crawfish processing plant. He approached some companies and said, 'How about setting up?' They said that they were not really interested and that they had processing plants in other States. They could ship crawfish to Louisiana very easily. The commissioner said, 'We can give you a guarantee of up to \$10 million on any factory that you set up.'

The company said that that was all very well but that someone had to provide the money, to which the commissioner replied that Louisiana would give it a loan of up to \$500 000. The company saw some possibilities in that. However, it was still not enough. The commissioner then said, 'We are even prepared to buy stocks and shares in the company.' In other words, the Government would show its complete faith in the venture. Needless to say, more than one company was interested in setting up in Louisiana. The industry was set up and now the situation is such that the Government has sold all of its stocks and shares. So that is gone; it has been paid off; there is no more debt and the company is processing at such a rate that there is no need for the Government guarantee that was initially given. I believe that we here in South Australia must look at similar action.

We are aware of the fiasco that occurred with the proposed tannery at Wingfield. A \$2.8 million tannery was proposed for the Wingfield area by a Korean company—just what this State needs, another new industry. What sort of help did that company get from the Government? Without detailing the columns and columns of print that have appeared in respect of this matter, in simple terms virtually nothing happened. In fact, it seems that the company was misled by the Government. The Koreans were ill advised and they are sick and tired of South Australia and the South Australian Government and are not interested in coming back here at this stage.

I say 'at this stage' because, hopefully, when there is a change of Government, some common sense might apply to the establishment of such important industries in this State. Whereas we see in Louisiana the Government bending over backwards to bring in a new industry, here the Government is happy to kick it out and, indeed, is seeking to sue the company for supposed liabilities that have been caused by it. That brings back memories of the Marineland developments, too. It is a despicable way to treat potential investors in South Australia.

We also witnessed recently the refusal of the State Government to help Merino Wool Harvesters complete the

research and development of the robot shearing machine. Members will recall the question that I raised in this House only last week. What was the Minister's response? Among other things, he indicated that it was the business of private enterprise to pick up the tab and that the Government could not look at these sorts of things. The Government has not been looking at any sorts of things. It is not able to help any more. It is looking at the multifunction polis, saying that it is two decades down the track, that there will be \$1 billion of infrastructure and the Government will be happy to help, but it realises that few, if any, present members will still be in the House by the time that eventuates. It is happy to give its full commitment to pie in the sky dreams, but, when it comes to an investment which would bring millions of dollars to this State, it does not help. This brand new machine incorporates wonderful technology that the Japanese are seeking; it has patents that we can sell; and already \$10 million has been spent on research and development. Less than \$1 million is needed, yet the Government says, 'Do not come to us for assistance. That has nothing to do with us.' It is little wonder, therefore, that again we shall lose a potentially technology-breaking piece of equipment from the State of South Australia.

It grieves me intensely that the Government continues to act in this way, yet makes statements from time to time as though things are going well. It has to take stock of the situation soon, before more companies refuse to consider South Australia as a site. Surely everyone, and at the very least the Government, knows that South Australia is the best State for new industry and technology: South Australia is the central State. It can promote industry more than any other State, yet the Government is doing everything to drive away industry.

There are many other things that I would like to report about what I observed in the United States, but members can look at the report that will shortly be written and be available in the library. I want to refer to another matter that is hurting the rural sector, and it relates to WorkCover. Early in June one of my constituents received a letter, as no doubt did hundreds of other farmer constituents, stating that the WorkCover levy would increase from 4.5 per cent to 7.5 per cent. I immediately contacted WorkCover and expressed great alarm and concern. I was told by the officer that my constituent did not have to worry because, if he had a safe record, he would be able to get a discount as there would be a bonus system. My constituent walked away very happy. Imagine his surprise and my surprise when, at the end of June, he received a letter, entitled 'Dear Employer' advising him that he would not be eligible for any reduction. The letter, from Garry McDonald, Chief Manager, Funds/Levies Division of WorkCover, states:

The rationale for this position is that for small employers the risk of having or not having an accident in any year is essentially a matter of luck. This scheme is not designed to penalise bad luck or reward good luck.

I could not believe it when I read it. We heard the Minister time and again emphasise the fact that if employers took a bit of trouble and had safe working conditions they could bring down the rate. However, many small employers, who often have got a good track record and who want to bring down the rates, are told, 'That is all luck. You cannot ascertain whether you have had a good safety working record in your area or not.' It is absolutely disgraceful, and that is another area where small business is suffering in this State. It is having to pay the full penalty. There is no provision for a bonus for small employers. They pay the 7.5 per cent or attract a fine and, if they do not pay the fine, they receive the gaol sentence that goes with it.

That underlines my point that more emphasis needs to be put on the family farm. Let us come back to the human element, to the people who are producing most of the wealth of this State. Do not treat them with disrespect and do not tell them, 'If you cannot perform, get off your land.' Rather, look at it and say, 'How can we assist? Can we perhaps bring in some guarantee and even buy stocks and shares in a company which will help you to sell your goods and help you with your marketing?' Let us see how we can help the small farming sector, and, indeed, the small business sector. Unless the Government changes its attitude, the rural sector will suffer more, and this State will be left in a huge mess which it will take many years to correct.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I support the motion. I should like to say to His Excellency the Governor, on behalf of my electorate, how delighted we have been over the years to see him in Glenelg and the Marion area. We wish him well in his retirement. It has been a joy to us to see the manner in which he has carried out his duties. It has been a joy to the whole State to see the position of Governor raised to its present level, and it has been through his efforts and attitude towards that position. We wish him well in his retirement and hope that he will retire in this State and have many happy years with us all.

I should also like to use this opportunity to welcome to the House the member for Custance, who came in during the last month. I join all members in wishing him well. I trust that we shall see him make an indelible mark in this Parliament over the years to come.

In my Address in Reply speech this evening I should like to refer to matters in the new Department for Family and Community Services. In May 1987, the then Minister of Community Welfare, Dr Cornwall, commissioned a formal inquiry into DCW policies and procedures. The aim of that inquiry was to advise him as to whether DCW policies and procedures were adequate to protect children of under-age parents and to recommend appropriate action if policies and procedures were not adequate. It now being August 1990 (three years down the track), I believe it is an appropriate time to look at some of the recommendations and to line them up with the performance of the Bannon Government in assessing what it has implemented and what the Minister has chosen to ignore. The 1987 inquiry, to which I refer, resulted in the 1988 Cooper report.

Most members in the House at that time would be familiar with the Cooper report. This wide-ranging report picked up more subjects than those included in the original terms of reference. It received wide circulation at the time and generated considerable public debate. It has been obvious that some of the recommendations have not been proceeded with because of the philosophic view of some members of the bureaucracy. Many excellent and logical recommendations have not been adopted or have been adopted only in part because the Government has starved the department of resources and, in particular, the additional numbers of highly qualified social workers, to enable the department to discharge its mandate.

There has been much public discussion about it, and members would have to be blind if they did not all agree that that has been the case. I have been the shadow Minister of Family and Community Services only for the past six months. Certainly, I do not claim to be an expert. That comes only with four or five years of university training at Flinders University or the Institute of Technology, followed by many years of experience in the department or out in the field. However, I would like to share with the House a few of the observations I have made during these six months.

In terms of the department's mandate in respect of child abuse, it seems to me that the only question asked is, 'Is the child safe?' Once the safety of the child has been secured, the child is handed to one of the main private or church-based agencies, which then provides long-term assistance. Do members see the scenario? The department steps in and asks whether the child is safe; after making sure that the child is safe, it has no further involvement with that child but passes the child to an outside organisation for long-term assistance. I will analyse that aspect shortly.

In her observations in 1988 Dr Cooper stated that, while referrals to outside agencies were made, many of the organisations to which people were referred for, say, parenting skills, such as CAFHS and the South Australian Housing Trust, did not appear to provide for the ongoing or long-term management of the cases. However, I would have thought that part of the department's mandate was to provide for the long-term management of cases. Dr Cooper's observation was that this does not happen.

She went on to say that referrals to outside agencies involve more than a telephone call. I would have thought that that was quite obvious. I fully acknowledge that the conflict and dispute situations in which departmental social workers find themselves are amongst some of the most difficult in which any public servants find themselves, and I have great sympathy when I hear of some of the cases with which they are confronted and which organisations such as Crisis Care have to take up.

It is inevitable that conflict will arise because of the difficulty in determining what is reasonable suspicion of maltreatment of a child before the appropriate action is taken, often against the wishes of a parent or guardian. Many of us could visualise occasions when someone from Crisis Care or the police arrived on the scene and the social worker had to take a decision based on what he or she believed was reasonable suspicion that maltreatment had occurred. That is a difficult situation for anyone to be in. When a decision has been made about the abuse or maltreatment of a child, obviously other agencies are involved and this leads straight to what has been the subject of major complaint.

I have received phone calls in my office and complaints have been passed on to me by deputations of health and welfare professionals. The consistent message is that, in the assessment of the child, no one person has responsibility in this whole area of child abuse: the child is taken from organisation to organisation. For example, the case is passed from DCW to CAFHS, to regional assessment panels, to the Child Protection Council and so forth. Those referrals originate from the one offence. Clearly, the Minister supports the concept of an interagency case management system, as we all do. However, from talking with the agencies, I believe it is apparent that his emphasis is on how the agencies work together and not on the quality of the product that the client receives.

I would hope that those in the department who read this contribution take clear note of that message: that the emphasis is on how the agencies work together, in other words how they are communicating and talking to each other, and not on the quality of the product that the client receives. That is an important observation that was made in the Cooper report. Indeed, the point is often made that the weakest link is the assessment process in the department, because of the limited number of interviews that take place at the time of assessment and because of the qualifications of some of those who are expected to make recommendations. This calls into question what the Minister is prepared

to accept in future as 'qualified social worker' within the Department for Family and Community Services.

I would ask members to consider carefully the future qualifications of departmental social workers, especially if later this year the Government gets through its new definition of 'emotional abuse'. Social workers out in the field may have to determine what they believe is emotional abuse. That is an extremely difficult decision for anyone who has been in this field of child welfare all their life, but now we are asking social workers with limited field experience and varying qualifications to decide, in a situation of confrontation, whether emotional abuse has occurred.

Social workers will be asked to make decisions which require enormous training and a wide variety of skills and which involve the question of ethics and child protection analysis, apart from the ongoing management of the child after assessment. I refer members to that part of my speech where I queried the ongoing management of the child after assessment in the Department for Family and Community Services.

The whole question of the ongoing management of children is vital, and I also note in the Cooper report a recommendation that the Staff Development Branch be required to determine its capacity and resources to undertake additional training functions. My advice is that because of the burnout factor in relation to many of the existing staff, the numbers of staff absent due to stress-related causes and the higher caseloads in child protection work, little, if anything, is done about the additional training that should apply to ongoing practice issues. Every profession has ongoing training available to its members, and I would have thought that in this rapidly changing field of welfare services, additional academic training would be made available to staff. The Minister does not seem interested in this issue.

The question of absenteeism or resignation of case workers from the department brings up another issue that has been raised with me by agencies that work in the area of family and community services, namely, the lack of stability for clients who cannot work with the same social worker. Several examples were related to me where a second social worker took over a case and disputed to the client the assessment of a former colleague. If the Cooper report recommendations on the qualifications of workers had been implemented (this certainly has not been the case), this sort of incident would largely be overcome.

I also note that existing workers have received little or no encouragement to undertake further postgraduate study in the field of child welfare. That is another recommendation in the Cooper report that has been largely ignored by the Government, a recommendation which I am sure the CEO of the department would be happy to implement if resources were made available and if the will were there to ensure that that happened.

It has become patently obvious that if the department is to do anything about its staff morale and working conditions officers will have to be given time out from child protection work. That occurs in every other profession which is under stress and working in difficult circumstances—at some time or other staff is rotated. If the qualifications of social workers are uniform, it is possible to shift staff so that we do not have this high level of burnout, resulting in the present situation with low morale and a high rate of resignations.

Dr Cooper recommends this, and experienced social workers and others in the department have indicated a similar attitude personally and by telephone. Yet, the Minister fails to take heed and reallocate resources to enable such movement to occur. The Department for Family and Community Services operates with some extremely dedi-

cated professionals. In times of depression—and make no mistake about it, this country has now moved into a financial depression phase—social pressure on families emphasises the work of this department.

It is about time this Government considered shifting resources—especially since we are moving into the budget phase—from the more affluent departments into the Department for Family and Community Services to provide help for families that are in genuine need. The Government has a mandate to do this but is doing nothing. I challenge it to get on with the job. It is intolerable for the Minister to accept such a high burnout, high resignation and high transfer rate among officers in the department without even a wimper in Cabinet. Although more social workers will be employed (in response to last week's advertisement), what about the burnout of existing staff, the heavy case loads, and the ongoing care of children which is not happening? We can safely assume that the department's case load is predominantly child protection work because mandatory reporting has become entrenched in our child welfare system.

I have reservations about the qualifications of those listed in the Community Welfare Act required to report what they believe to be suspected child abuse. Some of those required to report mandatorily are highly qualified, as I am sure members will agree. There is no problem with legally qualified medical practitioners, but I question whether dentists and enrolled nurses are qualified to pick up physical, sexual and psychological abuse. I have no problems with enrolled nurses who work in the casualty department of the ACH because they work in that field all the time, but some enrolled nurses would not have had that training.

Registered psychologists are listed, and they may be able to report. Registered pharmaceutical chemists are also listed: being a registered pharmaceutical chemist myself, I would say that I would be highly unqualified to assess cases of suspected child abuse. I doubt whether registered teachers would even know where to start, despite doing the short course. The list continues with teachers aides, teachers employed in kindergartens, members of the Police Force and social workers, and finishes with a 'class of people declared by regulation', which means that almost anyone can be declared to fall into that category. When talking to people who have completed the five year degree course one finds that child abuse is a minefield, an extremely difficult area which, unless a person is qualified, is best left well alone.

Last week I went to a seminar conducted by the Children's Interests Bureau, which had invited the former Children's Ombudsman of Norway to give a talk. She spoke about parents having no rights, only responsibilities. She then went on to talk about the welfare system in Scandinavia. During questions I raised the matter of how one determines psychological abuse of children, physical abuse being difficult enough to determine. She said, 'We don't have to determine or prove the psychological abuse of children because under our law the department decides whether psychological or physical abuse has taken place. Courts don't decide that; we decide. If we believe it has happened, it has happened and that is the end of the matter.' One wonders whether our department is heading towards the same goal. If it is, I think it will have some difficulty in getting the South Australian community to agree on all aspects. No-one supports or condones any form of abuse of children. Those people who have to eventually assess whether or not an abuse has taken place must be well qualified to make those decisions, and it is up to the legislators to

enshrine in legislation that that will be the case. That is not the case at the moment and I will enlarge on that shortly.

I find difficulty in establishing the Minister's standard procedures in relation to advising alleged perpetrators of their rights. There is plenty of information for victims, but when people come to us, as local members, and ask us to become their advocates I believe the Minister should provide some standards that we can convey to the alleged perpetrators. At present, many of them say that they do not have any rights in the eyes of officers of the department.

It seems to me that the handling and ongoing management of neglected children is not a high priority compared with the handling of abuse cases, and I say that because I believe that abuse cases are easier to prove. Appendix 2 (page 111) of the department's annual report shows a graph which makes my assumption patently obvious, with reported abuse cases continuing out of the graph. It now appears that the department is more and more honing in on child abuse, which certainly is part of its mandate, but is doing less and less for the ongoing management of children in other areas.

I was interested to read chapter 5 of the Cooper Report, which states that, unlike in the medicine and dentistry professions, welfare practice is not directly observed by supervisors. In the medicine, dentistry and pharmacy professions there are the Medical Board, Dental Board and Pharmacy Board respectively, and they provide the peer group review, an overview and the standards to ensure that the profession is run correctly. The ability of boards and other professions to register and deregister, as well as provide a peer group review mechanism, sets the stage for accountability.

In her report Dr Cooper highlighted the need for supervision and peer group reviews by appropriately qualified staff. It happens in every other profession, and there is no reason why the Minister should not implement it within the Department for Family and Community Services. I am advised that, despite the 1988 report, there is no formal monitoring, and that the Government has run down staff levels to the extent that the CEO would be hard pressed to implement any supervision or peer group review as is the norm in other professions in this State. At page 94, the report states:

In the child welfare area workers are required to make difficult and complex decisions about the needs of children and families. In many instances judgments are not clear cut, decisions being based on workers' understandings of the capacity of mothers and fathers to parent children adequately. Furthermore, in DCW this complex work is the responsibility of junior staff with the least experience with inadequate qualifications—

I repeat: 'with inadequate qualifications'—

Society is entitled to know that such decisions are overseen, that procedures are followed and that the rationale for judgments is clearly stated. This process requires that workers are accountable for the decisions made, and that they are assisted in this process by effective supervision.

Whilst there has been the general nodding of heads in the department to this part of the report, my advice is that it has not been implemented. This area of quality assurance and accountability is vital. It is so vital that perhaps the Minister might like to explain to the House his failure to follow through the Government's commitment during the 1989-90 budget estimates committees 'to develop quality assurance procedures in the department for FACS in accordance with the recommendations of the Cooper report', and also explain why the unit is not up and running despite the fact that a manager was appointed to carry out this very important function.

I will now deal with the very difficult area of client complaints. Every member in this House would experience one or two such complaints each year. Certainly, since I

became Opposition spokesman in this area, I have received two or three complaints each month. People come to us in a state of conflict and ask us to be their representative and advocate. They are always very difficult and it is very hard to play an advocate role despite the expectations of those we represent.

Other than going to their local MP, the Ombudsman or some other welfare agency, clients who wish to complain about the handling of a case which personally involves them have only the department itself to go to. They come to us in that atmosphere where there has been conflict, where a departmental officer has made an assessment based on an observation which has led to this reasonable suspicion of abuse, an assessment that will not sit comfortably with an accused. Those who think they have been wronged come to us or go to the department and seek some sort of justice. They can either go to their local district office or some other agency, going up the ladder, but eventually they reach the stage where they do not get satisfaction. I know it can be argued that the department has its own consumer advocate to handle complaints, but members would agree, I am sure, that the consumer advocate within the department is really Caesar judging Caesar.

I would hope that all members would welcome a call for a position to be created in this State for a community welfare ombudsman, a position about which some time ago the former Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. Greg Crafter) spoke, as have other Ombudsmen. It does not sit comfortably with the existing office, but it is something that we should stop talking about. As Minister, I would implement it and I am sure it would be welcomed by the broad community and, particularly, members of this House. Because of the nature of FACS complaints, which usually centre around the social worker's personal interpretation of 'reasonable suspicion of abuse having occurred', the grey area of adjudication does not sit comfortably within the Ombudsman's Act as it is presently written. In the absence of a professional registration board, for which I have called, it would be my intention to set up such an independent person qualified to hear these complaints, and I hope I would be supported by members of both sides. Such an office would be well received and I believe would assist in dealing with the trauma which many people experience. At page 160, the Cooper report makes several observations and recommendations which, I gather from the number of phone calls I have received, have had scant attention from the Minister. The report states:

The problem of inadequate practice is documented and it appears that few base grade workers possess the necessary knowledge and skills to be able to effectively control casework practice.

As I have travelled around to some of the regional offices and met some of the staff, I can say this certainly does not apply to all of them because, clearly, I met some very experienced and dedicated officers. Nevertheless, Dr Cooper is a highly qualified academic, and if she makes these observations in her report we must take careful note and react to them. She also noted that 'some workers had indicated that morale is low'. I can confirm this from the numbers of past and present staff members who have telephoned my office. Dr Cooper was concerned that 'in a situation where poor morale exists, and where decisions about practice are removed to a community forum, the willingness of workers to take responsibility for the scrutiny of their own child welfare practice may be diminished'. She added: 'This situation is compounded by the number of workers who do not have professional training or even specialist skills in child welfare practice.'

These observations come as a surprise to me and I am sure to all members who read the report. The confusion has

arisen in the minds of both MPs and the public because the department calls all its workers 'social workers' whether they possess an Associate Diploma, or a Degree from the SAIT or Flinders University. It goes without saying that the curriculum for the courses varies considerably. Dr Cooper recommended both internal and external mechanisms to examine the day-to-day practice of the department. She recommended that for external scrutiny of practice, the most important mechanisms are: provision of external complaints procedures for clients; information about access to complaint procedures; and the provision of information about clients' rights. Time will not allow me to complete this speech, but I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): As the closing contributor, I offer my support to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply on this the last occasion on which His Excellency the Governor will make his opening day address from the throne of another place. He indicated to us that it would be his last, and I compliment him on his dedication and that of Lady Dunstan. He has served South Australia with dignity and dedication, and I am sure that, in expressing my sincere appreciation to His Excellency and Lady Dunstan, I have the unanimous support of the House.

In passing, I mention that I always found a particular warmth and humanity in His Excellency. On one occasion some months ago, my daughter Angela was involved in nursing a member of Lady Dunstan's family. We in my home were all touched by the genuine warmth of His Excellency and Lady Dunstan who, from that day, never failed to enquire whenever I encountered them at public functions as to my daughter's well-being. I repeat I am sure my sentiments carry the unanimous endorsement of this House. We wish His Excellency and Lady Dunstan a long and rewarding life beyond Government House.

I will now make a few remarks concerning the controversy that has already been touched upon by the member for Gilles, and I refer to the current furore over a football club breaking ranks to join the VFL under its new title of the AFL. This would be the worst case of sporting morality since the Bodyline series nearly split what was then the British Empire. We have ever fewer examples today of sportsmanship that young people can look up to. Even the Olympic Games was contaminated by the drug-supported victory of Ben Johnson and his subsequent disqualification.

The AFL (or VFL as we tend to think of it), with its Victorian arrogance, has never given any consideration to the well-being of South Australian football. Faced with its demands for participation, such as the \$4 million up-front payment, the South Australian National Football League endeavoured to negotiate entry into the AFL competition in a way that would somehow still preserve the 113 year-old SANFL competition and its traditions. The SANFL refused to be dictated to by the AFL. Following that, the AFL spat the dummy. In an act of spite and vindictiveness, the AFL refused to conduct an interstate match, giving quite spurious grounds for so doing.

Furthermore, they then set out to bribe a South Australian club to break ranks, despite a pact between all 10 clubs that none of them would negotiate separately. The AFL set out to induce a club to do so, using one of the worst cases of a forged document since the Zinoviev letter. For those who are not familiar with the Zinoviev letter, I point out that it was produced in England in 1924, four days before the 1924 election, in order to influence the result of that election.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: I well remember it.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: The member for Napier is almost old enough to remember the Zinoviev letter, but not

quite. It allegedly came from Zinoviev, the head of the Comintern, and was supposedly calling upon the British trade union movement to rise up in armed insurrection. Most of the history books give a great deal of attention to the effect that a forged document can have.

Certainly, a forged document had a great deal of effect recently in the negotiations in relation to the admission of a club into the AFL. A document was produced that would appeal to the pride of Port Adelaide as a club and to the stupidity and cupidity of its board, but indeed it was a document that was apparently based on a lie. The AFL's current attempt to subvert the South Australian competition is apparently based on a criminal forgery. If that is the case, Schwabb and Oakley must be graduates of the business school of Ananias. They must believe that Ethics is just a county in England!

I quote from an article in the *News* of 9 August this year, by Leon Bignell, as follows:

Norwood general manager, Mr Wally Miller, said today the West Coast Eagles advocate and a member of the AFL commission, Mr John Adams, together with the Carlton executive director, Mr Ian Collins, approached the club with a proposal to join the AFL. They came to South Australia last month with a proposal and a letter typed by them on behalf of the Norwood club to be signed by the Norwood 'Chairman' Mr Nerio Ferraro. Their first mistake was the Norwood Football Club always refers to that leadership role as 'President'.

Later, the article points out:

Norwood stood by its intention to stick with the SANFL, and sent the two-man delegation away...The AFL men then went to the Port club and 'floated' the same deal. They produced that 'letter' of their own manufacture. Someone later leaked the 'Norwood Letter' to the media.

It is interesting to note:

The faxed document carries the number of John Adams' Melbourne office.

This is the same individual who is the advocate for the West Coast Eagles and a member of the AFL Commission. Lawrie McCauley of the *Advertiser* said:

I believe Port was bluffed into thinking another club was negotiating with the AFL. It fell hook, line and sinker—which was easy to do considering the 'leaked' document was so well constructed.

So, the board of one of our oldest and proudest clubs has been led by the nose and fell for this forgery, hook, line and sinker. Instead of having an honourable role in South Australian football history from now on, the board faces the risk that it may be placing the club of Quinn in the category of Quislings, and of going from Motley to Machiavelli and from Big Bob to Benedict Arnold and has decided to cast itself in the role of pirate and pariah. In the halls of football fame in this State, on the honours list where there are football heroes, there will in future be no place for the proud Port Adelaide club, if what is under way at the moment is carried through to fruition. The Port Adelaide Football Club will be seen as a fifth columnist; in going about the deal in this particular way it is losing great potential support.

There is, of course, some support for this move by the Port Adelaide Football Club. Eighty to 90 per cent of its loyal followers will close ranks behind it and give it the loyalty that the club itself was not prepared to give to the South Australian National Football League. As well as that core of dedicated Port Adelaide supporters, there will be available a fraction of the potential support that could have been gained elsewhere from other clubs. However, the board of the Port Adelaide Football Club expects the entire football league to fall in behind it in solid support, with a great deal of gall and chutzpah, which reminds me of the story of the young man who killed his parents and then pleaded for mercy from the court for now being an orphan!

The board seriously expects the SA Football League to hand over Football Park as a venue for it.

One letter to the editor that I saw pointed it out rather well. This contributor said, in effect, that it was similar to someone having their spouse run away with one of the neighbours and then finding the neighbour has the gall to ask for some money to pay for a hotel room for the night or, alternatively, perhaps, to use the original person's bedroom. That is what it amounts to, with the Port Adelaide Football Club's insistence on being able to use Football Park.

Some people, in analysing the situation, suggest that this is analogous to what happened when Kerry Packer made a great impact on the world of cricket with his World Series Cricket. However, the analogy is not a correct one. On that occasion a rival competition was set up parallel to the existing competition and in rivalry to it. In a situation where we are in effect being told by the AFL that Port Adelaide is South Australia, Port Adelaide is the one and only club that will represent South Australia, and that all South Australians will support the Port Adelaide Football Club, the analogous situation to that would be if Kerry Packer, several years ago, had said, 'Right, we will take the Queensland team and we will call that Australia. We will enter it in an international competition and we will expect all the other five States to support and barrack for Queensland.'

It will not happen. The supporters from other clubs have their proud traditions too and an overwhelming majority of them will not support the Port Adelaide Football Club. It will not get the financial support it needs; it will not get the attendances that are required; there will not be the potential crowds of barrackers that could be there in the case of a composite club; it will not have the strength to be able to compete in the AFL without the support of the rest of South Australia. Port Adelaide runs the risk of being the chopping block of the competition. What will be the attitude then of the proud supporters of a proud club when that happens and they become just a small fish in a big pond? To succeed in a national competition, a team has to have very broadly spread support in its base area. The Sydney Swans are struggling. The Swans are operating in a city where the majority of the population are at best apathetic and at worst antipathetic to the success of that club. The Brisbane Bears face the same problem. They also operate in a city where three-quarters of the population does not support them.

In the *Advertiser* of 13 August the Chairman of the Port Adelaide board said this about his club being entered into the AFL:

If you sit down and look at the facts, it is the only way to go. You only have to look at Western Australia to see the effects of a composite team.

That is true so far as the team's success is concerned. One does have to look at Western Australia to see the effects of a composite team. The West Coast Eagles are running third in the AFL competition at the moment. They get massive attendances at their matches when they are played in Western Australia because they have an entire city behind them. The supporters of all clubs in Western Australia rally behind the West Coast Eagles. If we had a composite team in the AFL, that is the situation that we would have here.

The fact that this current move will be unviable, because the majority of the football population of South Australia does not support it, is the reason why no other club seriously contemplated this option when it was put to them. Several years ago other clubs, including Norwood, were approached with a similar proposition to that of Port Adelaide but they did their sums and said that it could not be done. Norwood and Glenelg have supporting bases which are slightly smaller

but which are still on the same level as those of Port Adelaide. But they did their calculations and, with 20 to 25 per cent of the population supporting them, and the other 75 per cent openly hostile, it is just not a feasible proposition.

As I have just indicated, other clubs' supporters have their pride, too. I quote from three contributions that appeared in the letters to the editor page in the *Advertiser* of 10 August. The first is from Mr Jeff Crawford as follows:

The one thing that has been constantly repeated by Port Adelaide officials and certain supporters is that now the move to enter the AFL has been made it should go ahead, their logic being that people have short memories and would soon back the Magpies.

They would not be the Magpies any longer, I point out. They would have to surrender that title. The letter goes on:

If people involved in South Australian football had such short memories then Port's great tradition, which we are reminded of incessantly, would not exist. I have only one question for the Port Adelaide people who are backing the move: What if it were Norwood? Would you sit back and gladly watch Simon Tregenza and Gavin Wanganeen don the red-and-blue? Would you calmly accept your team becoming second-rate while Norwood cornered the South Australian football market? Think about it, and answer yourself honestly.

A West Torrens supporter, Mr Chugg of Lockleys, says:

We go to see Torrens every week and go to every State game, but we will never go to see Port Adelaide in the AFL because they have no honour.

Further on, a Mr Scholefield, of Rosslyn Park, states:

Victoria should not have it all ways: retaining all its local clubs, destroying local competition in South Australia and Western Australia and distorting the national league by adding it on to the VFL... If Port believed the SANFL should join the AFL it can almost certainly have persuaded the other clubs. Had the SANFL been offered the conditions which Port has been offered, it would have joined the AFL. It is totally unacceptable for the AFL to offer those conditions to Port, but not the SANFL.

It is interesting that the very conditions that the AFL told our people were unacceptable—conditions that could not possibly be met—are suddenly made available in its spiteful and vindictive effort to woo one of the South Australian clubs to break ranks.

I put it on the public record that, if Port Adelaide is admitted to the AFL under these circumstances, as long as I live—with one exception that I will come to in a moment—I will never attend one of its games. I believe that there are hundreds and thousands of South Australians who are supporters of other clubs out there in the community who feel the same way as I do. I did mention one exception: if Port Adelaide does play Collingwood, where someone close to my family is involved, I will attend that particular match—but it will be to barrack for Collingwood. Furthermore, I believe that not only will supporters of other clubs not support those matches with their attendance, I think that some of them may go a lot further and boycott those sponsors who betray this State by supporting the Port Adelaide Football Club in the AFL, by advertising on AFL television matches telecast in South Australia or in any other way being associated with something that is so objectionable to South Australians. And it is objectionable to South Australians.

I quote from Margaret Ralston on page 55 of the *News* of 2 August. Without giving the name of the person who had written to her, she quoted the letter as follows:

I always believed that Port Adelaide were true blue Australians who would stick by their mates in times of peril... You know, like carrying their mates out of the battleline or sharing a feed. How wrong I was. Their method of entry to the Victorian competition has left me cold.

Here is the bit that really caught my eye when I read this last week. The anonymous letter writer (I do not know whether it is a male or a female), stated:

They agreed with their mates to leave the apple on the tree until it ripened to be shared by everyone. Instead, one dark night they sneak down, steal it and eat it all themselves, then declare everyone else had the same opportunity. How bloody un-Australian can you get?

I congratulate the South Australian Football League on the principled stand that it has taken in relation to the bribe offered by the AFL to the Port Adelaide Football Club to break ranks against an openly reached agreement and I wish the SANFL total success in its endeavours. Some football followers have reacted with a shrug of their shoulders, implying that what has unfolded so far is just business. Perhaps there is an ever-increasing element of business in sport, but what distinguishes sport from business is the concept of sportsmanship itself, as distinct from gamesmanship. Without that ethical concept of fair play and decency, football totally ceases to be a sport. We are all the losers if it becomes just another commercial activity, only one step removed from television wrestling.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I would like to raise the issue of the possibility of Australia having its own royal family. I am putting the proposition that we consider having, within Australia, our own resident royal family. I am not suggesting that members opposite, or on this side, become the members of that royal family. I also do not have in mind the Bonds, the Skases, the Packers or the Murdochs. In no sense am I reflecting on the present Queen of Australia, her family, the Governor-General or the State Governors. I believe that the Queen has done, and is doing, an excellent job, as are the Governors of Australia and the Governor-General. I made that quite clear in my Address in Reply speech when I expressed my loyalty to the Queen as well as my appreciation for the work done by the Governor.

An honourable member: Who's on the short list?

Mr SUCH: I will get to that in a minute, but I do not think you're on it. I am suggesting that the British Royal Family offers the potential for us to take members from it—obviously with their consent—to establish our own resident royal family. I realise that this proposition is not without difficulty, but it has many advantages. As I indicated, there are many members of the British Royal Family who could be considered, as a group or as individuals, to start this royal family.

Members interjecting:

Mr SUCH: Well, like most of us, Mr Deputy Speaker, they would become Australian over time. I am not excluding royals of other nationalities marrying into our royal family if it is established. There is also the possibility of a commoner marrying into that family. I will not go through their particular titles in detail, but some of the current or potential successors to the throne are as follows: the Prince of Wales, Prince William of Wales, Prince Henry of Wales, the Duke of York, Prince Edward, the Princess Royal, Peter Phillips, Zara Phillips, Princess Margaret, Viscount Linley, Lady Zarah Armstrong-Jones, the Duke of Gloucester, the Earl of Ulster, and so the list goes on. I appreciate that there would need to be some fundamental changes to our Constitution.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will retain the decorum of the proceedings. The member for Fisher.

Mr SUCH: They are obviously not royal family material. As has been demonstrated tonight, they do not know when to keep quiet.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I would hate to see in *Hansard* the fact that I, as the member for Napier, representing an electorate which has predominantly British-born constituents, have been seen and portrayed by the honourable member as a republican.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr SUCH: I am not implying that at all. In fact, one of the reasons for suggesting this proposal is that I believe that there are a lot of advantages in having a monarchical system. I believe that, unless we take some steps along this path, inevitably the republican cause will succeed. It may be a long time off, but I believe that in due course it will succeed. I believe that the monarchical system is preferable to a presidential system, and it avoids many of the worst aspects of Party-motivated appointments. I believe that we could avoid that by establishing our own Australian royal family. Another advantage is that the royal family would provide the head of the nation and reinforce the importance of family, and I believe that that is a worthwhile objective. It also provides the opportunity for people of all backgrounds to be united behind our own resident royal family. It would also allow for the possibility of knighthoods or other appropriate awards which are traditionally associated with a monarchical system.

I turn to some of the problems. I am not saying that this would happen overnight, because it obviously would not. One of the difficulties with the scheme would be the question of religion, given that in Australia there are two very large religious groups, namely, Anglican and Catholic, plus many other diverse groups. That would be one of the major difficulties with the scheme, but I believe that it could be addressed.

An honourable member: Which one would you choose?

Mr SUCH: I will come to that in a minute. One of the problems to which I alluded earlier was the extent to which the Constitution would need to be amended. I believe that we have plenty of capable lawyers who could provide advice in that area. The question of the relationship between a resident Royal Family and State Governors would also need to be worked out, and also the numbers who would be involved in the initiation of this development. Clearly it cannot happen quickly, but I believe it is worth considering. It needs to be thoroughly considered and debated, with the public having its say together with other groups in the community. It may be rejected out of hand.

People may see it as having little merit, but I believe it should be considered sensibly and rationally, because the alternative is that we are unfortunately heading down the road towards a republican system. I believe that this proposition provides a sensible and viable alternative whereby we can retain the best traditions of a monarchical system. It is an inclusive system, to use the jargon of social justice strategy, because it would not preclude a commoner, for example, from being included within that Royal Family. In that sense, any resident of Australia who met the normal criteria of citizenship and so on would be eligible. That has happened in England in recent times, so there is no reason why it could not happen here.

I believe it would tackle what is a difficult situation at the moment where some people do not feel strongly towards what they see as an English monarch, even though the

Queen is the Queen of Australia. In a real sense it would be following in the traditions of which we are all part. Most of us have come directly or historically via connections overseas, and I believe this would continue those traditions. I believe it would have the support of Aboriginal people because, in my view, there would be no reason, need or desire to exclude them from being part of the system, and I do not believe they should be excluded. Whilst it might be seen initially as a fairly radical suggestion, I believe it has merit. The member for Hartley might be disappointed that he is not on the short list, but his work chairing the Select Committee on the Operation of the Worker's Liens Act has certainly raised him high in my estimation, so we should not totally discard him. I believe that this whole matter should be discussed. I am not saying that it will happen, but I believe it has merit. It should be examined on its merits rationally and sensibly.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): After my heavy remarks, which I am sure everyone here, including you, Mr Deputy Speaker, took on board about Judas Iscariot and Benedict Arnold and betrayal, I should like to turn away from football to something which is, in many respects, a lighter matter but one which I take seriously in this instance, even though it may seem trivial, and that is giving recognition to historic monuments and the purposes for which they were erected in the first place.

If one walks down King William Street towards the Torrens, alongside the Elder Park Rotunda, immediately adjacent to the footpath, one will see a small memorial consisting of a marble dome which rests on four marble pillars and which covers a drinking fountain. It carries an inscription indicating that it is the Fireman Gardner Memorial, erected 103 years ago. Until recently it carried a brass plaque which indicated that Fireman Gardner had met his death on Christmas Eve in a fire in Rundle Street in 1886 and that that monument had been erected by public subscription.

Some weeks ago the brass plaque disappeared from that monument. It may be that the vandals who took away the brass plaque that was on the Peace Park Memorial, which was the subject of some controversy, might have been responsible for this. But whatever the circumstances, I call on the Adelaide City Council to expedite its replacement to restore a small but interesting part of our history.

Having noticed the absence of that plaque, I went away and researched the reason for its original existence. With the assistance of the Parliamentary Library, I was able to uncover some interesting documents, and I will take the time of the House for a little while this afternoon to read the contents of some of those documents.

One, from the Adelaide City Council archives, the Mayor's Report of 1886-87, carries this description (page 17):

THE GARDNER MEMORIAL FOUNTAIN

A very beautiful marble fountain, the cost of which was borne by subscription, has been erected on the Rotunda lawn abutting on the King William Road, in memory of Fireman John A. H. Gardner, who lost his life at the fire in Rundle Street on Christmas Eve last.

The design is Gothic, the top being of Kapunda marble, and the pillars of polished Port Victor granite.

That struck me as being interesting, because they are the same two materials from the same two sources as the building in which we are currently housed, the upper part being of Barossa Valley marble and the lower half being of Victor Harbor granite. The description goes on:

It stands 9 feet high, and is an artistic piece of workmanship, and at the same time a useful acquisition to the Rotunda reserve, for a fountain at which water could be obtained was greatly needed here. The work was designed and executed by Mr Herring,

whilst Mr D. F. Harrison kindly gave the piping and laid the water on. While all regretted the circumstances which led to the erection of the fountain, they still found pleasure in showing their respect to the memory of the deceased. A monument has been erected over his grave at a cost of £50, and the fountain has been put up at an expense of £100, and the whole of the money, as far as possible, has been received in shilling subscriptions. Fireman Gardner fell at his post of duty, and the least we can do is to keep his name green in our memories.

The sum of £100 in the 1880s would have been a quite substantial amount of money in today's value. It shows in what high regard the heroism of this officer of the Fire Brigade was held, that public subscription, in shilling donations, was able to raise that sum of money.

The minutes of the Adelaide City Council meeting of 21 March 1887 state:

Pursuant to notice Alderman Shaw moved—

That the City Council grant permission to the Committee of the 'Gardner Memorial Fund,' to erect the memorial fountain obtained by public subscription in memory of John A. H. Gardner (who lost his life at the late fire in Rundle Street), in the Rotunda Reserve, on a site to be indicated by the Council, and that this Corporation thereupon accept the care and control of the fountain.

Motion put and passed.

I hope that, in line with its 'care and control of the fountain', it will soon return the plaque. The site was chosen by the council's Public Works Committee at a meeting on 28 March 1887, as indicated in the minutes. Under item 97, 'Gardner Memorial Fountain', it is stated:

The City Surveyor reported that, accompanied by Alderman Shaw, he had inspected the Rotunda Reserve with a view of selecting a site for the erection of the 'Gardner' Memorial Fountain.

Recommended—Of the sites reported upon, the Council approve the erection of the fountain 'one foot west of the King William Road fence, and nearly opposite the junction of the Exhibition New Road with King William Road.'

The circumstances in which Fireman Gardner died are well outlined in two documents. One is the *Adelaide Observer* of 1 January 1887 and another is a book on the history of the South Australian fire services written by Michael Page entitled '*Muscle and Pluck Forever!*'. The latter describes how, at about 7.30 p.m. on Christmas Eve, the streets of Adelaide were crammed with merry makers, sightseers, and last-minute shoppers.

It mentions a sudden burst of flame in the window of R.C. Castle and Co, a three-storey drapery store. It involved a sudden blaze which a bystander later attributed to some ribbons, or something of that sort blowing across a gas jet. One of the neighbours of that building was the Academy of Music Theatre, which was unfortunate enough to have been burnt out twice before. There was Mr Cunningham's Fancy Goods Store—presumably, no relation to Cunninghams Warehouse elsewhere in Adelaide today—and Cornish's Jewellery. A description is given of the blaze, which went up very quickly:

... Rundle Street was choked with a gigantic crowd ... thousands of people came streaming across the parklands rushing to the scene ... having seen the great tower of flames. Soon they were arriving from Port Adelaide, and the police had to divert the horse trams and buses hauling them into the city. But despite the mobs of spectators, nobody thought to advise the fire brigade about the fire. The police were distracted by attempts to control the crowd and to clear people out of nearby shops and buildings. Presumably all the spectators took it for granted that someone else had raised the alarm. Eventually the people from the station arrived and were received with groans and hisses because of their delayed arrival.

The description goes on further:

The interior of Cunningham's large store, chockful of toys and fancy goods exploded like a bomb. Shearing, whom the crowd had groaned and hissed at a few minutes earlier, made an immediate attempt to save the building. He called two of his men,

Albert Clark and John Gardner, away from the group in front of Castle's and told them to follow him with their hose. The water had not yet been turned on to it. They followed him about 15 feet into the store, and he positioned them to fight the blaze and turned to hurry out and turn on the water. Just as he did so the roof fell in 'on the stroke of 8 by the town clock'.

Gardner died instantly and Clark lived a little longer. There is then a rather morbid description of his final screams, the newspapers of that day being rather graphic in their detail. It is interesting to note that even in those days there were difficulties with emergency services not having all the facilities it was believed they required. The Superintendent of the Fire Brigade pointed out the following:

When we arrived in Rundle Street we had as full a pressure as we could expect, but during the summer months the pressure is not sufficient to play on a fire until the water is localised by the turncocks, which process occupies from half an hour to three-quarters of an hour.

In other words, until the other people in the vicinity had their water cut off, there would not have been enough water coming through to fight the fire. The Superintendent goes on to state:

While referring to this, perhaps I may as well add that it is considered necessary that a steam-engine for casting water should be provided, I gave my opinion on this subject last year, I think.

Obviously, like me, he never missed the opportunity to point out when inadequate equipment was provided to carry out one's work. He continued:

... and I consider that such an engine should be procured for the protection of the city. Very high buildings are now being erected, and with our present means of conveying water a great deal of time must elapse until sufficient pressure is given to us by the turncock to reach the upper stories of these buildings. If we had a steam-engine we could throw water almost immediately after arrival on any of the buildings in Adelaide—in fact, within eight minutes after leaving our stations, i.e., the time taken up for raising 100lb of steam, the quantity required to work the engine.

It is interesting to note another article in the same edition of the *Adelaide Observer* of 1 January 1887.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In the 10 minutes allocated to me tonight I would like to refer to the State's bid for the Commonwealth Games. From the outset I congratulate the Premier, and the Minister at the table and also the member for Hanson for their involvement. Anything that brings the sporting fraternity to Australia and to South Australia in particular should be congratulated, particularly given some of the problems in the Middle East. It is better to see people taking out their frustrations on the sporting fields than perhaps in other more deadly pursuits.

The benefits that will accrue to Australia are enormous, in my opinion. Australia has a good reputation overseas and increasingly so; indeed, I believe the already increasing number of people visiting Australia will further increase dramatically should we be successful in the bid for the 1998 Commonwealth Games. Obviously, the amount of money that the State has to put in would be more than recouped, as has been demonstrated by the manner in which the Grand Prix has assisted business people, employees and employers throughout South Australia.

It is interesting to note the large percentage of South Australians who have supported the bid for the Commonwealth Games. I understand that 75 per cent (in round figures) have supported what I believe will be a fantastic event, if we are fortunate enough to be successful against those other overseas bids. We are advised that the event will cost \$60 million to stage, but it is also expected to earn \$60 million if the Federal Government contributes \$20 million.

As I pointed out, the games would provide economic, social and sporting spin-offs for South Australia. The breakdown of the State's bid for the games (from the *Advertiser* of 16 June) is as follows:

The breakdown of the State's bid is \$20 million for capital works, \$3.2 million for the organising committee, \$5.5 million for revenue raising, \$15.8 million for head office, \$1.5 million for public affairs, and \$14 million for operations.

Income is expected to be \$60 million, with \$20 million being sought from the Federal Government, \$17 million in sponsorship, \$12 million from tickets and \$11 million from merchandising.

It is pleasing to note that the Opposition is giving bipartisan support to the project. On a more parochial matter, members can expect that I will be absolutely delighted with the fact that the western suburbs of Adelaide will benefit from this event. As we all know, the South Australian National Football League headquarters at West Lakes is a fantastic sporting stadium and, in my opinion, it is one of the best, if not the best, in Australia. The stadium has seating for 50 000 visitors with undercover concourse seating for up to 18 000 people in the outer section. The other features include floodlighting; comprehensive media facilities; a fully serviced viewing platform with access lift for the disabled; modern weight-training facilities; and 42 corporate units and 107 corporate boxes. Satellite television is beamed into the bars and dining areas and the reception room has a capacity for 400 guests as well as a fully serviced dining room.

Football Park stadium is well serviced by public transport and has parking facilities for 8 000 cars. It is only 10 minutes from the domestic and international airport terminals. Football Park is readily accessible to the centre of Adelaide and it takes at most about 20 minutes to travel from the heart of the city to Football Park. I would hope that, by 1998, should we be successful in our bid for the games, the remainder of West Lakes Boulevard from the Sabco intersection to the Port Road will be fully widened and beautified to provide what would be an excellent venue for the opening and closing ceremonies at Football Park.

As members are aware, the residents of the western suburbs of Adelaide will benefit quite considerably in relation to employment, especially in the catering area. Many years ago I remember the member for Coles bringing into this House an A4 size piece of paper, which I understand she picked up in Tasmania and which indicated that nearly every business or group in the community benefits from tourism. I cannot think of any South Australian business community that would not benefit from the Commonwealth Games.

I am absolutely delighted that the West Lakes Bowling Club will also be one of the venues that will be used for

the Commonwealth Games, should our bid succeed. It is an excellent venue with ample space for the extension of the club rooms and for an additional bowling rink. I was a foundation member of that club, and I take great pride in being involved with it. It is one of the four clubs involved in the West Lakes Community Club which, together with its management, supported very strongly our bid for the 1998 Commonwealth Games.

I commend the past President of the West Lakes Bowling Club (Mr Peter Gebert), who is one of my constituents, for the manner in which he and his executive, together with other executive members of the various clubs in the West Lakes Community Club, got together and made a very quick and positive decision to bid for the games. That action should be placed on the public record. They are excellent people with a tremendous amount of business acumen and knowledge of how to get the best out of those facilities. I have no doubt, given the past experiences of the West Lakes Bowling Club—the number of bowlers and the success that the club has had in the bowling competition—that our overseas guests and players will be absolutely delighted with that venue.

The other venues that will be utilised in South Australia include the entertainment centre, the Adelaide Aquatic Centre and the Basketball Association's stadium, and these venues will provide more opportunities for employment in this State.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: As my colleague the member for Napier says, it is exciting for the future of this State. It proves that South Australia has a good reputation within Australia, and I believe that that can be directly attributed not only to the business community, which has worked very closely with Cabinet, but also to the leadership of the Premier. I believe that everyone in this House will congratulate him and the Lord Mayor of Adelaide for their involvement. I know that I have missed a few people, but I am excited about this, and I look forward to participating in some of those events as the local member—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: No, not participating in the games, but assisting local people, particularly in the opening and closing events. Whoever thought up that idea is very intelligent, and I know my constituents would applaud such a decision.

Motion carried.

At 5.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 16 August at 11 a.m.