

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 14 August 1991

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

PETITION: FREE STUDENT TRAVEL

A petition signed by 613 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide special trains and buses for free travelling passengers during school travelling times and retain existing numbers of guards was presented by Mr S.J. Baker.

Petition received.

PETITION: JUVENILE RESTRICTIONS

A petition signed by 378 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to restrict juvenile access to materials used for graffiti, restrict free student travel on public transport and increase penalties for juvenile offenders was presented by Mr S.J. Baker.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MOUNT LOFTY RANGES AND BAROSSA VALLEY REVIEWS

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. S.M. LENEHAN**: I wish to inform the House on progress with the planning reviews which are currently being undertaken for two important areas of the State, namely, the Mount Lofty Ranges and the Barossa Valley. The Mount Lofty Ranges review began in 1987 and included the preparation of a consultative management plan and the preparation of a strategy report, released in July 1990. An interim supplementary development plan, later amended, was introduced concurrently with the release of the strategy report, in order to prevent speculative development activity occurring prior to longer-term planning and management strategies being brought into effect.

Since the strategy report was introduced, a joint Government and local government steering committee has been established and a working group is undertaking the preparation of a management plan. Statutory planning policies outlined in this plan will be contained in a regional supplementary development plan to replace the interim SDP currently in force. The review will also be liaising closely with the planning review concerning implementation matters, particularly in relation to the notion of a regional coordinating body. It is anticipated that public documents will be available for public comment by the end of the year, so that the community has another opportunity to make an input on the proposed policies for this important area of the State.

I now refer to the Barossa Valley review. In 1989, the Barossa District Councils, plus the District Council of Kapunda, proposed a major review for the Barossa Valley with the goal of determining 'the desired economic and environmental future of the Barossa Valley'. A steering committee was formed and, in August 1990, this committee requested me to introduce an SDP to maintain the *status quo* while a draft strategies report was released for public

consultation in October 1990. The final strategies report produced by the consultants (and reflecting comments received during public consultation) has been endorsed by the councils as a basis for future actions.

Strategies proposed in the report for the future development of the Barossa Valley are based on the premise that the region has special and unifying characteristics of culture, heritage, landscape, viticulture and winemaking which merit particular attention being paid to their retention and enhancement for the future benefit of residents, visitors and the State as a whole. Without such attention there is a fear that the Barossa Valley's character will be compromised. To implement the recommendations of the strategy report a management strategy and a more comprehensive regional SDP will be produced to replace the current interim provisions. This work will commence later this month and should be completed by the end of the year.

QUESTION TIME

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): What action has the Treasurer taken to ensure that all potentially illegal interstate insurance activities conducted by SGIC and its subsidiaries comply fully with section 51 (14) of the Commonwealth Constitution, other Commonwealth insurance laws and section 12 (1) of the SGIC Act?

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: These matters were part of the examination by the committee that I established, which has reported very fully. The committee has raised a number of these issues. Last week I indicated to the House that we intended to pick up nearly every recommendation made by that group, that some legal and technical matters were identified, and that these will be pursued and rectified. I will report to the House when I am in a position to do so.

YOUTH CRIME RATE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I direct my question to the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General in another place. Will he advise the House whether there has been a huge jump in youth crime as claimed by the Opposition and as reported in the *News* last Monday? The front page story, which carried no comments from any relevant Minister, claimed that the figure to the end of March 1991 showed dramatic increases in most categories of juvenile crime. The Opposition has reportedly claimed that the figures could be explained only by a lack of police resources.

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: I thank the honourable member for his question and I will obtain a full, detailed analysis of the current statistics for him and for all members so that this matter can be put into its proper context. South Australia, along with most other communities throughout the world, is facing an increase in crime. However, that increase must be put into its proper context and, in this instance, the Opposition spokesperson has tried to distort the facts with respect to the increase of crime in this State. The record needs to be put straight, it needs to be put on a proper statistical basis, as well as an analysis of the context in which it is occurring in our community.

Anyone who has read the documents accompanying the past three budgets would know that the resources provided to our Police Department increased in each budget and that

we in this State enjoy an excellent police service in excess of that which applies in any other State in this country.

Mr Brindal: Why don't you tell that to the victims?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: With respect to victims, I remind the House that the laws and provisions that apply in this State are not only the best in this country but are regarded as among the best in the world. Indeed, they are a model for the world in the provision of support, financial and otherwise, to the victims of crime. We can be very proud of that. The Opposition cannot have it both ways. While it calls for more police and a greater police effort, that results in a greater number of people being brought before the courts and being apprehended for various crimes in our community. We have developed a very successful strategy for community policing, and that strategy will continue to evolve and bring more and more people before the courts and deal with them in an appropriate way.

The Director of Crime Statistics has advised me that the increase in the number of break and enters, for example, is 11.4 per cent, and the number of break and enter offences involving dwellings is actually down on last year. The figures to which the Hon. Mr Irwin referred in recent press statements simply do not relate to the actual figures that are provided by the official statistician in this area.

We can go through these statistics one after the other, and I will obtain the relevant information for all members, so that this debate can be put on a proper and sound basis and not be distorted by the Opposition for cheap political tactics.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Why did the Treasurer ignore the advice of his senior Government advisers, tendered in the 1984-85 annual report of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, and not insist as far back as 1984 that SGIC obey all the prudential rules that govern its private sector competitors?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is another matter that has been very fully canvassed in the report, and I refer the honourable member to it. It is very interesting: we had a debate about this last Thursday. I suppose that some members could be forgiven if they had not heard what the Leader was saying in his speech: it was not delivered in the most riveting way. But it is interesting that both the honourable member sitting next to him and the Leader himself seem to have forgotten what was said.

He must have been in some sort of catatonic haze when he read his speech, because it did not even register in his own mind. A number of those issues were raised by him in his speech which, incidentally, was prepared in advance of the statement—and I do not complain about that; he said he was going to move a no-confidence motion come what may. His speech was prepared in advance of the statement I made on SGIC addressing those issues and indicating the plan of action the Government would take.

The SGIC is constituted under an Act of this Parliament. It is run under State guidelines in the interests of the State of South Australia. It is there to serve the public of this State; to provide competitive insurance products; and to stop the bleeding of investment income out of this State and keep it here in South Australia. It is not required to observe, necessarily, all those matters that a private insurance company may be required to do. In some cases, it exceeds them, and in others it is not required to do so.

It is not required to conform with some mechanistic accounting standards that might have been established in

some other area. It is operating under a commercial charter. It has been competitive, but I think it is a complete misreading of the whole basis of establishing our own State, publicly owned, community owned insurance company to suggest that, in some way, it has to conform absolutely with everything else that happens in the outside industry.

The better SGIC can perform, the better for all of us. As I said last week—and, obviously, members opposite paid no attention whatsoever; they did not even listen to their own debate on the matter—and as I have repeated since, these matters are being explored. Where it is appropriate to do so, such conformity will be introduced; where it is inappropriate to do so, we will explain the reasons why it is so inappropriate.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Has the Minister of Housing and Construction had the opportunity to check the minutes of the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the Adelaide Entertainment Centre, otherwise known as Parliamentary Paper 190, dated 5 July 1989, which was printed as an after session paper in accordance with House of Assembly Standing Order No. 252?

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, this was the subject of a personal explanation in the House last night.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is further to the point that, rather than being the responsibility of the Minister, it is a public document open to the public and to all members of this Parliament for reference. I feel that the question is out of order. The honourable member for Heysen.

WATER RATES ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I direct my question to the Minister of Water Resources. What budget has been set for the present advertising campaign on water rates, including the cost of air time for the television advertising? Would this money not be better put towards a program to reduce trihalomethane levels in South Australia's water supply?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I was hoping that he might have asked me one yesterday, but I was disappointed. So I am delighted that he has asked me one today.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I had a feeling that the Opposition would not want to hear the answer to this question, and no doubt members opposite will embark upon their usual shouting and screaming across the Chamber. I am delighted to inform the honourable member about the program and its projected costs. This is a program of information to inform the community about the first major change in the water rating system in this State, certainly in the time that I have lived in South Australia and for a long time before that. It is interesting to look at the reasons for this campaign.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well might the member for Heysen sit there smugly and ask, 'How much is it costing?' I will inform the House how much it will cost. The reason for this education campaign is that the Opposition, led by the person whose memory is obviously most forgetful with

respect to the matter yesterday, deliberately set about to misinform the community of South Australia about a number of issues. First, the member for Heysen started calling the whole system a wealth tax. When he realised that that was not correct, he then called it a property tax. When he realised that that was a problem, he then called it a tax on the family home. He has had a series of positions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The whole issue does not stop there. So intent was the member for Heysen to instil total confusion in the mind of the community that he said, 'We will try to confuse the community by saying that this system is a whole range of things it is not,' but then we will say to the community, 'I will move a Bill in the Parliament that will revert the situation to the old system.' Then he said, 'I will make sure that if we get elected we will move to a totally new system again.' This would mean, theoretically, that in four years we could have had several systems: the present system, the old system, and a system of user-pays under which 80 per cent of the 455 000 domestic consumers of South Australia would pay considerably more. I hope that Mr Wotton goes to the election with this campaign. Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will refer to members by their electorate.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will indeed refer to the member for Heysen by his title. Because we live in a democracy and because this Government believes that people who are aged or who at times feel that they are unable to get information because sometimes they are not sure of the way to go about it, and because those people have been deliberately misled by the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is interesting how upset members opposite are by my answer. I find this a revelation in itself. What the Government decided to do was to communicate the truth of the matter to the 455 000 domestic consumers, and that is what it is doing. I have made an announcement. I called a press conference. The media knows; the whole world knows—but the member for Heysen does not know this information.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: He has a most forgetful memory, and one should not be unkind to people who have this problem. However, I have informed the community of South Australia via a press conference attended by every television station that the budget allocated—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, am I being threatened across the Chamber?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair did not hear any comment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Chamber to order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Opposition well knows that idle threats made by way of interjections certainly do not have any effect on me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear the answer.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen is out of order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The E&WS Department has allocated \$60 000 to provide information to the community, and of that—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will be getting a proper report from the department—the campaign is not completed—on how that money is spent, but I have been informed by the department initially that the vast majority (probably about \$50 000) would be spent on advertising the new system in terms of explaining how people can avail themselves of a personalised information service. No department or Government could offer a better information service than one based on people's ability to pick up a telephone and find out what this means regarding their particular water rates.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: And well the Opposition might go on about this, because it has been deliberately misrepresented by the member for Heysen time and time again. As everyone in this House knows, politics is about the longer term and in 12 months time when we have had an opportunity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to draw her response to a close.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: In 12 months, when we have had an opportunity to see how the system has settled in and to see whether the predictions made by Mr Hudson (and confirmed in an independent assessment undertaken by Keith Conlon on his program) are correct, we will then have the opportunity to look objectively at the implications, both for conservation of one of our most precious resources and, indeed, for a system that I believe is both fair and equitable.

ADELAIDE ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House of the final cost of the Adelaide Entertainment Centre?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is important because there is a bit of scuttlebutt in the community that I fear is being generated—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am surprised that the member for Heysen interjects again; he cannot keep quiet. He cannot remember where he is, for a start. It has been suggested that there has been an overrun, and I want to put to rest the view being fired up by some members opposite regarding the cost.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: No, indeed; they are all enjoying the entertainment, even though they voted against it *en bloc*—all of them.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: They all enjoyed voting against the Adelaide Entertainment Centre yet they were all there on Friday night. In April 1989 the Public Works Standing Committee estimate of the centre's current cost was \$35.62 million. In April 1989 the committee's estimated final cost of completion was \$40.7 million, plus or minus 10 per cent. In August 1989, with tenders received above estimate, negotiations were being undertaken with the lowest tenderer, Jennings Construction (whom I congratulate on the brilliant job they did), bringing the final cost to \$44.7 million. That was within 10 per cent of the Public Works Committee's estimate of \$40.7 million.

In September 1989, Cabinet's final approval was for \$44.7 million. We then had certain recommendations from the project managers, following the changes in fire safety standards, particularly for seating, and the requirement of additional safety equipment and pedestrian safety crossings, including traffic controls, and an additional \$720 000 was endorsed, amounting to a total of \$45.42 million which was 1.6 per cent over the original approved funds. That final figure represents the total cost of the centre.

Contrary to the suggestion of some people in the community, that figure is not an overrun. It will not be a burden on the taxpayer, because it is within budget; the project was within time, and it is a very successful project in total. For the Liberal Party, particularly the member for Heysen, to vote against it was outrageous. Yesterday's events highlighted the quality of his memory—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OSWALD: On a point of order, Sir, the Minister was asked to advise the cost of the Entertainment Centre. He has done that and is now debating the matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! I accept the point of order. The honourable member for Bragg.

WORKCOVER

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Has the United Trades and Labor Council vetoed any of the Government's proposed changes to WorkCover involving stress claims and/or any other benefits that would bring it in to line with interstate competitors?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: In the consultation process undertaken by the Government with the trade union movement and employers, they give us their views which are considered. The Government takes all social partners' views into account when determining its policy on introducing legislation into this House.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Coles is out of order.

TAFE CHANNEL

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education outline to the House the benefits and potential use of TAFE channel and its implications with respect to MFP Adelaide? This world class video conferencing network was launched by the Premier on Friday 2 August 1991 at the Regency Park College of TAFE and is seen as a major breakthrough in distance education.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I certainly appreciate the strong support of members of Parliament on both sides of the House, particularly the member for Custance, for TAFE channel which the Premier launched about 10 days ago. The \$1.2 million network funded by the Commonwealth links TAFE colleges at Regency Park and Adelaide with TAFE colleges at Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla in an interactive video conferencing network bringing the electronic classroom of the future to the region.

Of course, other campuses are also in the network, including Nuriootpa, Gawler and Clare. TAFE channel puts South Australian TAFE students at the leading edge of distance education in Australia. Recently, a very senior TAFE expert on communications travelled to Europe and North America to examine their new learning technologies and found that TAFE in South Australia was the clear world leader.

TAFE channel will enable up to 50 extra programs to be run in the Spencer Gulf region by 1992, including more language courses, information technology, financial planning and control, business law, automotive LP gas conversion and tourism subjects. It will enable lecturers in country areas formerly isolated to make their expertise available to the city. We see that as providing an enormous opportunity to expand the system throughout TAFE colleges across this State. TAFE channel will also be extended directly to industry work sites, enabling TAFE to deliver the training urgently needed to accelerate the important restructuring process. The large number of industry and union leaders who attended the launch of TAFE channel were exuberant about the use of the channel to provide training for their work forces. Certainly the honourable member is right in saying that what we are doing in TAFE channel is the sort of thing that the MFP is all about—state of the art telecommunications. The exporting of education will be a major feature of the MFP.

Obviously, TAFE channel, which uses the world's latest technology, will be very important in building on that technology to sell to the world what we have in terms of expertise in education. It is a very interesting and innovative program, and I am pleased that the Commonwealth has decided to back South Australia's innovations here as a national pilot program.

FREE STUDENT TRAVEL

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Is there any truth to suggestions from his department that the Government intends to make further cut-backs to free student travel on public transport?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The question of free student travel on public transport is one that has been reported to this Parliament many times. The position is still—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will not go through all the issues again, in deference to you, Mr Speaker, but suffice to say it has already been modified, as the honourable member knows. Free student travel is not available after 6 p.m. With regard to any further modification that the Government feels is required, if and when that decision is taken, it will be announced to the public of South Australia, including the Parliament.

FISHERIES

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Fisheries advise the outcome of the request from me and others for the introduction of quarterly payments? During the Minister's visit to my electorate recently, members of fishing groups raised the issue with him and at that time the Minister told those representatives that he would look into the issue as a matter of urgency.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question, and I appreciate her raising this matter with me, along with various fishers in her electorate. Indeed, the matter has also been raised by the South Australian Fishing Industry Council and, as a result of an examination of this matter, I do have some good news to report to the House. Until now, the situation that has applied is that licence holders only for abalone, rock lobster and prawn fisheries had the opportunity to pay their licence fees in quarterly instalments.

However, last Monday State Cabinet accepted a recommendation that we should now approve the introduction of quarterly fee payments for the five other fisheries, which include marine scale fish, restricted marine scale fish, lakes and the Coorong, the Murray River and miscellaneous fisheries. I think this will represent a positive opportunity for those fishers who may be facing financial difficulties, to help ease the cash flow of this particular aspect of their costs, but there are many other aspects of their costs with which we are unable to assist.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Was the Treasurer ever advised by SGIC of any concern about the Scrimber project, given that they were partners in the project under investment guidelines approved by the Treasurer?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of that, nor can I recall SGIC's raising any particular problems about Scrimber with me. SGIC was an investor in the project but, as is the practice in nearly all instances with SGIC, it was a passive investor. It allowed the management of that project to take place in the hands of those who were in charge of it. That is SGIC's normal policy, and it is quite appropriate. Therefore, it is not surprising that that was its attitude.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT PLANT

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Is the Minister of Mines and Energy considering any proposal for the construction of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia? In the *Bulletin* magazine of 13 August 1991 the cover story, 'Life under the Coalition' and the article headed 'How Hewson would change Australia' spelt out the Coalition's proposal to abolish the three-mines uranium policy and its desire to see a uranium enrichment plant operating on Spencer Gulf. Such a desire could be fulfilled only with the cooperation of the State Government.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: This is an area where there is a considerable gulf between the views of the Opposition and those of the State Government. As I understand it, the Opposition believes that nuclear power generation should be a goer in this State. It believes that Roxby Downs should be used as a worldwide dump for nuclear waste and now, according to the *Bulletin* article, it believes that a uranium enrichment plant should be set up in South Australia. I have not heard whether the South Australian Opposition supports that but, on behalf of the Government, I indicate very clearly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:—that the Government is not considering any of those three options.

SCRIMBER

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Will the Minister of Forests confirm that Kinhill Engineers, a major consultant appointed by the Government for the MFP project, was appointed in December 1989 by Scrimber management to assist the Scrimber engineering team to bring the project to fruition? Given that company's national and international reputation, did the Minister ever discuss the

Scrimber project with Kinhill, and what advice was he given about the technical problems?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I confirm that Kinhill was appointed in either late November or early December 1989. It completed its brief in February 1990, I think, and I was informed that it had found a considerable number of very significant problems in the engineering process that Scrimber was attempting to undertake. At various stages during 1990, Kinhill assisted, made packages available or seconded staff to Scrimber management. I kept abreast of what Kinhill was doing. I understand that on various occasions people in my office directly contacted people from Kinhill, but I was informed largely by the Chairman of the board, as it was his duty to report to me about Kinhill's involvement and its findings.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Does the Minister for Environment and Planning agree with statements in a paper issued by the Leader of the Opposition entitled 'A Key Issues Statement on the Environment' that national parks are not fulfilling their primary objective of protecting native fauna and flora and that, as national parks are now run, they are not fit places for endangered species to inhabit?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yesterday we were subjected to the notion that our national parks should be turned into forced labour camps and detention centres. Upon reading the statement to which the honourable member refers, we can see quite clearly, first, exactly what the Opposition would like to see our national parks turned into and, secondly, an expose of the total lack of knowledge within the Opposition about what is happening in the National Parks and Wildlife Service and, indeed, of many of the principles under which the service operates.

I will share with the House a couple of statements from the paper on which the honourable member has asked my response. First, the Opposition says that 'too many park staff have to spend too much of their time behind desks and are not in the field managing the environment'. The fact of the matter is that we have the most decentralised park service in the country, and I challenge the Opposition spokesperson to prove that that is not a correct statement. The paper goes on to make such statements as 'form filling comes before bandicoot protection'. It reminds me of a statement that the member for Murray-Mallee might make. As well, there are a number of other statements such as, 'writing reports has become more important than the ability to recognise native plants and animals'. What an insulting statement about professionally trained and dedicated park staff. Another gem is 'driving a vehicle is more important than walking the area and becoming familiar with its natural values'.

And so it goes on: one sentence attacking the parks after another. I totally reject these claims, and I am sure that they will be rejected by not only the staff of our very fine parks system but the legions of South Australians who cherish and support our parks, including the many hundreds of members of the numerous friends of parks groups, who do not need another five or six full-time permanent staff to organise and coordinate them as the Opposition is suggesting.

I was also very interested to read the Opposition's very novel proposals for the privatisation of existing park management and for the establishment of more sanctuaries. The Opposition goes on to say that it would introduce admission fees for some of our parks as well as corporate sponsorship.

I am sure that the deputy Premier finds all this rather amusing, because when he was the Minister for Environment and Planning he actually introduced a fee for entry to our parks.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The member for Heysen should crawl back into his burrow before he gets any more of a savaging! Let me just remind the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:—that its members opposed the Deputy Premier, as Minister for Environment and Planning, introducing fees into our parks system. Let me also inform the House that every cent of those fees has been spent in the park from which it was collected, on improving the facilities and the quality of the experience for visitors to South Australia as well as for South Australians themselves.

The Opposition has suddenly discovered that for the past, I think, six to eight years we have had a system of very small, affordable fees for entry to our parks, and is going to introduce this scheme if members of the Opposition ever become the Government—and God help the parks system if they do! I wonder whether the authors of these proposals understands the broader responsibilities undertaken by the National Parks and Wildlife Service, but I very much doubt, given this document, whether they do.

The claims by the Opposition that the national parks service does not manage an endangered species program are incorrect. Members opposite conclude that section of their policy by saying that the zoo should embark on a breeding program of endangered species, but I am delighted to inform them that not only do we have such a program but also the zoo, working with the National Parks and Wildlife Service, oversees and undertakes that program at Monarto, which might even be in the honourable member's electorate.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Isn't it amazing! Well, that is a revelation! If the honourable member established it, he has launched a policy that he does not understand, or else he has had such a lapse of memory—and I put it to the House that this is becoming an art form—that he does not even remember what is in his own policy. All I can say is that the Opposition policy on national parks is an absolute disgrace. It is nothing more than an attack on our fine parks system and the magnificent parks staff.

It is also an expose of the total lack of understanding of the issues involved in managing more than 18 per cent of the land mass of this State, and managing endangered species as well as all the other animals, plants and other life within our parks system.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Will the Treasurer give the House an assurance that in SGIC's 1990-91 annual report, which he has said he will table at budget time, there will be a full disclosure of all directorships held by SGIC commissioners and executives at any time during the last financial year, and full details of all directors fees received?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The matter of directorships that were omitted from the report last year has already been raised in this place. On being made aware of that I requested SGIC to rectify the matter immediately, and the proper reporting procedures will be carried out.

RECYCLING

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House of any progress in the development of—

Members interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY:—State and national strategies for the recycling of materials from the waste stream?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is most interesting that again the member for Murray-Mallee raises his head above wherever it is and suggests that he is not remotely interested in finding out about a national approach to recycling and a waste minimisation strategy. His lack of knowledge and concern for one of the most important environmental issues of our time really is amazing. Notwithstanding that, I thank the honourable member for his continuing interest in and support for waste minimisation and the need for us to reduce our use of natural resources, to re-use what we can and to recycle.

Many of the materials I am talking about are currently going into the waste stream and are eventually ending up in landfill sites. The South Australian Government has, on a number of occasions, clearly articulated its commitment to waste minimisation, recycling and the sustainable use of resources. Indeed, in July this year the Australian and New Zealand Environment Ministers Council endorsed a national strategy to develop a recycling and resource recovery scheme. This national scheme will establish strategies for the collection of recyclables and set targets for waste minimisation.

At the same time this Government, through its Waste Management Commission and the Recycling Advisory Committee, is working on a number of State initiatives. Very briefly I would like to share with the House some of those initiatives.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the Minister does it very briefly.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I certainly will, Mr Speaker. Again I would like to say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: For the record, I would like to say that members on this side of the House are very keenly and vitally interested in recycling. The initiatives include: assistance to local councils to develop recycling schemes; assistance to councils to find viable markets for the more difficult recyclable items and materials; the development of relevant education and information material on recycling for the public, local councils and industry; assistance for research and development projects on recycling and environmentally friendly processes within South Australia; and the maximisation of the use of recycled products within Government departments and statutory authorities.

Also I would like to note that a number of Opposition members are aware of some of these programs as their constituents have benefited from funds that I have made available. I am sure that the member for Light will attest to that fact.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule whether this is a fair use of Question Time, considering the limited time available.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. The Minister had a very good run on the last question; I keep a check on the time. I did ask the Minister to be brief. I now ask her to bring her response to this question to a close very quickly.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I am finished.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I direct my question to the Minister of Transport. Does the Government intend to legislate to protect personal information that is contained in the Motor Vehicle Register? This issue has been raised by the Privacy Committee in its annual report tabled last Thursday. The report reveals that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles contacted the committee after receiving an opinion from the Crown Solicitor that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles is a public record open to access by the public at large. I quote from the report's summary of the Registrar's concern:

It was considered that the public might search the register for their own reasons which had nothing to do with the reasons for which the register had been established; furthermore, confidential information could be obtained in this way. For example, a man might discover the name and address of a woman he had seen on the street by searching against her registration number.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, I did see that report, and the Department of Road Transport is examining it. From memory, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles has said that in practice it has not been a problem, that we have not had too many, if any, requests from anyone to search the register and, if there were such requests, we would immediately take advice from Crown Law. The problem, even though it is a theoretical one, has been brought to our attention and is being dealt with by the Government.

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION STRUCTURE

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): Can the Minister of Education advise the House of what progress has been achieved in the establishment of a committee to investigate and report upon the structure of primary and secondary education in the Elizabeth and Munno Para area and what steps the Government is taking to ensure full consultation with the parents, students and the local community in relation to the review? The interim board of Inbarendi College is concerned to ensure that the optimum structure for the development of the highest possible standard of education in the Elizabeth and Munno Para area is developed in consultation with the local community and the professional officers concerned. Part of this strategy is the review of resources in the area to ensure that the structure best meets the needs of the community and that the available resources are used in the most effective manner to deliver education services to students.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in education in his electorate and, indeed, for his commitment to those schools that serve his constituents. Senior secondary schooling in the Elizabeth and Munno Para area has presented a number of challenges for some years, one of which has been how to improve the retention rates in that district and how to expand the range of curriculum offerings available to students in that area which has a background of substantial or severe decline in enrolments. For example, in 1986 year 8-12 enrolments in schools in the area were about 3 800 and in 1991 the student numbers had fallen to just over 2 600 students.

The Joel committee, which reported to us in the late 1980s, established the Inbarendi College and its several campuses and greatly improved educational opportunities for students in the area. Also, the adult re-entry program, which has been established in the Elizabeth West campus of Inbarendi College, has proved to be successful with about 880 enrolments at the school. Members will recall reading

in the press earlier this year that a taxi driver who attended that school was offered a place this year in medicine. The Joel report foreshadowed further developments at the college: for example, one of the options at the time the findings were being considered was the notion of junior and senior campuses for the secondary schools in that district.

A number of other elements must now be considered. One is the introduction of the new South Australian Certificate of Education and new ways that the curriculum might be provided as a result of that new certification process. Obviously, the consequences of the Finn report, which was released by Education Ministers last Friday, and the articulation of further education and training are fundamental to opportunities for young people in that district.

There are then changes in the enrolment patterns now occurring in the honourable member's district. It is predicted that enrolments will increase by about 1 000 students during the 1990s and that also must be taken into account. It is pleasing to see this growth in student enrolments, because of increasing retention rates, a return to school of adults, and a general increase in the size of the student population in that district.

For those reasons it is intended that there be a further review of secondary education in that district. That also has consequences for primary education in the area. There will be a full and thorough community consultation process and there will be within the review process a representation of the parents and the broader community. I am pleased that Mr John Joel has agreed to chair this review, as he chaired the previous review that was so successful. Now retired, he is the former Chief Executive Officer of the Lyell McEwin Hospital. He has once again agreed to take on this extra responsibility. It will have consequences for capital works programs in the area and will give impetus for the structure of our schools and the programs they provide to meet the very real challenges being faced by everyone in the education community.

ASIAN REPRESENTATION

Mr BECKER (Hanson): My question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. What has been done so far this year, in view of the Premier's undertaking in March, to improve South Australia's representation in Indonesia, Hong Kong and Malaysia? On 22 March 1991, in response to the Prime Minister's Industry Statement, the Premier announced:

We will improve South Australia's representation in the Asian markets of Indonesia, Hong Kong and Malaysia.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: At all stages our representation overseas is being re-examined to see if it is at its most appropriate level. The honourable member will know that last year we significantly upgraded our representation in Japan by changing the arrangement that we had there. This year our Hong Kong arrangements have been improved. Some members who may have had the opportunity to see the quarters from which our commercial representative, Angeline Tse, was working had expressed their concern to me about the poor quality of that accommodation, and I can now inform the House that she has moved to better premises and they have been operational now for a few weeks. Not only are they significantly better in terms of the space and facilities but also their accessibility is improved for those who want to make inquiries about South Australia.

With respect to Indonesia and Malaysia, these are ongoing matters of investigation at the moment as to the best ways we might improve our presence in each of those countries.

Essentially, Malaysia is handled from our Singapore arrangements. Mr Tay Joo Soon, of ASIACO, has for many years represented South Australia in that region. We have been considering having some presence of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology in Malaysia itself. Some investigation has been undertaken into that matter, because we have had a number of trade and investment inquiries from that region. In the meantime—and I will have to be doubly sure of my facts—I understand that Tourism South Australia has a person now based in Penang, and that is obviously a new arrangement. Following recent events, a decision was taken that perhaps we should not be proceeding too quickly with Malaysian activities until the atmosphere had cleared.

I am looking forward to the medical services trade mission, which was to go to that region, being put back onto the schedule as soon as possible. Indeed, I look forward to that happening within the next couple of months. As to when we might be in a position to have a commercial representative in Malaysia, it is too early to say, but we are actively still investigating that matter. The same applies to Indonesia: we are actively investigating that matter because of the potential, especially now that we have direct flights from Adelaide to Indonesia. I will keep the honourable member further advised as events transpire.

WEST LAKES REVETMENT WORK

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Marine advise the House of the latest developments in the replacement of deteriorated sections of revetment work at Nareeda Way, West Lakes? In the *Weekly Times Messenger* of 12 June 1991 it is stated:

Cracked and unstable walls around the banks of West Lakes are being replaced in a \$245 000 project by the Marine and Harbors Department. DMH engineer Malcolm Bagnall said work on a 150m trial section, which began last week, was expected to take about three months.

The article goes on to mention the effects of salt water on the stepped revetment, and it further states:

Mr Bagnall said high quality material was being used for the replacement walls that would last 80 to 90 years. More than 8km of stepped bank around the lake's edge need to be replaced.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Albert Park for his question. He has a great interest in this matter and he has asked numerous questions on replacing the deteriorating revetment. A number of methods and materials have been proposed to replace the revetment. A considerable number of discussions have been held with those vitally involved with the revetment, and who have had close contact with it. Those discussions led to the residents favouring a glass-reinforced cement stepped revetment, and trials of that material were held.

Unfortunately, those trials highlighted difficulties in building the revetment under water, and there is some concern about its reliability. The new revetments will now be built of high quality precast concrete, which will be placed on a special concrete footing. The form work for that is being fabricated now and should be delivered later this month. We hope the work will begin in late September and be completed by the end of November. I am advised that this work will not require the lake to be drained, as it can be carried out under water.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Why did the Treasurer advise the House on 5 March this year that SGIC had sold its

shareholding in SA Brewing 'as part of its ongoing review of portfolio weighting of its overall share portfolio' when in fact the SGIC review committee had reported that these shares were sold to reduce interfund loans which breached the SGIC Act?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I stand by the response I gave. As far as the SGIC is concerned, it attempts to have a balanced portfolio of securities and indeed that was part of the reason that it sold some of those holdings in SA Brewing. It disposed of those securities at a very good profit, and it now has a holding around about the level it would perceive as reasonable.

SOLAR STUDY

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Is the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology aware of a recent article in the *Port Pirie Recorder* of 5 July 1981 entitled 'Call for gulf solar study'? The article states:

State Democrat Leader Ian Gilfillan claims Israel's Institute for Desert Research wants joint research and development facilities established in South Australia.

Can the Minister tell the House what knowledge he has of this project?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am aware that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan did raise this matter by way of a press statement, but I have not received a direct approach from him on the matter. I will have it checked out as to whether either of my departments—the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology or the Department of Agriculture—received some approach on the issue. Certainly, on the face of it, there may well be something there that is worth some further examination but, clearly, it would be premature for me to say any more than that, because I do not have any more details available. However, I will obtain a report on that and advise the honourable member accordingly.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr VENNING (Custance): My question is to the Treasurer. Why did a spokesman for the Treasurer tell the *Advertiser* in March that SGIC had not approached the Government for a capital injection when the SGIC review committee has reported that SGIC has corresponded with Treasury on the issue of capitalisation over the past six years without resolution? Will the Treasurer now table this correspondence so the Parliament and the public can be fully informed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know where the honourable member has been for the past couple of days of sitting. There has been full debate on this matter, a report has been published and media comments and statements were made on this issue of capitalisation even before the report was put in the public domain. I am also very surprised that, as a country member, he is seeking to stir the pot on SGIC. I do not think that it is just because the leadership feels it has to fill out Question Time somehow—here are a quick few questions. Surely he has a bit of ingenuity. With the plight of the rural industry in this State at the moment, my Minister and I would be very happy to respond to questions on behalf of his constituents about that. I do not believe that it is in the interests of his constituents that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —he attempts to undermine SGIC, which has served rural South Australia very well. In

fact, it is interesting that I have received correspondence in relation to that matter from a country resident saying that they are very concerned about the way in which the Liberal scatter gun approach has been motivated to achieve cheap political mileage at the expense of investors in an organisation such as SGIC. The answer to the question has been given on many occasions. Why does the honourable member want to involve this tedious repetition on an extremely and extraordinarily obscure issue, which I have already said is being addressed in depth by the group that we have established, which I have made statements about in this place and which his own Leader tried to debate? He obviously nodded off during the Leader's speech, as well—yet another example—because he did not hear how that was canvassed and how that was—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Very good! The Leader of the Opposition is telling me that he has organised for his backbencher to try to get something on the record on this matter. I would have thought that there is enough limitation on Question Time opportunities not to have to resort to that kind of device. If the Leader wants to ask questions, let him ask them up front. He has the right to ask questions, as well. The answer has been given. It is quite clear.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST (COPELEY)

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands): I move:

That this House resolves to recommend to Her Excellency the Governor that, pursuant to section 16 (1) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 1966, section 1278, out of hundreds (Copley), be transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

Section 1278, out of hundreds (Copley) was dedicated as a community purposes reserve under the care, control and management of the Minister of Community Welfare in the *Government Gazette* dated 21 May 1981. Section 1278, out of hundreds (Copley) is situated adjacent to the town of Copley and contains a transportable building consisting of four offices, reception, waiting area, toilets and kitchen, with a double carport and double garage adjacent. A copy of the plan is available for perusal by members.

The Northern Flinders District Office of the Department for Family and Community Services provides two half day services per week to the Copley community from this building. The Aroona Aboriginal Community Council uses the offices for its administration and to arrange community activities, while another office is used by the Pika Wiya Aboriginal Health Service, which is based in Copley to provide services to the Marree, Copley, Leigh Creek and Nepabunna communities. In September 1989, the then Department for Community Welfare decided to rationalise services and minimise running costs by disposing of the Copley building. The Aroona Aboriginal Community Council has experienced difficulty in obtaining a building suitable for its requirements and requested that the property be transferred to them for use as an administration centre.

As the property is being used by two Aboriginal groups, it is considered that it would be preferable that section 1278 be transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust as the 'umbrella' body that could determine future usage if one or both of the present users vacated the premises. The Aroona Council has agreed to the property being held in trust by the Aboriginal Lands Trust. The Community Purposes Reserve over section 1278, out of hundreds (Copley) was resumed

on 13 September 1990 and the land is now Crown land awaiting the transfer to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I seek the support of the House for the transfer.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I support the motion, so there is no need to adjourn it.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST (WANILLA)

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands): I move:

That this House resolves to recommend to Her Excellency the Governor that, pursuant to section 16 (1) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 1966-1975, sections 160 and 166, hundred of Wanilla be transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

Located 22 km north-west of Port Lincoln, sections 160 and 166 comprised the Wanilla Forest Reserve which was dedicated in 1897. By the mid-1980s it had become apparent that this forest could not be sustained as a commercial operation. Following a public calling for expressions of interest and detailed negotiations involving the Ministers of Aboriginal Affairs and Forests and the Port Lincoln Aboriginal Organisation Inc. (PLAO), the following proposals have been developed. They have as their ultimate aim the benefit of the Aboriginal people of Port Lincoln and district.

1. The Wanilla forest should be placed under the control of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. To that end, sections 160 and 166 were recently resumed and are now Crown land.

2. The next step, and the subject of this resolution, is that the forest should vest in the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

3. PLAO will then be charged with management of the Wanilla forest under lease from the trust. Its management program will provide training and jobs for about 30 Aboriginal people in five years in four major areas:

- Forestry operations
- Conservation
- Information
- Other commercial enterprises.

Funding sources already secured to support these programs include the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Federal Department of Education, Employment and Training.

I seek the support of the House for this excellent project by its resolving to make the necessary recommendation to the Governor.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MICHAEL KEITH HORROCKS

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I lay on the table a ministerial statement relating to Michael Keith Horrocks made earlier today in another place by my colleague (the Attorney-General).

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSING CO-OPERATIVES BILL AND THE RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction) brought up the report of the select committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 13 August. Page 118.)

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I have pleasure in supporting the speech that Her Excellency gave when she opened the third session of the forty-seventh Parliament. I commend her on the manner in which she opened it and wish her all the best in her position. During the address Her Excellency outlined the Government's program for the coming parliamentary session. She referred to the passing of three former members of the South Australian Parliament, namely, Dr Victor Springett, Mr Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles MLC and later MHR, and the Hon. Ross Story. All three gentlemen were known to me. Dr Springett and Mr Story were members when I first entered this House. I appreciated the wise counsel they gave me from time to time. I join with other members in passing on my condolences to their families, and I recognise the valuable contributions they made to the respective Parliaments.

We meet at this time in one of the most difficult periods since the Great Depression. We have seen the Federal Government presiding over a massive balance of trade deficit, many times more than the highest deficit of previous Governments. We have unemployment running rampant. We have export industries grinding to a halt because of people's sheer lack of ability to farm and operate small business because of the lack of cash flow. We have youth unemployment running at 30 per cent. We have increasing input costs because of poor waterfront practices and many other restrictions on the cost of labour which thereby increase the cost of parts, machinery and cost inputs. All these factors mean that the producer, be that person a primary producer or a manufacturer, is fighting against incredible odds. It is those odds that we, as a Parliament, must address.

Some of the issues to which I have referred can be related to matters of a Federal concern. There is no doubt that the primary concern has been the fiscal management policy which is presently being pursued by the Federal Government. That policy is one of high interest rates which, in turn, works against the ability of the producer to be able to get on with the job that he knows best—that is, to farm and to manage his small business. The restrictions of high interest rates have been further compounded by low international commodity prices. I venture to say that, had it not been for the interest rates saga over a long period of time, the ability of the average farmer and the small business person to be able to weather the storm of the fluctuations of commodity prices would be much greater. It would certainly mean that we would have fewer people in the financial difficulties that many face at present.

The rural crisis with which Australia is now being beset had its origins far beyond this recession, particularly in many parts of my electorate where a series of droughts has meant that many people have been put in a position of nil equity or, in some cases, minus equity. For these people who are in that position, through no fault of their own but because of Government fiscal policies, some help is necessary.

Many ideas have been presented. On previous occasions I have proposed that a farmer assistance scheme could help many of these people. Other schemes have also been discussed, such as chapter 11 and chapter 12 of the American system. There has been talk about the principle of set aside schemes. All these schemes need to be brought together so that a workable scheme can be arranged whereby the genuine and *bona fide* farmer who has been able to work his

way through this crisis is not being disadvantaged, yet at the same time those who are in trouble because of circumstances far beyond their control can have the opportunity to work through this present crisis. That is not easy. It will require the input of many people over a long period of time and, more particularly, of sympathetic Government.

We want the ability for our people to be able to work their way through this crisis and to make sure that the true farmers of this country are kept on the land because, after all, they are the best managers of the land, and that resource in itself needs to be retained and protected.

The road to recovery is long. It will be hard: it will be difficult. It will be assisted with the election of a conservative Government, both at a Federal and a State level. Let us not for one moment believe that a change of Government will solve all problems. The entrenched problems that have been there, in some cases for decades, have to be turned around, and people's attitudes need to be changed from one of a 'give me' or 'handout mentality' to one of 'let's reward and encourage the person who can produce.' Let a person be rewarded for his or her efforts and not be penalised as is presently the case.

When one looks at the massive blow-out of the balance of trade problem and when one considers how that can be addressed, the only conclusion one can draw is that we need a viable primary producing sector with the appropriate service industries that can service that primary producer sector, in order that export dollars can be earned and be recirculated within our community as quickly as possible.

No other industry can respond to the present crisis that we now have other than the primary producing sector and maybe the mining industry. We must make sure that we do everything we can to see that the primary producer sector is given a chance to be able to respond in that way. If we had to wait for a new business or a new industry to be developed to create that cash flow, there would be a five to 10 year lead time, by which time this community would be sunk. We must have a quicker acting solution than we have at the moment.

In order to bring that about, first we need some considerable action by banks and by Governments in relation to interest rates. I do not believe that the banks are without criticism on this issue. For sure, many people borrowed money but, by the same token, Governments, banks and financial advisers were all advising that the way to go was to buy more land—to get big or to get out. That has now happened, and the price is being paid.

I wish to comment briefly on a statistical table which I will then seek leave to insert in *Hansard*. It is a statement of a farmer constituent in my electorate who, after borrowing \$120 000, on 3 March 1980 bought additional land. During the following 11 years, until February 1991, that person made repayments as and when he could on a reasonably consistent basis. He did not meet every payment; he sometimes caught up and sometimes let it slip by, depending on the season.

On the original \$120 000 loan the farmer has already paid \$190 875 but still owes \$183 250. This is an example of what many farmers are experiencing. Something is drastically wrong with our financial system when a person has already paid the total of the loan 1½ times but still owes 1½ times more than the original loan. In order for members to understand what I am talking about, I seek leave to insert this table in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Is it a purely statistical table?

Mr BLACKER: Yes.

Leave granted.

Family Trust Loan Account
Statement of Payments March 1980-February 1991

Date	Dr/Interest \$	Cr/Payment \$	Balance \$
3.3.80			120 000
20.8.80	4 616		124 615
1.9.80		9 190	115 425
16.12.80	7 601		123 027
25.6.81	8 369		131 396
15.12.81	8 096		139 429
5.1.82		9 190	130 302
23.3.82		9 190	121 112
24.6.82	10 765		131 878
13.9.82		9 190	122 688
14.12.82	11 140		133 828
23.6.83	11 911		145 739
13.12.83	11 052		156 791
1.3.84		11 940	144 851
21.6.84	11 873		156 728
3.9.84		12 925	143 804
11.12.84	10 268		154 078
1.3.85		12 925	141 153
20.6.85	11 878		153 036
2.9.85		12 925	140 111
10.12.85	11 223		151 339
19.6.86	14 579		165 918
16.12.86	16 364		182 283
2.3.87		12 925	169 358
18.6.87	17 367		186 730
1.9.87		12 925	173 806
15.12.87	17 239		191 050
1.3.88		12 925	178 125
16.6.88	15 804		193 935
1.9.88		12 925	181 010
13.12.88	14 034		195 049
1.3.89		12 925	182 124
15.6.89	16 545		198 674
4.8.89	(Dept of Ag.)	100 000	98 679
1.9.89		12 925	85 794
12.12.89	11 371		97 171
1.3.90		12 925	84 246
2.6.90	9 571		93 823
3.12.90		12 925	80 898
2.1.91	9 181		90 091
Total	260 847	290 875	90 091 C.T.B. 93 159 D. of Ag. 183 250 Owing

Mr BLACKER: I am sure that the person involved will appreciate my actions (and there are no names mentioned). Many other constituents will be able to relate to this dilemma. If we can control interest rates, we must then look at our input costs. Our roads, our transport systems and rail transport systems, and our taxes and charges that are levied on those systems become another cost to the primary producer that cannot be passed on. All of these matters need to be addressed. Every one of them is a negative aspect on production. Every one of them drives in the wedge and discourages the person who would like to have a go and try to earn some of those export dollars.

Fiscal management of this State is now in tatters. No-one could say that the Government has acted competently when it has allowed such things to take place. Whether it be the Premier, his advisers, his Cabinet or State Bank officials or statutory authority officials who are at fault, only the royal commission will determine that in relation to the State Bank. The result, however, is devastating for our State and our nation. Allow me to put at rest one of the beliefs that has been circulated, that is, that much of the problem of the State Bank is related to primary industry.

I categorically deny that position for, if we look at the amount of money that the State Government has already paid into the State Bank—that is, \$970 million—and then take into account the \$3.4 billion of non-performing loans,

and then divide that figure by the total number of rural enterprises in South Australia and then say, for example, that the State Bank has a financial interest in a quarter of those businesses, we see that the amount would be \$1.2 million for each rural establishment. Clearly, that cannot be right. The State Bank's problems resulted from its dabbling in the property development area.

I would like to further amplify that. On top of the \$3.5 billion related to State Bank non-performing loans and the recent press statements about a \$1.5 billion shortfall or problem area for SGIC, we could add \$60 million in relation to Scrimber and the losses in respect of WorkCover, the South Australian Timber Corporation and the State Transport Authority.

If we divided the total amount lost by the State Bank and SGIC by the number of people in South Australia, we would come up with a figure of \$3 571 for every man, woman and child or, for an average family of four, a figure of \$14 285. That is the extent to which the State Bank and SGIC have mortgaged every family in South Australia. Going another step further, if that \$5 billion—and Her Excellency the Governor said in her speech an estimated 500 farmers could not receive carry-on finance—was divided among 500 farmers, there would be \$10 million for each of those farmers.

That is the magnitude of the money about which we are talking. Obviously, I am talking not just about farmers, but that is the relativity that I want to highlight. Just 1 per cent of the \$5 billion—\$50 million—would get every Eyre Peninsula farmer out of a risk situation and put them back into a position where they could effectively work their way through the present problem. That is 1 per cent of the debt or the non-performing loan figure that has been talked about by the State Bank and SGIC.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: Let me take it another step further, and the member for Murray-Mallee raises this issue: if we divided the \$5 billion by the number of rural establishments—14 386 according to the 1991 Year Book—we would have a figure of \$347 560 per rural establishment in South Australia. The amount of debt that these two statutory authorities have inflicted on the people of South Australia is equivalent to the actual land value of the total rural area of South Australia. That is the magnitude of the debt. It is not small fry: it is \$347 560 for every rural establishment in this State.

These two organisations have mortgaged the entire agricultural land mass of South Australia. Such is the gravity of the situation. There can be no doubt that Government finances are now in a mess, and much of what we need to look at now involves new legislation coming before the House. We have too much superficial legislation: we have too much restriction and too much legislation, with little of this Government's proposed program being directed towards encouraging the generation of wealth and, therefore, job opportunities.

We must remember that export earnings mean profit and that jobs mean expansion and growth, more jobs, and so the cycle grows. Certainly, members need to assess as legislators every piece of legislation that comes before us as to how it will affect the State. First, we need to know whether it will work and whether it will create export dollars; whether

it will create job opportunities in a safe working environment; whether it will encourage efficient production; whether it will assist employers to create job opportunities; whether it will use existing resources effectively; whether it will promote the use of renewable resources; and whether it will create new money. Probably most importantly of all, we must assess whether it will be in the best interests of the people of South Australia and the nation as a whole.

I am saying that much of the legislation seems to involve the formation of new committees and authorities and I wonder what this reorganisation is supposed to be doing. We have seen it happen with the Country Fire Services, the Health Commission and many other authorities. These changes have drawn to my attention a quotation by Gaius Petroneus, dated Rome AD66, as follows:

We trained hard . . . but it seemed every time we were beginning to form up into teams we were reorganised. I was to learn later in life that we tend to meet any situation by reorganising, and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency and demoralisation.

Now, 1 925 years later we must ask ourselves whether we have changed. I venture to say that that has not been the case. There are a number of other issues that I wish to touch on relating to Her Excellency's speech. In about nine lines out of seven pages Her Excellency referred to rural matters. Such little emphasis on rural matters always causes me concern because, as I have mentioned previously, if the agriculture sector were given half a chance, it could be an important contributing factor in any recovery of the economy.

I note that the Government intends to introduce a Bill concerning the structure of the Australian Barley Board. That has created much public debate and doubtless the debate will continue for a considerable time. The Meat Hygiene Act is to be broadened with respect to premises and products. Again, I see restriction in that and I wonder whether the meat industry, and the red meat industry in particular, will gain any benefit from that or whether it will be yet another restriction on a primary producing sector.

Passing mention is made of the improvement in grain crops and the late rains that have helped boost prospective yields. Things look good in the rural community at the moment, and everyone would admit that, if we could have a continuation of the present season, average yields will be well above expectation and above average. However, we must take into account the fact that we have had very little rain. In my area, which usually receives 20 inches, we have had only eight inches so far this year. The crops are looking magic at the moment because the rain has fallen at exactly the right time, but there is no subsoil moisture and with three or four weeks of hot, dry weather, the potential of the crops could diminish.

I have already mentioned Her Excellency's reference to the 400 or 500 farmers experiencing financial difficulty. Without a doubt, that is the problem. I have seen statistics which would indicate the areas where much of this problem has occurred. I do not think any area in this State is exempt from the ravages of the interest rates, but I am sure that, given a chance by the Government, some benefit will be derived.

I noticed that there is to be an innovative employment and training program which has been mentioned by the Minister of Employment and Further Education. All I can say is that the scheme is ideal, but there is no point in having schemes to train people if we do not have jobs for them to go to. The whole thing has to be turned around so that we create the job opportunities and then train the personnel to fill those jobs. It will be much more difficult

if we have highly trained people within the community and even fewer jobs to cater for them.

Reference has also been made to WorkCover. No doubt there will be a lengthy debate when that matter comes before the House, because WorkCover has been a total disincentive to so many employers. It has cost countless jobs—hundreds if not thousands—in this State because of the red tape and abuse of WorkCover that has taken place. All this means that we as legislators must look very carefully at every step we take.

I want now to refer to the number of people involved in the Public Service and their percentage of the total work force. I understand that 28.4 per cent of the total Australian work force is represented by public servants. We have a problem with that number of people who are effectively out of the producing sector, unable to create new wealth. We must redress that imbalance so that we have the correct number and quality of personnel in the Public Service sector to service adequately a community and its producing needs. I also draw attention to the fact that there are 200 000 Government cars in Australia worth \$3.5 billion, a figure that has been bandied around South Australia quite a bit, particularly in relation to the State Bank.

I could cite some industrial disputes, but I will leave that for another time. I have been goaded on a couple of occasions to briefly comment on the GST. This matter will be debated before the House at a later date. However, the present system is wrong. Nobody can deny that. It is wrong and needs to be addressed. The whole system is crazy. For example, we have a situation where antique clocks, pornographic magazines and caviar do not attract any wholesale sales tax at all.

The Hon. H. Allison: The former Australian Treasurer deals in two of those!

Mr BLACKER: Yes. Next we have a 20 per cent sales tax on toys, tool boxes, soap and toilet paper—basic commodities of the community. Then we have a 30 per cent sales tax on lawn-mowers, radios and trucks. It is quite clear that the average person in the street—the pensioner and the worker—is being severely hit by the present wholesale tax system, either at 20 per cent or 30 per cent, and very little is exempt.

Mr Groom: Farmers are largely exempt, and they will be worse off under Hewson's consumption tax.

Mr BLACKER: That is something for a later debate and I will comment on that at that time. A question was asked today about the free bus travel available to students. There is a gross inequity between metropolitan and country people when it comes to free student bus travel. Most people in country South Australia do not have access to free travel on a school bus or for school excursions. More to the point, if two schools wanted to exchange, either on a curriculum study or sporting basis, every student would be charged for that travel. It is totally wrong for some students, required to travel by Government departmental bus to another school in order to fulfil the obligations of a curriculum requirement, to be charged for that travel, when those same students can travel free of charge on a public transport system inside the appropriate hours (it was previously open ended but has since been amended) anywhere throughout the metropolitan area.

Mr Groom interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BLACKER: The member for Hartley makes mockery of something I will not buy into at this point. However, there is an inequity, and the whole problem with most Government legislation is that it does not conform to a basic requirement that all people in this State should be

equal. All people should have equal access to a reasonable standard, whether it be education, health or basic services of the State that everyone else takes for granted. They are the sorts of things we need to address.

Again, I commend Her Excellency for the manner in which she addressed the Parliament. I wish her well. No doubt she will find her position very challenging. I am sure she will be able to carry out her duties with distinction. I support the motion in response to her address to the Parliament.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I support the motion and congratulate all those persons who should be congratulated.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I just want to keep it short. I want to raise several matters during this debate. In June and early July, I went on probably the most productive trade and cultural visit to Italy that I have experienced. It was the culmination of many initiatives and much effort over past years. In addition to myself, the trade delegation comprised the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and Minister of Ethnic Affairs (the member for Ramsay), Mr Paolo Nocella, the then President of the Italian Chamber of Commerce, who is now Chairman of the Ethnic Affairs Commission, and also Mr Giorgio Imperato, a promotions and marketing consultant in Italy.

The purpose of our trip was to promote trade and cultural ties between various regions of Italy and South Australia. We visited the Friuli Venezia Giulia region, Tuscany, Lazio and Campania. In the Friuli Venezia Giulia region we held trade seminars and meetings with officials, chambers of commerce and the regional government in Trieste. In Tuscany we also met with the Chamber of Commerce. We met with Siena Export and also with the Monte dei Paschi Bank which, as members know, established a branch in South Australia earlier this year. In Lazio, we also met with the regional government, heads of departments and chambers of commerce.

In April, when a delegation from the Lazio region was here in South Australia, I signed on behalf of the South Australian Government a trade and cultural agreement, an accord, with the Lazio region, and at meetings with the regional government, that trade and cultural accord was endorsed and ratified by the regional Governor, the Hon. Rodolfo Gigli, in the presence of his Ministers in Rome. In Campania, we attended the Mostra d'Oltremare fair which, literally translated, means 'the fair beside the sea'. It is one of the largest trade fairs in the region which, over approximately 10 days, has about one million visitors. There was a South Australian presence at that fair for the first time.

The result of this trade and cultural delegation is that in November we will see a delegation of business people coming to South Australia from Siena—the Siena Chamber of Commerce and Siena Export. We have the accord signed with the Lazio region, and that will lead to the promotion of trade and cultural ties with that region. We already have the Gemellaggio with the Campania region, and our presence there was in furtherance of that entwining with the Campania region, so we will see further developments in that regard. With respect to the Friuli Venezia Giulia region, we expect to be able to hold a Friuli Venezia Giulia week next April, commensurate with the Expo here in Adelaide. Also, the President of the Gorizian Chamber of Commerce, President Beuilacqua, will visit South Australia in November as a guest, at the special invitation of the member for Ramsay as Minister, to further our trade and cultural ties with the Gorizian area. In addition, we expect a trade and

cultural delegation from Lazio later this year or early next year.

Our trade with Italy at the moment is about 2 per cent to 3 per cent. It is very low and, because of our very large Italian population in South Australia of some 100 000 people, we have a strong basis for furthering the nexus and the trade and cultural ties with Italy. Indeed, after the Anglo-Saxon community in South Australia, the Italian community is the next largest, so the basis is already there. I should say that the Italian language lives in South Australia, because it is spoken by the Italian community, quite obviously, and we also have the second language program in South Australia. Certainly, in my area, which has one of the largest Italian populations—about 30 per cent—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I know that the member for Henley Beach has many in his area. They are a very industrious and productive community. I want to stress the importance in this process of the presence of the Monte Dei Paschi Bank in South Australia, because it is to South Australia's credit that we were able to attract that bank which, I might say, is the fourth largest bank in Italy. It is the oldest bank in the world and goes back to the fifteenth century. I think it is No. 41 in the world and has its headquarters in Siena. It is very important, because no longer will business people be told that they must have cash up front to be able to trade between Italy and South Australia. I should say that we are in advance of the other States of Australia: there is no question of that. We were the first delegation from the Australian States to visit Siena and meet with the bank. The establishment of the bank is very important because it will be able to take security over property in Italy and in South Australia for the purpose of trade exchanges by way of letters of credit.

By being in contact with the various chambers of commerce and private sector organisations in Europe, in particular in Italy, we in Australia have much to learn from the way small business receives support in Europe. Many of the services currently provided by the Small Business Corporation should, in my view, be provided by the private sector through the various chambers of commerce and industry-based organisations. That is not to downgrade the role of the Small Business Corporation; quite the contrary. The Small Business Corporation has filled a very important vacuum in South Australia, where the services currently provided were not properly provided in South Australia, and it has been at the forefront of ensuring that our small business community develops and receives assistance, but I do believe that, because of the trends, particularly in Europe, the fundamental direction of the Small Business Corporation needs to change in future, and so does that of the private sector industry-based organisations.

Small business really wants low-interest loans or guarantees to assist in obtaining finance to start up new businesses or inject capital to expand existing businesses. My view is that this should be provided by the private sector, as occurs in Europe, and not by Government. It is my observation that in Europe it is not possible to do business unless one is a member of a chamber of commerce or a trade-based organisation. As a result of having that membership, these bodies have the capital base to give guarantees or low-interest start-up loans to small business.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr GROOM: In reality, as the member for Albert Park says, it is a *de facto* preference to business members, and it is of great benefit to the small business community, because great benefit is attached to being a member of a chamber

of commerce in Europe—whether it be in Italy or any other country—or a member of a private sector organisation.

It is by becoming a member that those organisations are provided with a capital base. I believe that in Australia the various industry-based bodies would better serve small business by concentrating less on industrial disputation and more on providing these types of services to small business. In fact, they should be adopting a preference to business members approach to trade and commerce, and in giving loans and guarantees to small business, instead of attacking trade unions for a preference to members approach. They, too, should be adopting a preference to small business members approach, because they should be the ones who should be providing many of the services that are currently being provided by the Small Business Corporation. I do not want to see the corporation, having filled a vacuum and played a very important role, becoming bureaucratised in future by providing services that should properly be provided by the private sector.

I noticed in its annual report last year that the Small Business Corporation was not able to provide loans and guarantees to small business by way of start-up finance, which small business really needs. These should be provided by the private sector based chambers of commerce or industry-based organisations. So, I do not think that the Small Business Corporation should now simply look at targets and say, 'We have a target figure of 28 000 people a year to advise through interviews or telephone advice.' In my view, the Small Business Corporation should progressively become more involved in support for export-import related activities and promoting expos and trade delegations between South Australia and other countries. It should have more of a coordinating role, but it should also ensure that the services are provided to the small business community.

It is the small business sector—the private industry-based organisations—that should be emulating the trends and developments in Europe, because those privately-based chambers of commerce and industry-based organisations should adopt a preference to members approach. In Italy they have a capital base to provide the service, and some of the chambers told me that, even if they have given a loan or guarantee and the business fails, they have the expertise to send in people to run the business and make a good fist of it and carry it within their own capital base. So, great opportunities exist for substantial increases in trade between Italy and South Australia as a result of our visit, and I believe that the private sector industry-based chambers of commerce or organisations need to change and to look at what is occurring with analogous organisations in Europe. However, at the same time, Government needs to change direction, and in future I would like to see the Small Business Corporation providing fewer of those services that could be provided by the private sector. It should take more of a coordinating role in promoting trade delegations, Expos and import-export activities.

I also want to stress that I do not want to be seen in any way to be detracting from the excellent and valuable role provided by the Small Business Corporation, but our tax base as a State is just too narrow to support many of the programs and trends that we had in the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s in the way they were originally contemplated. More and more functions should be transferred to the private sector, with Governments providing a coordinating role and protection.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The member for Coles always lives in the past; their policies are of the past. There is a very great distinction, even in the area of welfare service. I had four

years in what is now the Family and Community Services Department. It was then called Children's Welfare and Public Relief and became Public Welfare and then Community Welfare. I had four years there and, when we came to office in the mid 1960s, there were virtually no welfare services. I worked there for four years, and it was the most primitive welfare organisation imaginable.

In the 1960s and 1970s, Governments had to fill the vacuum and provide these welfare services. Once again, the clock has turned and there has to be directional change. By my saying that even in the welfare area many of these services can be transferred to the private sector—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr GROOM: If the member for Coles hears me out, she will find that this has nothing to do with Dr Hewson's policy, which is to turn the clock back to the 1950s, for the Government to get right out of welfare services, not provide any welfare services and leave the people to the mercy of society. Family and Community Services is a department—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Of course, they would kill off welfare services if they had a chance. That is the direction of their policy, supported by members opposite. Family and Community Services is a department responsible for establishing, encouraging and coordinating services and facilities designed to promote the welfare of the community in general and of individuals, families and groups in the community. As I said, until Labor came to office, the services were extremely poor and again it was a Labor Government that had to fill the vacuum for a lack of services. However, as the composition of society changes, more and more we need to call on church and *bona fide* voluntary organisations to assist government and promote the partnership that has developed with regard to government and the private sector.

The department's organisation has a central office, five regional offices and something like 42 local offices. In addition, admission units, homes and cottages, community units and training, assessment and project centres are located throughout the State. The Auditor-General's Report indicates that the net cost of the services amounts to \$122.9 million, which is a substantial amount of money. Because our tax base is narrow, we have to be very cautious about our revenue raising. So, what do we do with regard to future growth?

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I point out to the member for Coles that there are often complaints about Government departments, and there is no question about that. I receive complaints about lack of sensitivity, that it is difficult to get 'on to' people and what I suppose could be colloquially called a sort of Public Service bureaucratic approach. I have read allegations in the media from time to time that Department for Family and Community Services welfare officers have encouraged children to leave home. I do not accept that. I think that is largely nonsense—a bit of media hype. However, those allegations float around from time to time. As a member of Parliament, I have observed that there is some basis to say that there is often a lack of sensitivity, that often it is difficult to get on to people and that people are offended by the 'cold Public Service' approach.

I cannot help thinking that Governments should more and more transfer services to voluntary organisations. For instance, I will read the sort of services that are being developed by a church in my electorate, outside its purely religious function. Quite properly, churches have a great civilising and social role in society. One church organisation in my electorate provides outreach work, which involves a welfare worker assessing people's needs and following up

on those needs with respect to housing and child care, for example. The church is connected with an emergency family shelter, and a welfare worker helps to find emergency accommodation and arranges a bond for that accommodation. The church runs an alcoholic support group and a community craft group which provides a central contact point for the elderly and women in particular. It runs a second-hand clothing store opposite the church, again providing a very substantial benefit to the community. In addition, it provides an indoor bowls session for the elderly and a number of sporting activities such as tennis, netball and table tennis, which are open to the community at large. As of the 13th of this month (yesterday), the church will be running a drop-in centre for the unemployed providing free meals, recreation and conversation groups.

As I said, church groups and *bona fide* voluntary organisations have a great social and community role to play and, as society moves on, Governments will look more and more to church organisations and voluntary groups to provide many of the welfare services that it was necessary for Governments to provide in the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s as a result of the failure of conservative Governments in the 1940s, 1950s and the early part of the 1960s. This process has been taking place already. For example, in September 1990, the Public Accounts Committee brought down a report dealing with statutory authorities. Part of the report dealt with the accountability of non-government organisations in receipt of Government funding. Page 47 of that report lists the funding. Approximately \$17.1 million was provided by the Government through the Department for Family and Community Services to the non-government sector.

I will not give all the details of those figures, but of that \$17.1 million there were non-government substitute care grants, family and community development grants, the supported accommodation assistance program, grants for seniors (an extremely valuable service to our elderly citizens), and the Home and Community Care Program. I want to make it quite plain that that \$17.1 million for the year 1988-89 was provided by the Department for Family and Community Services. Other amounts of public money were provided to other areas of the community through other departments. But I want to focus on that role.

It can be seen that there has been a gradual transition over a considerable period to ensuring that there is a proper partnership between the Government sector and church and voluntary organisations in the welfare area. I am not suggesting that we reduce welfare services. Quite the contrary, unlike Dr Hewson's policy, which abrogates responsibility totally in the welfare area, leaving people to the mercy of whatever they can find in society. I want to ensure that welfare services are not reduced, that we build on the existing structure and improve existing welfare services with increasing emphasis on assistance from church and voluntary organisations, with the department playing a coordinating role and ensuring that services are fairly and uniformly maintained and available to the people of South Australia.

As the Public Accounts Committee noted, if voluntary organisations are to play a far greater role in the provision of welfare services—and in my area church and voluntary organisations act with a great amount of care and sensitivity and are well equipped to provide this role—there needs to be more accountability from those non-government organisations in receipt of Government funding to ensure that we get value for money, that we deliver a more efficient welfare service to meet our future needs. The Public Accounts Committee noted the existing accountability structures of non-government organisations in receipt of Government

funds, and they can be summarised as natural accountability and ministerial control of the Government agencies which dispense those funds. That is one mechanism. Other mechanisms of control are by reports submitted to the funding agency by the funded organisation, often in compliance with the condition of funding; the annual reports of both the funding and funded agencies; and, in special cases, through the application of section 32 of the Public Finance and Audit Act, which provides, in limited circumstances, discretionary audit by the Auditor-General.

The Public Accounts Committee recommended improving the accountability structures for non-government organisations to ensure that the role or partnership that has evolved between Labor Governments and voluntary and church organisations in the community can continue and that there is value for public moneys going into the non-government sector and that there is a more efficient delivery of welfare services and greater accountability. That is not to suggest that we should intrude on the internal affairs of non-government organisations: quite the reverse. It is to ensure that there is value for money, accountability and an efficient delivery of services. As far as some of the accountability structures are concerned, the Public Accounts Committee in summary recommended that there be a three-tier accountability structure in future to enable non-government organisations to play their role.

These can be summarised as: first, the existing accountability structures, which I have already outlined; and, secondly, discretionary audit by the Auditor-General and report to the Parliament if the Auditor-General considers it appropriate. Hand in hand with that is a requirement to widen the ambit of section 33 (2) of the Public Finance and Audit Act to give the Auditor-General a probably enhanced ability to undertake efficiency and value for money audits of publicly funded bodies—in other words, under an amended section.

Thirdly, audit by the Auditor-General at the request of a Minister under section 32 of the Public Finance and Audit Act is to be undertaken when unusual or special circumstances exist or are perceived to exist. In addition to that, by way of a separate conclusion, the Public Accounts Committee recommended that when a non-government body receives substantial Government funding it should enter into a contract with the funding agency. This contract should specify the conditions of funding and should bind the recipient to standards of professional performance, standards of service delivery and financial management and reporting.

I understand that that process is under way with regard to a number of conditions that we have observed in relation to non-government organisations receiving Government funding. Once again, the Public Accounts Committee was ahead of trends in relation to this area in anticipating the need for non-government organisations, voluntary organisations—whether they be church or any other *bona fide* voluntary organisation—to play an increasing role in the partnership that we have built up with voluntary organisations during our period of government.

It is a role that needs to change. No Government can be static. Just because you suggest a change of direction does not mean that you diminish in any way the role of the Small Business Corporation, as I indicated. It filled a very important vacuum in the past, but I believe that its role needs to change. The example I used here was the Department for Family and Community Services. I saw this first hand, working in the department between 1966 and 1970, in a State that had the worst welfare services in the country, apart from Queensland.

It was a very primitive department, and it showed the way in which conservative Governments treated people in need of welfare services. I want to make it quite clear: I do not want there to be any confusion with the sorts of policies that stem from Mr Hewson, which are for the Government to opt out and leave people at the mercy of society to cope in whatever way they can. I am suggesting that Governments play a continuing, coordinating role to ensure the uniform, fair and equitable delivery of services in the welfare and business areas. It is this Government that cements the relationship with the non-government sector.

With regard to church and voluntary organisations, I commend, in particular, church organisations for the way in which they want to ensure that people who come to them for assistance are sensitively and properly dealt with, and I congratulate those organisations in my electorate and elsewhere in the State for the way in which they want to play their role in our welfare services. It is a very important role for the church to play: not only do they have a religious role but they have a great civilising and social role in the community. I believe that, in future, church organisations and *bona fide* voluntary organisations that want to participate in the welfare area will give Governments great value for money and great efficiency if we progressively and responsibly transfer many of the Government services that have been undertaken in the past to the private sector, which can undertake them properly and with great sensitivity.

In doing that, I do not want in any way to diminish the role of Government agencies in respect of the way they carried out their tasks in the 1970s and 1980s. They did it admirably, but society changes. Our tax base in South Australia is extremely narrow and, more and more, we need to call on assistance, whether it be from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in the business area, industry-based organisations or the church and *bona fide* voluntary organisations in the welfare area. I support the motion.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the motion. I express my loyalty to the Queen and should like to congratulate Her Excellency the Governor on the manner in which she is fulfilling her vice-regal duties. All of us have been immensely impressed by the sheer zest for life of Dame Roma and by the way she has entered into her position as Governor with all her characteristic warmth, energy and dedication. I know that I speak, especially, for the women of South Australia when I say what a wonderful example she sets for us all and how inspiring the performance of her role is to all women.

I see the member for Stuart nodding in warm agreement on the other side of the Chamber. The Governor had the responsibility of opening Parliament with a speech prepared by her Government, which I regard as absolutely sterile in its approach to the monumental problems confronting this State. It was interesting to hear the contribution of the previous speaker (the member for Hartley) and to note that his normal cocky contribution to debate was somewhat subdued and that he actually admitted that the Government cannot do everything; that there may be a role for the private sector, particularly for the voluntary agencies, in picking up, in effect, the shattered pieces of the lives and livelihoods of South Australians who have suffered so cruelly under this Government.

The member for Hartley said that no Government can stand still. I suggest that this Government is not standing still: it is going backwards very fast, and it is dragging the State of South Australia with it. It is not possible to do so precisely, because the figures are not available, but if one

were to add up the liabilities that the management of this Government has inflicted upon the taxpayers of this State, the total sum is roughly equivalent to the total State budget in the current year; in other words, in the region of \$5 billion.

Never in the history of this or any other State in the Commonwealth, if one takes it on a *per capita* basis, has there been such colossal, hideous debt and such a refusal by the Government in office to admit its total failure as far as management is concerned. The suffering that has been inflicted on the community is immense. The two groups that are suffering most (apart from the group in the middle—families—who are being squeezed severely) are young people, one-third of whom are unemployed.

That is one-third of the age group 18 to 25, and is a human tragedy of enormous proportions, which will probably have a ripple effect for some of those young people into the next generation. The other group that is being severely affected is, of course, the aged and the ageing, particularly those who are frail and in need of some support in addition to that which can be provided by their families.

As far as young people are concerned, I suppose that I saw the epitome of the tragedy a few weeks ago in a young man who came into my office. He looked so beaten that I actually thought that he was in some way disabled. When I read the letter that he left with me, I realised what his disability was. He had graduated at the end of last year, and in the past six months he had applied for over 400 jobs. He had graduated well; he was well qualified for a technical position. That young man was just about destroyed mentally and emotionally as a result of the feelings of rejection by a society that could find nothing useful for him to do that would bring him any kind of financial reward.

I make no apology whatsoever for saying that the responsibility for that and for the tragedy that has befallen so many other young people must be laid fairly and squarely at the doors of the State and Federal Governments. When things are going well, those Governments claim credit for success. These Governments must accept the responsibility for total abject and colossal failure.

The issue of the State Bank is before a royal commission. Therefore, I will not canvass in any detail the issues that already have been canvassed and raised by me and others in this House over the past three years. However, I do wish to address the issues raised in the report that was provided to members on the State Government Insurance Commission. Of the \$5 billion liability that this Government is presently carrying in the name of the taxpayers, \$1.5 billion is the responsibility of the State Government Insurance Commission. In his statement to the House on the day that Parliament opened last week the Premier, with respect to the report, said:

The Government set up this review to tell it whether mistakes were being made, whether systems were inadequate or policies inappropriate.

I suggest that the Government set up that review for one reason and one reason only—because the scrutiny of the Opposition, notably of the Leader, the Deputy Leader in this House and the Hon. Legh Davis in another place, had exposed mistakes. The Government did not need to see whether mistakes were being made. It was demonstrably clear that mistakes were being made, and those mistakes were being defended continually day after day in this House by the Premier. He defended the commission's right to operate on a commercial charter. He defended quite stupid and insane property acquisitions. He defended quite foolish commercial acquisitions. Time after time, when these actions of SGIC were being questioned by the Opposition, we were branded as talking down the State, as attacking State Gov-

ernment institutions and not caring about the welfare of the State.

I would like to address in some detail certain aspects of the report. On page 95 of the report the operations of the board are dealt with—and the operations of the board were the subject of sustained Opposition questioning. The report states:

The committee has been made aware of a perception that the Chairman substantially influences SGIC's activities.

The Chairman is Mr Vin Kean and, of course, that is more, I believe, than a perception. Mr Kean has been Chairman of the commission for more than a decade, and he certainly has been in a position to influence very powerfully the commission's decisions. The report continues:

The committee doubts the wisdom of certain transactions given these negative perceptions. For example, the loan of \$20 million to United Landholdings Limited—

of which Mr Kean is Chairman—

a company associated with the Chairman, was somewhat unusual because of its size and the fact that it was for the total value—not part of the value, not a proportion, but the total value—of a building project including capitalised interest.

In other words, 100 per cent plus of the cost incurred by United Landholdings Limited was provided by SGIC. The report continues:

Other loans made by SGIC were for a maximum of two-thirds of the value of the property, and apart from two other loans of \$2.5 million and \$6 million no other loans exceeded \$2 million. Accordingly—

and this is important—

this loan was outside of SGIC's normal lending practices. It should be noted that two banks had agreed to lend the same amount, but with different security and conditions.

The report does not say, but it is abundantly clear, that SGIC's conditions were infinitely more favourable to Mr Kean and his company than were the conditions laid down by the banks which were willing to lend the money. The report continues:

Security for the loan includes personal guarantees from two directors and shareholders.

Mr Deputy Speaker, who of us would not be very pleased with the prospect of borrowing \$20 million, the basis of which were personal guarantees from two directors and shareholders? It is quite clear that the Chairman of the commission obtained a loan on terms more favourable than he could have obtained from any other source. He obtained it for his company while he was Chairman of the commission that made the loan.

What does the Government Management Board's Business Operations Review Sub-board's review of the SGIC have to say about this in its conclusions and recommendations? On page 13 under the heading 'Other Matters/Operations of the Board' it states:

The committee accepts the Crown Solicitor's advice that there have not been any breaches of duty, impropriety or illegality involving the Chairman in his relationship to SGIC. His direct and indirect dealings with SGIC in real estate or as a borrower create undesirable speculation and perception. The committee believes this to be unfortunate, and it is damaging to both SGIC and the Chairman.

I believe it is more than unfortunate: I think it is absolutely outrageous that this should have occurred, and that it should have been allowed to occur with the full knowledge of the Premier and Treasurer. The Premier in this Parliament on 7 March defended it and said:

I have to say that at all times Mr Kean, the Chairman of SGIC, has acted properly in terms of his declaration of interest.

It is one thing to declare an interest and then proceed in one's own interests to take advantage of the situation. That, in my opinion, without any doubt whatsoever, is what Mr

Kean did. I think there is something rotten in the public life of South Australia when there is no official condemnation whatsoever by anyone—by any member of the Government or by any member of the Government Management Board or its review sub-board—of such an outrageous breach of responsibility as that which occurred in relation to those borrowings from SGIC to Mr Vin Kean and his company.

I can only say that either the review committee pulled its punches when it came to its conclusions on page 13 or, alternatively, the review committee was more stringent in its criticisms of Mr Kean, as it well should have been, and its report was sanitised by officers of the Premier's Department before it was released publicly.

I cannot condemn too strongly the failure of the Premier to supervise properly conflicts of interest that were so blatant, so deep, so strong and so sustained as those that occurred between the board members of SGIC and United Land Holdings Ltd. Those transactions ought to have been denounced and publicly condemned. Nothing has been done by the Premier, and that indicates to me that he condones what occurred. The Premier has said nothing to indicate the contrary view.

On this side of the House we believe that it is wrong, wrong, wrong that such a thing should have been allowed to occur. It presents to the public a perception that people in high places can get away with anything, that there will be no retribution, no criticism, and no public condemnation, that, in effect, no action will be taken, because no action has been taken and no condemnation has been made. It is fair to say that Mr Kean as Chairman of SGIC was in a position far, far more influential than almost any Minister of the Crown could be placed in in the execution and administration of his or her duties.

The conventions imposed upon Ministers in respect of conflict of interest and pecuniary interest are stringent, and I venture to say they have not been as stringently observed under this Government and under this Premier as they have been in the past under previous Governments and Premiers. The activities of the Minister of Recreation and Sport in respect of section 50 of the Planning Act and matters to do with property in the area adjacent to his home are a case in point.

Nevertheless few, if any, Ministers of the Crown would have the opportunity for influence and self-advancement of interest as Mr Kean had in his position as SGIC Chairman. If any Minister had in any way ventured close to the position in which Mr Kean finds himself, that Minister would have been censured and condemned, and certainly should have been dropped from Cabinet. Mr Kean is still Chairman of SGIC and the Premier has had nothing whatever critical to say about it. That presents a picture to South Australians that it is possible to carry enormous responsibility, to be in a position where there is enormous potential for conflict of interest, but not to withdraw from that position and to put oneself in a position that is infinitely more favourable than that which any client with whom the organisation deals could ever be in or could ever enjoy.

I hope that what I am saying is being listened to carefully by members opposite, and I hope they feel ashamed of the fact that not one of them or their Leader or any Minister or any public servant or any person appointed by the Government has taken up this issue and voiced in even the smallest degree the deep concerns that South Australians feel that this should have been allowed to occur and, having occurred and been exposed, that it should be allowed to pass with no more comment than that it is 'unfortunate'.

The other aspect of the report upon which I would like to comment concerns put options, in particular, the put

option of \$520 million for the building at 333 Collins Street. At page 25 of the report, we see the heading 'Role and Function of SGIC' in respect of its business; we also see headings such as 'life insurance', 'health insurance', 'general insurance', and 'compulsory third party insurance', and a fifth point is identified as 'credit and financial risk insurance'.

In other words, SGIC insures credit and financial risks, which includes property puts, share puts, credit risk insurance, securitisation and residual value insurance. The very fact that these financial operations require reinsurance is a clear indication that they are high risk operations, but SGIC, without undertaking any insurance of its own, decided to embark on this course of action. In fact, the Premier told Parliament yesterday:

The put option on 333 Collins Street seemed like a good idea at the time.

Was not the Premier, as Treasurer, aware that put options are the tool of speculators? They are not and never have been the tool of investors, let alone investors who are backed by Government guarantees. That is not a new idea. That is not something that the Opposition knows from hindsight: it is something that every dealer in real estate and finance has known ever since put options were developed. They are a high risk operation, which is precisely why they customarily carry insurance. No, this is not what occurred with SGIC's put option. On 20 March this year the Premier told Parliament:

In this instance reinsurance was not taken.

SGIC was reinsuring other people's put options. It knew it was operating in a high-risk area but it decided, 'No, our judgment is good, we know the odds and we cannot possibly go wrong. Let us go ahead and buy this building.' The Premier said:

In this instance reinsurance was not taken, but SGIC could have sold down part of the risk. This was not done as it believed there was little likelihood of the put being called, and indeed at the time of entering into the transaction professional advice indicated that the building should have a value in excess of the amount of the put, at time of completion.

The Premier ought to be ashamed to stand up in this House and expect us to believe that kind of twaddle. It is like someone who owns a valuable house and whose family is asleep in it saying, when it burns down, that he had not taken out any insurance or put in any fire hydrants, and that he did not think it mattered because he thought the house was safe. That is the exact equivalent in insurance terms of what SGIC did with that put option on 333 Collins Street. The sub-board of the Government Management Board in respect of puts states:

The property put business should be critically reviewed before SGIC re-enters this area.

That understatement of the year is on page 19 of the report, and I repeat it:

The property put business should be critically reviewed before SGIC re-enters this area.

I question how anyone with any sense of responsibility whatsoever could do other than condemn—not sweep aside lightly and gently, as the Government Management Board has done—totally and out-of-hand the practice of a Government guaranteed investor investing in put options. Fortunately, the Premier has had some late change of mind and glimmer of commonsense and, in his statement to the House on Thursday, said:

The Government intends to maintain the prohibition on this type of business and consequently does not believe any further review is necessary.

One can only say: at last they appear to be learning. But one cannot say it with any conviction, because over the

past 18 months we have had a catalogue of calamities and I believe there are more to come. Nothing effective, aside from the royal commission into the State Bank, has been done by this Government in order to deal effectively with problems which would never have seen the light of day under the administration of this Government had the Opposition not raised the matters in Parliament.

I can only say that opposition is frustrating in the extreme; it is unrewarding in the extreme, and there is certainly no pleasure for members of the Liberal Party in exposing this kind of fraudulent (in some cases) and irresponsible (in others) conduct of the affairs of State by this Government. However, I do believe that South Australians have reason to be grateful for the diligent way in which the Opposition has tackled these matters and for the way in which the media, in the main, has responded to the intensive parliamentary questioning and has exposed this Government for what it is: totally incompetent, unfit to govern, with no mandate to govern. I doubt that it will govern for its full term; I certainly hope not.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): It is with pleasure that I am able to support the adoption of the address delivered by Her Excellency the Governor at the opening of the third session of the forty-seventh Parliament. It is disappointing to note that we must acknowledge the passing of three very esteemed former members of Parliament. The late Vic Springett, a former member of the Legislative Council, to me was one of nature's gentlemen, and his albeit short term in Parliament did not go unnoticed. I thought that Vic Springett in his own way made quite a worthy contribution during his term here. He retired from politics to go back into medical practice and medical research, mainly in relation to cancer.

Geoff O'Halloran Giles, whilst not in Parliament during my time, served in both the Legislative Council and the House of Representatives. I knew Geoff through my banking associations. Whilst he had a colourful political career, Geoff was also a well-known cattle breeder—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And art collector.

Mr BECKER: —and art collector, as the member for Coles advises me. The late Ross Story was truly a professional politician. He was a member of another place when I first came into Parliament. He was one who would readily take you aside and give you some advice, and he was not without giving the odd stern warning. When we were in Government from 1979 to 1982, periodically members would receive a telephone call: 'Ross here; I would like to see you in the Premier's office.' You would be advised, with Ross sitting alongside the Premier. 'We're not happy.' He might not have been happy with the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, but I kept reminding him and the Premier that my brief was to continue carrying out my responsibilities without fear or favour. I did that, and certainly paid the price. I would never change my attitude and would never take back anything I did during that time, because it had to be done. It is a pity that some of the chairmen of the Public Accounts Committee since have not followed the same principle.

I believe that we have wasted the past 10 years with the attitude and performance of that committee, which is a disappointment. That will be the subject of another debate because the member for Elizabeth at this stage has convinced the Government to introduce legislation to change the committee system and structure. As I said to that member, it is just simply change for the sake of change. It will not achieve very much. Whilst it may widen the powers of the Public Accounts Committee, it is still a matter of the personalities of that committee and the role of its Chairman.

What disappoints me once again is that we have listened to a speech prepared for Her Excellency outlining the Government's program during this session of Parliament. In paragraph 5, Her Excellency said:

My Government believes it is vital that, as we move out of the recession, there are in place policies and projects which will position South Australia to take the best advantage of new business activity, increased employment opportunity and a secure outlook for our young people.

With youth unemployment running at about 30 per cent, certainly we need some very positive action from the Government, and even with some of the latest announcements coming from the Treasury benches, I believe there is no real positive plan to do something about the unemployment among our young people. They are being given a reasonable education, but they are not being prepared for the job ahead of them, and certainly not for life as we knew it when we were their age. That is the greatest disappointment I can see in the past 15 or so years as we have plodded along under this current Administration. The Governor went on:

The multifunction polis proposed and recommended around a core site at Gillman is one area in which the State has the potential to develop a project involving all these opportunities.

That is a long way off, some 15 years at least before real job opportunities could be created. They will be specialist job opportunities and will not be of any great benefit to those young people currently unemployed, many of whom are well educated and are finding in some situations that they are over-educated and having difficulty finding suitable employment.

I notice that the multifunction polis has already soaked up about \$12 million. It has been a glorious exercise in marketing; an exercise where the people are brainwashed first. It is the same old story. We have heard it for the past 50 years in various countries around the world. The real challenge and test is that we need the work now for these people. I look forward with interest to the debate on the proposed legislation for the multifunction polis because, if there is any issue that has divided the community, this is one. It is not the Government's role to divide the community: its role is to give the lead to the people, but this was an issue that got off to a very poor start with the naming of the involvement of the proposed Japanese investment.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr BECKER: That is right: as the member for Coles says, a refusal to impart information. Now, selective information is coming forward, but there is still much damning evidence in relation to this project. For \$12 million I would want to see much more than we have seen at this stage. I am extremely disappointed that so much money has gone into that area where private enterprise probably should have been given the green light and by doing this could have saved the taxpayers all that money. It still comes back to the original point I raised, dealing with youth unemployment. This is an absolute blot on the Government.

I am also concerned that there will be further legislation in relation to consumer matters. There are many areas where current fair trading and consumer laws are quite deficient. They are not satisfactory in protecting the consumer. They are not satisfactory in relation to the sale of new and used motor vehicles, for instance, plus many other normal day-to-day household consumer goods. I look forward with interest to that proposed legislation as well. Her Excellency went on:

My Government plans a number of initiatives aimed at giving young South Australians access to world standard education, as well as boosting programs to improve employment opportunities.

Following the amalgamation of five South Australian tertiary institutions into a three university system my Government is

proceeding to ensure that State objectives in tertiary education work closely into national priorities.

That is all very well. It is a long and time consuming policy goal, but not one word is mentioned in relation to the role of primary and secondary education. I found Her Excellency's speech again disappointing in relation to what is happening in education.

The western region of the Education Department has been examining the utilisation of various schools, and the West Torrens cluster comes into my area. There has been a primary schools review of the western suburbs, and in that review it was suggested that Camden Primary School be amalgamated with Plympton High School on the Plympton High School campus. This issue has probably caused more anxiety, anguish and annoyance to the residents in Camden than has any other issue in the past 20 years. When I was first elected to State Parliament in 1970 we undertook a campaign to have the Camden Primary School, which was built some 75 years ago, re-established on land that the department had bought some years previously, so the children attending that school would have a reasonably sized open space area, a playground and, in particular, a standard oval. The Camden school, having been built so long ago, did not have any provision for sporting or recreational facilities. It had an asphalt yard and a tiny piece of lawn so small that one could cut it with a handmower; the lavatory block was across the other side of the campus; and it was outdated and inconvenient.

The Minister of Education in the early 1970s, Hugh Hudson, agreed that a new school would be built on the land purchased by the Education Department for Camden Primary School. He realised that it was important and urgent that the school be relocated, and he put the proposition to me whether, if we accepted a Demac structure for the school—provided that it was suitably landscaped and sufficient funds were made available to the school to be established on the new site—the school council would agree. Naturally, the school council was sceptical, but it agreed. It accepted the offer, so Camden was one of the very few schools that was built totally out of Demac. It was an experiment in those days and it has worked extremely well. I believe that the school was opened in about 1975. It has probably been one of the most successful transitions from brick, wood and iron school buildings into this type of campus.

The Camden Primary School has never had very much money in its school fund. We used to hold various fundraising functions and raised \$50 here or \$100 there, and we thought that was absolutely superb. Under the chairmanship of Wal Merriman, the school council devised a system where the parents volunteered to clean the school and the money saved would be pooled for the benefit of the students' education. They would provide the facilities that the school had never been able to provide before. During the next few years the school council continued to raise money and to involve the whole of the Camden community in the aims and objectives of that school—so much so that, within a few years, a multi-purpose hall was built at a cost of \$288 000. The Education Department put in \$250 000 and the school council contributed \$38 000 in cash.

That was a pretty good effort for a school community that had hardly any money in the bank whatsoever. I would like to add that at the present moment the school council has about \$130 000 in the bank and when one goes to council meetings it is a matter not so much of what will be done with the money or where it will be raised, but of what sort of short-term investments will be considered. This hall was the basic structure and certain facilities, such as air-conditioning, additional furniture and sporting equipment,

were necessary to equip it. This cost \$150 000 over the next seven years and it was all raised and paid for by the school council. In other words, the Education Department only ever made one contribution—that \$250 000 to build the hall—but, through the school community the school council contributed \$188 000 over a period of a few years.

Following the recommendation that the Camden school be merged with the Plympton High School campus, we have undertaken quite a considerable campaign to save the school and to ask the Education Department, and particularly the Minister of Education, to reconsider any proposal to close the school. Of course, we have met with absolutely deafening silence from the Minister. On 20 June this year I sent a facsimile to the Minister, inviting him to visit the school following public meetings which were well attended by the school parents and friends. As yet, I have not had a reply or an acknowledgment from the Minister. I believe the Minister's behaviour and that of the Director-General and the senior officers in his department to be nothing short of disgusting. I find discriminatory the way in which they have treated me and the Chairman of the school council, and the way that the staff have been intimidated by regulations so that no member of the school staff is permitted to speak to any member of the school council or parents or to discuss the issue of the proposed school merger, closure or whatever.

In my lifetime I have observed, read and taken note of dictatorships around the world. I have looked at the bizarre behaviour of some of the best dictators, but I have never yet struck in the operations of any department the behaviour that we have witnessed in the Education Department when it comes to handling the very sensitive issue of deciding the future or the fate of a local school. The Camden school is probably the linchpin of the Camden community. Over the years thousands of people have gone through that school. It is a wonderful school, which has provided an outstanding educational opportunity for all these people. It has had a first class music school and has enabled hundreds, if not thousands, of children to learn a musical instrument in the past few years.

Apart from that, the school has provided a very caring and valuable primary education to the community. To treat the school in the way that the Adelaide area office and the Education Department have is beyond comprehension. In all my years in politics I have never known such an attitude. I can understand that the Adelaide area office would be very wary about wanting to close a school in my electorate, following the closure and the very bitter campaign that was run by the parents and friends of the Fulham Primary School.

In that case, there were only 98 students attending Fulham Primary School and it was difficult to argue for the retention of the school. Even so, the Fulham community lost a very valuable resource. Approximately 220 students attend Camden Primary School, and it is a viable proposition. The Minister responsible for the establishment of the school on its current site, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, was quite proud of it. He was proud of that achievement. He was proud of this demac school, as he described it to me. Yet a person has come up with advice to the Australian Capital Territory Government, which I believe has been accepted by all Australian Ministers of Education, that schools with 500 students or fewer are not viable. That is absolute garbage.

Hugh Hudson fought a long and bitter campaign when he was first elected to Parliament. He absolutely hounded our Minister of Education. He demanded and in many instances received huge sums of funding for education. He made education the number one priority. Yet, during his

term as Minister, primary schoolchildren probably received a very poor standard of education. Today we have a crisis with a generation that has very poor literacy and numeracy skills. When the member for Mount Gambier was the Minister of Education, he proved on many occasions that it was Hugh Hudson's policies that affected the education of children in the mid 1970s.

Members can understand how bitter I feel when we have fought to build up a school and maintain it, when parents and friends of a community have worked so hard to raise so much money and feel so proud of their school, to find now that the Education Department which they have served in a voluntary capacity over the years wants to wipe them. That is why, when I received a copy of a letter sent to the Minister of Education on 12 August by the Chairman of the Camden School Council, I felt even more bitter towards the Minister and the administration of his department.

The challenge I am making today in this Address in Reply debate is for the Minister of Education to have the courage to come down and visit this school and meet with me and the Chairman of the school council as a matter of urgency. I do not care whether he comes during the day or at night. He is more than welcome at any time, whether or not the children are there. We want the Minister of Education to show an interest in his portfolio and to show an interest in this school. I do not believe that he has the courage to do so. I believe that he has been absolutely bamboozled by his administrators and his Director-General, who is not a South Australian, and I detest any departmental head who comes from another State. Any Government that appoints people from outside the State demonstrates cowardice. We should be masters of our own destiny in our own State and I have no time for people who sit in multi-storey buildings and disregard the advice of we who pay the taxes and charges and who work in a voluntary capacity to raise the money to improve the facilities that should be provided by the Government.

Before I read the text of the letter, I ask members to bear in mind that, in order to raise funds to provide the salary of a music teacher and equipment and resources for the school, the school council has been quite entrepreneurial and uses every opportunity to raise substantial sums of money to assist the Education Department. It has arranged to let part of the school hall to an organisation called Tri-Skills, but the Education Department is trying to override the school council's agreement with this organisation and take away from the school another source of its funds. The letter is headed 'Unacceptable changes proposed to agreement for Tri-Skills to use facilities at Camden Primary School' and reads:

Under current Education Department regulations, school facilities may be hired to outside bodies by principals, after consultation with and the agreement of school councils. Camden Primary School has a current agreement for the use of the gymnasium by Tri-Skills. The Adelaide Area Office, supposedly acting on your behalf, has caused great offence to the school council, the parent community and the school staff by:

Seeking to set aside an existing contract between the school and Tri-Skills, when the agreement is in conformity with Education Department regulations.

Seeking to usurp the legitimate powers of the Principal and school council as set out in the Education Department regulations.

Ignoring the fact that the school community contributed \$180 000 to the cost of building the facility, primarily for school purposes.

Ignoring the fact that the existing agreement is mutually acceptable to both parties and is far more flexible than the one advanced by the department.

Seeking to impose a two year contract not wanted by the school when one year is preferred.

Removing from the school council and Principal rights of control, access and use of its facilities and vesting it in you as Minister.

Denying rights to Camden Primary School that are available to all other schools as outlined in Education Department regulations.

Seeking to give Tri-Skills exclusive rights outside school hours which is unacceptable to the Principal, school council and staff.

Seeking to give Tri-Skills shared use with the school during school hours, at the absolute discretion of the Minister—likewise unacceptable to the school council and the Principal and staff.

Trying to superimpose a new contract on an existing one and a defunct one for 1990 in a retrospective manner.

Seeking to have moneys paid to the Minister, which according to Education Department regulations must be paid into school council funds and worse still to apply it retrospectively. The fee for 1990 was \$25 000 and for 1991 is \$27 000.

The school council has a number of other concerns viz:

The school council has not been adequately informed or involved and at least on two occasions it appears that revised contracts have been presented to Tri-Skills by the department for signature without informing the school council or presenting the school council with a copy. Such action is regarded as unethical by the school council and reflects ultimately on the Adelaide Area Director, in our opinion.

Another Adelaide area officer was heard to say that I, as Chairman of the council, would not be welcome at meetings.

Yet another Adelaide area officer, at assistant director level, who assured us there must have been a misunderstanding, gave other assurances which council believes have not been honoured.

Ian Wilson at SAASSO has expressed amazement and is dismayed to think that the department could behave in this way and has assured me of his full support to enforce our rights in this matter.

We trust that you will agree to discuss this matter with us so that the matter can be resolved satisfactorily and amicably and in the hope that our school's grievances can be redressed. We think it fair to point out that we shall take all reasonable measures to protect the interests of the Camden Primary School as perceived by the community.

It has not escaped the notice of school council and parents generally that the Adelaide Area Office's move to remove control, access and usage of the gymnasium from the school level and to give local powers and the fees for hire to you as Minister comes at the very time that the Adelaide Area Director is persisting with proposals for relocating and amalgamating the school. These proposals, as he well knows, are likewise totally unacceptable and are, and will be, resisted with all means in the power of the school community.

The letter is signed Paul Cichowski, Chairman, Camden School Council. As I said earlier, the text of that letter to the Minister of Education should cause concern to every person involved in education. It should be of concern to the Minister that the type of behaviour that is being demonstrated by the Adelaide Area Office of the Education Department is such that it has reflected not only on the school council but on all things involving education and the provision of education to the young people in our community.

The damage that is being done to the education system by a few hot-headed bureaucrats in endeavouring to force their way is totally unacceptable. If we were in another country, we would be leading a revolution against this lot. There would be a revolt against the Adelaide Area Office in the Education Department building. We would storm the building.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BECKER: We would demand the hide of those people. If they were working for me in a bank or in private enterprise, I would have them sacked for the way they have treated the school, the staff and the school council. They have nothing but contempt for the democratically-elected school council, and it is a huge reflection on the taxpayers who provided the money to build and develop an education system at Camden Primary School. We will not tolerate this behaviour. It is high time that the Minister of Education—

this wimpy little creep—acknowledged my letter and invitation of 20 June to visit the school. It is high time that either he takes a greater interest in his portfolio or he resigns.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I rise to support the Address in Reply. I congratulate Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell on the presentation of her first speech to this Parliament. I, too, wish her all the best in her term of office. I also wish to express my condolences to the families of the three former members who have passed away since this Parliament last sat, that is, Dr Springett, Geoff Giles and Ross Story. I particularly frame my remarks to the late Ross Story, because he influenced me very much as I came along the road to politics. I can well remember sitting on the front verandah of the Story home, talking about what politics is, how to survive the system and how to approach it from the family side. I appreciated those words of influence from him.

I am heartened to know that the Government recognises the vital need to take account of concerns about overall economic management, but the question springs to mind: when will it act upon this vital need? It is all very well to talk about it—and we have been talking about responsible economic management—but what do we have? This document is full of it again—just talk. Our economic managers, the Government, need to lift their game before it is too late, if it is not, in fact, already too late. The Governor's speech talks of efforts towards micro-economic reform, focusing energy on increasing productivity, minimising costs, improving quality, better development of markets and so forth. It is so much talk that these words are losing their meaning.

In my electorate alone, every day I see businesses, particularly in Clare, that are just waiting to happen. If the Government would get out of their way, they could compete on the world market. We have entrepreneurs who want to have a go, but the system beats them. How would any Government member who is listening here like to go out there today and start up a small business? You might be the smartest person or might have the smartest invention, but to survive in the South Australian scene today you would have to be more than lucky.

Many of these people are now having to go offshore. I will cite one in particular, and that is Preton Constructions in Clare. Peter Eaton has spent a lot of time developing a parcel rack, a folding display area. Members might think that that does not amount to much but, of all the products that are marketable, it really stands out. This gentleman has met nothing but frustration. He has the product ready for manufacture but just cannot get his industry off the ground because he is bogged down in red tape. I hope that that industry is not taken offshore into the Asian market. I am sure that members of this Parliament will see the product on the market within two years but, if it is made overseas, we will all regret it.

The planning review called '2020 Vision' is a great worry to rural constituents, because it dismisses outside areas of Adelaide, saying that decentralisation is not a viable option for South Australia. How do you think my constituents feel about that? Here is a big, glossy document called '2020 Vision', and it contains comments such as that. We may as well all pack up now and come to live in Adelaide and further overload your system.

Mr Ferguson: And we would welcome you.

Mr VENNING: No doubt you would. However it is a sad state of affairs when you see comments such as that. This document will not be given any credibility at all when

comments such as that are its foundation. Surely, there is as much need for sane strategic planning in rural areas as there is in the city. At this very moment, the Mayor of Wakefield Plains and the CEO are discussing a new industry for that area with the Minister of Transport. That new industry, Arisa Ltd, involves the manufacture of paper from straw pulp. However, there are hurdles in the way, particularly in relation to the planning and the environmental impact study. Those things are a hurdle to all our industries, and I wonder how much easier it would be if these hurdles were not there.

I could go on for hours about the blatant discrimination suffered by rural residents at the hands of this Government. You do not need to be much of a scholar to read the statistics and see what I am talking about. I know that we must look at the overall State perspective, which I do, but we need a fair go.

In relation to health services, we have new funding arrangements for hospitals. They will no longer be split in two. General operations funding will be the way to go, and there will be a fee for service. There will be global budgeting, requiring hospitals to budget for everything together. If the fee-for-service expenditure rises, hospitals will need to reduce spending in other areas, for example, by reducing nursing staff who do not perform surgery. Therefore, they will act only as first-aid posts. City people would not put up with that reduced level of service.

With the closure or threatened closure of SACON depots and the office in Clare, the nearest offices will be in Port Pirie and Gawler. These were services created by this Government. People have become used to them, are using them and now the Government has cut them off in their prime. I refer to the closure or threatened closure of the ETSA depots and offices in Clare and Riverton. I am sure that most members of this Chamber will have a very good knowledge of the town of Clare. Imagine taking 23 families out of Clare just for the sake of the GARG report, to save a few dollars and a couple of salaries at the overseeing level.

The office is to move to Kadina, which is not a central position, and the reason for doing that does not stand up. I hope that the Government will see the folly of its ways and change direction before it is too late. We are faced with the closure or threatened closure of road transport depots in Bute and the rationalisation of services in Crystal Brook at the same time as the Morgan-Burra road is in dire need of sealing. It is the major road between Sydney and Perth, as well as having great tourist potential.

In the past few weeks alone, we have seen a move to close the district registrars' offices in both Clare and Burra. I know that you, Sir, have to sit through tedious debates on the many matters that we junior members bring forward, but I ask you and the House, in these areas where both culture and heritage is very important: why should we be closing the registry offices and why should we be moving the records? I say, 'Be blown!' If Adelaide people want the records, give them copies and leave the originals in Burra and Clare where, I assure you, Sir, they are in safe keeping. I have inspected them myself within the past few days. Kindergartens are being closed—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach is out of his seat and out of order with the interjection.

Mr VENNING: Kindergartens are being closed and no child-care services such as there are in the city are now available. People in Adelaide take that for granted, but people in the country have no option when their kindergartens close. Schools are losing staff under the new for-

mula. Senior secondary students are subjected to several teachers for a matriculation topic in a single semester.

I will take the opportunity now to be positive in respect of the Government, although it is very difficult. I applaud the Government for what it has done with Channel TAFE. I was present and had a lot to do with the introduction of this service, which the Minister talked about earlier. I congratulate the Government on that service. I see this technology as one of the few shining lights to be able to give isolated students a chance of any sort of education, particularly when we have the wide curriculum choices we have today. It is a plus, I congratulate the Government on it, but ask that it ensures that it is affordable for the user. Public transport is not readily available in country areas, including user-friendly railway services. Today the Minister of Transport said that he could see no reason, if the Mount Gambier service is to be kept in place, why the Iron Triangle Limited should not be kept.

That is a positive step. This service should be reintroduced as a user-friendly service with timetables that match with the delivery of passengers into the Adelaide Railway Station and with modern rolling stock. Good heavens, it was almost a National Trust outfit before. We can be positive that this can have a bipartisan approach. I will support the Minister if he goes along this track!

Instead of the Government making strategic plans for the regional areas of this State and capitalising on comparative advantages in various areas, it is actively reducing the quality of life for rural people and encouraging them not to live and work in country areas at all. As I said, we will all end up living in Adelaide.

I welcome the reforms that have emanated from the Special Premiers Conference on duplication of State and Federal services. Heavens above, if ever something was long overdue it is this. All our States' individual parochialism is apparently going out the door, as it ought to have done 30 years ago with all the different gauges and different ideas, I offer my support to the Government as it goes along this track. Also, I urge the Government to make sure that South Australia gets the national rail freight centre. It is most important that we get that new freight transport centre for South Australia. If we do not, we will see so many more services lost, particularly with the inevitable linking of Alice Springs to Darwin. The national rail freight centre must be in Adelaide, and when we get it the whole system will have a very good chance of working. I assure the Government that the Opposition will do all it can do to cooperate and ensure that that happens. It is a welcome sign to see the Federal Minister and all the States getting together to try to come up with a common policy.

I have serious reservations about the new heavy vehicle registration costs and its implications for people living in the country. As all members would know, everything rural people consume has a transport component built into it. If heavy vehicle registration costs are to increase, as has been flagged by the Federal Minister, there will be terrible repercussions for everyone living in country areas. This relates particularly to farm trucks. It is all very well to have a user-pays system and make heavy vehicles pay for the roads that they allegedly damage, but what do we do with farm trucks that are on the road for only five or six weeks a year? That matter needs much more thought, and I will again support the Minister if he comes up with a user-pays system that sheets home the cost of damage to the roads. Farmers are very worried about this. Some of these increases in relation to trucks and trailers are up to 250 per cent. Members can realise why rural people are so anxious about it.

I now turn to the planned new legislation that will supposedly benefit the agricultural community. I ask, 'What new legislation?' There are only two references in the document, and they were to the Barley Board and to meat hygiene.

Last Saturday, I was pleased to attend the Crystal Brook show. I noted that six politicians were present, four belonging to the Government Party, and I wondered what was going on. I thought that Custance must be a marginal seat and that they were after it, or that they were there to hear what I was saying. It was very pleasing to have the Minister of Agriculture open the show. I acknowledge that this is the third show that he has attended, and he attends because he and his family enjoy it. The speeches that day reflected appreciation of the Minister's presence.

Last Thursday, the day Parliament was opened, I noted that the Minister of Agriculture (the member for Ramsay) was asked to support the Premier in the no-confidence motion, I thought that that was a most unusual occurrence. However, during the events at the Crystal Brook show, it all came together. When Treasury changes hands in this House, as surely it will when the full State Bank story is known, it will go to the member for Ramsay. That will be a loss to agriculture, but I can see now, too, where that will end up—with the Hon. Ron Roberts, a member of the other place. He is going around the traps in agricultural areas obviously being groomed as the new Minister of Agriculture. In the next few months of this Parliament we look forward to seeing some interesting changes on the Government benches as a result of the State Bank debacle.

I now refer to meat hygiene, which causes me a lot of anxiety. I record my support for any measure that will straighten out this matter. This area is choked up with bureaucracy, which gets in the way of small business and which costs us all money. Many butchers have been told by the Meat Hygiene Authority to do certain things. One butcher was told to install flywire on the window. Twelve months later an officer of the authority told him to put the wire on the other side of the window, irrespective of where the window was hinged. Recently an officer went back and said that the window now had to be filled in. In 12 months he will be back saying that the window should be opened up again to provide light.

It is a ridiculous situation. New slaughter works were built in the past year or so to the required standards, yet within 12 months around came the inspectors with a full list of modifications that needed to be done. People have had enough of this nonsense. There are little soldiers running around the country justifying their existence. I ask the Minister to consider this issue. Let us have some sanity in this area of meat hygiene.

At the Crystal Brook show last Saturday the Minister made speeches which were well received, as his speeches always are. People in country areas appreciate that he gets out there so often. But I wish his Government would deliver in these areas. The Minister, at the Crystal Brook show, spoke about a very emotive issue—spray drift legislation. I appreciate what he said; he said that nothing would be introduced until there was agreement and further discussion on this subject. That is commonsense. I am sure that the industry is prepared to go along this track and support any such changes. We look forward to what the Government can do working in cooperation with industry, not against industry, in this very important area.

I support the Government's assistance to farmers; so far 500 farmers have been given finance from the banks. As the Minister said last Saturday, these people were given finance almost at too high a cost. Many will have to put

their farms on the market straight after harvest. I do not think that that should be a reasonable proposition at all. I support the Minister when he said that farmers need a fair deal, but finance at that cost is far too high.

The Governor's speech referred to the social justice principles of this Government. The people of Custance ask, 'What social justice?' What a cheek this Government has! It should climb down off its pedestal in the clouds and make sure that social justice considerations continue to underpin GARG. Already areas in the Custance electorate are victims of the anti-social justice activities of this Government. Other areas will be threatened by the time GARG has finished. People in my electorate do not get concessions worth talking about. Travel concessions are non-existent, because there is no public transport in many areas.

As to assistance with the cost of getting to hospital, my constituents do not qualify for assistance in getting to Adelaide because often public transport is not available. Country people pay more for petrol and they travel further to get to the nearest local hospital. As I have said, technology can help, and I give credit to TAFE channel for what it has done to try to close gaps in isolated areas.

What a disaster WorkCover is. As the new member for Custance I had many ideas about what I could do for my constituents, particularly in policy generation and assisting the Party and the Parliament to come up with new ideas, but I spend 50 per cent of my time bogged down with problems, the most prominent relating to WorkCover. Two nights ago on my way to the Parliament I made a scheduled stop in Kapunda to visit some ladies, and I was there until 10.30 at night discussing the vexed question of WorkCover.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I cannot give them answers because these people have been given unreasonable expectations as to their entitlements, and now they have been left in the lurch as to what they will lose. One has already separated from her husband. They will lose their homes and everything else, because WorkCover gave them expectations as to their injuries, which I observed were quite genuine. But now they have been left in limbo. The Government must overhaul this monster of WorkCover.

It must look after the people of the State so that members of Parliament can get about their business without confronting such problems. A problem that came to hand the other day in respect of WorkCover involved a constituent who cut his hand with a chainsaw. He had this small injury to his finger stitched up.

When he went back to the large Adelaide hospital to have the stitches removed, the charge was \$125 for no more than 15 minutes to remove four or five stitches. However, this is the standard WorkCover cost, and it is just ridiculous. It is high time WorkCover was given a chance to work, without having these ridiculous costs built in.

I wish to conclude my contribution on a more positive note by indicating that tourism in the Mid-North is developing in leaps and bounds, and it would be greatly helped by the bitumenisation of the Morgan to Burra road. I know that the Government, through the member for Napier and others, have provided assistance in this matter, but I hope in my time as member for Custance we can get more than one or two kilometres surfaced at a time. As I said in my maiden speech 12 months ago to the day, this is a ridiculous situation in respect of such a major road as this.

As a new chum I thought that what the member for Walsh said yesterday was pretty cheap politics. Members on this side make up the Opposition and we do not have the power of Government members. We do not have the advantage of ministerial staff, as they have, and I believe,

as a new member, that my colleagues are doing a commendable job. To single out people as the honourable member did was very low, and I will support my colleagues with all my strength.

As to what the Premier did to me today during Question Time, I thought it was a basic privilege of this Parliament for anyone, including a backbencher, to ask a question. Basically, the Premier told me that I did not have the right as a backbencher to ask such a question. Not only did he not answer the question but also the Premier accused me of being asleep in this Parliament.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: He did not.

Mr VENNING: The member for Napier should read *Hansard*. If any member ever sees me asleep in this Parliament during my time here, they should call a doctor, because I would have to be very sick, I am not the sort of person who sleeps in daylight hours.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Check *Hansard*: it is on the record. No-one will see me asleep in this place, yet the Premier claimed that I was asleep and that is a disgrace. The Premier also reflected that I read my question, almost saying that it was against the law to do so. If I had taken points of order and if I had been more confident, I would have brought the Premier to order. As a backbencher, I have the right to ask questions, I have the right to read them and it is ridiculous for me to be accused of being asleep.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg is out of order.

Mr VENNING: Finally, I wish to talk about the Commonwealth Games bid. I support that bid and I see that the Minister of Recreation and Sport is present, but what will be the cost? At this time the State is on its knees. I hope we can succeed with the bid, but I do not want to see it achieved at the cost of the rural sector and the rural community. True, it might sound parochial, but are we chasing pie in the sky and ignoring the State's base?

From where is 47 per cent of this State's income derived? What percentage of public works in the past year was undertaken in rural areas—only 5 per cent of the total expenditure. If that is social justice, I must be asleep. It is not social justice.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The member for Albert Park was on the podium at the Crystal Brook show and was a welcome visitor (he is probably after my seat). I am sure that he enjoyed himself and he heard the Minister's speech. He enjoyed the company of rural people and he would appreciate how they are feeling: he knows that at least 10 per cent of them are in grave trouble in seeking to stay on their farms.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Let us do something about this. Let us make sure in the budget to be announced in a few days that there are positive moves towards helping these people to make sure that they can produce their products more cheaply than at present. Bringing down the cost of production is a positive step and, in my budget speech, that is what I will be talking about—reducing the costs of production. I have much pleasure in supporting the Address in Reply. I certainly hope that the Government will take these initiatives in the budget session to help rural people and get this State back on its feet, that is, by producing and not by using gimmicks and tricks. We should get South Australia producing again and I await the budget to see what the Government will have in store for us in the next 12 months.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to Her Excellency's speech. In so doing, I acknowledge the positive impression that Her Excellency has made on our State during the short time she has held office. I was interested to note that Her Excellency, in her opening remarks, stated:

The task of government is shadowed by an unprecedented range of issues that impact on most South Australians.

Truer words have probably never been spoken, because there are a number of important issues before us at the moment and many of them have been generated with one thing in mind, that is, to put up a smokescreen (and a very thick one at that) to try to hide the State's financial woes. As we are aware, they include things like legislation to introduce poker machines into clubs and hotels in South Australia; to decriminalise or legalise prostitution; to make parents responsible for the crimes of their children; to establish a development corporation responsible for the overall management of the multifunction polis; and to enable persons lawfully to withhold information about prior convictions after 10 years from the date of conviction.

However, this legislation will serve to draw attention away from the State's economic woes, away from the State Bank crisis, away from SGIC, Scrimber and the spiralling crime rates, away from our ailing transport system and problems in the education and health systems. Despite these things that are there to try to focus attention away from those issues, let the Government know that this Opposition will not be deterred from its concentration on the failings of the Government. It will not be deterred from concentrating on the basics of Government—things like State finance, law and order, education, health and transport—things on which all Governments should concentrate. The Opposition will make sure that it does.

This Government has bled our State dry. A massive \$970 million of taxpayers' money has been used so far to bail out the State Bank. As members are aware, since 1984 that bank's total contribution to our State budget has been \$164 million but, at the same time, the Government sunk a net \$1.76 billion of taxpayers' money into our State Bank.

SGIC's contingent liabilities now exceed \$1.5 billion, and we know that SGIC has now more than \$750 million in non-performing assets when we take into consideration the property at 333 Collins Street. We also know that Work-Cover faces unfunded liabilities of approximately \$250 million, with an extra \$500 million facing us according to internal estimates. We have also the failure of the SA Timber Corporation and SGIC, where their joint involvement through the scrimber project has lost up to \$60 million, despite warnings from the Auditor-General as far back as 1986. Those warnings were not heeded. Likewise, despite warnings from members on this side of the House, and despite consistent questioning, the Government has allowed this project to go on unchecked. In this place yesterday, the Minister admitted that he had not even been to look at the scrimber plant because he had no technical knowledge. What sort of an excuse is that?

With this record of financial mismanagement, this Government has failed all South Australians. Indeed, the Government can be thankful that a debate in this House last Thursday was determined by the vote of two Independents and not by the people of South Australia, because the people are in no doubt at all how they wanted that vote to go. They wanted an election, and they still want an election so they can throw out members opposite—and throw them out for a long period.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Albert Park may well interject, but the facts remain. The people of South Australia

have had a gutful of this Government, and they want it to go. Members opposite can bleat, 'Failure—no, there cannot be any failure, surely.' They have done some wonderful things! We have the Grand Prix and, finally, the entertainment centre, after many years of promises. We also have the MFP coming up. Let us look beyond the bread and circuses, which is all we are talking about—bread and circuses. But what has the Government delivered to this State? What has it delivered outside the metropolitan area, for example? Not a heck of a lot.

Look at the Government's investment outside the metropolitan area. Approximately only 15 per cent of the State's total investment has gone outside the metropolitan area, a total of approximately \$600 million, whereas we are looking at 85 per cent in the metropolitan area. Some members may sit up and ask why a metropolitan member is talking about things like this. Why highlight that sort of discrepancy? The reasons are quite simple: 27 per cent of our State's population lives outside the metropolitan area. If we take out of that the investment in Roxby Downs, we find that only 5 per cent of moneys have gone toward the 27 per cent of South Australians, and that is clearly a discrepancy that needs to be looked at. We must remember that approximately \$1.7 billion of our State's export income is derived from those regions. We are talking about a major part of our State's exports.

We have heard a lot of noise from members opposite. We have heard Government members saying that something has to be done about the rural community, but they are bleeding it dry. Whether they like it or not, the rural community still helps support this State. It helps keep it afloat. I know that as a metropolitan member. People in my electorate come and tell me that also. They know that, when the rural economy is going bad, there is even worse news ahead for the rest of South Australia. It was with interest that I noted the following statement in Her Excellency's speech:

My Government is planning new legislation that will benefit the agricultural community.

Well, all of South Australia looks forward to seeing some benefits go to the agricultural community. Earlier I mentioned the Roxby Downs project. It is interesting to note the proportion of regional investment that has gone into that project. That same project was described by our now 'visionary' Premier as nothing more than a mirage in the desert! It is also interesting to note that, on 4 June 1980, he told the Parliament that he was opposed to this particular development. In the *Advertiser* on 9 December 1981 he was quoted as saying:

Roxby Downs, far from being the saviour of the State's economy, could well be a total disaster.

That is the man of vision who is leading this State. He said that Roxby Downs was going to be a total disaster.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He voted against it.

Mr MATTHEW: Indeed, he voted against it!

Mr Becker: That's on the record!

Mr MATTHEW: It certainly is on the record, as it is in the Port Pirie *Recorder* of 23 November 1981, where the article states:

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr John Bannon, dismissed the future of the Roxby Downs mining operation . . . The proposed gold, copper and uranium mining operation was dismissed by Mr Bannon on the grounds that depressed prices for these minerals were making the project unrealistic.

So, Government members on the other side of this Parliament who bleat about a negative Opposition should look at *Hansard* when the Premier was Leader of the Opposition if they want to see negative comments. They should look at the sort of development that he opposed as Opposition

Leader, and that man now claims to be our visionary progressive Premier.

This responsible Opposition has been instrumental in exposing this State's economic woes. We have done that in a responsible manner. Indeed, the Premier himself has actually acknowledged that with respect to our debate on the State Bank. In the same way, we have been responsible for exposing the problems of the administration of law and order in this State. It is interesting to look at the latest police statistics—and I know that many members opposite are interested in these statistics—to see the alarming increase in juvenile crime. We see that offenders aged 18 and under are responsible for nearly 80 per cent of offences involving the use of cannabis oil and resin in this State for the quarter ended March 1991. In almost every category of offence—and these are Government statistics—the juvenile crime rate is soaring. Members must be concerned at the contribution to the crime rate by children—and I specifically say 'children'—aged 14 years and under. That is the sort of problem that faces our State at the moment.

For the quarter ended March 1991, juveniles were responsible for nearly half the offences cleared up by police. Looking at those statistics in some detail, I note that 45 per cent of all total break and enter offences, 51 per cent of motor vehicle thefts and 71 per cent of total use and possession of drugs involved juveniles. In other words, these offences were committed by people aged under 18 years. The Government wants to know what it can do about it. Quite clearly, it must not relent in a program that it has to set into place for proper penalties and proper counselling for juveniles who go astray, with proper and adequate resources for our police. These provisions are certainly not in place at the moment.

The other reason this has happened is that we have recently seen the tragedy unveiled in this State through our unemployment figures. One in 10 people in this State are unemployed. It is even worse when we look at the juvenile figures. A total of 26.6 per cent of people looking for work aged between 15 and 19 are unemployed. If we go back only one year ago, that figure sat at 19 per cent, showing an increase of 7.6 per cent in one year. That is this Government's proud contribution to our economy. Is it any wonder that so many juveniles are turning to crime? They are looking for money to help make ends meet. That is the other area in which this Government has to start: it needs to start being constructive by creating jobs.

We have often heard members on the other side of the House say, 'Well, these sorts of things happen world wide.' Three months ago I was in London and I spent some time with the metropolitan police there. Members opposite might be interested to know that in London they do not have an increase in juvenile crime; indeed, the opposite is happening. They have actually found that in the past 12 months their juvenile crime has decreased by a massive 40 per cent. As an example, in 1979, 34 864 juveniles were arrested and last year the figure was a little over 24 000. It does not mean that their police are getting any worse at catching them. They are still catching them; they are reducing their crime rate. That city is almost free from graffiti—quite a drastic difference from the problem we have here.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Well, members should go there and look at it. Those who have been there should have hopped on the trains and looked at those systems. It is all too easy to sit down and blame the world for our woes. It is about time the Government got on with the job of governing and

doing the job it is there to do, instead of bleating about how bad things are everywhere else.

The other thing that is interesting to note is that the United Kingdom has also ensured that education in its schools has played a significant role in reversing this trend, just as it can here in South Australia. However, we hear all too often that education in this State is not fulfilling its objectives. Our schoolteachers are becoming increasingly frustrated with their lack of opportunity to teach in the manner in which they have been professionally trained. The solution is not in the reduction of spending, as this Government seems determined to bring about in education. The money that is available needs to be allocated properly. We need to reapportion it and maintain a concentration on the resources where they are most needed—in the classroom—not in top-heavy bureaucracies.

This Government has had before it a number of recommendations from the Education Department on the restructuring of that bureaucracy. The Government has still not acted. It is about time it did; it is about time it started looking at its problems and solving them, and not pretending they are not there. They are fooling nobody but themselves.

So, education is indeed an investment in our future, and the benefits from it can flow on to the whole community. It is frustrating to hear continually from organisations that employ a large number of school leavers that they are having to spend time they regard as effectively wasted in teaching new employees straight out of school basic skills that they should have learned in the classroom. This is unproductive time that is being lost to business, and it should not be necessary. The Opposition has advised members of the other side how they can go about rectifying these things and perhaps they would like to look at our position paper on education; they might just learn something from it.

It is about time they looked at the whole matter properly, instead of saying there has been a bit of a downturn in the economy. By doing that, they are jeopardising the whole future of our State and jeopardising the future of our youth and their ability to learn. The Government is putting the education of our youth in jeopardy and on the line, due to economic fluctuations.

The Government must address that problem as a matter of social and economic fairness. This sort of situation makes an absolute nonsense of the Government's frequent claim of providing equality of education in our system and guaranteeing curriculum standards. Clearly, it is not doing that. Cutting teacher numbers might have some sort of economic appeal but, by heck, it does not help to educate our population; it does not provide for our future, and certainly does not do very much for teachers', parents', or students' morale. That is why the people of this State want this Government out and, quite shortly, they will get their opportunity.

Members opposite might bleat constantly, but the Government's cut-backs in all these areas are simply a bid to stabilise its losses incurred through its shameful record of economic mismanagement. It does not stop at just law and order and education. We could look at a number of other areas. Transport is receiving one heck of a bludgeoning at the moment. We know that this Government is hell-bent on discouraging people from using our metropolitan train service. At least one member of this place at the moment will have to watch that service very carefully in his electorate. The member for Albert Park will be one who has to protect his little train very carefully indeed, particularly from the point of view of his own background. He often tells us he is an expert in trains. He had better watch his line very carefully, because the Minister would love to close

it as, Sir, I am sure he is also keen to close yours. Let him try.

I am aware that our trains lose money; I am aware that they lose up to \$48 million a year, and I know that that is only in operating costs. It is probably possible to expand that figure out further. I am aware that the trains transport just over 1 per cent of South Australia's population. The Minister might tell me, too, that trains carry only 14 per cent of STA travellers, while they account for 40 per cent of its debt. So, it is pretty easy to cop out and say that the only way to solve the money problem—the drain on our public purse through trains—is to do something like cut them out.

Let the Minister look at the matter more closely and see why people are not patronising trains. It is always easy to look at cutting services. Why do people not find trains convenient? Why is it that this Government has failed to attract more than 14 per cent of STA passengers to use trains? Why is it that it has been able to attract only 1 per cent of the people to use them? The answer is simple. People do not like travelling on trains because graffiti has been allowed to proliferate; because the trains are infrequent; because the connecting bus services are infrequent or inadequate and do not meet the trains at the right time; and because passengers are frightened for their safety, because now there will be no guards.

These are hardly ways to entice people to use public transport, and that is why people are not using the trains. What we need is a positive approach from this Government. How about promoting the State Transport Authority and promoting the virtues of catching the train? How about telling people just how good it can be, instead of winding it down and making it hard for people even to buy a ticket to get on the train? It is not possible even to buy a ticket on a train or a train platform. What sort of public transport system is that? It is not one at all, and that is why people are turning away from the trains.

Once again, the Government has taken the easy way out; it has simply taken the cop-out. It will tell me time and time again that we do not have the population to use the trains. Once again, I would like to draw an analogy with London, because I also spent some time with London Transport, where I was made aware of some very interesting things indeed that occur there. In London the transport authorities actually started to go down our track; they started to close railway lines. Then they realised that they were making a mistake and three years ago they actually opened a new railway. They are not closing railways; they are opening them. That railway has become so successful that now it will be extended. It is a new light rail system and, by the mid-1990s, they will be carrying 35 000 passengers an hour. Eighty-four per cent of people travelling to London use public transport, and rail travellers account for 76 per cent of those travellers to London, or just a little over 90 per cent of public transport users.

How pathetic that makes our 14 per cent look in this State. Clearly, we are doing something very wrong and it is about time it was turned around because South Australians are fed up with the 'close down' mentality of this Government instead of looking at moving things forward.

It does not stop with the transport system. The Government is also getting stuck into the health system. Recently the Minister announced that the health budget will be slashed, another grim reminder of our economic woes. Hospital administrators now face the task of somehow winding down their budgets while increasing pressure is being put on their resources. The Royal Adelaide Hospital's allocation for 1991-92 has been slashed by \$1.7 million. The QEH is down

\$2 million, Flinders Medical Centre down \$750 000 and even Mount Gambier Hospital has been hit by a \$400 000 reduction. The Hills zone hospitals—South Coast, Strathalbyn, Mount Barker, Onkaparinga, Mount Pleasant and Gumeracha—are down \$1.3 million, and there is no doubt the Government has plenty more in store for country hospitals.

When will this Government start concentrating on the basics of government? When will it start concentrating on economic management, education, law and order, transport and health? That is what government is about. When will it stop involving itself in enterprises that Governments have no right to be involved in because they can be and are already being undertaken successfully by the private sector? Let us look at some examples. Why do we need a State Government printer? There are plenty of printers out there who are quite capable of doing the job and they will do it with confidentiality assured. Why do we need a State Government printer that charges rates often well in excess of 300 per cent above the rates that are charged by the private sector?

Why do we need a Government clothing factory manufacturing clothing in Whyalla, a factory that manufactures that clothing at a loss, that is competing with private enterprise and has no right to be there? Why do we need the State Government Insurance Commission selling health insurance? We already have companies that can do that. Why did the State Government involve itself in projects such as Scrimber and throw away \$60 million worth of taxpayers' money? The Government is responsible but it is making the average South Australian bear the brunt of the responsibility for its mismanagement. All sorts of taxes will be introduced in order to slug them and to try to do something about the State's ailing economic opportunities and fortunes.

The people of this State want a responsible and accountable Government to look after the important ingredients of government. They clearly do not have that at the moment. They have one that is throwing away their money like Monopoly money. Well, that money is not just a figure in the book. I have got news for you: it is real money, it is South Australian taxpayers' money and they are fed up.

The disgraceful charade of taxation increases that we saw just before Parliament resumed bears witness to the sort of troubles in which the Government is involved. At the last moment of the financial year, we saw the State Government embark on a frenzy of increasing taxes and charges. The Government raided the public purse with an announcement of some 800 increases in taxes and charges. That was an unprecedented rate of increase in our State's history. These increases were so great in number they had to be included in an extraordinary *Government Gazette* that was released 12 hours late because of the number of increases that were involved. Perhaps if it had been put out to a private company the *Gazette* might have been printed on time. Perhaps the Government wants to blame State Print. One way or another, it was a much larger *Gazette* than the one the printer is used to printing.

It does not stop there. It is not just the increases in taxes and charges. The Government is using the Police Force as a revenue collector. The front page of the *News* is emblazoned with headlines about the doubling of the number of speed cameras. At the moment four cameras are in operation and they net the Government some \$500 000 a month. If the number of cameras is doubled to eight and they are moved to 30 sites instead of 15, the Government will get \$1 million a month—\$1 million through the Police Force. That is well done, fellas! You must be very pleased with

yourselves. What are we going to have next? What other revenue measures are you going to come up with? What else are you going to buffet over the head? The public does not want to see our police collecting revenue—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, will you ask the honourable member to direct his remarks through you and to pay you that courtesy rather than direct them to us?

The SPEAKER: I take the point of order. I ask the honourable member not to refer to members on the other side as 'you'. I also ask the honourable member to refer to other members by their electorate and I ask him to direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I will do that. I actually said, 'fellas', and I apologise to the honourable member who is obviously not a 'fella'. This Government is taking our Police Force down a path that it does not want to follow. The police are not revenue raisers, they are not tax collectors. They are there to promote public safety, to prevent crime and to catch law breakers. That is what they want to do, and they are sick of being revenue raisers. I cannot recall a time in our State's history when members of Parliament would have been approached as we have been by members of our Police Force in an unofficial capacity saying, 'We are fed up with it. You have to do something. They are destroying our force. They are destroying our credibility.' That is not what the Police Force is about. That is not what we are supposed to be doing.

South Australians deserve better, they demand better and they should get it. The sooner this Government goes, the better. We welcome the calling of an election by the other side. We are ready whenever they want to go. We have the policies ready to run to help steer this State back in the direction it needs to go. Just let the Government name the day, because not many of its members will be left in Parliament and those who are most definitely will not be sitting on the Government benches. There will be a very sorry little bunch collected on the Opposition benches left to regroup their numbers, work out their factional problems and see what they can do to get themselves back on the rails again. The signs of disunity are spreading right through their Party. Already they are squabbling over the boundaries dispute: who will be sitting in what seat, who will be in, who will be out. At least two of them have to go. Look at their result at the last election. They certainly will not all be here and I wait with interest to see what happens after the new boundaries are released.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I support the motion before the House and add my congratulations to those of members who have commented on the role of Her Excellency and the various tasks that she has performed in her short time as Governor of South Australia. I found many aspects of the Governor's speech both interesting and worthy of comment. In fact, much of the comment in that speech touches the cornerstone of many of the issues that have confronted my electorate.

The constituents of Playford were well and truly covered in Her Excellency's speech last Thursday. Having said that, however, Parliament, whether State or Federal, requires not only a Government with firm direction and a steady hand on the wheel, that knows where it is going and can portray that message to the community at large but needs a constructive Opposition that posits alternatives and plays its part in a democratic system and, for the good of the community, keeps the Government on its toes and plays out many other functions.

The Government, the Opposition and the Governor all have a role in our State. At Federal level, the Government, the Opposition and the Governor-General have a role to play. I believe that in South Australia the Governor is playing her role and carrying out her tasks very well. Despite the hard times and all the problems that have emerged (from which I would not walk away) and despite the problems of the State Bank and other issues which, this year, have cast a shadow on the proceedings of government, I believe that the Government is doing a very good job in extremely difficult circumstances. I cannot say that about the Opposition. However, I really thought earlier this year that at Federal level we would have an alternative put to us. I never thought that anyone in his or her right political mind would seriously countenance a tax led recovery. But that is the only thing that has come from the Opposition ranks in Canberra: that we need not only more taxes but that we are taxing the wrong people. What we have to do is change the mix.

The Federal Opposition says that capital gains and those sorts of taxes that fall fairly upon the group in society that makes a great deal of money and can afford its share of tax ought to be abolished, and the tax should be placed on the battlers, the unemployed, the pensioners and many others in our society whose means to pay that tax is in doubt. At the Federal level, that is a very bold step. There is no doubt at all that going down the consumption tax road is an extremely bold initiative. In fact, the Opposition has run the risk of political annihilation. I am pleased to hear that it is not going to walk away from it. It has made it clear that it will stick there right to the end.

Anyone who wants to put forward a consumption tax as his main election platform ought to be congratulated: it will not be voted for, so he ought to get something out of it. We in the Labor Party looked at a consumption tax many years ago but rejected it, and for many good reasons. One of these was the problem of compensating those people who would be seriously hurt as a result of the implementation of that kind of tax. Another reason we rejected it—

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr QUIRKE: I think that the Federal Opposition's movement to a consumption tax is a move to very dangerous ground. I note the member for Flinders coming into the Chamber. Much will be put on him where that tax is concerned, because many of his constituents will suffer under a consumption tax regime that will see ordinary people paying the tax that is currently being paid by those who can afford it. At the Federal level, the problems we looked at in 1984 during the great tax debate made it quite clear that to compensate people for even a small consumption tax would be very difficult. However, I must give credit where it is due. It is a bold, clear-cut and concise policy. I do not like it and I do not think the electorate will wear it, but I must congratulate the Federal Opposition because at least it seems to know where it is going.

Here in South Australia the Opposition does not have that sense of direction. I must say that yesterday I came in here for Question Time with some trepidation, because I had been reading in the *Advertiser* that we were going to be torn to pieces within a few days; that the Government would fall apart; and that the Opposition would use all the issues that are currently available and get straight into all of us on this side, particularly the front bench.

At the end of the day, what did we get? We got nothing. It was the most pathetic Question Time that I have seen in the 18 months that I have been here. The Deputy Leader

made the comment that he finds all this tedious. I can say only that I thought he would put in a much better performance yesterday, because he is one of those who, I understand from the whisperings in the corridor, is under a cloud. Some of the women around here should have a very close look at *Hansard*, because, when the Deputy Leader was making his contribution to the House last night, he said, about the Minister of Employment and Further Education:

He has a lot in common with some women who rely on falsies.

I should have thought that that is a sexist comment. In fact, he comes to this House and the only role he plays is that of batting for time. Looking at the Opposition front bench, we can see that the changes are probably not that far away. That is the campaign that the media in South Australia seem to be running. I wonder why they keep running these leadership stories. Obviously they want to see a change in the leadership style and its direction.

There is no doubt that of the three members opposite who spoke in that debate last week the member for Bragg was the best of a bad bunch. That really needs to be said. I sat there quite dispassionately scoring the debate, and I gave the member for Bragg five out of 10, and that was a good score. I believe it is very hard to get much better than eight out of 10, and the other two speakers did not approach the member for Bragg's score.

I was disappointed with the no-confidence debate last week, and I have been disappointed with yesterday's and today's Question Time. The role of the Opposition should be to keep the Government on its toes by asking incisive and important questions in the interests of the community. Unfortunately, we did not get that; we have not seen it yet. But, it is probably not too late. It has been slightly more than 18 months since the last State election, and I have not yet seen the Opposition play that role.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The honourable member opposite who interjects has made a positive contribution, and I think he should be rewarded for it. Twelve years ago on an overseas trip I went to Dachau, which has a big gate on top of which is written—and I will not embarrass the House by trying to pronounce it in German—'Work sets you free'. What do we find? We find that a much maligned member of the Opposition frontbench has made a suggestion which I totally reject but which is a novel idea that has caught the imagination of many members on this side of the Chamber. Unfortunately for that honourable member, it has also been an embarrassment and has caught the eye of many members opposite.

I think that that is a shame, because it is one of the few ideas that has come from members opposite. The member for Murray-Mallee suggested that unemployed youths could be herded together and made to attend compulsory camps where they could sharpen their rabbiting, feral cat and cooking skills; they would stay there for at least three months, possibly longer, and they would then be well versed in those skills which would help them in the community to catch rabbits and feral cats. They would also acquire one or two other skills that would probably not serve them very well at all. The honourable member has definitely been underrated, given his contribution, and I am sure that many other members will comment on it. It is unfortunate that work camps were so sullied in Nazi Germany 50 or 60 years ago. I hope that the unemployed youth of South Australia do not take the cynical view that I have heard around the corridors of Parliament House—that it is really that sort of policy being reshaped. I fear that they will not like the idea too much and suspect that, in all probability, they will

believe that this is just a further attack on the unemployed by the Opposition.

My friend the member for Napier has been a guiding influence to me since I arrived in this House in 1989; to me he has really been a guru. In this place he has given some wonderful speeches and some enlightened prose, and I think he has shown the humanity of this House. However, tonight, as I am handing out the good and the bad, I must remonstrate with him on a couple of points. I think that his letter to the Editor in Monday's *Advertiser* was no excuse for his behaviour here last Thursday. It was entitled, 'Do you blame me?' I would be the last person to blame the member for Napier. His letter states:

After reading Rex Jory's comment (the *Advertiser*, 9.8.91), I feel obliged to inform your readers and my constituents how I saw it and, more importantly, how I suffered at times through the no-confidence debate (8.8.91).

During my life, hard as it has been, I have, while doing my National Service, spent many a night guarding strategic defence installations and ended my tour of duty as bright as a button.

I have worked night shift, finishing a strenuous night's work as fresh as a daisy. My colleagues in the Labor Caucus even swear I would be one of the few to survive the notorious 'water torture treatment'.

Yet, during Dale Baker's speech, I must confess, for a brief moment, I gave up and my system closed down. Can you blame me?

I was a little disappointed at that, but I understand his dilemma. I took a different view of what happened here. I looked not only aghast but was waiting for every word to drop from the Opposition benches. I believed that the role of the Opposition, as clear in this system as it could be, was not being fulfilled by the present incumbents.

After that debate and the subsequent two Question Times, my opinion has been confirmed. I have no doubt that the Opposition is not greatly interested in many of the debates. Basically, it does not have the stamina or the ability to get in there and play a constructive and positive role. We had a clear cut example of that tonight. Before the dinner adjournment the member for Bright gave us the word on the train system, to which I will return in a moment. The member for Bright told us that the front page of tonight's *News* stated that the Government was to double the number of speed cameras to make money. I did not think that that comment was on the front page of tonight's *News*. For that matter, I did not think that the number of people who have been caught by speed cameras was high. In fact, I seemed to remember that the figures indicated that there had been a decline in the number of people who have been fined for speeding in 1991.

I thought that the member for Bright had obviously done his research, and I got a copy of tonight's *News*. What I found was that the front page of tonight's *News* referred to spy cameras and not speed cameras—it referred to red light cameras. The Opposition cannot even get that right. I can understand that a member gets very busy, particularly when speaking on a broad range of things as does the member for Bright, and would not read past the fourth or fifth paragraph, maybe even the second paragraph. But, the very first paragraph of the story was as follows:

A report on Adelaide's controversial red light spy cameras has recommended the number of sites be doubled.

It talks about red light spy cameras. When a member cannot even read the first paragraph it does not say too much for his research.

The sad thing is that one day Opposition members might be invited to form a Government, and they will have to do a lot better than they have done. Also, they will find some decisions pretty hard: government is not easy. What we find is that as soon as we bring in a measure of free travel for school kids, we get carping, whingeing, moaning and press

releases going out claiming the cost is \$40 million plus. Indeed, that went on for some months. When the figures came out it was found that the cost was \$7 million and the scheme provided a great deal of help to many families. There are many people in the community who are hurting greatly, and they would hurt a lot more if the Opposition's Federal mates bring in a consumption tax. It will hurt them every time they go to the grocery store.

At the end of the day, what happens: we have no end of the Opposition nagging and whingeing that free student travel is a bad thing. It is blamed for everything from graffiti right through to bad weather. What do we find now? Today in this House we heard the suggestion that the scheme might not be with us for much longer or that it might change as a result of the changed economic circumstances of the State; Opposition members are now saying how terrible that is. I bet there will be some press release going out if that change comes about. Members opposite will go out into the community and say how terrible it is that the Government has had to tighten its belt. What we hear all the time in this House is that members want this, that and the other but that the Government is not willing to take the hard decisions.

Last year I spoke about bounties for wheat crops and the like. A motion came before this House about five months ago and my colleague the Minister of Agriculture wanted me to vote for it. I told him that I was not happy about it because it was to guarantee a minimum price for wheat. Indeed, I remember speaking in the adjournment debate that night and I put out the challenge to the Opposition; I said that I could understand the position confronting many farmers in the rural sector but I hoped that some of their representatives here would have something to say about the single mums, the pensioners and the poor in the community who also need a bit of help. I hoped that comments might be made about public housing, which is being screwed through the floor in this State. Did we hear any of that? Did any member opposite say anything about that? There was not a word from anyone. However, when the motion was carried, one Opposition member came up with the novel idea that we ought to look at fruitgrowers as well and provide them with a guaranteed income.

The truth of the matter is that members opposite protect bastions of privilege, and that is why at the Federal level they want changes to the tax system. They want to look after their mates and make sure that the capital gains in the community remain untaxed. They want to make sure that the fringe benefits that previously applied are reintroduced. They want to make sure that the tax burden is shifted to the bottom of the community, so that the poor will pay more while the rich get all the benefits from the tax system. There can be no clearer example of that than the current campaign run by the member for Heysen concerning water rates. Water rates, and water in South Australia, are among the key issues. Indeed, water matters were responsible for bringing down one Liberal Government. I am concerned about the role the Opposition has played in this: it is nothing short of disgraceful. The member for Heysen has gone out deliberately and sown confusion and fear in the community.

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: As the member for Napier points out, he had encouraged people to break the law, which is a serious step and one which a shadow Minister should never take. There is also no doubt as to the hypocrisy of the Opposition on this and many other issues and that was shown clearly yesterday by the claims of the member for Heysen that he had to later retract. The fact is that the Opposition in South Australia wants it both ways. The member for Heysen

interjected today and asked, 'What are you doing about rabbits?' My natural reaction would be to say, from what I have seen every afternoon, that very little is being done in South Australia, and certainly it is not enough. Yesterday the comment was made that we need a rabbit-led recovery. In all fairness, I must say to the honourable member who put forward that proposal, it is the only thing which the Opposition has come up with in the past 18 months and which can be pointed to as an example of where it really stands.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: And catfish farming!

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Napier reminds us about catfish or the Louisiana experiment. I do not know what credence has been given to that by the Opposition. It is possible that that scheme and youth camps could become its twin planks—that and support for its Federal colleagues shifting the burden of taxation to those who are least able to pay for it. I refer to a Bill King column on the back page of the *Sunday Mail* which passed judgment on the performance of the Opposition last Thursday. It sums up not only the naivety but the laziness of the Opposition. Headed 'Sound Tactics' it made clear that the Leader might have delivered a nicely worded speech but in essence his heart was not in it. That is a shameful thing to say, but I would have thought that we would see a strong, invigorative and extremely exciting performance. We certainly did not see that from the Leader, although I give credit to the member for Bragg, who virtually rescued the unrescuable.

The only other interesting story that I have found in my reading in recent times was also by Bill King where he summed up the Opposition in South Australia very well. I will use that article analogically. The Bill King column included a story about a lost dog, and that story clearly illustrated the Opposition's lost sense of direction and performance. The story was as follows:

Lost: one male dog, three legs, blind in one eye, part of his left ear missing, recently castrated and with a broken tail, and answers to the name 'Lucky'.

The Opposition will be extremely lucky if it gets up at the next election given the performance it has given in this place over the past 20 months.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): It is with pleasure that I rise this evening to support this motion and to congratulate Dame Roma Mitchell on her presentation. I also take this opportunity to pass on my condolences to the families of the late Ross Story, the late Geoff O'Halloran Giles and the late Dr Springett. I did not have the privilege of knowing Mr Giles or Dr Springett, but when I first came into this House. I had the privilege of meeting and being advised and counselled by Ross Story. Very few young members have not had that privilege. He willingly and openly passed on his knowledge and experience.

The sarcastic, cynical presentation that we have just heard from the member for Playford is very disappointing. I have listened to him many times in this place and I thought on many occasions that he had some talent, but one thing all members must learn in this place is that talent and sarcasm are not two things that go together. When a Government is in trouble, I understand that its members spend most of their speeches having a go at the way the Opposition is structured and having a go at the Opposition's general presentations in Parliament. However, that last presentation I believe really takes parliamentary debates down to their lowest level. I am disappointed that it has occurred, and that is a pity, because this debate provides the opportunity to make positive comments, either in a general sense or as constructive criticism.

I want to talk about the economic mismanagement of the Bannon Government. Before I do so, I want to reply to the member for Playford's comment that the people of this State are having difficulties at this time. It is important to know why they are having difficulties at this time. It is because of the economic decisions of a Federal Labor Government, which has been the most arrogant and brazen Government that we have had, and also because of the mismanagement and supporting decisions of our State Labor Government.

I am fascinated by the number of times Government members opposite get up and say that it is Liberal policy that will get us into difficulty. What about the position we are in right now? That has been created by the mad, idiotic ways of a Labor Government at State level for 10 years and Federal level for 10 years. All this nonsense that is run out on a daily basis about what the Liberal Party is going to do is of no relevance whatever, because we have had to put up with the misguided management and direction, as I say, at Federal level for seven years and at State level for 10 years by Labor Governments.

The member for Playford talked about free travel for students and referred to 'mates'. What about Mr Hawke's mates? What about Sir Peter Abeles, or St Peter as he is often called? What about Christopher Skase? What about Mr Bond? What about all the mates of Mr Hawke and his gang, and let us tie in the Premier of this State with that list, because when things were going well where was Mr Bannon? He was hanging onto the coat tails of Mr Hawke and Mr Keating at every possible opportunity. But what happens now? He is running away at 100 miles an hour because he does not want to be tied in with the Hawke failures.

I noted yesterday that Mr Bannon had the cheek to stand up and say that interest rates ought to come down. This same Premier was on the EPAC committee which told this State and this country that high interest rates were the way to go. He is the same Premier who yesterday had the gall to say that interest rates had to come down. The problem with this State is the Premier, Mr Bannon, and his mismanagement, and all of those cuckoos who run around with him. Not one of his front bench Ministers has the guts to stand up and say to Mr Bannon, 'You're wrong; it's time we changed.' They all sit quietly by. Five minutes ago we had the member for Napier laughing while the member for Playford was telling us that the Liberal direction would be the future problems of this country. I reiterate that we have not been in Government in this country for the past 10 years. It is you and your mob, the Premier's mob, that have been causing all the problems in this State.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Sir—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not refer to the Government as 'you'.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: You read my mind, Sir.

Mr INGERSON: I apologise, Sir. The member for Napier is all very happy and willing to stand up here now when he is getting a bit of his own medicine back, but it is the Premier who has to face the music. What about the \$1.5 billion—

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Sir, I rose just now to draw your attention previously to the fact that it was the duty of all of us to address other members by their electorate. I was not concerned with what the member was saying—

The SPEAKER: Order! You have made your point of order. The Chair upheld your point of order and the member for Bragg acknowledged it. I shall listen very carefully to ensure that honourable members are not referred to by

anything other than their electorate or their parliamentary position.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr INGERSON: As I was saying, the member for Napier needs to remember the current position. I refer to the \$1.5 billion problem of the State Bank, the \$200 million that will need to be put into SGIC, the \$317 million unfunded liability of WorkCover and the \$60 million write-off of Scrimber. But what about all these other organisations that we never hear about? What about the Adelaide Convention Centre, which lost \$5.8 million in 1989 and again in 1990? What about the Central Linen Service, which lost \$67 million in 1989 and \$71 million in 1990? What about the Clothing Corporation, which lost \$600 000 in 1989 and \$250 000 in 1990? What about the Film Corporation, which lost \$438 000 in 1989 and \$290 000 in 1990? What about the Jam Factory, which lost \$600 000 in 1989 and \$821 000 in 1990? What about the State Opera, which lost \$1.1 million in 1989 and \$952 000 in 1990? What about the State Film and Video Centre—the much hailed video centre—which lost \$978 000 in 1989 and \$917 000 in 1990? Losses involving those seven single issues, about which we have heard nothing, totalled nearly \$76 million in 1989 and \$80 million in 1990.

Little things just seem to get away from this Government. When \$76 million in one year and \$80 million in the next are tallied on to all these other Government authorities, we are running into anything up to \$2 billion in possible losses. The Parliament does not have a great deal of control over all these statutory authorities and business transactions to which this Government should not be party. Yet, we hear tonight from members opposite that the future of this economy rides on what the Liberal Party does in the future. The Bannon Government has been in power for eight years. The Premier and all his stooges along the front bench have got us into this mess and tonight we hear the drivel and the tripe that has been coming from the other side about the policies of the Liberal Party.

The unemployment rate in this State announced last week is 10.4 per cent. It is the highest unemployment level in the country. We are also the inflation capital, at 4.1 per cent, the highest rate in this country. And the Premier stood up today outside this House and said that interest rates must come down. He was the one, along with Keating and Hawke, who believed we should have high interest rates, and yet today he had the gall to say that we should now have low interest rates. Perhaps it is the soft underbelly of the members opposite now realising the mistakes that have been made are putting the pressure on. What about the Chamber of Commerce survey showing that 40 per cent of respondents believe that fewer people will be employed in their businesses in the next 12 months? Who will be blamed for that? Will the future policies of the Liberal Party be blamed for it? We have not had a chance to get in but, once we are in, we will fix up a few of those problems once and for all.

The business people in this community are complaining, and I think it is important that we put them on the record in this House so that members opposite, since they do not seem to be able to understand what is going on in the economy, might read this and learn a few lessons. First, the biggest single issue is interest rates. As I have been saying, the Premier has at last decided that it is no longer a priority issue to have high interest rates; it is now an election issue. The Premier has suddenly realised two years out that if he does not get those interest rates down he might not survive.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Spence wishes to participate in the debate he must rise in his place at the appropriate time. The member for Bragg has the floor.

Mr INGERSON: The next important issue to business is Government charges. I will just mention a few of them so the member for Spence understands. Electricity charges are the highest in the nation, as are E&WS charges. Those who are in business have noted a significant increase in their water rates. Land tax has been abolished in Queensland but is maintained here as a ridiculous tax. South Australia has the highest payroll tax in the nation, the highest FID in the nation and WorkCover, as the actuary said last week, is the most expensive program, not just in Australia but in the Southern Hemisphere. Its benefits, its administration—the whole exercise is a shemozzle; it is a socialist dream gone mad, and every business in this State has to pay more for this socialist claptrap that we get thrown at us on a daily basis by people who have never run a business and never employed people but who, nevertheless, try to run this State.

Those are the sorts of problems we have in our State. We have an argument that industrial relations must change, and I will get to that point in a minute. The two most important industries suffering in our State at the moment are the automotive industry and the textile, clothing and footwear industry. We have heard Premier Bannon and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology saying in the past couple of days that if the Liberal Party gets in the tariffs will come down. Who is bringing the tariffs down now? It is the Labor Party. The very people who were arguing that it is likely to be our fault belong to the group that is virtually driving the automotive industry and the textile, clothing and footwear industry down. It does not matter what our policy is right now, because the member for Spence and his Labor group are in Government, and it is their responsibility to make sure those industries are restructured.

When we come to power they will know what is our policy and it will be implemented the right way around. It will not be done in a back-to-front way, where tariffs are reduced but industrial relations are not touched and nothing is done about transport problems or communications. This Government does everything back to front. The real issue in this country is to get the industrial relations systems right and when they are right, and we have a decent free market moving the labour system, there will be some change and proper enterprise bargaining, in which both the employees and employers will benefit, and then tariffs can come down.

The Labor Governments in this country do not have the guts to do what must be done because it is their mates in the union movement who will not let them do it. That is what it is all about. Earlier in the debate, mention was made of mates. If anything has caused this country to go backwards, it is the connection between the Labor Party and the union movement. Nothing progressive coming out of the Labor movement in the past 20 years has been of any benefit to this country. What we need today is a change in industrial relations, which will change the whole direction of this country. Tariffs cannot come down at a rapid rate until we get a decent change in industrial relations and all the other things that I mentioned that need to occur. As I said—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: That is a very fascinating comment. A third world country? We are a third world country now, because of the Labor Party. We are in the single biggest mess nationally and at State level because of the Labor Party, and the honourable member opposite has the gall to

say that we want to take this country into third world status. Members opposite ought to go out there and ask the business community what sort of mess they are in. I think members opposite sometimes walk around in a dream. They do not go out and talk to the people who are generating the wealth and employing people. They do not bother to go out and listen to the real world and discover where the engines and important things are produced in the community. It is the Labor Party that has got us in this mess today and no excuses or nonsense coming from the other side can change that position.

I want to talk very briefly about what I called the other day the single biggest disaster in this State, and that is WorkCover. Since this socialist dream has been introduced in South Australia, the premiums have gone up from an average rate of 3.2 to 3.8 per cent, to give the highest average rate in Australia. In New South Wales it has gone down to 1.8 per cent average. Last year \$500 million was given back to employers and employees in New South Wales in increased benefits and reduced premiums. In this State we have gone from no unfunded liability to an unfunded liability approaching \$300 million in four years. Who will pick up that deficit if it is not turned around? It can be picked up by only two sectors, namely, the employers or the State Government, and you know, Mr Deputy Speaker, as I know that it will be the employers.

The Premier made a statement two months ago that WorkCover premiums would come down and make it economic and competitive with the rest of the country. A WorkCover Bill is floating around out there in the community now that recommends six changes, and the Minister could not even get those changes through Cabinet last week. The reason he could not get them through was that the Teachers Union and the UTLC jumped up and down because the Government was not game to do the one fundamental thing that must happen to this scheme. It must get back to an affordable scheme; a scheme that this community can afford but one which still gives reasonable benefits to those who are injured at work.

Mr Atkinson: What's your policy?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence is out of order.

Mr INGERSON: The changes to the scheme that were going to be introduced earlier this week but were knocked on the head by the Labor Party's union mates would have gone a long way to fixing the problems. But, no, the Minister of Labour could not convince his Cabinet colleagues that those sorts of changes ought to occur. As I said, at the moment, the WorkCover deficit is about \$259 million. In 1991-92, it is expected to be \$317 million and, if there is no change to the system, the unfunded liability in 1994-95 is projected to be \$453 million. They are not my figures but figures supplied by the General Manager of WorkCover (Mr Lew Owens). Those figures damn and condemn the system and spell out clearly to the Labor Government that it has to do something about this problem. But what do we get? Absolutely nothing.

The select committee set up by this House to look at WorkCover has met 11 times since February. We met seven times during the parliamentary sitting period and only four times during the four month break—four times in four months for the most serious business problem in this State. One has to believe that the Labor Government could not care less about this problem because its mates are doing all right out of this scheme and it does not care whether or not it is funded because its mates do not have to pick up the bill: it is the employers in this State. What the Government does not realise is that, with the unemployment level

as it is at the moment and with the economic conditions created by the Labor Government, fewer people will be employed if these sorts of costs continue to escalate. Members opposite know full well that that is true.

I turn now to a local issue that is directly affecting my electorate, that is, water rates. It is all right for the member for Spence to laugh. He is part of this socialist group that believes that they ought to transfer the wealth from the people who happen to live on the eastern side—

Mr Atkinson: To the west.

Mr INGERSON: I notice that the honourable member is nodding his head. This is a disgraceful set up. I do not mind if wealth is transferred as a Government decision but, when such a tax is applied on a basic commodity like water, it is a disgrace. When the Minister stands up in this House and says that it is not a wealth tax, that it is not a property tax, that is blatant misleading of the House. Anyone else who made that sort of statement would have to resign if he were fair dinkum because it is a wealth tax, it is a property tax. It is a deliberate redistribution of wealth from one side of the city to the other.

I would not mind if the wealth was transferred from everyone who is wealthy, but it just so happens that 60 per cent of the people in my electorate are pensioners, superannuants, or people on low incomes. They just happen to have bought their property in the eastern suburbs some 30 or 40 years ago. They just happen to have educated and brought up their children in public or private schools and they just happen to have been part of the community and have contributed to it with all their taxes and so forth in the past. They are not wealthy people but they are nailed by this deliberate, blatant socialist scheme to transfer wealth from one side of the city to the other.

The Government will fall flat on its nose when the system creeps into the western suburbs. Members opposite will start jumping up and down when the same system that has been levied in my electorate and that of Norwood and Coles creeps around to the other side of the city. There will be yelling and screaming then. The member for Spence will start jumping up and down when people who own large homes in Woodville get nailed, and the same will apply to people in Mitchell Park. The member for Spence will be crawling through the back blocks making sure that the Minister of Water Resources knows all about it. This blatant tax change is scandalous and should be wiped out, and I will be supporting the member for Heysen when he introduces an amending Bill later this week.

The other issue raised in the Governor's speech about which I will speak is the MFP. It has been put forward as the future panacea for our city and our State. I think the project has tremendous potential but what disappoints me is that, in the 12 months since it was formally announced as an official project, Parliament has not been given the opportunity to debate the issue, to debate whether the concept is fair and reasonable for the State and to debate whether the problems that have been echoed by the community are discussed by Parliament. The MFP concept is being kept as another election plank for the Government. Concepts such as the MFP require Parliament and the State to have a general direction of support for them, and the only way that can occur is if Parliament, which in principle represents all the constituents of the State, has an opportunity to debate it, argue about it and put down its points one way or the other. The Labor Party wants to play games with the MFP and use it as another election gimmick, but the future of our State is on the line and the Government's attitude is disgraceful and should be objected to. I support the motion.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): On behalf of my constituents I record my appreciation of the Governor's speech on the opening of Parliament and wish her well in her term of office. I would be grateful if those sentiments could be conveyed to her. I will use the time allocated to me to raise two important issues, one relating to recreation and sport and the other to community welfare. It is true, and it cannot be denied, that since the Bannon Government came to power we have seen a decline in sport in schools. The junior sports policy has been much talked about. The Government has been very vocal in this area. It has put it up as a panacea for introducing and developing sports in schools but, at the end of the day, we are not seeing greater sports participation in schools. To the contrary, we are seeing far less.

Over the past 12 to 18 months, in some high schools sport has been reduced by 55 to 65 per cent. In other schools sport has been cut out altogether. For a Government that claims that sport is part of the curriculum to allow that situation to arise is gravely serious. For years the Government has claimed that sport is part of the curriculum, and rightly so, but the evidence does not show it up. It is about time members on the Government side went to their school councils, took counsel from those bodies and came back to this place and told the Minister and the Premier that they will not stand by and watch sport disappear from our schools.

Let me put some examples on the public record. Earlier this year I wrote to every high school in the State. Some 103 letters went out and others were contacted by telephone. I received 33 written replies from those schools, supplemented by over 20 verbal submissions, which means that I have a sampling of over 50 per cent of high schools. The following are some of the results we received. I will not refer to individual schools, but will refer to schools in zones or in country areas.

In the western zone in the first term of 1990 we had 199 teams competing. For the first term of 1991 that number had been reduced to 64. That was a group of 13 high schools. In three of those schools, Henley, Woodville and Croydon High Schools, all zone sport activity has ceased completely. A similar situation arises in the northern zone, in which 11 schools are affected. A departmental officer from that area gave me figures that showed that the events catered for in the northern zone last year covered approximately 5 000 students. However, this year that figure could be cut to somewhere around 600.

Also in the northern zone, some seven carnivals were organised. The swimming carnival was cancelled at the last minute, and winter inter-school sport has also been cancelled. Decisions about the lightning carnivals will be taken later this term and it is highly possible that another six carnivals they have listed may not take place. It may be that the athletics carnival is the only inter-school carnival in the northern zone this year which will mean a drop of nearly 4 500 students having the opportunity to take part in school sport. This is a serious matter. The question arises of why it is happening.

It is happening because of the curriculum being set down by the department whereby teachers are now required to spend 85 per cent of their time in front of the classroom, and only 15 per cent of their time can be allocated to other duties. The problem is that, in many cases, the administration—the Education Department—is saying, 'Let the associations fill the gap.' That may be a solution in the long term, provided that the associations have the coaching skills and the coaches available. At the moment they cannot fill the gap, and we are seeing a decline in sport.

Let us be correct in saying that many very good things are happening in sport. There are many very dedicated teachers and parents still participating in sport on a voluntary basis. In many schools, sport is still happening because of the dedication of the volunteers, who are very small in number, but the list of volunteers is diminishing at an alarming rate. Unless it is arrested, we will have a generation of children in school who will not be exposed to sport. It brings up the social justice issue.

I should have thought that, by now, some of the Labor members would have been on their feet talking about the social justice issue that the Labor Party has introduced into high school sport, which is this: if you are lucky enough in this State to send your children to a private school, it is part of the contract under which teachers are employed that they participate in sport as part of the curriculum of the school, and that includes after school and on weekends.

A teacher at a public high school does not have to sign such a contract. So, now we have the situation in which high school teachers are compelled to spend 85 per cent of their time in front of the classroom and only 15 per cent can be allocated to other duties. So, in the public schools only those who volunteer their time are involved in sport. The rest walk out the gate at 3.20 or whatever time school is dismissed. Of course, at the end of the day, the children miss out.

I appeal to members opposite to do something about this, if they have any influence at all over the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the Premier. Let me cite a few examples for the record. A large metropolitan school in term one of 1990 had eight teams comprising a girls' tennis, softball, boys' tennis, cricket, volleyball and table tennis. In term one of this year it is down to two teams: a girls' tennis and a girls' softball team. I quote from a response I received from a large Riverland school as follows:

We are able to allow zero time for sport. Organisation, coaching, etc., is shared by all staff who do it in their own time, but a particularly heavy load falls on the PE staff who still have a full load of classes to teach.

A Mid-North high school had an opportunity of sending 40 students down to town to take part in the Secondary Schools Sports Association Cross Country Championships, but I am told that that will not now happen. I cite a letter from a high school not far out of Adelaide, as follows:

Last year the staff at this school coached and supported a large number of knockout sports teams. This year this is not possible. These are not isolated cases. A high school on the periphery of Adelaide had a sports coordinator in 1988. The staff were not expected to take sports teams as part of their workload, but lessons and class sizes permitted a number of teachers to do this anyway. The school council supported sport in the form of funding for transport and uniforms. In 1991, a couple of years later, we find no sports coordinator time at all. The staff had neither the time nor inclination to be involved in school sport in light of their extra commitment to lessons and to substantially increased numbers of students in classes, and there was no longer any support from the high school council.

The Education Department staffing formulae are based on classroom instruction time and make no provision for recognition of teachers coaching or supervising sporting teams. Consequently, as I said initially, they rely entirely on the goodwill of a few teachers. An argument has been put up about physical education teachers and why they are not involved. No Government high school could administer its sports program relying entirely on the PE facility.

Those teachers have a specific role in schools, which should not be confused with the role of teachers in sport. Sport is a whole school community responsibility and should

be resourced as such. If we are to accept in principle that we want sport in high schools in the public school system, it will need to be resourced and teachers will need to become involved in it. To rely on outside resources of the associations is impractical. A brief note from a very large metropolitan high school on the western side of the city summed it up quite well, as follows:

There is no specific allocation of teacher resources from the Education Department for sport at [our] high school. Physical education is one of the subject areas offered in the curriculum and staffed in the normal way under the staffing formula. Information and skills related to sport are covered in physical education.

General sport is taken by volunteers who give up their own time for practice and for after-school matches. In a climate where teachers for various reasons have had their formal time commitment increased, the elements which depended on goodwill have suffered and will continue to suffer. Sport is one such area and I fear for the programs which have provided so much for young people and for their schools.

I will cite one sentence from a letter from a school in the Iron Triangle, as follows:

Presently, we have withdrawn from all knockout sport involvement for 1991.

I will not read any more letters. I think that I have made the point that we have a problem in high school sport. No-one denies it. Anyone who talks to a high school council will find out that what I am saying is absolutely accurate. I will be very interested to see how long it takes the Government to respond to my challenge and do something about it.

I now refer to the provision of sports facilities in Adelaide. I know that we are in a recession and I know that the Government will say that it does not have the money. Since 1985 this Government has tried to win elections on the promise of certain sports facilities. We can go on every year with bread and circuses but the day of reckoning will eventually come. The Government has promised services too often, and has not delivered. Sometime or other you have to stand up and be counted or go down the political gurgler.

In the 1989 election a lot was said about the need for a southern sports facility of some sort. Just prior to the last election at the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium it was said, 'If you elect us we will build you a stadium.' In the baseball arena that was said not only in 1989; it went further back, to the previous election. At that time the Minister of Recreation and Sport was massaging the baseball community and said that the Government would do something about a baseball facility, and that massaging continued through the 1985 election period to the 1989 election period.

Sometimes when one goes back through a file one's memory is refreshed as to the number of promises that have been made. Baseball is a good example of that, because that sport has been promised facilities but has been kept hanging on the hook for so long. Thinking that a facility would soon be forthcoming, the baseball community talked to overseas organisations and was offered teams from Japan and the United States which would be involved here for lengthy periods. Because the South Australian baseball community did not have a suitable facility, the teams did not come to this State. In fact, they went to other States.

Any responsible Opposition or organisation would accept that if a facility was promised it would be rolled in a depression. But, this promise has been made since 1985—in fact, probably even before that. These long drawn-out electoral promises cannot be made forever; the day of reckoning has to come. In the Premier's 1985 election speech, in the paragraph concerning recreation and sports, he referred to an international baseball complex and said:

We have plans to build a cycling velodrome, an indoor sports centre, an international baseball complex and a headquarters for rowing and swimming.

That speech refreshed my memory of this matter. I recall that an article appeared in the local press stating that Glenelg would have a \$4.4 million multi-sports complex catering for hockey, lacrosse, small bore rifle shooting and weight-lifting. I had almost forgotten that; it was one of the grandiose promises to get the Labor Party through the 1985 election. In 1986 Mr Mayes wrote to the President of the South Australian Baseball League and said:

I will be seeking funding in the 1986-87 financial year to undertake a feasibility study to determine the cost of establishing a staged development.

Later in 1986 he again wrote:

I am able to advise that the project is presently listed on the department's capital works priority list for the period 1985-86 to 1989-90.

Here we are in 1991. Again, in 1989 a letter signed by the Chief Executive Officer, Mr George Beltchev, stated:

... I am now in a position to formally advise that funds have been included in the 1989-90 capital works program for the department to undertake detailed planning and design for a baseball facility. Sufficient funds have been allocated to enable all design work and documentation to be completed for the Public Works Standing Committee hearing in May 1990.

The *Messenger Press* in 1989, on the front page, carried a photograph of Mr Mayes with the headline, '\$6 million baseball park plans for two sites'. One of the paragraphs stated:

Baseball does need a home and if a home is going to be built it's got to be viable.

Once again that was the Government getting through an election campaign. This Government seems to survive by using these tactics to get through election campaigns. I am acutely aware that, if you make promises, you have to make sure you can deliver the goods. Maybe in a depression you can put off something for a couple of years, but the public will not accept having promises rolled for five or six years. No doubt the next election will come around, and on the third occasion we will have these promises of another baseball stadium once again. It is probably good for three elections, but I do not know whether the Government will get away with it a fourth time. It is sad that international sporting people have to go interstate because the Government has not delivered on its promise.

The worst possible scenario is that there will be no baseball stadium in place for the 1993-94 season. If the Clipsal Giants do not have an international facility by that time they will lose their licence under the agreement with the Australian Baseball League. There is not much time left to address this issue.

The last matter I want to raise concerns community welfare. On 25 July I wrote to the Premier and suggested that we set up a bipartisan conference—because this matter is important enough for a bipartisan conference—attended by the Federal Minister for Social Security and State and shadow Ministers with portfolio responsibilities for family and community services, health and education. I also believe that the Austudy people should be involved. I suggested that this conference look at the whole question of runaways.

It is a community problem which has got to the stage where we need to step back, stop playing Party politics and have a look at the real problem. In my 18 months of research on this project, it has become clear to me that the majority of children who leave home following a parent-adolescent conflict do so once money becomes available from the State. I admit that there has to be a safety net created by the State for abused children or for children who legitimately have to leave their home. However, from my

research I have found that many children have chosen to leave perfectly loving, normal homes. In years past those children would have stayed at home, but now, because of the job search allowance that is dangled under their noses and the young homeless allowance they leave home when such conflict occurs.

Children are taught much in schools now about their rights. It is crammed into their mind and on many occasions they are not mature enough to handle all that knowledge. As to community welfare workers, the Department for Family and Community Services comes under too much criticism in this area and is unfairly bearing the brunt of much community anger. My research shows that much of the advice given to children does not necessarily come from the department but comes from the Education Department and some Health Commission services.

For that reason, I believe all those organisations should come together to work out a strategy about what we are going to do with these children. Many parents ring me and say clearly that no-one from the department contacted them after their child left home. I do not know whether or not other members have received such telephone calls, but I have literally had dozens of them over 18 months; parents have rung up and said that their child was advised by some social worker or youth worker in an organisation about how to leave home.

The first thing the parent knew was that the child did not come home from school, a dance or wherever they had been, but the irritating aspect has been that, despite the department's protests that it always checks, it has not done that, and too many parents have contacted me saying, 'If only the department had asked us what the conflict was all about.' On many occasions it would have ascertained that the conflict was because a father or mother objected to a child wanting to go to Hindley Street to get drunk at 3 a.m. when they were 13 or 14 years of age. Perhaps a mother disapproved of the boyfriend of a child 13 or 14 years old. That might have led to parental conflict and the child left home.

All the cases I have investigated show that children have left home when some financial support has been given. For this reason, I believe the time has come to bring the Ministers together and have a conference about this matter. I would certainly be pleased if the Independent members would join the conference, because they have experienced such cases in their electorates and would have a contribution to make.

I wrote to the Premier on 25 July and I hope that he is taking the issue as seriously as I am. This is a matter of great concern in the community. True, we do not have a large number of runaways. The officer-in-charge of the Bank Street Police Station puts the number of genuine runaways at well down in double figures, but the number of children who are on their own is extremely large. They are all on social security benefits, and I put to the House that many of those children would be at home if it was not so easy for them to obtain financial benefits. Certainly, we should have the safety net for the genuine cases. I have never walked away from that and, as a Minister, I would be very supportive of that safety net, but I am not in the business of making it easy for a child to leave home simply because some parent has said, 'I disapprove of the boyfriend,' when the child is 13 or 14 years of age. Perhaps they said, 'I am not going to let you go up to the pub tonight and get drunk.'

If members are interested in this subject, I would be happy for them to come to Glenelg, go through my files and read about some of the cases of kids who have left home. The reason for the alleged parental conflict is set out,

but it is also clear that the department has not talked to parents to ask why the children left home. The situation is appalling. This should not happen, and I ask members for their support at the appropriate time when I move to try to remedy this situation in the community.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I have pleasure in supporting the motion before the Chair, particularly as the Governor's speech was delivered by Dame Roma Mitchell, a woman for whom I have great personal admiration. I regard myself as being lucky to have met her socially several times. This is a good appointment for Governor, and I believe it has met with universal approval, primarily due to Dame Roma's personal attributes. Her appointment as the first woman Governor in Australia crowns a glittering career, which included being the first woman QC, being a judge of the Supreme Court for 18 years and being the Chancellor of the University of Adelaide. That is indeed a career of highlights and her appointment as Governor will be the crowning glory of this great career of public interest and contribution to the public good.

The Governor's speech contained many issues relevant to my electorate and to my shadow portfolio responsibilities, and I would like to go through some of those. First, the Governor talked about '20-20 Vision—Ideas for Metropolitan Adelaide'. This project is extremely important for the whole of metropolitan Adelaide, and particularly so for the district of Adelaide which, after all, is the heart of our State.

One of my dilemmas with the grand plan of the '20-20 Vision' is that there has been an enormous amount of scepticism expressed to me by my constituents as to whether it was worth having any input. I was asked whether the Government would listen to their input. There was also enormous scepticism about whether it was just another report that would eventually be shelved to collect dust. I note that a green paper is to be released for comment early next year and we are told it will agglomerate the planning, heritage, City of Adelaide development control and parts of the real property Acts. So far as it goes, that is well and good, but I note there is no mention at all of any proposed streetscape legislation. I know there have been discussions between the Adelaide City Council and the Minister for Environment and Planning about streetscape legislation, which will be of extreme importance in the fabric of Adelaide in the year 2020 and later. I can only assume that this will be part of the green paper.

We heard of a new policy that will result in neighbourhood schools becoming the initial point of contact for students with disabilities seeking appropriate enrolment. The Opposition is in total support of this concept, and I signal that to the House now. In fact, the Liberal Party is so supportive of this concept that it was covered in our position paper on health issues released in May, and I will talk more about that later and how this position paper has influenced Labor Party thinking and about how the Liberal Party's innovative plans have set the agenda in the health area.

The speech also detailed a strong marketing move to broaden the base from which overseas students are recruited for South Australian universities. Like most areas that this tired Government delves into, it is a good idea on the surface but it is long on bluster and pitifully short on substance. One might ask why. It is because the students who are attracted here by this marketing program are drastically under-resourced at the institutions when they arrive.

Correspondence recently went between the Professor and Head of the Department of Biochemistry at Flinders Uni-

versity and the Minister of Employment and Further Education. As we know, the Minister of Employment and Further Education is also Minister of Youth Affairs, and I understand that he is carefully looking at numbers for the moment that Caucus decides that the Premier's 'use by' date has expired. I would have thought that the only number the Minister of Youth Affairs ought to be interested in at the moment is the 30 per cent youth unemployment, a staggering indictment, and he ought to be doing something about that.

Let us come back to the letter dated 9 July 1991. The Professor and Head of the Department of Biochemistry indicated that the encouragement by this marketing program of overseas students coming to our institutions in fact saw a decreased standard of education for both the South Australian students and the overseas students because of their being under resourced. So, the headlong encouragement of this program in the quest for funds from any source other than the beleaguered taxpayer in fact disadvantages the very students for whom the Minister of Employment and Further Education has responsibility, and yet we hear the program will career onwards unfettered.

Why is the Government prepared to sacrifice the goals towards which it ought to be heading and the goals it has identified as being worthy, for this helter skelter grab for dollars? Unfortunately, the reason is clear to all South Australians, and it is the Government's mismanagement of the State's coffers which has produced a financial problem of dramatically cataclysmic proportions. Let us review some of the jewels in Labor's financial management crown that have caused the need for this grab for money.

First, I refer to the State Bank debt of \$1 500 million—one and a half times the total annual spending on health for South Australians gone. The response of the ultimate guarantor, the Treasurer, our tired and lacklustre Premier, in the face of this enormous loss is, 'Who else can I blame?' I will not comment on the specifics of the State Bank issue because the royal commission is looking into that matter, but I remind members opposite that the electors know only too well who is responsible. I also remind members opposite, who are in seats becoming more and more marginal by the day, that when things were not going too badly they managed to scrape up 47.9 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote. My advice to them, giving full heed to the financial status of South Australia, is that they do not give up their day jobs before the next election.

Let us look at another jewel in Labor's financial management crown, scrimper. A total of \$60 million gone on a gamble—an absolute entrepreneurial gamble with State money! We have the same morality as though the money were taken down to the TAB and put on the favourite in the first at Morphettville. Taxpayers' money is far too precious to be wasted on frivolities. But the taxpayers will not forget.

Let us look at another financial jewel in Labor's mismanagement crown: SGIC. I will look particularly at one component of it, SGIC Health. Yesterday I asked the Treasurer how much longer South Australians would prop up a company that was making losses in direct, unfair competition with the private sector. I was told, 'Not very long; but it is perfectly all right because these were perfectly normal set up costs'. I inform all members opposite that we will absolutely delight in telling the business community about the fact that the Treasurer of South Australia regards four years of losses, a loss making enterprise, and four years of its not paying interest on a loan so it would not go completely broke, as normal business practice. We will delight in telling the business community that. We will delight in it, because

even members opposite know that that is not the case. Members opposite know that the Premier's answer was a poor political rationalisation. Members opposite all know that that line of argument would be absolutely laughed at by taxi drivers, fish and chip shop owners, grocers, delicatessen owners, video store proprietors, and the list goes on.

All of these people are struggling to keep their businesses going, despite land tax increases, FID and payroll tax being the highest in Australia, and despite stamp duty and WorkCover impositions, against all of which they struggle to keep their businesses going. But what does the State do to SGIC Health? It allows it not to pay interest on its loans, and the Premier then has the gall to come in here and say that they are normal set-up costs. The business community will love hearing that. Most importantly, I guess, as well as knowing all those facts, members opposite also know that the people of South Australia will not forget. They know that the people of South Australia will exact their pound of flesh at the next election. The Governor further stated:

The administration of the South Australian health system is under review.

Well it might be, I say, because there are many efficiencies to be made. The Liberal Party, I signal now, is supportive of efficiencies being made in the health system. Indeed, the Liberal Party is so supportive of efficiencies being made in the health system that we focused on them in our health position paper which we released in May, a mere three months ago. However, as I said before, we are seeing now that this position paper has set the agenda in health, and the Labor Party, tired and lacklustre, is following these ideas.

In particular, one of the efficiencies on which the Liberal Party position paper focused was that of regionalisation of health care. That would see the devolution of authority into the actual regions, so that the consumers of health care were having decisions made by the direct producers. Our Liberal Party view of doing this was in relation to our Liberal philosophy of giving power to individuals rather than to bureaucracies. So, what did we see in the Minister's green paper, shall we call it—his discussion paper prepared by 380 staff of the South Australian Health Commission? We saw conclusions similar to those to which the Liberals came with no support staff whatsoever, and it was three months later!

It is all unfortunately part of a grand plan. There are many errors in this paper, many of which members will all come to rue and regret, not the least of which is the plan for the central metropolitan health region which sees the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children, among others, grouped in one area, and funding is then to be allowed on a per capita basis. I can tell the Government now that it will not work. It is as simple as that. However, despite having taken the ideas from our Liberal position paper, the Minister has missed the boat. What the Minister has missed—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member's attention to the protocol of the Parliament whereby in general terms members do not display material in a debate.

Dr ARMITAGE: The Minister seems to have missed the boat. What the Minister has failed to realise is that the reason for regionalising health care, among other things, is in fact to dismantle the bureaucracy and to remove a bureaucratic layer. The Minister's paper would see the insertion of another layer of bureaucracy between the consumers and the providers and, unfortunately, this does nothing more than illustrate the differences in philosophies between

our two Parties. It illustrates why the Administration presently in power is costing South Australians so much money.

On the subject of expensively produced discussion papers, members opposite would probably know of something called the National Health Strategy, also known as the Macklin review. Recently we received issues paper No. 1, dated July 1991. Macklin has been doing a review for a long time and at great expense to the Commonwealth Government. It is a review set up by Minister Howe. So, what did we see in the first of these issues papers, eight or nine background papers having been produced? I looked on page 50 and found, at great expense to the taxpayer, the following statement:

Area or regional health management is increasingly being regarded as the key point for integrated planning and administration . . .

This is yet another example, this time of the Federal Government being behind. It is typical of Administrations that are without ideas.

Let us look at another idea that the Federal Government has had about problems in the health area. Minister Howe (perhaps in celebration of his new role and, indeed, of his new salary, following the Hawke-Keating brouhaha, which is, as everybody knows, only round one of a 10-round bout) reverts to the age-old Labor problem-solving method. Rather than addressing the cause of the blow-out of health problems, he said he would just get people to pay more. With all the potential solutions to the problem, Minister Howe says, 'Let's charge the patients who are bulk billed \$3.50.'

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Next year it will be \$5.

Dr ARMITAGE: Next year it will be \$5, as the member for Kavel says. Members of the Government should make no mistake about it: this is dismantling Medicare. It is as simple as that.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They do not encourage people to look after themselves.

Dr ARMITAGE: Quite right. So, what did we hear, given the dismantling of Medicare, from members opposite about this proposal, which will hit their constituency before it hits everyone else's? Every one of their disadvantaged constituents will have to pay \$3.50 every time they go to the doctor. What did we hear from members opposite? Silence, and I can only say that, because of the meek way they have accepted this, indeed, we heard the silence of the lambs. The Federal and State Ministers of Health—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I think it's the silence of the cowards.

Dr ARMITAGE: The member for Kavel says it is the silence of the cowards. Certainly, given the rapidity and the joy with which they have trumpeted the benefits of Medicare around Australia, I would have thought that, when we had the first sign that even the Federal Minister has realised that the edifice is cracking somewhere, perhaps some members opposite would have said something about it. But, no; they said, 'We're okay. Let's let the Minister do it and all our constituents will pay \$3.50 more', and not one of them has done anything about it. They are dismantling Medicare; they are dismantling something of which they have been so proud but which is an absolute and abject failure. It is hitting their constituents and they sit there and do nothing about it.

The Federal and State Ministers of Health with their grandiose plans are dragging the chain. With all the resources of Government behind them, what these dull, lacklustre Governments have done is fall in behind the Liberal Party's position paper. The health agenda is being set by the Liberals. We understand that; they have taken our ideas. That is part of the game. We understand that but, I assure members opposite, so do the voters.

So, why are we as Liberals so keen to see changes made to the health system? We are so keen to see changes made to the health system because, unfortunately, under the Administration at present in power and under this Minister, our health system is on the critical list. No better example of this was given than about one week ago, when cuts in funding to public hospitals were announced by the Minister. The Royal Adelaide Hospital had \$1.7 million pruned from its budget; the Queen Elizabeth had \$2 million pruned from its budget; Flinders Medical Centre had \$750 000 pruned from its budget; and as well as that, any future expenses, such as award restructuring, superannuation and so on—unforeseen expenses impossible to budget for—must come out of the budget. The Minister seems proud of it.

Let us look at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, which, of course, is in the constituency of the member for Elizabeth, whose vote was responsible recently for this Government's remaining in power. The Lyell McEwin Hospital will suffer this year. At present, without award restructuring and all the other potential on-costs, the Lyell McEwin Hospital will suffer a \$900 000 shortfall, which means that the member for Elizabeth's constituents will be affected. How will they be affected? They will be affected because at the moment the hospital is under-funded. Yesterday I heard of someone who has had a tonsilectomy cancelled five times. This is a young woman who is doing matriculation. She has had her operation cancelled five times. Every time it has disrupted her study. Her mother, a single parent, is also a student, and her course has been affected by the disruption to the family, to the extent that she is now potentially about to be removed from her course. The Lyell McEwin Hospital has turned this woman away from the door five times.

What do members of this Administration do to the hospital that is in the constituency of the man who keeps them in power? They remove \$900 000 from the budget. I can tell them that cuts have cast doom and gloom over doctors, nurses and hospital staff and, unfortunately, they will see an increase in the waiting lists, which are already simply too long. They will see modern equipment no longer purchased which, of course, means that up-to-date services will not be provided for South Australians. Hospital administrators are in turmoil and yet, despite all this, the Minister said in his media conference at the time cuts were announced words to the effect, 'We're not telling hospitals how many beds they can open.' Well, I merely ask whom the Minister thinks he is fooling. I can tell him that he is not fooling anyone in the health area, and he is not fooling the voters.

What about other effects of the financial constraints on the health area? I was recently contacted by Mr Robert George, a radiographer, who was very distressed because of reductions in positions in the Radiation Control Section. He first wrote to the Minister on 12 October 1990 regarding a reduction in qualified radiographic staff to support ionising radiation regulations of the Radiation Protection and Control Act. He expressed great concern at the decision by the Health Commission not to fill a vacancy created on the board.

The duties of this radiographer who was not to be replaced included assessing shielding proposals for new sites, lecturing radiography students on legislation, answering queries and reviewing the codes of practice for radiation protection. I want to draw the attention of members opposite to this sentence:

As medical diagnostic radiology is acknowledged as the greatest contributor to population radiation dose, failure to support the regulations is not in the spirit of the Act.

What Mr George was saying to the Minister was that these people cannot do their job to protect the people of South

Australia from radiation because the Minister will not pay for the staff.

On 13 May 1991 he wrote another letter, as follows:

I wrote to you last October regarding the decision of the Health Commission not to replace a radiographer which would, amongst other things, threaten to seriously jeopardise medical radiation management by the commission.

There was still no response, so he wrote again on 26 July 1991 re staffing levels in the Radiation Control Section of the South Australian Health Commission. Amongst other things he said:

The situation outlined earlier has now further deteriorated . . . A diagnostic radiographer previously involved in the medical area of the section transferred to the industrial area and was used as back-up to the lone radiographer in the section . . . He has now resigned and his new position has also been frozen.

As I said, the Radiation Control Section is concerned with the greatest source of radiation to the community. Mr George continued:

Radiation Control is now left with one radiographer to:

- (1) train country doctors and nursing staff
- (2) carry out follow-up inspections of these sites
- (3) inspect new installations before registration
- (4) answer queries, liaise with the professions, etc.

This will be impossible for one radiographer.

Because of the lack of support for the health system by this Administration, Mr George, who has been a member of the Radiation Protection Committee for eight years and is an acknowledged expert in the field, has done the only thing that he thought he could do in the circumstances: he has resigned from the committee.

This Administration is not only cutting the hospitals so they will be unable to provide services but it is also making the situation untenable for the experts who ought to be there to help South Australians. What it means in this circumstance involving radiation is that this Government's policies are endangering the people of South Australia. Let us not forget that these budgetary restraints are caused by the mismanagement of the Bannon Government. The cuts have led to the resignation from boards and committees of previously dedicated people who are simply saying: enough is enough.

Having put the torch to the belly of the health system, this Government is now turning the torch to its own election promises. Today the House heard of departmental plans to cut free student transport. With no denial from the Minister, we can only assume that this cynical vote-buying exercise has been pointed out for just what it was. This Government has run its race. It has been found wanting and, rather than make meaningful changes, it will continue to inflict financial woes on the people of South Australia by taxing, taxing, taxing. Those same people, like this radiographer getting off the committee, will say via the ballot box that enough is enough.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I am prompted to speak in this grievance debate because I am concerned at a headline that appeared in the paper today, 'War crime case gets go ahead'. That headline does not particularly disturb me but the fact that the High Court has given a 4:3

decision to allow this case to proceed indicates one of two things: either the law is an ass or the High Court is politicised. My view is probably the latter. We have had these cases before. When the highest court in the land suggests on a 4:3 majority that an important issue such as this, which I believe is critical to the dispensation of justice in this nation, should proceed to trial, the law is indeed an ass.

It has been my view for some time that the High Court is politicised because the highest court in the land is staffed by justices who are political appointments. The Liberal Party appointed Barwick, and others. In Government, the Labor Party appoints its own justices, so the High Court makes political decisions. I make no apology for saying that, although I was not supported by the Liberal Party, I, for one, was sorry when the law lords, the judicial committee of the Privy Council of Britain, were excluded from being the final court of appeal for constitutional matters in Australia. I was described as being behind the times. It reflected the republican debate. Why do we want to be hooked to some law lords in Britain when we are a nation in our own right? We have people who can make these decisions.

What I say is that when we are looking for a dispassionate, rational and disinterested (in the sense of fairness) judgment on the constitutional affairs of Australia, having somebody of absolute expertise divorced or remote from the scene is a strength. The argument about the monarchy is that we have nothing to do with Britain. We have to assert our independence, we have to get rid of the monarchy. Surely the strength of a democracy is that the figurehead presiding over it is totally divorced from political influence and gives some continuity to the political process. My view is that the High Court is politicised, and that is a sorry state of affairs for Australia.

Looking at the great republic of America, I remember President Roosevelt being thwarted because the Supreme Court was overturning some of his political decisions, so he stacked the Supreme Court. He made no bones about it. He put his own men in the Supreme Court so his will could prevail. In my judgment that is an unhealthy situation and it is my firm view and that of other people of my ilk that, in seeking to subvert the Constitution of this nation, the Commonwealth Government is using the High Court for its own purposes.

It is my firm view also that the strength of the Australian Constitution is that, if any significant changes are to be made, the people of this nation make the decision. This country has always had smart lawyers and others who know better than the people. We had it all with the Kerr decision. The bottom line of the Kerr decision was that the people decided and they gave the Government its marching orders.

All the smart constitutional lawyers vilified Kerr, but no credible argument can be mounted that what he did was anything but constitutional. The strength of democracy is that the people decide. We get the smart law professors and these gurus in the High Court. They are political appointments, and I am yet to be convinced that they do not do what their political masters want them to.

A 4:3 decision in the High Court is absolute nonsense. We had it with the Tasmanian dam. I am saying that this is a ruse used on both sides of Federal politics. The Federal Liberal members think that they are a race apart, and the Federal Labor members think that they are a race apart. They know best: they are for Australia. We are only little States: we are not as bright as they are. And the people know even less. The Federal politicians know all the answers: the people do not know. I do not subscribe to that theory. I think that the people know best, and the people closest to

the people know what the people are thinking. They get themselves closeted over there in Canberra and think that that is the fount of all wisdom, so they stick their mates in the High Court, which makes these decisions to subvert the Constitution of Australia.

The Tasmanian dam case was a 4:3 decision. All they have to do is invoke some remote overseas treaty. You can dream up some treaty to sign, and they say, 'This is a matter for the Commonwealth.' So, the Constitution is not worth the paper it is written on. I say that those who drafted the Constitution—and it was the States that had the say—would turn over in their grave if they could see what is happening in this day and age with these centralists in Canberra seeking to subvert the Constitution by stacking the High Court with their own, so that if the Labor Party had a 4:3 decision in the court it would win, and if the Liberal Party had a 4:3 decision it would win. I might be being rude to the Chief Justice—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If I have said it in this place once, I have said it a hundred times: I am frightened of lawyers! You want to keep out of their hands. You need to have deep pockets if you get into the hands of lawyers. But when you have a 4:3 decision in the High Court on fundamental issues such as this, the law is an ass, and the High Court is politicised. In fact, I subscribe to the second view strongly. I rue the day when, in the name of Australia doing its own thing, we got rid of final appeals to the Privy Council. The Privy Council does not give a damn about the politics of Australia.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No fear! They are top people. If they looked at the Constitution, I bet that the States would win over the feds every time. The States gave away four powers to the feds at Federation, and had nothing to do with these fancy international treaties that allow them to subvert the Constitution. They are frightened of the will of the people—that is what it is all about.

So we have this poor old fellow Polyukhovich who tried to kill himself because he could not hack it, and on a 4:3 decision the trial will proceed. The first report was that the trial would proceed at a cost of \$5 million 50 years after the events and on evidence from commo countries. They are trying to refresh the memories of these sods about events 50 years ago! I could expand at some length on where the votes are in this deal. That is what it is all about—votes. But it is nonsense. Justice delayed is justice denied. Justice delayed for 50 years, when memories have gone, is justice denied. The first report was that it would cost \$5 million; now it will cost \$10 million. I might say that my children do not agree with me, but I am giving my views and they are strongly held. So, we get the arguments: \$5 million, \$10 million. What can we do with that? Why has this suddenly erupted 50 years after the event? That is the question that interests me. Why has the High Court come down with a 4:3 decision?

Mr Ferguson: What do you think?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Because I think the High Court is politicised; that there is political mileage in this exercise. I said that at the start. It is Roosevelt revisited. I am saying that the law and the issues should be clear. If the High Court cannot see these issues clearly, the 4:3 decision makes an absolute nonsense of it all.

I am concerned at what has happened since the final court of appeal has become the High Court of Australia, and I am concerned about some of those major constitutional issues being decided on a four/three majority, as has happened here. I have no axe to grind in all this, but I am

pretty cynical about the political process and the exercise through which Governments will go to gain votes from minorities.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Yesterday afternoon members on this side of the House might have been somewhat bemused by the fact that the Deputy Premier did not proceed with a motion listed on the daily program. Perhaps I can enlighten them why he did not proceed. In case members might have forgotten, I will read the motion that was to be moved, namely:

That pursuant to section 18 of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927, the members of this House appointed to that committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sitting of the House tomorrow.

Sections 18 (1) and 18 (2) of the Public Works Standing Committee Act provide:

18. (1) The committee shall have power to sit and transact business during any adjournment or recess of Parliament and during the interval between two Parliaments as well as during any session of Parliament, but shall not sit during any sitting of either House of Parliament except by leave of such House.

(2) The committee may sit at such times and in such places, and conduct its proceedings in such manner as it deems most convenient for the proper and speedy dispatch of business.

The Public Works Standing Committee Act was assented to on 2 November 1927. It has served this Parliament throughout those years in a bipartisan manner and one which has been beneficial to the people of South Australia. Because the Deputy Premier was not in a position to move that motion, 64 years of tradition was destroyed by a decision of the Liberal Party room, under the direction of the Leader of the Opposition, that in effect made it impossible for the Deputy Premier to move that motion. Everything was done in accordance with the rules.

The Public Works Standing Committee wrote to the Government Whip, who then discussed the matter with the Opposition Whip. The Opposition Whip came back with the information that no pairs were to be granted on that day. No reason was given whatsoever. We often hear members opposite prattling away about the power and strength of the Parliament, yet by one decision of the Liberal Party room a particular project—the Myponga filtration plant, which, hopefully, would improve the water quality for people right through the District of Alexandra, at a cost of \$48 million—has been denied scrutiny by members, as is the logical course.

So, we had the hearing at the Riverside building and then we were faced with the dilemma of not being able to carry through to the next stage of the exercise which is demanded of us by the Parliament—not by the Cabinet or the Minister who is sitting on the frontbench—under an Act that has been in force for 64 years. It was only because of the courage of the Hon. Peter Dunn, who told the Hon. Terry Roberts in the other place that he would defy that ban and ensure that the numbers were maintained in the Upper House, that we were able to send a subcommittee of two people to look at this project, which was costing \$48 million.

I understand that Standing Orders are to be amended to include an earlier starting time on Thursday, if the recommendations of the Standing Orders Committee are proceeded with. The decision made in the Liberal Party room in relation to the Public Works Standing Committee as it exists today—although I understand that changes are in the pipeline—will mean that site inspections by the new committee will no longer be able to occur. As I say, I tried to find out why. I asked the member for Heysen, who is on the committee, and he could not tell me. And I can under-

stand the reason why: he is suffering a loss of memory. I would assume that the member for Heysen put up a spirited defence of the Public Works Standing Committee. I asked the member for Bragg (I am sure he will not mind my mentioning it) but he said he was not there—and I accept that. He said he would endeavour to find out. As the Chairman of that committee I have yet to be officially informed why the Liberal Party has thrown 64 years of tradition out the window.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Oh, rubbish!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My fellow committee member, the one who suffers from Heysen's disease—a lack of memory—says, 'Oh, rubbish!' All I can say to the Liberal Party, and I say this to the member for Bragg, who is one of the most sensible members opposite—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —is that, if that is the way the member for Heysen protects his committee—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I thought it was a custom in this House that members had to address their remarks through the Chair. The honourable member opposite is debating the matter directly with members on this side of the Chamber.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take the point of order. The honourable member will direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Through you, Sir, I make a plea to the member for Bragg—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —after that comment of the member for Heysen, that, when the committee system is restructured, under the new Act—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —he ensures that the member for Heysen is not appointed to that committee, because obviously he did not protect its interests when he was in the Liberal Party room. I am still at a loss to know why the Liberal Party Whip informed the Labor Party Whip that pairs would not be allowed. I would like to know why the Liberal Party room felt that a \$48 million filtration plant was of so little importance that Opposition members did not want us to go on an inspection.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I would have thought it was most inappropriate for the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee to refer to a project that was currently before that committee.

The SPEAKER: Order! The references made are to the project as such. Certainly no detail or any analysis of the project is being given here. As it is common knowledge that it is before the committee, I think it can be referred to but not debated.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: That just underlines my plea to the member for Bragg, through you, Sir, in the Liberal Party room when it removes one member from the committee. The member for Heysen knows that the Minister released a press statement which stated that the Public Works Standing Committee would be looking at the Myponga filtration plant and that it would be approved subject to the recommendation of that committee.

Not only does the member for Heysen show a marked memory loss but he also shows a marked degree of ignorance in this whole matter and he ought to be ashamed of himself. Of anyone on the other side of the House who

would stand up and support it, I would have thought that the member for Heysen—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Again, I would suggest that it is most inappropriate for the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee to be referring to other members of that committee in the way that he just has and I ask him to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the reflection on the members, and I ask the member for Napier to withdraw the reflection made on members of his own committee.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Sir, I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): It is fortunate that I should be listed to speak now. I am amazed at the member for Napier's comments. Some of it was falsehoods, and whether they were deliberate falsehoods or untruths I do not know, but they were falsehoods and, as much as I do not wish to talk about what goes on in the Party room, I will disclose part of it.

I received a letter from the Government Whip asking for pairs, for the Public Works Standing Committee to go and inspect a site yesterday afternoon. I believe that the practice is becoming too prevalent in respect of a committee whose members are paid an extra increment—and paid at the same time to be in Parliament—to carry out an extra duty, and making use of an opportunity to double dip, when the members should be in Parliament.

I raised the matter before the House of Assembly Party: it had nothing to do with the Leader. I did it as Whip and I might say that the Party Chairman accepted my raising it. The Party meeting realised that this modern practice—not a practice developed over 23 years, or however many it is—was starting to abuse the system. I was not really telling the Party, because the Party also believed that the committee should meet outside of parliamentary sitting times, as was the practice for the vast majority of the time over which the committee has operated. It has been only in the past five or six years that it started sitting whilst Parliament was sitting. That is wrong in principle and the practice has to stop, especially in a Parliament when the numbers are nearly equal—which members need to remember.

As to what the member for Napier said, the Act does not demand, nor does Parliament demand through the Act, that the committee should sit or meet on sitting days. The honourable member said that Parliament demanded it—it does not. The Act just says that the committee shall sit and, in practice, the committee should sit outside parliamentary sitting hours. The honourable member has been here long enough to know that committee members are paid—and paid handsomely—to operate as a committee outside of parliamentary sitting times. I believe that each member of the committee should be asked concerning the next time of sitting, whether or not they were at the previous meeting. I do not know, but in the future if any committee wishes to sit whilst Parliament is sitting it will have to be an exceptional occasion for the request to be granted. Certainly, to plan a trip to Myponga deliberately on a day that Parliament is to sit is an insult to Parliament.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: You're an utter fool.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member shows what he really is when he hides behind that sort of statement. I do not mind if it is recorded because, fool or not, integrity, honesty and truth are important in this place. The member

for Napier did not tell the truth in this place tonight and he knows it. He knows that he told an untruth; a fabrication.

When I spoke to the Government Whip I said there would be no pairs because the meeting is being called together in parliamentary sitting time. That is the explanation. Let the Whip deny it. One thing that I have done in this place over the years as a Whip is to stick to the truth. I believe that the Government Whip will confirm that what I said was that it was in parliamentary sitting time. It is not on on this particular occasion as far as the Liberal Party is concerned. There is another matter to which I want to refer.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER:** Order! Both sides of the House will come to order.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The **SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Albert Park is out of order.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Following the traditions that I believe I have followed in this House in the past, on 9 April this year, referring to a decision of the Adelaide City Council with regard to development, I made some pretty harsh comments about the decision that was made. As a result, the Chief Executive Officer of the Adelaide City Council wrote to me asking for an apology because he believed I had impugned or reflected upon the character of the City Planner in particular. On this occasion I apologise most sincerely to that person if he believes that I have reflected upon his character. I apologise unreservedly if that is how he feels about it. However, in making that apology most sincerely, I am still not satisfied that the answers that I got from the Chief Executive Officer of the Adelaide City Council are the end result of the council's attitude.

My constituent has a property in North Adelaide to which he is entitled, as he and I believed, free and unrestricted access on a right of way. The Adelaide City Council has informed me that it has operated completely within the law by allowing the adjoining property owner to build a cantilever over that right of way. By building that cantilever over the right of way, the owner of the rear property, my constituent, has lost access to his property for any vehicle exceeding 3.1 to 3.3 metres. That includes removal trucks of the larger type, concrete pre-mix trucks, some delivery vans, (because many of those are from 3.8 to 4.5 metres) and fire brigade vehicles. The Adelaide City Council said that it is satisfied because the fire brigade said that it was happy; it could rig up out in the street and run the hoses from the street to the rear property. That still does not give completely free access. The only way to get concrete on site

is to have smaller delivery trucks and pay a surcharge or pump it to the site. That is not free and unrestricted access. Indeed, with a furniture van, one would have to pay people to cart the furniture out to the street to get it to the van.

I would not have minded if the Chief Executive Officer had written to me and said, 'We did not like your comments in the other area, but we realise that this person has lost some of his right to free and unrestricted access to that property.' But that has not been said. My constituent wrote to the Minister asking that he put the matter before the Planning Review Committee to make sure that it is covered in future. I hope that the Adelaide City Council will do the same. It cannot correct what has happened to my constituent—he has lost some of the right to free and unrestricted access to his land—but the council can at least attempt to have the law changed so that in future it cannot happen to somebody else.

They can also set out to make them fight for third party appeals again because that would have given this person some other right. As it is, there is no appeal, and the person is emphatic that he was never informed of the second submission in changing the plans to put in the cantilever. The Adelaide council tells me that it did inform all neighbouring property holders. However, my constituent is adamant that he never received that information.

The other thing that shows a lack of interest, as I put it, is sticking to the legalistic side but not worrying about the moral aspect. The person who put over the cantilever also increased the height of the drive. Because of that, the water from the drive was running into the window of my constituent's property. The road level was raised to that point. Really, that is a citizen-to-citizen argument and has nothing to do with the City Council. But, at least the council could have said to the person that what he was doing was improper, because the other plan concerning the cantilever was still floating around at the time.

My constituent had to set about and vary the height of that drive or change the course of the water to run it away from the windows. Again I emphasise that I apologise to the planner for any reflection I may have made against him, if that is how he feels, but I am still not satisfied that the Adelaide City Council is concerned about the right of people to have unrestricted access to their properties. I hope they will take note of it for the future.

Motion carried.

At 9.56 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 15 August at 11 a.m.