

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 13 August 1992

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

**ANIMAL AND PLANT CONTROL
(AGRICULTURAL PROTECTION AND OTHER
PURPOSES) (IMMUNITY FROM LIABILITY)
AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Act 1986. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The object of the Bill is to make an amendment which has been shown to be desirable since the Act was introduced to provide an integrated system for the control of proclaimed plants and animals under the guidance and direction of the single authority, the Animal and Plant Control Commission.

The present section 70 of the Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Act 1986 provides protection from civil liability for members of the commission or its staff or persons acting at the direction of the commission and also for local control boards, their members, staff or contractors. The liability attaches to the Crown. The introduction of the Local Government Mutual Liability Scheme which provides comprehensive liability cover for local boards has made it desirable to amend the section to attach the liability for board actions to the local board.

I commend the Bill to members.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 repeals section 70 of the principal Act and a proposed section is substituted that provides that no liability attaches to—

- a member of the commission or its staff;
- a State authorised officer;
- a person who accompanies and assists a State authorised officer at the request of the officer;
- a person acting at the direction of the commission;
- a member of a control board;
- a local authorised officer or other person appointed or employed by a control board;
- a person who accompanies and assists a local authorised officer at the request of the officer;
- or
- a person acting at the direction of a control board,

for an honest act or omission in the exercise or purported exercise of a power or function under this Act.

Proposed subsection (2) provides—

- that a liability that would, but for subsection (1), lie against a member of the commission or its staff, a State authorised officer, a person who accompanies and assists a State authorised officer at the request of the officer, or a person acting at the direction of the commission, lies against the Crown;

and

- that a liability that would, but for subsection (1), lie against a member of a control board, a local authorised officer or other person appointed or employed by a control board, a person who accompanies and assists a local authorised officer at the request of the officer, or a

person acting at the direction of a control board, lies against the relevant control board.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

**BOTANIC GARDENS (MISCELLANEOUS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Botanic Gardens Act 1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Regulations made under the Botanic Gardens Act 1978 are due to expire on 1 January 1992 under the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978 regulation review program. It became apparent to the board in the course of reviewing the regulations in conjunction with the Office of Regulation Review that certain amendments to the Act have become desirable.

The Botanic Gardens Act was enacted in 1978 and has not been amended to date. The legislation establishes the Botanic Gardens Board and the position of Director, sets out the functions of the board and creates a general offence of damaging property of the board. The amendments proposed address a number of miscellaneous issues raised in the course of the regulation review.

The State Herbarium is an integral and important part of the botanic gardens operation and it is appropriate that it be given prominent recognition in the legislation governing those operations. The Herbarium was re-established in 1955 and has grown in stature since that date. It houses a significant and well respected collection of specimens and is used extensively in the identification of species and in the course of many research projects.

It is proposed to alter the short and long titles of the Act to include reference to the State Herbarium. The functions of the board are also adjusted to give prominence and recognition to the function of establishing and managing a herbarium. The Bill specifically requires original specimens to be retained in the collection, although, as is the case with the museum legislation in this State, the board is not required to accept, accumulate or retain material if it does not consider collection or retention justified. In addition, it is proposed to alter the name of the board and the title of the Director to include references to the State Herbarium.

The functions of the board are altered in three further respects. First, references to zoological functions are removed since the board does not exercise such functions and it is not intended that it should do so.

Secondly, the board is expressly given functions relating to nature conservation. This aspect of the functions of bodies that oversee botanic gardens has gained increasing recognition in recent years both in Australia and elsewhere. The board has an important role to play in conserving plant species and this Bill reflects that role.

Thirdly, the participation of the board in commercial activities is recognised. The board acquires extensive knowledge and expertise in the course of its conduct of research. Hybrids of plants are cultivated or occur naturally in botanic gardens. The Bill promotes the use by the board of that knowledge and expertise in a commercial sense. It enables the board to provide consultancy services and to propagate and sell hybrids or cultivated varieties of plants, including by way of joint venture or partnership with a nursery business.

The board's ability to charge fees for entrance to various parts of the Gardens and for other services and to waive or reduce those fees where appropriate are clarified.

The Bill brings the reporting obligations of the board into line with that of other agencies under the Government Management and Employment Act 1985. It also brings the employment provisions relating to the Director and other staff into line with the requirements of that Act.

The regulation-making powers under the Act are clarified and expanded to support the regulations proposed as part of the review program. New regulation making powers make it clear that powers to enforce the regulations may be given to botanic gardens employees and that fees may be imposed for permits for activities usually prohibited. The regulation making power and sections of the Act relating to the regulation of parking of vehicles on land vested in or under the control of the board are replaced with powers that allow for a code of parking to be included in the regulations along the lines of the local government parking scheme. This will enable appropriate regulations to be made concerning the provision and enforcement of parking controls on behalf of the board.

The divisional penalty scheme is adopted. The maximum penalties for contravention of disclosure of interest provisions by a member of the board and for damaging the board's property are increased with a view to retaining them as effective deterrents. The maximum penalty that may be imposed under the regulations is also increased.

A schedule of amendments updating the language of the Act to modern standards is also included.

I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 substitutes the long title of the Act. The new long title makes it clear that the Act provides for the establishment and management of herbaria as well as public botanic gardens. The reference to the repeal of the earlier Act is removed as part of a statute law revision exercise.

Clause 4 substitutes the short title of the Act. The new short title is the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act 1978.

Clause 5 amends section 5, the interpretation provision, by alerting the definitions of 'the board' and 'the Director'. The board is to be known as the board of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium and the Director as the Director of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium.

Clause 6 amends section 6 which establishes the board. The amendment provides for the establishment of the board under the name referred to above. Clause 13 is a transitional provision relating to this change.

Clause 7 amends section 13. Subsection (1) which sets out the functions of the board is substituted. The new subsection emphasises the board's functions in relation to the State Herbarium, includes within the ambit of the board's functions matters related to the conservation of the natural environment and gives the board commercial functions as follows:

- to undertake the commercial exploitation of knowledge acquired by the board in the course of conducting research;
- to propagate and sell hybrids or cultivated varieties of plants developed in the course of conducting research or occurring spontaneously in its gardens, including by way of joint venture or partnership with the owner or operator of a nursery business;
- to provide consultant services.

A new subsection (1a) is inserted. It provides that the board is only required to collect and classify material where that is, in its opinion, justified under the Act.

Subsection (2) is amended to make it clear that the board has the power to lease out facilities for the provision of refreshment.

Clause 8 amends section 20 to bring the title of the Director up to date as referred to above (see clause 3) and to bring the provision into line with the Government Management and Employment Act 1985. It sets out that the staff employed in connection with the administration of the Act may be public servants, persons appointed by the Minister (for example, daily paid gardeners) or persons appointed by the board with the approval of the Minister on terms and conditions from time to time approved by the Commissioner for Public Employment.

Clause 9 amends the penalty provided in section 21 (1) for contravention of the disclosure of interest provisions by a member of the board. The penalty is increased from \$500 to a division 7 fine (\$2 000). It also updates subsection (3) in line

with the amendments to section 20—a member of the board who is a member of staff is not by reason of that fact to be taken to have a direct or indirect interest in any matter relating to the staff. Consequently, the member is not excluded from the board's deliberations on matters relating to the staff.

Clause 10 substitutes section 23. The new clause provides that the board's annual report is to be presented to the Minister on or before 30 September in each year and that the Minister must cause copies of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 12 sitting days.

Clause 11 amends the penalty provided in section 24 (1) for damage to property of the board. The penalty is increased from \$1 000 or six months imprisonment to a division 6 fine (\$4 000) or division 6 imprisonment (1 year).

Clause 12 amends section 27, the regulation making power. The following express powers are included:

- (a) the regulations may confer powers on the Director and other members of staff for the purposes of the enforcement of the regulations;
- (b) the regulations may provide for the waiving or reduction of charges by the board or Director;
- (c) the regulations may confer powers on the board or the Director to approve (on payment of a fee, if any, determined by the board) any act or activity that would otherwise be prohibited by the regulations.

In addition, the regulation making powers with respect to the control of driving and parking vehicles on land vested in, or under the control of the board are expanded and allow for regulations of a similar nature to those that govern local government parking controls. The evidentiary and expiation provisions currently found in section 27 are removed with a view to them being included in the regulations.

The penalty that may be imposed by the regulations is increased from \$500 to a division 7 fine (\$2 000).

Clause 13 is a transitional provision relating to the change of name of the board. It ensures that the board and its activities are not otherwise altered.

The schedule contains various amendments of a statute law revision nature.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 12 August. Page 127.)

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): It could hardly have escaped anyone's attention that this is my second maiden speech in this Chamber. Similarly, it cannot nor will it be denied that it is made in circumstances different from those that I may have chosen. Much valuable time will be wasted over the matter of my return in this Chamber in the coming months by Government members. Let us get it over and done with once and for all. I will even say some of it for members opposite to give them some relief from going through the tedious process that they no doubt will. Yes, I believed I had the numbers. Yes, some of my colleagues had requested—even encouraged and applauded—my decision that I return as Leader and then did not vote for me. Yes, I suppose that makes me feel somewhat embarrassed. Yes, it makes me feel somewhat let down. To members opposite I say, 'Enjoy it while you can.'

As Churchill said, 'In war you can be killed only once: in politics, many, many times.' Regardless of whatever has happened to me on a personal level, absolutely nothing has changed my belief in either my philosophical approach or that of my Party—except perhaps one or two individuals. J.F. Kennedy said, 'I will forgive them, but I will not forget their names.' When Churchill was asked why he went into politics, he answered, 'Ambition, pure,

unadulterated ambition.' When he was asked why he stayed in politics, he answered, 'Anger, pure, unadulterated anger.' My anger is directed to the Labor Party and what it has done to South Australia over the course of the past 10 years.

When I left, I told the Senate that it was my consuming passion to change Government in South Australia, and nothing has changed. I believe the Bannon Labor Government has forfeited the right to govern South Australia. That means, unequivocally, that all the energy and the determination I put into, say, the 1989 campaign—and it was substantial—without reserve, will be committed to winning the next campaign for the Liberal Party in South Australia. The work of that campaign brought to this side of the Chamber five new members. I remain proud of that. What is more, they are good members who have made a significant contribution to this Chamber. I know that at least another five new members will join the Liberal Party after the next State election.

Mr Ingerson: Five at least; probably 10.

Mr OLSEN: Well, 10; any multiple of five will do. So, the past three months has not been all that easy, I concede and acknowledge that. But there is far more at stake in South Australia than what happened to John Olsen in May 1992. So, watch the lips: whatever happened to me is totally inconsequential to the big picture. Whatever position I now hold, the reason for my return to South Australia remains as valid today as it did on the day in March when the decision was made to come back. I returned here because there is a job to be done, and I will still contribute to that job. I first sat in this Chamber in 1979—perhaps somewhat naive and idealistic—sure that I could change all that I saw wrong with Labor Party politics.

Trying to run a small business in the Dunstan years had shown me that Labor was no friend to anyone outside the union umbrella. It is unfortunate that my reasons for involvement in the political process are more valid today than they were 13 years ago with regard to the impact of Labor Party policies on small business. In the intervening 13 years I worked hard to maintain an opposition to Labor's erroneous policies on behalf of the business community generally and the small business community in South Australia in particular. Along the way I have become cynical about the political process, cynical about its lack of speed, often its lack of energy and its continued wrong direction simply because to make the right move at the right time may offend factions or particular interest groups within the community.

All political Parties from time to time have been guilty of that. Yet, I remain convinced, despite its frustrations, that it is an honour to be part of the political forum in a democratic society. As Churchill said, democracy is the worst form of Government except all the others that have been tried. I am here because I want to be here, and I am proud to be here representing the electorate of Kavel—an electorate that has welcomed me. The vote in the by-election was an outstanding result, and the Labor Party should hang its head in shame when its vote gets down to 14 per cent of the primary vote. Who would have thought that any major political Party's vote would collapse to that extent, but it did in both Kavel and Alexandra. I will attempt to serve well the electorate of Kavel in the interests of the constituents who have shown faith in me by

electing me to this Chamber, and I will not let them down.

In addition, whilst talking about the Kavel electorate, I briefly acknowledge Roger Goldsworthy's commitment. I know that a motion has been put before this Parliament recognising it but, briefly, Roger Goldsworthy has made a significant contribution to South Australia in that he was the principal architect of the development of the Roxby Downs project—a project that will generate wealth for South Australians for decades to come. It is a great legacy, in stark contrast to the legacy that the Bannon Labor Government will leave in South Australia.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Tens of millions this year.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, tens of millions of dollars this year. Roger Goldsworthy can stand proud and tall of this achievement—and it is only one of his achievements—that he secured for South Australians of the future. South Australia is in what can only be described as an economic black hole after a decade of circuses and wrong policy mix—policies that were never formulated to stretch beyond the short-term horizon of the next State election. That will take an enormous amount of determination and hard work with difficult decisions being necessary to turn around this State. The economy of the State is no game of chance and should never be played like one. However, that is exactly how this Labor Government has played it. We are now paying dearly for the gambling loss. The equation that summarises our position best is that almost 50c of every dollar that we pay in State taxes and charges is required to pay just the interest on the State debt.

Since Labor came to power in 1982 our State debt has increased by a record \$1 million every day. There is an old sailors' saying that once you see the rocks it is too late to change course and save the ship. That is best ignored in dealing with this State because the rocks were there and certainly visible more than four years ago. It is simply that the captain and his crew—the Labor Government—looked in the opposite direction because it suited them best to do so at the time. To be constructive we need to concentrate on the speed and accuracy with which we can change direction and set a course for recovery.

If you go to the United States and make a profit in the private sector, you get a pat on the back and you are asked: 'How did you do that, how did you achieve a profit? If I can follow that example, perhaps I can be successful, too, and make a profit'. However, if you make a profit in Australia the first question you are asked is: 'Who did you rip off to make that profit?', and then we insist on introducing a host of laws, regulations and inhibiting factors to ensure you never make a profit again. Until we get back to recognising that profit is the key to jobs and security for the future, until that attitude starts to come through the policy development of the major political Parties, we will have lost the plot in terms of fixing economic direction for job security for young South Australians and Australians of the future. I am convinced that this Liberal team has the courage to make such tough manoeuvres successful under great pressure, which there will be over the course of the next few years. I want to be part of that team which makes those tough

decisions and set the right policy mix and course for South Australia in future.

Mr Brindal: You have cowed them into silence.

Mr OLSEN: So they should be silent. I know they are—

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Well, perhaps there is—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And shame, perhaps.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, and so they should hang their head in shame based on their track record and the anguish that they have forced onto the shoulders of individuals in this State.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I can assure the honourable member that a number of us have seen at first hand the result of Labor's policies and how they have cost jobs and wrecked the lives of individuals. That is no overstatement; in many respects, it is an understatement. I want to put one matter to rest during this Address in Reply. There are some who are suggesting that I will be leaving this Chamber before Christmas; and I can understand why they are putting that story around. Let me say now that that will not be happening; I will be sticking around, because my first priority in 1982 was to defeat Labor and John Bannon, and that priority has not changed one iota since then. The depth of our State's economic mess 10 years on—

Mr S.J. Baker: You could well be a Minister by then.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, and putting in place right policies for the future.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat for a moment. It is not the honourable member's maiden speech, as he said himself, so the normal protection for a maiden speech has not been given, but the interjections from both sides of the House are becoming far too great. I ask members on both sides of the House to come to order and respect the honourable member.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I did not really expect to be given any protection—I anticipated rather accurately what the cut and thrust would be—but I thank you. The depth of our State's economic mess 10 years on simply makes the challenge ahead more imperative if we are to make South Australia again a secure place in which to live in economic and lifestyle terms. With hard work, planning and strong and compassionate Government the correct course can be steered for the future. The people of South Australia deserve more when they deliver their trust by way of the ballot box. All of us have been let down by the past decade of Labor, and we have been let down badly. History will record sadly that in the past decade we have achieved little but bread and circuses Government houses in castles built on sand. Major castles such as the State Bank and the State Government Insurance Commission have cost us dearly.

A decade of plastering over the economic cracks with high gloss announcements of circuses has left us with a State infrastructure that an earthquake could not have weakened more. It has been ignored and starved of funds. Ask our teachers, nurses, policemen and unemployed. John Bannon and his team have helped deliver us more than 80 000 South Australians out of work. In a startling figure, during Labor's years in office, the top 5 per cent of income earners in South Australia have increased their

share of total taxable income by 30 per cent, while the bottom 20 per cent decreased their share by 15 per cent. Under a Government which claims to believe in social justice, the gap between rich and poor has increased significantly. The 2020 Vision planning review indicated clearly that we are becoming a State of haves and have-nots with whole ghettos of poverty with lack of access to basic amenities.

We have been told that child-care centres in South Australia see between one and 10 cases a day where children are malnourished, inadequately clothed or otherwise neglected. Child poverty in our State is now likely to exceed 30 000 children. Housing Trust waiting lists have almost doubled during Labor's reign, while the number of rent relief recipients has increased by more than 72 per cent. Schools, both city and country, need huge amounts spent on them, as even basic maintenance has been ignored for years. Many have no physical education programs for students and inadequate sporting facilities, or they lack the teachers who have specific qualifications to guarantee courses to their students.

Our public hospitals have waiting lists for elective surgery in their thousands. They have been treating patients in corridors while our private hospitals have empty beds, and our country hospitals are being closed despite promises to the contrary. Our STA fares have more than tripled, yet the system—it could hardly be called a service—is drastically deficient, losing disgruntled passengers by their thousands each year. Services to Hills residents have been reduced, and the 1989 election promise of free travel for students has been broken, as we knew it would be when that promise was made during the course of that State election campaign.

The cost of our electricity has become the second highest in the country. In the past two years the Government has been increasing taxation by more than double, even triple, the rate of inflation, and we have the highest workers compensation premiums in the country because South Terrace told North Terrace that it could not undertake the necessary reviews. Moody's and Standard and Poor's have downgraded our credit rating, and for the past two years John Bannon has received the Institute of Public Affairs lemon award for the most irresponsible budget as well as the Sir Humphrey Appleby award for closed government.

The Hon. H. Allison: There will be another one on the way.

Mr OLSEN: I am sure there will be another one on the way. And there are changed accounting methods whereby we cannot compare one year with the next, making it difficult to judge the track record and the performance of this Administration. In Canberra, the Bannon Government's closed government methods, its adjustments to its budget each year to prevent comparisons, is a frequent topic of conversation, as is John Bannon's continual refusal to join with other States in agreeing to conformity and transparency in presentation of Government finances.

It is South Australia that will not contribute to transparency and conformity with those rules and, as a matter of fact, it is noted in Canberra in minutes of the relevant Under Treasurer's meetings that South Australia is the one State that will not contribute to and be part of the national scheme. Why? Because the Bannon Government

does not want to be exposed for its track record and performance in its Government and financial instrumentalities.

Mr Atkinson: The other States are out of step.

Mr OLSEN: That is just so inane that it is not even worth responding to. On the first day of Parliament last week, John Bannon said he felt he was in a time warp. I realise full well that he was referring to the return to this Chamber of the member for Alexandra (the Leader) and me. However, when I heard that phrase, it struck me that it would have been much better for South Australia if John Bannon himself had been stuck in a time warp. He came to power so sure of what this State needed in terms of good economic management; he then threw the book away but, if he had actually held to some of his plans for South Australia, we would not be in the sorry mess that we are in today. That is what happens when economic wisdom falls foul of economic cowboys.

I suppose that I do remain true to my beliefs of that time—stuck in my own time warp. If that makes John Bannon any happier, it is fine by me, because the principles underlying those policies of 10 years ago that we want to put down are clearly the signposts and the framework for the next decade.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: You ought to talk about Elliott and Bond. You ought to talk about Bond and Skase and a few others. Your performance in bankrupting the State would leave them for dead. As for the \$2 million that this Government used to buy its way back onto the Treasury benches, I want to remind members opposite that they got only 47.6 per cent of the vote. We got 52.4 per cent of the vote. We had the moral and technical win. Only the boundaries refused us the opportunity to sit on those benches.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Not only will we get the percentage next time but we will get the seats, and you will be a much depleted group. As was put forward by the Minister, you will need to have the cut-outs on this side of the Chamber to make it look as though you have some members sitting in the House, because all members will be sitting on the Government benches next time. You have an absolute hide to talk about Bond, Skase and a few others; your own track record would leave them for dead. Alan Bond happens to be in gaol at the moment because he was involved in a secret commission. I think it ought to be pointed out that during the 1989 State election campaign John Bannon used taxpayers' money—\$2 million of it—in a secret deal. In principle, what is the difference? Absolutely none! Members opposite should hang their head in shame.

This man wanted to be a statesman. Statesmen do not leave a legacy of debt or unemployment, and they do not leave small business all over the State in bankruptcy. That is the legacy that this Bannon Labor Government has left to South Australians.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

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

Mr OLSEN: As long as I never have to rely on the member for Napier for anything, I will be doing all right. I remain of the view that it is not the Government's role to provide all services but to ensure that those services

are provided. To that end, I am certainly committed, as is this Party, to competitive tendering for Government departments and services. I can see no earthly reason why the private sector cannot, for example, offer a range of public sector services, such as electricity meter readings. There is a whole list that ought to be reviewed in the interests of efficient government getting out of the pockets of the taxpayers of South Australia and reducing the burden on them.

It is well known—and it is spoken of with glee by members on the other side—that I put privatisation on the agenda back in 1985. I vividly remember the election campaign.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It would have been, too, if I had been given the chance to put it in place. I remind the Minister that every one of the items on our privatisation agenda of 1985 was put into practice by this Government within two years of that election campaign.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Plus SAGASCO!

Mr OLSEN: Yes, plus SAGASCO. You opposed it, but you did it. That is the typical hypocritical approach of the Labor Party. They oppose it in the public arena: the economic imperatives force them to do it. Members should look at what the Labor Party is doing now in relation to Qantas, Australian Airlines, the Commonwealth Bank—and so the list goes on.

I well remember an advertisement at that time which showed a person standing in front of the brass plaque of the State Bank of South Australia. The advertisement said something to the effect that a vote for the South Australian Liberal Party would take the sleeves off one's shirt; one by one the sleeves came off the shirt. That might have been all right about the sleeves coming off the shirt, but we would not have taken the shirt off the taxpayer's back, his pants and everything else he had. That is what you have done with your track record, performance and guidance of the State Bank of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will recall his Standing Orders, which provide that all references to 'you' and 'they' are not allowed. All references must relate to members' capacity in the Parliament or the electorate that they represent.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker; it was just the emotion of the address. We are at the crossroads in South Australia. We need a new policy direction and a new policy mix. That means, as a first priority, economic development and the creation of jobs so that we do not have our young people having to go to the Eastern States or South-East Asia looking for job opportunities. When young people graduate and cannot get job opportunities here but must shift interstate and overseas to get a job, something is seriously wrong with our economy—something that needs changing. It will change only when different policies are put in place.

We also need to get back to having a competitive edge for South Australian industry. In a time warp, if you like, Playford got one thing dead right, and that was that the expansion of the economic base of South Australia was predicated on the principle of low cost of production, giving a competitive edge compared with other States. That principle is even more relevant today as we now have to compete against not only the Eastern and other

States of Australia but also the international markets. We have global competition as well as Eastern States competition, so returning South Australia to a competitive comparative advantage, not only against the Eastern States but also against our major trading partners, is absolutely essential.

We need to look at increased productivity through industrial relations reform. It can no longer be squibbed. Industrial relations reform is essential. We need smaller and more efficient Government to ensure that we keep our tax levels down, to give some breathing space to the tax slug that has been applied to South Australians, year after year under the Bannon Administration. We need community involvement in the delivery of local services, tapping into that magnificent resource that we have in South Australia, in our local communities.

Debt stabilisation is absolutely essential. We must stabilise this debt and then reduce it. Obviously, it must be done in two steps. That stabilisation is to stop the continuing escalation of debt and with it its debt servicing cost, which means increases in taxes and charges upon South Australians.

An honourable member: Hear, hear!

Mr OLSEN: The honourable member says, 'Hear, hear!' If he agrees with that, perhaps he could speak with his front bench and Cabinet and put into practice what he obviously believes in so much. Honest government, open government and government for all the people is not what we have had from this Administration. Under the guise of commercial confidentiality, it has been prepared (in fact this has been a hallmark) to keep concealed the truth of its policy directions and its impact on South Australians. That is why we are in the position we are in today. They would never have been able to get away with this, for example, in Federal Parliament because there would have been closer scrutiny. The Government would not have been able to get away with the excuse of commercial confidentiality.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: The Labor Government.

Mr OLSEN: Obviously, the Labor Government—which participated in a tax rort—would not have been able to get away with, 'It's commercially confidential; we cannot explain.' It got away with it for a short period of time because, under the guise of commercial confidentiality, the Government was not required to put those matters on the table for all to see. They would never have been able to get away with that in the Federal Parliament at the national capital, and thank goodness they cannot, because we may have had a repeat of the track record and performance of this Administration. Open and honest Government must be the hallmark for the future.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Whitlam tried.

Mr OLSEN: Whitlam tried but, certainly, measures put in place subsequent to the Whitlam era mean that they just could not get away with that now; nor should they be able to get away with that here in South Australia. The efficient delivery of essential services is also essential. There is an eight-pronged approach to policy development and the direction of South Australia, the signpost towards the turn of the century.

To put this in some sort of perspective, one should state that the performance and policy direction of this Government seems very unfair. It is leaving people angry

and deprived. They should be angry at what this Administration has done. The South Australian electorate cannot understand why the Government is still there. I do not see other than a change of Government at the next election with a substantial majority for the Liberal Party. We will not sit here silently and let the Government lose the election. We will win in our own right, not by default but on the Government's performance. We will govern in our own right and introduce the right policy direction for the future.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Before getting into my main discourse, I should like to congratulate the member for Kavel on his second maiden speech. I think it was very clear, precise and well put together. I sincerely believe that he put a great deal of effort into his speech. I hope that the last part of his speech turns out to be true—that is, that he and his colleagues will come clean with the policies they intend to put before the people of South Australia before the next election.

Mr Lewis: You can count on that.

Mr QUIRKE: I hope that the comments that he made towards the end of what I consider to be a very good and outstanding speech will be proved right, because so far there has been silence by the Opposition about what it would do about the problems facing South Australia if it were in Government. It is difficult to associate the two new personalities, the members for Kavel and Alexandra, with the names of those two electorates because the former incumbents, during the two and a half years that I have been here, were so dominating in many respects that they are considerable shoes to fill. I wish both new members well. I believe that they have already brought depth to the Opposition and I congratulate them on their position.

I also congratulate the new Deputy Leader of the Opposition. His talents have finally been recognised and he has been put in a key position. We look forward to seeing how that transpires in the next 12 to 18 months or so.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I shall not be dragged by interjections from the floor into speculating about numbers for members opposite. The reality is that they have been through a very traumatic time in the past three or four months. We look forward to the next 12 to 18 months to see how the new look Liberal Party performs in this place.

I should like to make a few comments about youth and training. Before doing so, I congratulate Her Excellency the Governor on the excellent way in which she has conducted herself and performed as Governor of this State since she has occupied that position. In my view, we have been well served by Governors in South Australia. The appointees who have taken up that high position have done an extremely good job. They have brought a common touch to the South Australian community that is well recognised by ordinary folk. In my view, Dame Roma Mitchell has carried on that tradition to such an extent that the Governor truly is held in high esteem in South Australia. Accordingly, I have no hesitation in supporting the motion before the House. I wish Dame Roma well during the rest of her term as

Governor and hope that she will carry on the high standards that we have observed in the first 12 months or so.

Quite often, only the short-term problems receive air time in this Chamber. It seems to me that in the 1970s, with the collapse of the post-war boom, Australia was at a crossroads. We did not perceive it then, and I doubt whether many of us perceive it now. Because South Australia's rate of growth in general has been less than that of the national average, in many respects we have been a slave of the national economy. We have felt the impact of that economy more than other States.

In the 1970s when the post-war boom collapsed, no longer could we rely on the sheep's back, mining exports and an archaic manufacturing sector to keep our standard of living one of the highest in the world. We were slow to realise that it was necessary for educational reform in the primary, secondary and, where the Commonwealth Government is concerned, tertiary sectors to encourage the creation of an educated populace that would be able to change and mould the new circumstances. In many respects, in the 1980s we were very slow to realise that the first step was to encourage retention rates in secondary schools so that they were not one of the lowest in the OECD countries.

That was realised only when the Hawke and Bannon Governments and the various other State Governments of Australia in the early 1980s set it down on the agenda. The reality is that it should have been perceived in the late 1960s or early 1970s. Certainly, it should have been perceived by 1974 or 1975, and something like seven years was lost. It is not possible to have a retention rate change overnight from what was an Australian average of about 33 per cent in the 1980s to what it is today, around the 85 per cent mark nationally. It has taken a number of years to do that and, in many respects, they, too, are lost years.

The hope of Governments around Australia is to try to have a retention rate approaching as far as practicable the 100 per cent mark by the turn of this century. That in itself will not solve many problems. It is not a solution of itself but, in part, it is the beginning of building a highly educated work force that is capable of meeting the challenges we face going into the twenty-first century.

Governments have been slow to take the second step, which is to provide an adequate level of curriculum and resources to ensure that that curriculum is in place for many of our youth who require training. It is quite obvious that going from a 33 per cent to a 100 per cent retention rate for years 10 to 12 means that courses need to be tailored for the needs of many students. There have been many speeches in this place, sporadically, I suggest, on the necessity for computer literacy and a number of other important subjects in our schools, but it is equally true that there are many other skills out there into which we need to put money.

We need to put it into the TAFE system and into the secondary education system, so that students going through these courses obtain the best possible training in the world. We have had considerable success. Recently, I visited an average, as I was told, school in New Zealand, of 829 secondary students—and three computers. There is not a school in my electorate, either primary or secondary, that cannot boast between four and eight times that number of computers. All members know that a gap

needs to be fulfilled. The reality is that our educational resources of today will build the community of tomorrow.

This Government has been slow on another area, the teaching of a second language, but has picked it up now and is running with it. It is impossible in a country of this size to remain remote from the rest of the world. The best sign of that remoteness is the refusal to teach a second language in schools. I was a teacher for many years, and we all know the teacher who had the hardest time—particularly on a Friday afternoon when the sun came out—was the language teacher. The community did not ever grasp the important position that a second language must occupy in this community. As a consequence, we have not penetrated many of the Asian markets as other countries have done in the past 20 years. Most of our principal trading partners do not speak English, and English is not a language that is widely used in those nations.

With regard to Japan, Korea, Singapore and Malaysia it is absolutely essential for the Government to encourage the community and take a lead by putting resources into schools to have these languages as part of our curriculum. As was said by educationalists more than 20 years ago, the area in which to introduce that is the primary school. It is no good bringing it in in the middle of high school curriculums: it needs to be done much earlier. It needs to be a part of our primary education system. It is as important an ingredient as anything else in our education system.

As a Government, we need to make clear from Parliament that 17 million people in Australia cannot keep their present standard of living and we cannot expect to export to countries if we are not at least conversant with those nations in their native tongue. Many benefits will accrue to our community as a result of multiculturalism, one of which is that we will embrace language education as we have never done before in our primary, secondary and tertiary systems of education.

I turn now to some events that took place during the recess that have led me to believe we need to strengthen our educational resources. During the recess, I was very alarmed to be told of some of the events in the 'have a go' skills share program at Tea Tree Gully. I looked at the facilities at the skill share enterprise, and I saw a number of things that I believed were well and truly substandard. I place on the record that I believe that Governments have a responsibility to upgrade those facilities so that the educational training of young people in that area can be fully realised.

I saw the mechanics training area, which involves a series of old sheds, a very dangerous pit and substandard wiring. I am no great expert in that area, but I could tell there was a shortage of adequate tooling, of modern equipment, of the sorts of facilities that are necessary to train young people in the automotive and mechanic fields. I also looked at the area of business study, which is very important for many young people who, in the secondary education system, for one reason or another, have not picked up the necessary skills and who need to improve their skills through those sorts of courses.

I found a series of very temporary buildings, inadequately serviced with modern equipment, improperly air-conditioned so that on hot days they were ovens and on cold days in many instances they could not be used. The

reality is that the one great asset out there was the staff. The staff of that enterprise made the whole thing tick over. One exercise that took place shortly before that visit that led me to go out there and look at it was the number of former students who rallied behind the staff of that enterprise in their hour of need. I would have thought that members of Parliament would have done what I have just done and drawn to the attention of the public the matter of the shortage of equipment and facilities out there, that they would have been badgering Governments at the Commonwealth and State levels to put their money where their mouth is, to put equipment in these places and to match the excellent staffing with the necessary computers, modern business machines and all the other resources necessary for education. Not a bit of it!

The member for Newland was on that committee. She was on the committee that controlled it and that did not happen. The public servant out there in charge of the enterprise, Miss Sue Gluche was called in by the committee and castigated. She had her employment threatened by the said member and by the former Chairman of the Board of Management and the two of them cited, as the reason for that, the fact that the staff out there had contacted the Department of Education, Employment and Training. I make clear to this House that I will be forwarding a copy of this speech to that department because what has happened out there is not good enough.

I am somewhat surprised that a Liberal politician did not want to expose these things because, quite frankly, the committee of management in my view has been derelict over the past so many years—at least the past two or three years—in not drawing to the attention of Government such shortcomings. I hope that that matter is rectified now. It was a curious thing that the committee of management out there called in an employee who was trying to secure better resources for students and threatened her future employment. As a result, when elections were heard for the board I was quite happy to go out there, with many of my constituents, a large number of young people and their families, who went out to give support and elect a new board that would ensure that these sort of practices did not continue. Indeed, that is what happened: a new board was elected. I was surprised to read in the local *Leader Messenger* the next week of 1 July 1992, under the headline 'We were rolled: Dumped Kotz on board overthrow', the following:

Labor Party heavyweights orchestrated a standing-room only turnout last week at elections for an employment program management board, says dumped board member and Newland MP Dorothy Kotz.

'We were rolled,' Mrs Kotz said after all eight board members of the Tea Tree Gully-based Avago Employment Program were replaced at the annual general meeting.

She said such meetings usually attracted up to 15 people but 210 or more showed up to vote on Monday last week.

Anyone who attends an Avago AGM can register a vote and Mrs Kotz, the only politician on the old board, said she believed Labor-sympathetic candidates had been canvassing for votes and inviting supporters to attend the meeting.

The new board includes ALP member for Makin, Peter Duncan, ALP Florey MP Bob Gregory and ALP Newland candidate Cathy Watkins.

Mrs Kotz said she believed a staff member from the Premier's Department also had won a place.

Other Labor supporters attended the meeting, including Playford MP John Quirke.

'It has become so political,' she said.

'We never politicised it in any way.

'We can stand on the record that the Federal Government, through Skillshare, has already promoted it as being one of the best.'

Mr Duncan said he had been a long-time supporter of Avago, and had attended its meetings before joining the board.

He denied there had been a conspiracy to stack the board with ALP members.

Avago manager, Sue Gluche, said she knew of no hidden agenda for the program and most of the people who turned out to vote were former Avago job trainees.

'I've been encouraging more participation,' Ms Gluche said.

'Instead of coming and doing a course and going away, we've encouraged them to come back and have some input.'

I think it is essential that, in order to correct that article and some of the anomalies that are contained in it, I read a letter that I dispatched to a subsequent issue of the *Leader Messenger*.

Mr Hamilton: Did they print it?

Mr QUIRKE: They did. They missed out one bit, which I will come to in a moment, but in essence the newspaper did a very good job, I can tell the member for Albert Park. The letter states:

I read with interest the article entitled 'We were rolled: dumped Kotz on board overthrow' (1 July).

It stated that 210 attended the AGM of Avago Skillshare and that normally only 15 would be present.

It was further stated that Labor Party identities had 'been canvassing for votes inviting supporters to attend the meeting'.

It was correctly reported that I attended and so did a large number of my constituents.

The voting, with only one exception out of 17 candidates, saw the winning vote averaging 120.

Mrs Kotz—

the most popular candidate on her ticket, I might point out, Mr Acting Speaker—

received 92 votes; most others on the losing side averaging 88.

Two candidates received 10 and 17 respectively because neither the pro nor anti-Kotz forces voted for them.

One candidate received 193 because he was on both 'how-to-vote cards'.

They were quite openly handed out at the meeting by both sides. The letter continues:

Liberal Party members were there in force, with candidate for preselection—

I understand he has now been preselected—

Sam Bass and other identities who stand on polling boxes at election time.

I will digress for a moment and say that there was one paragraph taken out of the letter that I sent to the newspaper. It identified a chap whom I had not seen for a long time, a great friend of mine from Playford, who was out there on the other side, as he always is. I see him on polling boxes at election time handing out leaflets for the Liberal Party. We had a great chat together. I had not seen him since the 1990 Federal election. The letter continues:

So, if a normal meeting would see only 15 persons, and let us assume—

and this is a big assumption—

they would vote for Mrs Kotz, where did the other 77 come from?

At the end of the letter, I offer a bit of advice as follows:

It is no good whingeing about losing afterwards. The first law of politics is succinctly stated as: make sure you have the numbers.

The second law of politics is: don't leave immediately after voting as this annoys even your own supporters.

The reality in this particular exercise is that we desperately need resources for training young adults and,

for that matter, many other adults who cannot be seen in the traditional mould as those who go into these training exercises, as has been the case over the past 20 years. Our economy is changing. We desperately need education and training to prepare the community for the twenty-first century and to maintain the standard of living.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Hanson interjects that it should have been done years ago. I suggest that he reads the beginning of my speech because I recognise that in many instances we were 20 years late in promoting things like second languages and we were 20 years too late in pushing for retention rates in our secondary schools. However, the Avago experience comes down to this: a community out there that is working on building a level of skill amongst young people and some not so young needs Government support. They do not need to be told to disappear, to shut up, to keep quiet and not write letters to Government departments demanding more resources.

In fact, I would have thought that one of the most shocking things was the way in which this whole lack of resources has been covered up by the old board over many years. I have no doubt that in this exercise the Avago staff will continue to provide an excellent level of skill training. I have no doubt that where that is concerned the new board will go forward instead of trying to hide things in a hole. It will go forward and will ensure that necessary teaching resources will be put in place.

The curious aspect about this is the role that an Opposition politician sought to play on that board over some years. I am curious about the way the member for Newland conducted herself on that board. On that night 210 people were in attendance, and quite a lot, including students and parents, came to support the staff and not to whinge about the equipment. They could rightly whinge about the level of equipment and the fact that the board did nothing about it over many years and was seen to do nothing about it, thus threatening the very livelihood of the people involved. However, these people came out to support the director and other staff. They were present in their droves and made it clear which way they were voting.

They were voting with their feet, and that night it was standing room only in voting for the new board. I congratulate the new board which has a real challenge out there to carry on the good work and to get Governments at State and Federal level to resource skill training adequately. I know the Minister will do his utmost to ensure that we have the best possible training facilities in our TAFE institutions. Governments in Australia can no longer sit back and not actively take the lead in respect of education. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): It was again a pleasure to be present on 6 August when the Governor, Dame Roma, presented her speech to the Joint Houses in another place. As we are all aware, the Governor's speech is prepared for the Governor by the Government of the day and each section is prepared by the various Ministers. I will deal with them as I proceed through my contribution.

Like many members, I was saddened during the past few months by the news of the death of the Hon. Joyce

Steele, a member of the House of Assembly from 1959 to 1973. For some time after I was elected to this place in 1970 I shared the crossbenches with Mrs Steele. She taught me much in relation to procedures of the Parliament and conduct in this House. She was one who performed her duties astutely and she was a credit not only to the Party but also to the people she represented and to her son—who helped me on occasions—and daughter. I extend to both of them our sympathy.

Bert Shard, of course, was one of those colourful characters who served in another place. Bert was well known on my side of town. Over the years while I have been doorknocking, constituents have reminded me of Bert's activities before he entered Parliament. Here again was someone of character who made a worthwhile contribution to the Parliament and to the State.

I was also saddened to hear of the passing of the Hon. Bert Teusner, who was the member for Angas from 1944 to 1970. He served in this Parliament almost as long as I have been on this earth. He represented the district in which I was born and educated. Again, I extend my deep sympathy to his surviving family. Mr Teusner was one of nature's gentlemen and someone to whom we could look for advice and guidance, and he was a wonderful example of what a member of Parliament should be. In her speech the Governor said:

My Government has been working to set in place a number of major reforms and to present policies which will have a major bearing on the future development and economic security of this State.

I hope that statement is as sincere as its delivery was, because the great socialist experiment of the 1960s and 1970s has failed dismally not only in South Australia but throughout the world. However, the impact of that on South Australia will have such a bearing on future growth and development in this State that I doubt that we will ever see a major recovery in our lifetime.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Not this century.

Mr BECKER: I hope to live longer than the end of the century. I am concerned that the Government has been able to gloss over some of the most disgusting and disgraceful management practices of any Government anywhere in the democratic world. I have visited many countries recently and if they had faced the situation we are facing there would have been a revolution and the Government would have been replaced. Perhaps in Australia we are too complacent about the performance of our Governments. Certainly, no Government, ministry or Cabinet should be able to place the future of its citizens in such jeopardy as has this Government. So, I will be watching very closely in the following months to see exactly what the Government has in mind in relation to the Economic Development Board and all the other legislation that we have been promised.

Of course, we have heard and read a lot about the great planning review; we have been getting a welter of information about it. What does it all achieve? Will it pick up the 12 per cent unemployed and give them jobs, opportunities and hope for the future? Will it provide employment for the 40 to 50 per cent of young people who are unemployed today? The trouble is that we have been too wishy washy in the past and we have put up with all sorts of populist nonsense that has been generated overseas to divert attention away from the problems this Government has been facing.

In fact, the honourable member who preceded me in this debate reminded us that perhaps 20 years ago we should have been doing more to plan for better educational opportunities and vocational guidance. Ten years ago we had a program in this State to train and place disabled people. If a similar scheme had been in place for able bodied people, it could have helped solve a lot of our unemployment problems. Of course, the Federal Government was providing the funding and the program was lost interstate. The tragedy of that program, which I brought back from America, was that it was 10 years before its time, and what I am finding now is that parts of that program are being picked up by Governments and various Government departments. It is too late: the damage has been done.

I am concerned to note that the Government proposes to change our time to Eastern Standard Time. I cannot honestly see any reason for that. I worked in a bank in Sydney for three years. We were half an hour ahead of Adelaide time, but we adjusted our timetable for the day so that, when the banks closed in Sydney at 3 o'clock, if we could not place our surplus funds on the short-term money market, we transferred them to Adelaide, where we knew we had half an hour to get them on the short-term money market there. If we were not successful, we knew we had another hour and a half to place them on the Perth short-term money market, and we chased the time clock around the world. Most times, we would have to wait until 9 p.m. or 10 p.m. to place the money in London or through the European banking system. We do not have to adjust or change our clock to suit other people: all we have to do is chop and change our time schedule. If it means we start work at 8.30 a.m. in Adelaide instead of 9 a.m., so what? I do not see the point, or why we have to change.

Mr Lewis: It's only 50 people.

Mr BECKER: I would be surprised if there would be even 50 people at the moment; I did not think there were that many left. I do not believe the change to Eastern Standard Time will satisfy many people, except the media: it will make it a lot easier for them to schedule their radio and television programs, because many of them come out of Melbourne and Sydney and, of course, we will see a tremendous number of jobs lost in the South Australian local media because the whole thing will be on a relay system and we will be subject to the propaganda that is pouring out of those States now.

Mr Lewis: Why don't we go to New Zealand and be done with it?

Mr BECKER: That's quite right. The Government also mentioned that agreement has been reached with the Commonwealth Government to establish a national TAFE training system. It is disappointing that we are witnessing the takeover of the TAFE system by the Federal Government. I do not want the Federal Government involved in any way at all. I have said to the Minister, who is in the House now, time and time again that the greatest success story we have in this State is TAFE. Technical and further education has the ability to meet and is meeting the needs, and it has the means, the wherewithal, the staff and the dedication to fill the role that we urgently and desperately need to be filled in this State. If there were any resources, I would be pouring them into TAFE to encourage and assist the colleges to

train their clients and to place them into worthwhile employment.

A lot is being done out there by TAFE. I am proud to be a foundation member of Marlestone College. I have not always been able to attend meetings over the past 12 months or so, but what I see and pick up from the meetings is that for years all we seem to have been doing is considering cutbacks.

We try to avoid them, but we have done extremely well with staff, and this year we have balanced the budget again under very difficult circumstances. In conjunction with private enterprise, and using its initiative, Marlestone College has come up with a new woollen blanket. It is a little early to say too much about it, but the initial trials are encouraging and successful and, if this type of blanket (which is made from recycled products) is the success I believe it will be, judging by the blanket that I saw, a whole new area will have been opened up through the initiative of our TAFE college. That is only one small program. Croydon has many pluses. Its section that is working on a racing car receives a lot of criticism, but I would not get too upset about that, because it is training specialist mechanics. Once they have been through that program, they can get a job anywhere in the world.

I do not know how many members have had the opportunity to attend an international Grand Prix. I was lucky enough to attend the 500cc motor cycle Grand Prix at Donnington in England a couple of weeks ago. Never before have I been so proud to be an Australian seeing Wayne Gardner win. I went through the pits and also looked at the motor homes and the vehicles used by the teams to transport their machinery and mobile workshops. The people they seek are Australian mechanics. We can be very proud of that, because normally the top mechanics in this area come out of Europe, particularly Germany and Italy, but the Australians are now in there. Our TAFE college here gives them the experience and opportunity. Having the formula 1 cars operating in Adelaide, we are also creating the opportunities for expertise and the prospects of a whole new world in technical engineering. These are the things we must do.

Time and again, wherever I go, I have been wondering how we can create 80 000 to 100 000 new jobs in South Australia. I do not recall too many new industries coming in. I can remember as a lad, as you would, Mr Acting Speaker, when we would read in the press almost weekly that Sir Thomas Playford had been overseas or that Sir Thomas Playford had attracted some new manufacturing company from Europe, England or wherever. We have not seen that for years. I do not know how long it has been since the Government has been proud to announce that a new company is coming to Australia, that it will open its head office in South Australia, that it will expand and that it will require people to help it to do that. We just have not done that. We have missed out.

The conflict that we have in this country is between the Governments which want to take off the tariffs and those of us who believe in tariff control to protect our own industrial and manufacturing base. I believe in import control: I always have and always will. I also believe in heavy tariffs. That happens in every country in the world. The Americans are not frightened to do it. The Canadians were exporting thousands of tonnes of timber

across the border into America, and the Americans very quickly slapped on a 30 per cent tariff with no ifs or buts about it.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: They want to protect their own industry. It does not matter. The point is that they do not care and they look after their own people first. We should be doing the same.

I am pleased that there is to be an extensive review of the Lands Titles Office and the registration system. We know about the problems that have arisen with stamp duty and the practice of not upstamping mortgages. When I was at the Bank of Adelaide it was hammered into us that if we made a loan the mortgage documents had to be stamped to the fullest extent. The people in head office who supervised our work from the branches used to write us absolutely stinking memos if we did not do it.

It is ironic that I am serving on a parliamentary committee that is looking into the stamping of a document for SGIC. I cannot understand that, because Gerschwitz was in the Bank of Adelaide and Robert Bruce was also in the Bank of Adelaide and he used to pounce on us. These chaps were trained and they knew the rules. Vin Kean and Hayes and United Motors—all that group—banked with the Bank of Adelaide and they knew and still know the rules. I have no sympathy for these people. You either do the thing properly or not at all. Vin Kean is right. Many large developers in this State have probably done the same thing, but I blame the banks. The lending institutions are as guilty as anyone else. Many of the banks do not even register the mortgages that they hold and do not have them properly stamped. I hope that the Lands Titles Office can come forward with a scheme and go further than that so that, if money is lent, we can make sure that we get the correct stamp duty on the true valuation of the property.

I am also told that there are numerous property transactions in this State where the valuation is deliberately written down to avoid the payment of other duties and charges. It will take a really gutsy organisation to do something about it, but I do not see why I or the rest of the people in this State should pay high taxes because others who get good legal advice based on the current legislation avoid their true payments. The Coast Protection Act needs to be reviewed, but what gets me is that we will have a green paper, a white paper and all these other papers and documents, with heaps of time and money being expended on reviewing the Act, but we do not get too much. We do not get enough money to solve the problems.

It is a tragedy to see the West Beach area being destroyed through a lack of sufficient funds to do what we believe is correct, that is, to protect our foreshore and our beaches, and to build up our beaches, as they are the greatest and cheapest asset we have to prop up our tourist industry. Whilst we are going through a difficult period, it is better to keep people in Australia, and the best relaxation is to visit the beach. So, any investment we put in there is well worth while.

The Governor also advised that through amendments to the Summary Offences Act the police will be empowered to establish road blocks when trying to apprehend a person using a car illegally. Another reform will be an amendment to the Evidence Act to allow for video taping

of the evidence of children and to allow children and other vulnerable witnesses to be questioned using screens and in-house video links. First, I am a little concerned about using road blocks, because if someone pinches a car, I do not think that he will worry about ramming a couple of cars or something, scattered across the road.

We have a terrible problem with the illegal use of motor vehicles and putting the police at risk in a having to pursue them. We need to come up with something better to stop these louts stealing the cars and, at the same time, we need to solve the problem of why they do it. We need to get to the real problem of what is happening with young people in this community. Of course, the problem is lack of employment. No matter where you go, even concerning the riots in Los Angeles, the cause of the problem is unemployment and poor housing. We need to get right back to basics and be able to reach these people before they get to the mentality where it is easy to pinch a car, go joy riding or commit further crimes. More work and study needs to be undertaken there, rather than putting the police at risk by stopping those people after they have committed a crime.

The videotaping of children concerns me. Over the past few years I have had several complaints in relation to allegations of parents or guardians being charged with sexual abuse of their children or the children whom they are looking after. It seems to me that certain people within the Department for Family and Community Services have an obsession with child sexual abuse. I cannot blame anyone for wanting vigorously to pursue people and to protect vulnerable children. I believe that some of our social workers do that well. Others, however, at the slightest hint go uncontrollably to all the various Government agencies and scream child sexual abuse. The next thing, the guardians or parents are charged and, in two cases I have come across, anything up to \$60 000 or \$100 000 has been spent by these people in defending themselves, insisting upon their rights and demanding that their innocence be accepted.

They are exonerated by the courts, yet the department persists in pursuing them. One case that I have already brought to this House is that of Bruce Yates of Lockleys. The treatment given to Mr Yates by some of the staff of the Department for Family and Community Services and by some Government Ministers is an absolute disgrace. Mr Yates is totally innocent, yet he has been driven to the point of despair. He is a bit like most of us: when you are being continually harassed and accused of doing something you have not done you get a bit annoyed about it. Bruce is not beyond saying in a very forceful way a few words in his own defence. However, these are interpreted as threats and, the next thing he knows, he is being harassed for making threatening statements. It means nothing. The point is that the department is totally out of control in this area.

I have another case before me which I hope to put before the House on another occasion and which involves Mr and Mrs Bean from Murray Bridge. Here again, unsubstantiated and untrue allegations have been made against them. However, it has almost broken them financially and ruined their business. It has also put a tremendous amount of stress on the marriage and everything else. This is all because some wimpish person in the department believes that there may be a possibility.

I have seen a video of a child being interviewed by officers of the Department for Family and Community Services in this way. It is disgraceful. It is absolutely disgusting to see how this poor five-year old child was treated and pumped with questions. I thought we got rid of that type of behaviour when World War II was settled in Europe. Certainly, if we are going to allow it, then I fear for the innocent in this country and in this State.

I am delighted that, at long last, my call of many years for whistleblowing legislation will be dealt with. As the Government has said, it will introduce into this House legislation providing for a regulatory regime to protect those who seek to expose corruption, malpractice, negligence and other unacceptable practices in the administration of the affairs of South Australia. Hear, hear! It is about time.

As Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee from 1979 to 1982, I received numerous complaints from public servants—as I still do—relating to the malpractices operating in the Public Service. However, you can forget trying to get something done on an official basis. If you use the person's name to back up your allegations, you can write off that person's career. There is discrimination; it is well and truly alive in the Public Service. Vendettas are carried out against people who are prepared to stand up and highlight the incompetence of some of the managers within our Public Service system and statutory authorities.

What is going on is disgraceful. Had we whistleblowing legislation some years ago, there is no doubt in my mind that we would have a cleaner and clearer picture of what has happened in Beneficial Finance and the State Bank. There would have been no question of who knew what and when, because the Premier did. I told the Premier in early August two years ago exactly what was going on in Beneficial Finance. Information was being leaked to me because someone could see the demise of the State Bank and could see what would happen if it were not stopped. Someone from Treasury was brought in to have a look at the situation as well.

Marcus Clark quit as Chairman of the Commonwealth Games bid committee, because he knew I was breathing down his neck, and he had to get back to look after the bank. He knew what was going on; they all did. But, how we get that out in evidence, in a court case or before a Royal Commission, I do not know. We will leave that up to Mr Justice Jacobs, and good luck to him.

Whistleblowing legislation is an essential part of the accountability of government and we must give all we can to support that. I am also pleased that in relation to the Guardianship Board the administration of the Mental Capacity Bill and the accompanying Mental Health Bill will create the position of a public advocate, with a watchdog role on behalf of mentally incapacitated persons. The legislation will seek to strike a sound balance between an individual's right to autonomy and freedom and the need for care and protection from neglect, harm and abuse. It is an area in which I have been involved for a number of years, again on behalf of many constituents, who complained that their affairs were placed in the hands of the Guardianship Board. It is essential—in some cases in some families—to protect individuals, and the Guardianship Board does carry out a

very important protective a role which is essential and necessary to assist these people and to protect their money.

We have had many allegations about all sorts of practices in relation to disabled people and about who looks after their financial affairs. I am concerned about the treatment that the Government is giving retirement villages. I have several in my area, with several vacant properties. They are having difficulty selling the properties after the relatives pass away. Bad publicity being created by the Commissioner for the Ageing and the Government is not helping the viability of these retirement villages. It is affecting everyone who has a property in those organisations and it is affecting the value of their properties. I warn the Government to look carefully at what is happening in that area.

Not much has ever been said and little credit given to the late Alice Dixon. She fought very hard for a royal commission into Aboriginal deaths in custody and did a stirring job. It was a lonely and difficult job at times. Alice was given a pretty rough time. Not too many people ever took Alice seriously as they should have done on both sides of politics. I always found her approachable. We had many long discussions about the problems and on how we could resolve them to help her people. It was sad that she passed away in the circumstances that she did. I always thought that she was a much stronger person. The Government must do something about the situation. I could not believe that the things that she brought to my attention were going on. We must make a greater attempt to understand Aborigines. We do not have to bend over backwards to appease these people but must give them some respect and at the same time demonstrate to them that we are prepared to look at the problems associated with their culture and do something about it.

Finally, I refer to the reintroduction of the Gaming Machines Bill. Fortunately, I was not here when the final vote was taken on that Bill as I was paired when the moral issue was voted upon. I do not know what the Parliament did in the closing stages. To ascertain what was happening within the community I conducted a simple survey of 551 constituents asking them, 'Do you approve of poker machines in hotels and licensed clubs?' I finally received the replies a couple of weeks ago, before the *Advertiser* came out with its survey results. I found that 33.3 per cent answered 'Yes', 64.7 per cent answered 'No', and 1.2 per cent said that they did not know. It appears that the *Advertiser* campaign has been able to swing public opinion right around so that 65 per cent are now against poker machines in clubs and hotels. The next question I asked was, 'Do you approve of poker machines in the Casino?' and 63 per cent answered 'Yes' and 34 per cent answered 'No'.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr GUNN): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and express my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I congratulate our Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell, for the way that she is fulfilling the duties of her office. I regret that illness prevented me from being present on the

opening day of Parliament, but I know that Dame Roma fulfilled her responsibilities as she always does—with grace and dignity. I express my condolences to the families of the late Joyce Steele, Bert Shard and Bert Teusner.

I have already put my tribute to Joyce Steele on the record in the motion of condolence. As one of his successors as Minister of Health, I know that Bert Shard did his utmost in that portfolio to fulfil the goals of his Government. He had the benefit of enjoying what were then good economic times, and that was reflected in the improved provision of health services. Mr Teusner was renowned as a Speaker for his justice and the fairness with which he fulfilled his office and also for his gentle courtesy in his dealings with people in Parliament, his electorate and the community.

I congratulate most warmly the members for Alexandra and Kavel on their re-election to this Parliament at by-elections. It is unusual, if not unprecedented, I believe, for two members to come back into a Parliament in the circumstances in which the new Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kavel have returned. I admire them both for their dedication to the State and their willingness to serve in the belief that their service can, as I am sure it will, be of immense benefit and very enriching indeed to a Liberal Government and to this Parliament.

I would also like to pay tribute to the retired members for Kavel and Alexandra. My appreciation of Mr Roger Goldsworthy's work is already on the record in a motion that was passed by this House in the last session. Mr Ted Chapman was always a most diligent member for Alexandra and a very vigorous and enthusiastic Minister of Agriculture. His work in establishing South Australian trade links with the Middle East laid very valuable foundations which have been of considerable economic benefit to South Australia and which continue to be of benefit to this State.

It may be that this is my last Address in Reply in this Parliament. I see the Minister on the front bench shaking his head in disbelief. I hope for the sake of the State that we do not have to endure one more year of this Government, which is bereft of confidence, ideas and ideals and which has brought the State to its knees. I hope for the sake of South Australia that this is my last Address in Reply because the sooner we go to an election the sooner the State will be relieved of the burden it is bearing as a result of the actions of this Government.

Nevertheless, I speak with some regret at the thought that this may indeed be my last Address in Reply. It is reasonable to ask why a member with 15 years service next month would choose to retire on the eve of her Party's gaining Government, as I hope and expect it will, and with the very likely opportunity of a senior Cabinet position in that Government. I do not propose to outline all my reasons for doing so, but I think it is reasonable and perhaps it might be instructive if I outline some of them. I believe it probably takes three terms in this Parliament for members to become fully acquainted with their role and function as legislator and representative. In my case, I believe it took five years for me to become fully acquainted with Standing Orders and feel totally at ease in speaking, acting and voting in this House. However, I think it was at about the 10-year mark, at the conclusion of three terms, that I became fully aware of

the extreme limits of the power of elected representatives in State Parliaments and, very likely, in the Federal Parliament in this country.

There have been many speeches in this House—and I have made several of them—on the need for parliamentary reform and the serious alienation from the political process which is afflicting the electorate and eroding the efficacy of Parliament. I can say that only after 10 years in this place—two as a new backbencher, three as a Minister and the remainder as a shadow Minister—I believe I fully understood the political process, and it no longer held any mystique for me. I was fully aware that the power of the media in our society to influence Governments and political Parties in their decisions is overwhelming and overweening, and I believe extremely damaging to the full and energetic exercise of the democratic process. The power of the Public Service, with its vast resources of information and experience, by comparison with Ministers (and I do not say this insultingly) sometimes of limited intellectual capacity and experience in the field in which they are administering, gives the Public Service a power that in many cases in my belief is far greater than this Parliament exercises.

The Hon. H. Allison: And it's permanent.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As my colleague says, it is permanent. The power of Executive Government and the willingness to use the brute force of its numbers to carry the day whatever the merit of the case we have seen far too often. Consequently, the power of private members and of Parliament itself is correspondingly reduced. The discipline of the Party system, which thankfully is considerably less in the Party that I represent in this Parliament than in the Labor Party, in my opinion limits the full flow of vigorous debate and the free expression of individual ideas and, what is more, of ideas that are truly representative of the people whom we represent in this Parliament.

There are far too many limits placed on the free expression of ideas in this Parliament and it is the discipline of the Party system that is responsible for that. All of the institutions I have mentioned are male dominated, and in 15 years I have lived in this male dominated culture which I believe is sometimes almost tribal in its loyalties and its perspectives. Much as I regret leaving Parliament and thereby depriving myself of the opportunities that I have enjoyed over the past 15 years for advocacy of the causes in which I believe, I have come to the sad conclusion that it is possible to be a much more effective advocate outside this Parliament, untrammelled by the constraints of the Parliament than it is to be an advocate in the Parliament. That statement is one that I would not believe I could ever possibly have made when I entered this Parliament. Nevertheless, I hope that I can find in a third career outside Parliament the opportunity to do something that is publicly useful and to express views fearlessly within the law and without the constraints that are placed upon so many of us in this place.

Because it will soon be the fifteenth anniversary of my election to Parliament, I cast my eye over the speeches I have made in the Address in Reply since my election and I note that there are consistent themes in those speeches, which is perhaps not unusual for any of us. The most

consistent theme is the theme of the decentralisation of power and the importance of that decentralisation for the preservation of the rights and liberties of the individual in our society. That was the theme of my maiden speech and it continues to be an overwhelming interest of mine. I believe that the preservation of individual liberties is best guaranteed in this country under a Federal system in which power is shared between the national Government and the State Governments. I think the continued accrual of power to the Commonwealth and the deprivation of the States in terms of both fiscal and political power is having an adverse effect on the liberties of citizens in this country.

I would like to see that trend reversed. That is why I hope that the newly formed Samuel Griffiths Society, and other organisations that are calling for constitutional debate, will help Australians focus on the importance of decentralising power in this country. Continued decisions of the High Court, in terms of the external affairs power which resides with the Commonwealth and which consequently require the State Governments to adhere to policies of the Federal Government, is limiting the powers of the States, as is the continual fiscal power of the Commonwealth.

There is a need to redress the balance; there is a need to safeguard judicial independence in the light of increasing Executive encroachments; there is a need to re-assert the role of Parliament *vis-a-vis* the power of the Executive; there is a need to review the financial arrangements of the Commonwealth and the States and to redress the duplication by twin bureaucracies that are imposing enormous burdens on taxpayers. Further, there is a need to consider and develop alternative methods of constitutional amendments, such as States' initiatives. I would warmly welcome amendments to the Constitution to enable the States themselves to introduce initiatives that would then have to be carried by the same democratic majority as is required under the present Constitution. The Constitution has served us well, but I believe that it could be improved.

Looking back over those themes of the decentralisation of power, of parliamentary reform, of a greater role for women—the advancement of women and the further emancipation of women—and the consequent benefits to children, I also see other strong themes were the environment and, in particular, national parks—which reflected my portfolio responsibilities—energy supplies and economic management. The national parks theme is one I wish to continue today. In my Address in Reply speech of 11 August 1988 I referred to the Government's proposal to establish a resort at Wilpena within the Flinders Ranges National Park. At that time I said:

There is manifest conflict between the scale and nature of the project and existing legislation governing reserves. There is conflict between the project and existing policies governing the National Parks and Wildlife Service. There has been a failure by the Government to undertake separately two entirely different statutory procedures; that is, the environmental impact statement under the Planning Act and an amendment to the management plan under the National Parks and Wildlife Act.

I said that the Government stood to be condemned on all those counts. Nothing has changed. It is now almost six years since the release of the Cameron McNamara report identifying the Wilpena Station lands as a possible resort site and we still have no resort there. I want to read to

the House very few of the incidents and events over that six years which demonstrate that the Government chose the wrong path, has been blindly and obstinately pursuing the wrong path and that that wrong path is leading to the ruin of the park and the possible addition of an enormous debt burden on the taxpayer.

I also want to point out that the terms of the lease that the Government signed with the developers—Ophix Limited—on 16 January 1989 are being breached, have been seriously breached, and that the Government is doing nothing whatever about it. The terms of the lease (page 17, point five) required that the lessee will replace, repair, rebuild and keep the whole of the demised premises in good and substantial repair, order and condition. Further on, section 5.3.1 states:

5.3.1 so often as the Lessor may reasonably require during the term colour paint paper or stain with such materials and to such standards and colours as may be approved by the Director such parts of the interior and exterior of the structures on the demised premises as are normally so treated;

If anyone chose to go to the Wilpena Station site, they would see (if they were allowed by law to see it, and they are not, because a regulation in the *Government Gazette* prohibits people from going on to the station lands) that those precious heritage buildings at Wilpena have been allowed to deteriorate to the point where they are almost beyond repair. Despite the terms of the lease which the Government and the lessee signed, salt damp has risen up the walls of those historic buildings until it is almost to the roof line. The walls are fretting to the point where whole structures could collapse. The paint has been eaten away, complete doorjambs have been consumed by white ants, the whole structure is riddled with white ants, the internal timbers are riddled with white ants and in the kitchen the cupboards are eaten away and there are simply piles of dirt where the ants have consumed the kitchen furniture. This is in direct breach of the lease; the Government has done nothing whatever about it.

I will briefly go through and select just some of the events that have occurred. On 5 November 1988, 82 prominent South Australians signed an advertisement opposing the resort. Later that same month I condemned the development. Still later that same month, a further 81 prominent South Australians added their names to another advertisement opposing the resort. Later again in November 1988 the manager of Ophix stated that plans to keep the resort an Australian venture would be ensured by holding major Australian equity. We went on and on. There was a High Court challenge but, before that occurred, on 28 November 1988, the Minister for Environment and Planning said that work on the resort could begin by March 1989. That was three years ago, and nothing has happened.

There was a protest rally on 29 November 1988 on the steps of Parliament House, attended by 2 500 people and still the Government did not listen. There were reports expressing doubt about the reliability of the long-term groundwater supply and the effects of the worst case drought conditions. Public access to the site was restricted on 11 October 1989 to allow for construction. Not one brick has been laid; not one stake has been hammered into the land. No construction has taken place, yet the public is forbidden on that site.

On 31 January 1990 Ophix announced that it had sought finance from the State Government Insurance Commission, the Building Union's Superannuation Scheme and from the Aboriginal Development Commission to help finance the resort. It is clear that the resort was never viable for private investors, and the developers had to try to dredge what they could out of the Government. They have not succeeded, because in this climate the Government would not dare, and no one else would want to. The appeal for funds to take the appeal to the High Court was launched in April 1990, and we go on to 10 August 1990, when the developers said that they could meet a State Government deadline to begin work on the site by 1 November that year. That was more than two years ago. It was reported that Ophix Investments hoped to start work before November 1990, and then we had a Bill introduced into Parliament.

What did the Minister for Environment and Planning say in the Committee stage of debate on that Bill on 25 October 1990? She said:

As soon as the proponents have the ability to proceed unimpeded by vexatious, obstructionist-type activities, we will see these things proceeding very quickly.

That was almost two years ago. Nothing has happened, except that the white ants have eaten more and more and the salt damp has risen higher and higher in the heritage buildings on the site.

On 5 March 1991 doubts were expressed over the developer's ability to obtain finance, but on 1 May that year the Acting Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. M.D. Rann) said:

There is no Government condition for the commencement of construction.

The lease requires that the facility of a nominated size is constructed by 30 June 1994. Throughout all this time we have had developers saying, 'We are going to get the money soon.' How soon is 'soon'? Almost two years after a Bill has been passed, after the proper processes of law in the High Court have been thwarted, nothing has happened. The Parliament had to rush to legislate to assist the developers and then all would be well. All is not well and nothing has happened. The Government sits and twiddles its thumbs while the white ants and the salt damp eat away at the heritage buildings. Meanwhile the tourism industry in the Flinders Ranges is depressed because no other tourism operator is willing to risk capital investment for fear of this resort to which the Government has put its name and has backed to the hilt.

On 22 October 1991 the Minister of Tourism stated that the lease contained no scheduled date of commencement and that there would be no extension to the 30 June 1994 obliged completion date for stage 1. On 9 January this year Tourism SA rejected Opposition claims that the \$50 million resort would not proceed due to lack of finance. I think that was a fair claim to make after four years. It is not as if they have not had more than ample time and the law to back them, yet nothing has happened. TSA stated that the developers have until June 1994 and that in TSA's books that means that stage 1 can commence as late as the end of 1993. Those people just do not know what they are talking about.

The building of stage 1 of a resort of the size proposed by law for Wilpena cannot be achieved in six months. Even if we had an army of people working on it, the weather conditions would mean that it would not be

possible. At certain times of the year that site cannot be worked upon because of the boggy conditions. Whether there has been rain or not, the ground waters rise. The former station owner, Mr George Hunt, could testify to the fact that there were months of the year when he had to get off his horse to go over some of the station lands because of the boggy conditions caused by the ground waters. It would be impossible for a building to be constructed within six months. I want to know when the Government is going to front up to its responsibilities and require the lessee to front up to its legal responsibilities.

The Minister for Environment and Planning talks continually about heritage, yet she is permitting and condoning one of the most precious parts of the heritage of the Flinders Ranges to deteriorate. The outhouses in which early explorers camped and which have considerable historical value—they were constructed of pug and pine—are deteriorating. They are leaning to the point where they are about ready to fall over, yet the Government does nothing. Many questions need to be asked and to be answered. The developers have had more than a fair go. The conditions that they have been offered are the most favourable conditions that any developer in this State has ever been offered. They have not been able to come up with the goods. It is time they called it quits and it is time that the Government made them call it quits.

I do not propose to take the further brief time that I would have beyond the luncheon adjournment. I simply want to call the Government to account for one of the most shameful decisions and lack of action and failure to adhere to the law that has ever occurred with respect to national parks in this State and to say that South Australians should not, and I believe will not, tolerate a continuation of this negligence and dereliction of duty on the part of the Government.

Debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COUNTRY ARTS TRUST BILL

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

PETITIONS

GAMING MACHINES

A petition signed by 625 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to repeal the gaming machines legislation was presented by Dr Armitage.

Petition received.

AUSTRALIAN FLAG

A petition signed by 249 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the Australian flag was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

SEPARATION PACKAGES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I would like to begin this ministerial statement by informing the House that I am still to receive from the member for Bragg the names of former public servants who he alleges have been rorting the system of voluntary separation packages. He has spent the past two days making unsubstantiated allegations against three departments and, it goes without saying, these have found enthusiastic support in the unquestioning columns of the *Advertiser*. I note that today's *Advertiser* conveniently omits my explanation to this House of how the member for Bragg had got it wrong in his allegations concerning the Department of Agriculture, of how no employee's voluntary separation package, as such, had exceeded \$100 000 and how, according to the information provided to me, no officers who accepted VSPs have been re-employed.

With regard to SACON, I present the House with the following information, as it has been given to my office. Since the introduction of the VSP program in July 1991, SACON re-engaged through Drake Personnel a temporary keyboard operator, who had accepted a VSP. Her re-engagement prompted a written instruction from the chief executive officer to comply with all VSP regulations. The operator's temporary employment was terminated.

In February this year, the Comskill personnel agency provided SACON with another temporary keyboard operator who had also accepted a VSP. She began work on a Wednesday afternoon but, when her status was discovered, her employment ceased the following Friday morning. SACON can find no-one whose re-employment or contract fits the description alleged by the member for Bragg, of \$100 000 redundancy packages. In fact, the VSPs of the two people concerned were only \$16 082.50 and \$12 758.26, respectively.

In all the welter of trivia that he has raised in this House in the past two days, he is yet to make an allegation stick. I have received no information from the departments named by Mr Ingerson to substantiate any of his claims. Of course, if in his heart he is so sure of his claims he should give me the names of the individuals concerned. My door is open to the member for Bragg.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I bring up the eleventh report 1992 of the Legislative Review Committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I bring up the twelfth report 1992 of the Legislative Review Committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

CONSULTANCIES

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Acting Premier. Why has there been public disclosure of only \$5.4 million spent on consultancies for the past five years when the actual figure is at least \$100 million, and why has the Government conducted this cover-up? The budget papers itemise these allocations under the line 'Payments to Consultants'. Over the past five years, there has been full disclosure of payments by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and by the Attorney-General.

However, for all 11 other Ministers, there is no reconciliation of the \$96 million difference between the budget papers and the information made public by the Economic and Finance Committee yesterday. For example, the budget lines of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet state that there were no payments to consultants, whereas the Economic and Finance Committee has now been told that the department has spent more than \$2.7 million on consultants over the past five years.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: My answer to that is a bit of a resounding 'So what!' I just wonder whether—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Leader of the Opposition does not want to hear the answer, the Chair does.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Close to the wind, brother. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There are a number of ways in which the information is made available. I wonder whether the honourable member has looked, for example, at the annual reports of departments in which there is a good deal of information on these matters. There has been no attempt to cover up any of this. It is perfectly legitimate expenditure in the context in which I explained it yesterday. I do not know whether the honourable Leader's spokesman on Treasury matters did that bit of mathematics with which I challenged him yesterday. We are talking about .04 per cent of the budget. There is absolutely no attempt to cover up these matters.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In relation to consultancies, I am one of the big spenders. There has never been any apology or any attempt to hide that. The member for Adelaide knows what I am talking about. He is talking about the Booz Allen consultancies in the hospitals. They have been expensive consultancies, but on

the other hand the advantages to us—the gains which have resulted from those consultancies—have been very considerable indeed. It would appear that the savings, which continue year in year out would not have been made but for those consultancies having been let. Was there any attempt on my part or anyone else to hide that? Of course not! The whole point of the consultancy was that it was an extremely open process.

If the Deputy Leader thinks that there was any attempt to hide it, he should have been sitting in this place when the Budget Estimates Committees went over this issue last year. Where were his members when the other Ministers were before the Budget Estimates Committees? This is an attempt by the Deputy Leader to get a little more publicity for something which seems to have flopped a little in the media in the past 24 hours. I do not want to get into details about specific consultancies: that is for individual Ministers to respond from their intimate knowledge in that area, just as I would not expect the Minister of Finance to respond in any detail about the Booz Allen consultancy. However, in relation to the overall issue, I again make the point that this Government has very responsibly spent .04 per cent of the total budget over the period of this review on consultancies, on getting information which would not otherwise have been available to us, given that we have very responsibly reduced the size of the Public Service over the same period.

TRANSPORT NETWORK

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House of the information that he is providing to State Transport Authority commuters about the transition to the day/night network from Sunday next?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I do not want to go into the question of consultancies at this time. Certain examinations are going on in response to questions asked by members opposite regarding how much has been spent on consultancies. When one looks at it, who has these consultancies? It is certainly not relevant to the question here.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The Deputy Leader.

Mr INGERSON: Mr Speaker, I ask that you rule on relevance in relation to the Minister's comments.

The SPEAKER: The question and reply so far have taken one and a half minutes. It is hard for me to decide what the Minister is going to say at all. I suggest we wait to hear what he says, but I ask him to be relevant.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Of course, Sir. Precisely 350 000 new route maps have been letterboxed. Every householder in the metropolitan area will have received a map showing the day-time services and how these will change after 7 p.m. Timetables have been made available through the STA Customer Service Information Office. Timetables have been published in local media outlets showing in finer, more concise detail how services will change. The new network will operate after 7 p.m. Mondays to Thursdays and after 10 p.m. all day Sundays and public holidays. The network is a rationalisation of day-time bus services providing

coverage of most of the metropolitan area during periods of low demand with fewer buses.

This means that people can still catch regular services until the normal closing time, but they may have to walk a little further to the nearest stop or wait a few minutes longer. The new systems is being introduced, as I explained in the last session, in an attempt to target services to where people have demonstrated they require them. I did mention, and obviously I will not go through it all again, that after 10 p.m. in the evening our buses on average carry three passengers from terminus to terminus. Clearly, that is an awful lot of taxpayer's money being used in a way that everyone in the House would have to agree is not appropriate.

We are supplying the services through to midnight. They are less frequent, better targeted and that has enabled us to introduce such services as the Aberfoyle Hub transit link, the new Elizabeth transit link and the new Noarlunga transit link, which will also start on 17 August involving fast and frequent train services. It is a shifting of resources in those areas that are lightly and expensively patronised to areas where we believe people require them, and we are confident that we will—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: They can sort it out themselves. We are confident we will encourage people to come back to public transport and I believe that that will be to the benefit of the community in many areas. In summary, the publicity around the new route network has been extensive. We have attempted to contact every household in Adelaide and I am sure that the changeover will be relatively smooth from 17 August.

CONSULTANCIES

Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Acting Premier. Why have Government departments been allowed to flout a directive from the Premier on the commissioning of market research consultancies? Over the past five years, Government departments and agencies have commissioned more than 80 separate market research projects which have cost in excess of \$1.7 million. Yesterday, the Economic and Finance Committee reported that there had been little or no public tendering of consultancies.

In 1984, after it was discovered that the then Minister of Health had commissioned market research at public expense which asked questions about the approval rating of the Premier and voting intentions, the Premier gave a directive that 'normal procedures for the commissioning of consultants and survey work are to be observed. In normal circumstances, agencies are to obtain proposals from at least three appropriately qualified and experienced individuals or firms.'

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will have that thoroughly checked out. Certainly, Ministers take that directive very seriously. I remember it well when it was brought down and I also remember the circumstances in which it was brought down. While I am on my feet, one or two of my colleagues on this side have said that with a slip of my tongue I might have said earlier that it was .04 per cent: it is .4 per cent of the total budget in consultancies. It is still pretty small.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I know that you will be interested in my question, Mr Speaker. Will the Deputy Premier as the Minister of Health—

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Quiet, you!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park will resume his seat. The member for Albert Park is out of order. However, interjections are out of order. I warn members once again that Standing Orders prevent interjections. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: I apologise, Sir, but the seriousness of the question prompted that outburst. Will the Acting Premier, as Minister of Health, give the House a categorical assurance that the State Government has no intention—and I emphasise 'no intention'—of closing the Queen Elizabeth Hospital now or in the future? Further, will the Minister give a categorical assurance that the State Government has no intention of privatising the Queen Elizabeth Hospital now or in the future?

Mr S.J. Baker: What about the closure of wards?

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

Mr HAMILTON: Allegations have been made to my electorate office that certain medical practitioners have advised their patients that the aforementioned events will occur and have told them that they should contact their local member. Hence my very serious question.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The allegations are disgraceful. I can certainly give the honourable member a full assurance in that matter. Amongst other things, we have spent a lot of money at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the past three years. In fact—and I will be very careful in quoting this figure—we have spent just slightly under \$20.5 million on capital improvements at the hospital in the past three years. Obviously, if we were about to close the hospital that would be money down the drain. I can assure the honourable member that we intend to spend a lot more money on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, as we do at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in the next few years.

As for privatisation, let me make it absolutely clear that in the health area, as in so many other areas, this Government is interested only in some sort of partnership with private capital where people are prepared to put money into something. I do not see that we would attract any private capital, as such, into the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, nor do I see that it would be appropriate. Therefore, there is no advantage for us in doing such a thing. So, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will not be privatised and it certainly will not be closed.

CONSULTANCIES

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I direct my question to the Acting Minister of Tourism. Why has information been concealed from this Parliament about the spending of Tourism South Australia funds on the proposed Tandanya project and did a firm of architects funded by the department for work on the Tandanya Supplementary Development Plan have a serious conflict of interest? On

1 April this year, the Hon. Barbara Wiese told another place that she assumed the only spending by Tourism South Australia on this project related to the holding of public meetings on Kangaroo Island and with pamphlets and similar material.

However, information released yesterday by the Economic and Finance Committee shows that the department provided \$3 800 to Nelson Dawson Architects for consultancy services for the Tandanya Supplementary Development Plan. This company is the architect for Tandanya and Tourism South Australia has been a strong proponent of the project, which raises serious conflict of interest issues in this matter.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Minister, I remind the House that reference to debate in another place is not permitted under Standing Orders.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will obtain a report on that matter for the honourable member.

CENTRE HALL DOORS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I direct my question to the Minister of Housing and Construction. As the Minister whose department has responsibility for the construction and maintenance of Parliament House, can the Minister report to the House whether the centre hall doors and the stairs leading up to them are of a nature that would minimise the likelihood of a repetition of yesterday's incident in Canberra involving a most unorthodox and dangerous method of entry into the building?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It comes as a complete surprise to hear the Whip raising this question in the House. I guess not only does it affect every member but, of course, it affects you, Mr Speaker, as one of the Presiding Officers. There has been ongoing debate and discussion in both Houses as to access to this Parliament via the centre doors. Given the seriousness of the event in Canberra yesterday, one has to be conscious of the potential or possibility of some unusual action of that sort taking place.

I would think it highly unlikely that anyone would attempt to open up the argument by entering through the centre doors via a vehicular mode. I will ask the department for a report on the strength and capacity of the doors to withstand such an attack. They seem to have withstood many attacks over the years by being open, so I guess they could withstand a physical form of attack. In view of the nature of the question asked by the member for Walsh, I will get a report for the Parliament. I will also report to you as well, Mr Speaker, as the Presiding Officer of this House.

CRIME

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister of Emergency Services investigate the methods being used to collate police crime statistics to ensure that the Parliament and the public remain reliably informed about the true levels of crime in our community? On 24 July this year the Police Commissioner revealed preliminary figures for 1991-92 which show a reduction in housebreaking, car theft and larceny, which would be

most welcome. However, I have since been inundated with calls from concerned police officers and Neighbourhood Watch representatives who believe the figures to be incorrect.

Further investigations have revealed changes in statistical classifications which invalidate some comparisons with previous years; incomplete keying of crime reports into the computer system; and a backlog of reports of crimes which occurred before 30 June 1992 and which had not been keyed into the computer system. My informants believe that, as a result, the crime statistics quoted by the Police Commissioner were invalid comparisons and could be substantially understated.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In response to the honourable member, I would need to draw attention to the fact that at the time that the Police Commissioner made those statistics available, as a result of a question that he was asked on a radio program, he made the point very clearly that these were preliminary figures. I think he had in mind the fact that preliminary figures need to be adjusted to ensure that the final figures are correctly tabulated. I am sure that the Police Commissioner had in mind, as I do whilst answering this question, that Australian crime statistics are difficult, because the different States have different ways of tabulating the figures, and the Commonwealth tabulates differently from the States.

For a number of years the Australian Police Ministers' Council has been trying to get the various figures onto a common statistical basis so that they can be compared correctly as distinct from a correlation which always has to be taken with a grain of salt. To get back to the import of the honourable member's question, the Police Commissioner made it perfectly clear at the time that he gave that information that they were preliminary figures.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Mines and Energy indicate what progress is being made towards commencing the South Australian exploration initiative which, as the Government has announced, is designed to encourage much higher levels of mineral exploration and ultimately mineral development in this State? The Government's commitment of \$11 million to the initiative has received considerable coverage in the media and aroused great interest in my electorate, which is in relatively close proximity to some of the areas which are to be surveyed.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for her question. The people in her electorate are right to be very interested in this matter. On previous occasions when we have carried out aeromagnetic surveys, there has been an increase in exploration and that spends money on the ground. Cities such as Port Augusta and other towns in the northern parts of Australia would be well placed to ensure that they get some of the benefits of that exploration, let alone the benefits of any mining that might result from that exploration. Therefore, I am pleased to give the House an indication of where we stand. Tender specifications for the airborne geophysical work will be released next week,

so the department has not been letting the grass grow under its feet.

Subject to the satisfactory completion of the tender process and the availability of aircraft, airborne surveys are scheduled to commence immediately after the October long weekend with, hopefully, two aircraft. One, which will probably be based at Ceduna, will overfly the Gawler Craton and the other, probably based at Coober Pedy, will cover the Alberga map sheet. Drilling programs are also part of the initiative, and tender documents are being prepared for two deep holes on Kangaroo Island.

The bedrock drilling program is due to start in early September. Approximately 600 holes will be drilled sequentially in the Burra/Nackara, Ooldea/Barton and Gawler Ranges areas, and a brief is also being prepared for seismic survey work, which is to be an important part of that initiative. This should be completed by mid September, and the detailed tender process is expected to be completed by early February.

By and large, the process we are going through is going well, and the Director-General's indication to an earlier seminar of mining people—that we expect to be able to have preliminary results out to them by the end of the year—I think still holds true.

SAGASCO

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): Will the Acting Treasurer acknowledge that there is a potential conflict of interest regarding the proposed SAGASCO sale with Bankers Trust acting as consultants to SAFA and Bankers Trust Securities purchasing shares in SAGASCO, and will he advise the House what the Government proposes to do to protect the interests of South Australians?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No, I will not acknowledge that, because I do not believe that there is any.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Not only do I not believe that but I do not believe the member for Kavel believes it, either. If he believes that, he is free to go outside the Parliament and make that suggestion outside. I am sure that, with the courage of his convictions, he will accept the challenge. I would expect that the media in this State, fine people that they are, will ask him outside whether he believes that BT—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. I assume that the Deputy Leader has a point of order.

Mr INGERSON: My point of order relates to relevance, Mr Speaker; will you request that the Minister's answer be relevant?

The SPEAKER: I will allow the Minister some very small leeway in composing his answer but, once again, I point out the need for relevance in his response.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Certainly, Sir. The question related to a conflict of interest within BT Australia that could be to the detriment of the people of South Australia. If there were a conflict of interest, the detriment to the people of South Australia would not be a fraction of the detriment to BT Australia. BT Australia is

a very highly regarded company internationally, and it is more than its reputation is worth for it not to have the various divisions acting separately, even giving the reasonable appearance of a conflict of interest.

If members want to traduce BT's good name, of course in here they are free to do so. If they have the courage of their convictions, let them go outside and say that. Not only will they be laughed out of the financial markets and the financial industry in this State but BT might have a few words to say to them in another forum. The Government and I have absolute confidence in the integrity of BT Australia.

We have absolute confidence in the way in which its various arms act—and act independently—and I have absolutely no reason to believe that the taxpayers of this State are in any way disadvantaged by the activities of BT Australia. Again, all I can say is that these things are always available to be tested. If members opposite believe there is a conflict, they have a duty to go outside this Parliament and state their case. I am sure that BT will be only too pleased to test it in the appropriate arena. It is a quite scurrilous accusation, even more so because the member for Kavel knows it is nonsense.

GLASSHOUSE DAMAGE

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Agriculture advise what reports he has received on damage to glasshouses as a result of recent storms? Will he also advise what affected growers should do to cope with the financial losses they may be sustaining?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can give only a partial report on this matter at this stage, because I have information only from the Virginia office of the Department of Agriculture and not from those officers who would be responsible for hearing reports in the western suburbs. I am very conscious of that, and I will certainly obtain that information for the honourable member and other affected members.

With respect to the northern plains area, the advice is that three properties have sustained substantial damage: one at Virginia had a glasshouse written off; another one at Virginia had five glasshouses damaged and three written off; and another at Waterloo Corner had 25 glasshouses written off. It was either a particularly spasmodic form of hail or other damage might well have been sustained by other glasshouse owners in the intervening spaces.

In the first instance, of course, growers are advised to check with their insurance companies, if they are insured. I recall a similar hailstorm about 12 or 13 years ago; at that time there was a lot of discussion about insurance coverage problems for growers, and I know that over the years that has improved somewhat. They should then contact their normal source of finance to discuss their financial situation. But they could also contact the Rural Finance and Development Division of the department on the toll free number 008 182 235 for details of the current assistance scheme, which includes the concessional rural adjustment scheme for debt reconstruction and farm improvement, the RAS interest rate subsidies on existing commercial debt, and household support assistance to provide eligible growers with

essential living expenses. In addition to that, growers are advised that they could perhaps contact the Department of Social Security direct to access income support under the hardship provisions.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL

Mr GUNN (Eyre): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport—and I hope I get a precise answer. What action is he taking to prevent the transfer to Whyalla of railway jobs at Port Augusta? An article in the *Transcontinental* states:

The combined rail union says it is angered by a contract with American firm Morrison Knudsen to rebuild locomotives in Whyalla. We believe the Morrison Knudsen company has leased land in Whyalla to set up its operations . . .

'What we believe is they plan to buy 25 locomotives from AN and rebuild them in Whyalla, then lease them back to AN on a power by hour basis.'

Why is the Minister supporting the transfer of jobs from an existing workshop to a new operation at Whyalla?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: More than any other question in my 17 years in Parliament, this one presents me with a problem. The fact is that, in Parliament, I can claim absolutely no credit whatsoever for it. Members opposite will realise how much that hurts. I was at the opening of the operation in Whyalla, and very good speeches were made by the principals of that company, in which they said they had literally travelled all around Australia searching for—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I don't need any notes. These are highly respected international business people; the member for Hayward would do well not to laugh at them. They made a decision to locate at Whyalla for a whole range of reasons—the deep water port, the heavy lift crane from the shipyard fitting out wharf not being used and a whole range of other reasons, including the availability of a contract for locomotive refurbishment from BHP and also the potential which apparently has been realised from AN.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I find this very interesting, although I am not sure of the relevance. I praise this company as it did not come to the Government for a handout, and that is unusual these days. It was not interested in a handout. There was an empty factory in Whyalla adjacent to BHP where it could do the refurbishing of the BHP rolling stock and everything was superb. They came to my electorate office some time after this and said that they were opening up in Whyalla and would be employing something like 100 people. Quite frankly, I almost kissed them.

I could not believe that people would walk into my electorate office with industrial development proposals without the begging bowl. But here they were—a very important international company. This note is supposed to be important, although I cannot see the relevance of it other than some black ban on sending locomotives down to Whyalla from Port August. I am not sure what that has to do with this company. There are black bans all over

the place. Morrison Knudsen is a highly regarded international firm spending, as far as I know, on all continents, its principal interests being in purchasing and leasing back locomotives on a power-by-the-hour basis. They are one of the biggest operators in the world. They are very welcome in Whyalla, and I wish them a long and happy stay.

HENDON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Education tell the House what progress is being made on redevelopment of the Hendon Primary School? The Minister would be well aware of the intention to close the Seaton North Primary School at the end of this year and many queries have been directed to my office concerning the extent of improvements to be made at Hendon Primary School.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and acknowledge his persistence in his advocacy on behalf of schools in his electorate—indeed, the courage he has shown in the way that schools can be rejuvenated in that part of the metropolitan area in which there have been falling enrolments. Work will commence almost immediately on the refurbishment of Hendon Primary School—a school with excellent programs and one which exudes a great deal of energy within the school community, although it does exist in buildings that are markedly run down.

The schedule of work is divided into three phases, the first relating to the provision of teaching and support facilities and geared to redeveloping and upgrading the existing solid core buildings. In phase 2, provision has been made for the construction of new buildings for administration, library, a resources centre and multi-purpose hall. Thirdly, landscaping and rationalisation of the site will then be carried out. It is expected that occupancy will occur from 1993, and new building work will commence later this year. It is expected to be ready for use by the second term of 1993.

CATS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. In light of the release of the Cat Working Party Report, will she explain why her department rejected the offer of cheap and effective assistance from Dr John Wamsley and his team from Warrawong Sanctuary to help eradicate cats and other feral pests killing rare Australian animals in national parks? Following the success of Dr Wamsley and his team in eradicating cats and other feral animals from Yookamurra Sanctuary, I have been informed that he offered assistance to the National Parks and Wildlife Service to help clear these pests from some specific national parks. However, that assistance was rejected by the National Parks and Wildlife Service, which instead said that it was looking at long-term biological solutions. I am told by Dr Wamsley that his solution by which a small team of experts uses a variety of approved means to eradicate the pests is cheap, quick and humane, while

biological controls traditionally take five to 10 years to be successful and can ultimately be overcome by feral animals' immune systems, and that a biological means of death does not know the difference between a feral cat and a domestic pet.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member touches on a number of issues in his question. First, he refers to the release of the Cat Working Party Report today. The honourable member has a copy of that report and would be aware that within it a whole range of options and solutions are canvassed because, indeed, it is a discussion paper. I would refer all members to that report because I think it is an excellent example of what we can do in South Australia in terms of addressing some hard political issues.

The control and management of feral cats in national parks is a serious issue, as I am sure that the honourable member in asking his first question as the new shadow Minister for Environment and Planning believes it to be, or he would not have raised it. I have had a lot to do with Dr John Wamsley in the time I have been Minister. I have visited his sanctuary at Warrawong and I believe that I have a close working relationship with him. As the member for Heysen would know, Dr Wamsley was one of the guest speakers and presenters at the cat seminar—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, he did. I refer to the seminar that the member for Heysen, myself and Mike Elliott from another place co-hosted during the last session of Parliament. Dr Wamsley did speak, as the honourable member said, very well and canvassed a whole range of issues. I believe he does have interesting information and techniques to offer in terms of the management and control of feral cats within national parks as well as on privately owned land. I will certainly take up the matter with my department.

There is always a second side to every story and it might well be that perhaps there was some cost involved and that the department at this point did not feel it could put money into it in terms of its priorities. But it is a suggestion I take seriously. I know the work that Dr Wamsley does in this State is valued and he is certainly at the forefront of a range of protective measures, not the least of which is providing comprehensive fencing around Warrawong and other sanctuaries to keep out feral animals and other forms of predators to protect native animals and of course our native reptiles. So, I will take that suggestion to the department and ask the Acting Director of the department about the reason for not accepting the offer. I am not sure whether the offer came with a cost. We should probably get all the facts of the matter, but I thank the honourable member for raising this important issue.

LAKES SYSTEM

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning tell the House what steps have been taken to resolve some of the land use conflicts which have arisen in the past over the coastal lake system in the South-East of our State?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in this area and I would

also acknowledge the interest of local members in the South-East because there certainly have been a range of land use conflicts relating to a number of lakes in the South-East. Members may recall that late last year I released the document 'The South-East Coastal Lake Strategy', which proposed a number of solutions to deal with these various land use conflicts arising in the vicinity of Lakes Hawdon, Eliza, St Clair, George, Frome and Bonney, as well as Parinki Lagoon.

Among other things, the strategy document recommended sustainable forms of multiple use for a number of the lakes. It also recommended that certain areas of public land should be given additional protection by being added to the national parks system, while other land should be leased to local authorities or sold to local landowners. The strategy document did not establish an order of priority for the various recommendations. However, I think it would be fair to say—and I am sure the local members from the area will agree with this—that it has generally been agreed that Lakes Frome and George warranted early attention and, indeed, I think they should be given priority.

I have had some discussions with local government in the South-East and they have certainly acknowledged this. I understand that survey work and commercial negotiations are well advanced with respect to Lake Frome and that representatives from a number of local organisations have been sought in order to establish a steering committee to propose a management plan for Lake George and its environs. This is an important issue because the management of this very precious lake system, while still retaining its environmental and conservation characteristics, but allowing multiple use on a sustainable basis, is important. I would like to acknowledge the work of all of those involved in working towards a successful resolution.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): How can the Minister of Transport justify the provision of two free buses and staff to participate in the Hollywood Plaza street parade at Salisbury on 14 November at the very time that STA public transport services are being cut back on week nights and weekends and when volunteer organisations are eager to provide community transport services for such events? I have in hand a council officer's report, which states:

STA have advised that sufficient supervisors and staff will be available to redirect and control buses as required. STA has also offered to donate two buses specifically to assist with the parade, to be used as deemed appropriate.

The STA's cooperation goes further, as the report states:

STA have advised that trains will be held back to allow uninterrupted passage of the parade, if necessary.

My informant states that, under the new boundaries, Hollywood Plaza will become part of the member for Briggs' electorate, and that could explain the STA's generosity.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not quite sure what crime the STA is accused of here. I know nothing of the issue, but that will not prevent my making a comment on the general principle. I have no idea about any buses being used in a parade at Salisbury, whether it

is in the electorate of the member for Briggs, the member for Newland or anywhere else. It seems to me that there has obviously been a request for some assistance by a council or a body organising a parade, and in its promotional activities the STA has provided that assistance.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The STA does a whole variety of things. I seem to remember its bringing produce into the city one day for a church group that ran a promotion involving the collection of blankets and food. There is a whole range of requests. I believe that, in conjunction with SGIC, there are free bus rides on Christmas Eve or New Year's Eve. I am sure that, if I am forced to ask the STA—which quite frankly I would rather not be bothered doing—about this kind of promotional activity to pass the information to the member for Newland, we will find that it is involved in a whole range of activities with kindergartens, handicapped children, and so on.

I really do not think that this is a sensible way to use Question Time. I have absolutely no doubt whatsoever, without any knowledge, that somewhere within the electorate of Newland a good deed has been done by the STA; whether it was in Tea Tree Plaza or somewhere else, I have absolutely no idea. If the member for Newland insists on my investigating the background to this performance, I will certainly do so.

RURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDING

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Agriculture inform the House what action he has taken to persuade the Federal Government not to slash rural research and development funding? It was reported in the press several weeks ago that the Expenditure Review Committee and Federal Cabinet had agreed to cut rural research and development funding by more than \$24 million, including a proposed \$8 million cut to CSIRO.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. A deal of concern has been expressed by the rural industry in South Australia and by the Department of Agriculture, amongst others, about the proposed cutbacks that appeared in the *Weekend Australian* of 1 August. The situation is that the concerns from rural industry and departments around the country have seen a change by the Federal Government in this area. Those changes were reported in the *Australian* of Friday 7 August, at which stage the Federal Treasurer John Dawkins indicated that there would be major changes to the proposals that had been mooted a week earlier.

That raises the question of what may still happen. Much of the concern by rural industry research groups was that they had been promised one thing by the former Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, John Kerin, and suddenly that was changed overnight without any warning. A number of research programs for 1992-93 were premised on the funding being according to a formula that had been laid down. In other words, the funds had already been committed. That may mean that more work still needs to be done to convince the Federal

Government of the importance of this area and that, if it is to make any changes, it should have adequate consultation with those involved in the rural research sector.

In that context, the Director-General of the Department of Agriculture will be convening a meeting in Melbourne in November this year in his capacity as chair of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, which answers to the Agriculture Council of Australia and New Zealand, of which I am a member. That will bring together various State and Commonwealth Directors-General, also the CSIRO, Research and Development Corporation chairpersons and representatives of the various Deans of Agriculture Committees in the tertiary education sector with a view to developing a national agriculture research strategy, in particular looking at the areas in which that research will be funded with particular relevance, in the light of recent events, to the Federal Government's funding obligations and commitments to this area. I think that should develop a new commitment to the rural industry following the commitments made by John Kerin, which I am pleased to see for the moment—

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If the member for Goyder chose to listen, he would have heard me say that John Dawkins has backed down on his earlier statement. The member for Goyder was obviously asleep. The point is that the broader issue of longer term funding into 1993-94, for which November 1992 happens to be adequate notice, is still something that should be talked about. That is what will happen. Until then we have this undertaking from John Dawkins that I think indicates that they have changed their mind on what they wanted to do and that John Kerin's commitment, as I understand it, substantially stands.

ADELAIDE-MELBOURNE RAIL LINK

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): In the light of the proposed standardisation of the Adelaide to Melbourne rail line, can the Minister of Transport assure the House that the existing Belair line and Steamranger broad gauge services will continue?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No, I cannot give that assurance. I shall be doing all that I reasonably can to see that that is the case. If standardisation occurs and isolates Steamranger, we will have some real problems. There are no problems with the Belair line. Steamranger is a problem and we are having a look at it. It is the same with Mount Gambier. Unless the line to Wolseley is standardised, it will be isolated. By the very nature of standardising Adelaide-Melbourne, unless we standardise everything close to it, we shall get some problems. We are trying to work through those problems to the best of our ability. We are aware of the Steamranger issue. I commend the honourable member for trying to look after it, but I am already doing that as best as I can.

VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Transport please explain South Australia's stand on

uniform registration charges for heavy trucks and buses and the likely effects this will have on the transport industry?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The South Australian Government gave a commitment, through the Premier at the Special Premiers Conference, to support the heavy vehicle charging system, but when the first proposals came out we made perfectly clear that we could not and would not support them. Quite extensive discussions took place and many modifications were made to the original view put forward, and that brought us to the stage where I was able to sign the declaration of intent. The effects on our industry will be fairly minimal. There will be some increases, although relatively small ones, at the heavy end—

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I would not do anything to someone as out of order and disorderly as you have been all week. It's quite outrageous.

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not unduly sensitive, but members on this side have been subject to attack after attack by the member for Goyder this week. What we have been able to negotiate will result in some increases at the heavier end of the industry and some actual decreases at the lighter end. All in all, I believe that there will probably be more winners than losers. However, the industry in this State has taken a very responsible attitude, and the entire industry, through CETAC, has urged me and the Government to sign this particular notice of intent, and I have been very pleased to do that.

I believe that to have uniform charges throughout Australia is long overdue. I have made one proviso (and I was very pleased to see it reported in the national press)—that South Australia's agreement was conditional upon a thorough investigation into our putting all these road user charges on fuel. I know that the economists believe that that will not give the precise allocation of user charges to a particular vehicle, and they may well be right. But it seems to me that, as a rough and ready way of allocating who should pay what, it is not bad.

I told the economists quite vigorously, when they brought me all the documents, to go away and use a little commonsense. That has been South Australia's position from the day some of these fancy papers came out from the Interstate Commission and others. That has been and remains our position. We believe that, if that were done, it would save a great deal of administration and nonsense and, if the economists do not like it because it does not allocate appropriately to the nth degree, or as far as I am concerned, that is too bad.

What has been proposed by the National Road Transport Corporation is an enormous advance on what we have at the moment, where charges as well as regulations vary between the States and where interstate freight is subject to a variety of regulations and charges as it traverses the continent. New South Wales and Victoria have impediments on some of our heavier vehicles. They require permits for particular stretches of road, and the whole thing is nonsensical.

I was the first to congratulate Mr Greiner, because there is no doubt that Mr Greiner was one of the main

proponents of this reform. He stood up and said that States' rights in this area is nonsense: that there ought to be a national system. And he was dead right. However, it grieved me to note that, no sooner is he out the door—quite unjustly, in my view—than the New South Wales Government starts falling apart and reverting to its old ways. I see the Hon. Mr Murray (Deputy Premier and Leader of the National Party) has said that New South Wales will not sign. New South Wales will not do this—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister was asked about the affect upon South Australia: the argument that accompanies his response is irrelevant.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Mitcham has a point of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I refer to *Erskine May*, which quite clearly states that lengthy answers to questions should be circulated, not given orally.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was about to wind up, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the House and I have discussed the matter and we have decided that, if an answer is relevant and long, it will be acceptable: however, if it is irrelevant and short, it will not be accepted. The Minister has had a long time to respond, and I ask him to draw his response to a close in relation to South Australia.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I confess that I was taking a little longer than I normally do, because I know that members opposite, including the member for Eyre and others, have a vital and genuine interest in this matter. They would all congratulate this Government on the action it has taken. If this agreement does not go ahead and if the reforms are not made, I believe that South Australia—in fact, the whole of Australia—will be severely disadvantaged. I am sorry for a whole range of reasons that the ex-Premier of New South Wales, Mr Greiner, is no longer in that position and that the backwoodsmen of the Country Party are running New South Wales again.

BETTER CITIES PROGRAM

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. What portion of the \$60 million Better Cities program has so far been forwarded to the State Government or local instrumentalities? Has the Government yet signed the agreement between the Commonwealth and the State Government for \$40 million to be spent on the MFP under the Better Cities program and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Last Friday, I signed the agreement with Brian Howe over the telephone, as it were. The specific contents will be available very shortly.

CHEMICAL SPRAYS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Health undertake an investigation to establish whether there is any connection between the incidence of leukaemia among young people and the use of agricultural chemical

sprays in close proximity to where these young victims live?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A central cancer register is kept in this State. The incidence of a disease such as leukaemia is kept according to postcodes. As I understand it, the problem is that it would be very difficult to obtain similar information as to postcode as to the incidence of chemical sprays. We can certainly check with the Department of Agriculture, but it seems most unlikely that there would be very detailed information about particular sprays in particular postcode areas. In those circumstances, it would be very difficult to run a correlation between the two.

So far as I am aware from this postcode collection of the incidence of leukaemia, leukaemia is not significantly higher in rural districts, where one would expect a greater use of agricultural sprays, than in urban districts. Therefore, it may be that it would be very difficult, and perhaps even fruitless, to even undertake such an investigation. However, I will ask the commission to look at it more closely. I will also liaise with my colleague the Minister of Agriculture who I notice is indicating his assent to cooperating very fully in any such study if it seems to be merited.

CONSULTANCIES

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a brief ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: During Question Time, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me a question in relation to the letting of consultancies for the testing of public opinion in a number of areas. The implication in the question was that there was a divergence between the circular, which the Premier issued some years ago, and actual Government practice. As his evidence for this, he cited the report that has just come down from the Economic and Finance Committee. The Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee spoke to me during Question Time and indicated that no such finding has been made in the committee's report.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If there were no findings, then there is no question. Either the honourable member misread the report or whoever wrote the question may have misread the report. The report indicated that they would be examining any possibilities, but certainly there is no finding and the Chairman has given me the approval to make that clear to the House.

GOVERNMENT HOUSING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I apologise for any inconvenience caused to the House earlier. The printer apparently went astray.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: If the member wants to hear it, I am more than happy to share it. I wish to respond to questions put to me yesterday by the member for Murray-Mallee in relation to Government employee housing. The honourable member asked why unauthorised deductions were made from the pay packets of blue-collar workers who live in Government employee housing in the country; how many employees were affected; or will they be refunded and, if so, how and when?

I respond by saying that workers were notified that their rents would be increased in accordance with the CPI, and taking into account the capital value of the property. The Government placed a ceiling of \$15 on increases. The increase in deductions applied from the first full pay period in July. This was implemented smoothly in all departments except the E&WS. There was a payroll error, which meant that deductions were made one week early for 53 weekly and daily paid employees. The affected tenants were reimbursed immediately the error was detected.

Independent of CPI considerations, an assessment was conducted of those tenants receiving rental concessions (because total household income is below average weekly earnings). Tenants must apply for the concession each year, stating their income. Where tenants become ineligible for a concession, normal rents apply. The Government is in the process of phasing out concessions over three years. Until now, rents have been set at 15 per cent of income for concessional tenants. In 1992-93, as part of the phasing out process, concessional rents will be set at 17.5 per cent of income. This year, therefore, concessional tenants will be paying a rental 2.5 per cent higher than the previous year. In some cases, tenants are no longer eligible for concessions and will this year pay normal rents. Their rents have been increased accordingly. These adjustments are independent of those of the CPI and do not have a \$15 ceiling.

In fact, a total of 48 tenants will pay rent increases of greater than \$15 per week because of adjustments to the concessional scheme. The member for Murray-Mallee claims that rent increases of up to \$60 per week have been charged. The majority of increases were in fact between \$15 and \$20 per week, with the single highest increase at \$40.50. It appears the honourable member's information is not correct, and I would be happy to discuss with him any concerns he may have in relation to individual cases.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I bring up the second report of the committee on supplementary development plans and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I wish to enlarge slightly on the question that I asked earlier in Question Time as I have just had the opportunity to read closely the National Rail Corporation's statement on corporate intent. This document states:

Direct employment by National Rail will concentrate on its core functions, that is, those necessary to keep the wheels turning. Other activities (for example, track maintenance and heavy overhaul of locomotives and rolling stock) will be subject to competitive tendering to be phased in over the transition period. This policy will mean that not all of the work force required for interstate freight will be directly employed by National Rail; therefore, direct employment in National Rail is likely to represent only half of the 4 000 mentioned above.

Only half—so there is going to be a drastic reduction in the number of people to be employed by this new organisation. That is why I asked the question today, because some of those jobs could have been protected if the refurbishment of AN locomotives were to be undertaken at Port Augusta and not Whyalla. It is pretty clear what has happened: Frank has been too quick on his feet for Colleen. He is looking after Whyalla, because there is a downturn there, but there is also a downturn at Port Augusta. The powerful have won. That is what has happened. He has been too quick on his feet. Bad luck, Colleen: you are a nice lady but you have missed out.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Deputy Speaker, on a point of order: the member for Eyre on two occasions has referred to the Minister of Transport as 'Frank' and the member for Stuart as 'Colleen'.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I accept the point of order. The member for Eyre will refer to members by their parliamentary electorate name. The member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: Certainly, Mr Deputy Speaker, I will not transgress again. An interesting situation has now arisen because the National Rail unions at Port Augusta have decided to step in, and at a meeting on 20 July the following motion was moved by Mr Rodney Simpkins, who is well known to a number of members in this Chamber, and seconded by Mr Scharenberg:

That all paid officials of unions present oppose the deal done by Russell King concerning the sale and refurbishment of AN locomotives at Whyalla by Morrison Knudsen and that they be done at Port Augusta workshops. That all unions present at this meeting ban any attempts to move CL2 or any other locos to Whyalla for major repairs or redevelopment.

That motion made the position very clear. What will be the situation? I have raised the matter in the Chamber this afternoon to seek the clear support of the South Australian Government in ensuring that there is no downturn in the employment base in the railway workshops at Port Augusta or Islington because they are essential to the welfare and long term benefit of the people of this State.

If members read the National Rail Corporation statement, it is clear that the corporation will have no social responsibility whatsoever. Governments have to understand clearly that when they set up organisations such as the NRC they just cannot hand over responsibility to the organisation and be at arm's length from it. If hundreds of people are put out of work, the Government has to provide those people with dole payments and my point is that the Commonwealth Government has to ensure that, in establishing this new corporation, account is taken of the social effects of the

decision, because, not only will it affect employment directly but also it will affect employment indirectly in these regional centres, and the Commonwealth Government cannot merely wash its hands of the problem and claim that it has handed over responsibility to the corporation it has created.

The Commonwealth Government is a significant shareholder in the corporation and it is the Government that will have to pick up the dole payments. It is high time that the Commonwealth Government gave sensible and direct instructions to this organisation to be aware of its social obligations and the impact that those decisions will have if they are not implemented in a responsible and sensible manner, because the sort of resistance and concerns that have been expressed to me about this matter are only just beginning.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Members will recall that in the last session I raised the question of noise and the impact it has upon constituents. Only yesterday I received through my electorate secretary a complaint from a constituent who lives in the same street as me. The constituent was complaining about motorists doing wheelies. Most of us understand that wheelies are accomplished when a motorist revs up a stationary vehicle and puts the brake on as hard as they can and then releases it.

The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Or putting kerosene on the back wheels, as my ministerial colleague advises. These people create havoc, usually late at night or early in the morning. In raising this issue I hasten to add that I am not criticising the Henley Beach police because they have been very good in the past in addressing any problem I may have had in my electorate. I refer particularly to Inspector Bruce James-Martin and his staff. My reason for raising this issue is that I want to advise my constituents through the forums of this House and, indeed, by newsletter at a later date that doing wheelies as I have described them is an offence. I am advised that drivers who are apprehended doing wheelies may be charged under the following sections of the Road Traffic Act: section 45, driving without due care; section 101, undue or excessive noise; and section 46, driving in a dangerous manner. Of course, section 46 offences would apply to the more serious cases.

These hoons who carry out this activity must be very much 'loved' by the tyre manufacturers in this country and, perhaps, overseas. This ratbag element—and I make no apology for using that terminology—if they were as good as they think they are, could go out to one of the raceways where those activities can be carried out in a lawful manner. If they have half a brain, I enjoin them to do that and not to disrupt the local community and cause distress and, indeed, not to endanger the lives of other people who use the roads.

These uncaring clowns seem to have no respect for the peace, quiet and serenity of many people. In particular, there is a considerable number of elderly people living in my local area and they have had an absolute gutful of this. Whilst I have encouraged my constituents to report these incidents to the police, we all know that some of

our constituents are reluctant to do that and, to some degree, that ties the hands of the local police. As I indicated previously, I offer no criticism of the local police, because in my area in particular they do a fantastic job. However, for those who are prepared to report these matters to the police, I suggest that they take the registration number, the time and the date of the incident and a description of the vehicle so that they can give that information to the local police.

I was reluctant to raise this matter on my own behalf, because I am big enough and ugly enough to look after myself. However, in my own street there is visible evidence night after night of this activity whereby these hoons, clowns and ratbags want to disrupt the local community. On every occasion that I am approached about this matter I advise my constituents that they should report the incidents to the police so that the patrols in the area can take up the matter. I just hope that these people are caught because, as I indicated, they will find that they can be charged under the Road Traffic Act, and quite properly so. It is a stupid act and they should be charged. If they want to develop good driving skills they should at least go out to an appropriate venue, such as a speedway. In addition, in my view, television programs have a lot to answer for in this regard.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Members will be aware that many areas on Yorke Peninsula have shacks on the foreshore. In most cases these shacks provide a very cheap and economical holiday for hundreds of thousands of people, mainly from this State. They are part of our heritage.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They used to be.

Mr MEIER: As the member for Light said, they used to be able to do that. I shall be getting to that, because the economics are such that the Government, in trying to pay off some of its debts, has increased rents by astronomical amounts. These shacks are undoubtedly part of our heritage. They are probably as significant to South Australia's heritage as areas like the Rocks are to Sydney and Fisherman's Wharf is to Brisbane. Before the last State election the Liberal Opposition put out a very clear policy stating that it would seek to freehold any life tenure shack or shacks in these positions wherever possible, and it was clearly detailed. At that time the Minister for Environment and Planning said it was an irresponsible move. Yet, seven days before the election, she came out with a policy that would give life tenure to all people who owned those shacks on the foreshore, but she did not say that she would increase rentals by several hundred per cent in the following year or years.

That is exactly what has happened, so people who were paying about \$100 per year are now paying up to \$1 200 per year. Therefore, the cheap holiday has become an extremely expensive holiday. To add insult to injury, the Minister is prepared to use not only the finance tactic to throw these people out of their shacks; she is also prepared to use other means to see that the shacks are destroyed. I should like to refer to Marion Bay in my electorate, which is perhaps typical of many shack sites.

Mr Oswald: She's trying to wash them into the sea.

Mr MEIER: She is trying to wash them into the sea, as the member for Morphett says. At Marion Bay there are several shacks right on the coast. Those shacks have been looked after for many years. However, as we know, from time to time severe storms can eventuate. In fact, in the past day or two I know that has happened in the Port Pirie area, and a warning was put out for last night, tonight and tomorrow night that some Port Pirie residents may be subject to flooding. Likewise, we have seen on the metropolitan coast that the Glenelg and Brighton areas can be subject to storm damage. If it were not for the protection afforded by councils and the Coast Protection Board, many buildings would have been washed into the sea.

Last year there was a severe storm at Marion Bay and at least one shack was undermined to some extent. The residents took matters into their own hands. They put the sand back. One resident even put rocks in front of his shack. The council and the residents erected a tyre and post fence. By Christmas time that tyre and post fence had achieved a large part of the desired result, namely, that sand and seaweed were coming in and forming a natural protective barrier. However, the Minister for Environment and Planning determined that that tyre and post fence had to be removed. I took deputations to see the Minister and they were unsuccessful. The Minister determined that the fence had to be removed. The net result is that the shacks have been undermined by a further storm. One of the shacks was virtually washed into the sea and it has now been removed. The other two shacks have been taken away, and I believe that one is still left.

To add insult to injury, the Department of Environment and Planning has proposed the building of a gypsum wall 2.8 metres high in front of the remaining shacks. That would be an absolute eyesore. I believe that is now to be modified down to one metre. There is nothing natural about it; it is completely unnatural. It is simply the department's determination to ensure that these shacks do not remain. The Minister will use any method available to her to ensure that they do not remain. She is destroying what was once a cheap and affordable holiday for South Australians and, unfortunately, destroying one of the heritage parts of this State's early settlement. I hope that the Minister will be removed from her post as soon as possible.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I think that I speak on behalf of most members of this Parliament who have represented their districts for in excess of 10 or 15 years when I say that a variety of constituents ask us as individual members of Parliament, regardless of our politics, to write to the courts seeking some form of clemency if they have broken a law. In some cases we do so, because we feel that our constituent has a case that should be considered by the courts.

However, I cheerfully admit to this House—and I would do so anywhere else—that there is one offence in relation to which I send my constituents packing, refusing to have any part in the resolution of the problem for which they are seeking my assistance, and that is drink driving. Too often, people who have been apprehended

for drink driving suddenly realise the ramifications of what they have done—not so much of what they have done to other people in the community or to other people's property but how it will affect them. It is a very selfish attitude.

While they are having a good time, drinking and driving their vehicles in a dangerous way, that is okay but, if they get caught, suddenly it comes home to them that their licence will be taken away for between three and 18 months and their means of livelihood is taken away. I cheerfully send those people packing and say, 'You deserve all you get and all that's being meted out by the law.' I am sure that you, Sir, would do the same. So, it was with some degree of satisfaction that I received a press release from the Attorney-General in another place under the heading 'Hardship licences for drink drivers ruled out'.

There was some agitation, as members would know, to allow drink drivers to receive hardship licences. In effect, it was saying, 'You break the law. You may commit mayhem and damage life or property but, when you get caught, plead hardship and you will be allowed to continue to drive.' The Attorney laid it on the line when he said that the introduction of such licences would significantly diminish the deterrent effect of the mandatory licence disqualification provisions for the offence of drink driving. The Attorney-General said:

Although it is recognised that a loss of licence can cause considerable hardship, this must be balanced by the realisation that the person has chosen to drink and drive without duress and despite massive publicity warnings . . .

And he or she then wishes to be allowed to drive. All too often we see the results of drink driving: we see the bad side. Anyone who has been related either through marriage or as close family to someone who has suffered injury or even death at the hands of a drink driver would have no sympathy whatsoever with those people who deliberately go out and flout the law in the name of having a good time.

It is also interesting and encouraging to see that, apart from the Police Force, organisations such as the Victims of Crime Service, People Against Drink Drivers and Families Against Senseless Tragedies, have actively backed the Attorney's rejection of this hardship licence and moved to support him. Most people have got behind the Attorney-General and said, 'No way should society in any way condone the actions of those people who go out and drink and then drive on our roads. If you break the law, you pay the cost.' As I said earlier, although there may be times when, as an act of clemency, we may want to assist our constituents, in the area of drink driving they get nothing from me, and I am sure that they should not from anyone else.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I am quite prepared to take up the point that has just been made by the member for Napier, because I have stood in this place on earlier occasions drawing attention to the selfsame issue and pointing out my abhorrence of people, of my own political persuasion or anyone from within the constituency, who ask for that leniency. I agree: it is not on.

This matter was picked up on a much earlier occasion in this House, when Molly Byrne was the member for Tea Tree Gully. She was proffering to the House a suggestion that there ought to be a little bit of tolerance for those who were caught the first time. She was saying that there should be a warning, a tap on the wrist and I interjected and said that the person whom that person kills is just as dead as the person who is killed by the second time offender; the message sank in very quickly. She sat down and did not come back in on that argument. That is the point that we must understand clearly: a potential death is directly associated with those who drink and drive, and I totally concur with the point just made by the honourable member.

It is fortunate that the Minister of Housing and Construction is with us this afternoon, because I want to refer to Housing Trust rentals. I fully appreciate the cost of Housing Trust concessional rentals to our community, but I do believe that Sir Humphrey Appleby, or someone, has gone really mad—the bureaucracy has gone over the top—in the most recent situation. I draw members' attention to a letter of 3 June 1992 which was forwarded by the Housing Trust and which indicates a change in rental policy. The first paragraph states:

The Government has recently approved a change in the method used by the trust to determine reduced rents in situations where tenants have extra people, other than their own son or daughter, living with them.

There is nothing unequivocal about that: it is quite clear. Last week, a constituent of mine said to me, 'I am a pensioner. I am in a Housing Trust home, having transferred to it from my mother's home (and she was also a pensioner) because we are both growing older and it will not be long before my mother won't be with us. So, I have gone into a smaller home and I have taken my mother with me.'

The point is this: the mother is obviously not the son or daughter of the son. In the latest shake-up of rental, we find the ludicrous position that the mother is having to pay more for her portion of the rent, or more of her pension towards the rental, than is the son, yet the son, has benefited the Housing Trust by moving out of a home which had three bedrooms to a two bedroom home, which will be more satisfactory when he is by himself, and taking his mother with him, accommodating his mother, who is a pensioner, in that second bedroom until she passes away. However, he is being penalised by virtue of the fact that he is providing that accommodation for his mother.

If they had transferred to the two bedroom home in the mother's name, and if he had continued to live in that rental accommodation with his mother, he would have been able to get a concession. However, he moved for the simple reason that the original home was in the name of his mother and, when his mother passed away, he would be out on the streets with no accommodation. The bureaucracy has gone mad in achieving this unreasonable result, and I will seek to have it overturned. Let us have a little bit of rational thought on these matters.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I just cannot help myself: I have to take up the theme of the last speaker with respect to Housing Trust rents. It is well known by the House that our policy has always been that rents for

Housing Trust tenants should be 25 per cent of the tenant's income.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The honourable gentleman says that there is no argument, but in fact there has been an argument from his side over the years. In the past decade I have had to sit here and listen to spokesman after spokesman from the Liberal Party saying that it is time we started charging market rents. Members opposite cannot deny that that has been the policy of the Liberal Party over the years. It has from time to time been very critical of the way that we have been charging Housing Trust rents. This is certainly reversing the argument from the one we have heard in the past.

Furthermore, the proposition we have heard from the Opposition time and again concerning the rental market is that the subsidies paid in connection with the housing industry should not go to those people who pay rent but to the private sector—the landlords. The Liberal Party has argued that money provided to us by the Commonwealth should go to the private sector. Indeed, I have been approached by members of the Liberal Party or those who support them who want to abandon the Housing Trust altogether, wishing to put the money with the private sector.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Goyder is butting in and interjecting to emphasise the fact that he would rather see the money go to the private sector, and that is nonsense. What about the poor and impoverished of South Australia whom this Government has assisted over the years? That money has been spent, and spent wisely. The Housing Trust is a monument to the South Australian Government and it would never have survived under the policies of the Liberal Party, which wants to see subsidies paid direct to the landlord. Malcolm Fraser wanted to send a letter to all these people who were paying rent stating:

Dear 'Mrs Smith', Included herewith is your rent subsidy for the month. [Signed Malcolm Fraser]

Why did he want to do that? It was for political purposes. He wanted these people to be reminded every month that they were getting subsidies from the Commonwealth Government. I have been taken a little off the track as that was not the subject that I wished to address today. I do not have a lot of time, but this Parliament saw fit to send me to New Zealand to look at the juvenile justice situation there. I do not have time today to discuss this matter in detail, although our esteemed Chairman has been burning the airwaves with decisions that the committee might make on this matter.

I wish to draw a contrast between a conservative Government in New Zealand and this Government here. I mention in particular the GST. It is incredible how a GST makes everything more expensive. A person who goes into a delicatessen to buy a cup of tea will find that 17.5 per cent GST makes everything more expensive.

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

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Superannuation Act 1990. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The main purpose of this Bill is to make a number of amendments of a technical nature to the Police Superannuation Act which came into operation on 1 June 1990. The technical amendments will clarify certain matters relating to the scheme and overcome some minor problems that have arisen since the new arrangements came into operation. The principal Act established a new lump sum superannuation scheme and closed the pension scheme to new entrants.

The provisions of the Act which specify the salary upon which contributions and benefits are based are revised under this Bill. The proposed provisions are intended to overcome some interpretation problems in relation to the existing wording of the relevant provisions of section 4 of the Act. Clause 10 of the Bill will also overcome a problem by specifying that employee contributions to the scheme for the first financial year after the Act came into operation are to be based on the actual salaries of employees on 31 March 1990. This gives the administrators a 12 month period in which to determine the salary of the highest position ever held by each employee. Under the new arrangements introduced by the Act on 1 June 1990, contributions and benefits are based on the salary of the highest rank and band ever held.

Amendments will be made to section 17 of the Act dealing with contribution rates. These amendments are designed to provide conformity with the amendments to section 4 of the Act.

Section 32 (1) (a) (ii) of the Act specifies the lump sum benefit payable to a spouse, where the contributor retired before the commencement of the Act. The provision should only relate to a lump sum received under the repealed Act, and not a lump sum received under the scheme in existence before the commencement of the repealed Act. Clause 5 of the Bill makes the appropriate amendment.

An amendment is also proposed to section 34 of the Act dealing with the entitlements and options for members of the pension scheme who resign. The clause of the Bill amending this section provides a definition of what is meant by resignation. The proposed definition is the same as the one in the equivalent section of the new scheme provisions—section 22 (8). The definition effectively classes a dismissed officer as having resigned for the purposes of the superannuation scheme.

Section 37 of the Act which deals with the return to work of an invalid or retrenchment pensioner is to be amended to restrict the application of subsections 1 (a) and (b) to return to permanent employment. The amendment also introduces provisions for dealing with any lump sum that the pensioner received on his or her earlier cessation of service. Without this amendment, an individual could receive an overall package of benefits greater than the normal maximum under the scheme.

Several other minor amendments are made to enhance the understanding of provisions.

An amendment is also sought to the provision of the Act which deals with the situation where a member's salary is reduced for disciplinary reasons. Under the existing provision, the member's salary after demotion is used to calculate all benefits. The effect is that the accrued benefit, even up to the date of the misdemeanour is retrospectively reduced through the application of a lower salary. The Government is concerned, principally because of its retrospective aspect, that the provision can have a large and unintended financial effect upon the member's accrued superannuation entitlement. The Government believes a fairer and more appropriate arrangement in such circumstances would be to allow the member to retain the accrued benefit at the higher salary, and continue to accrue a benefit applicable to the lower salary after demotion. The Bill seeks to amend the Act by introducing such an arrangement. The Police Association supports the proposed arrangement.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement of the provisions of the Bill.

Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act. New subsection (3) inserted by paragraph (a) spells out the salary on which contributions and benefits are to be based and makes it clear that contributions as well as benefits are to be based on the highest level of salary received. New subsection (4) replaces existing subsection (5). New subsection (5) is a new provision that gives an officer whose salary has been reduced for disciplinary reason an additional benefit to reflect the higher contributions made during the period before his or her salary was reduced. Paragraph (b) of clause 3 makes a consequential change to subsection (6). Paragraph (c) excludes from the operation of subsection (6) officers who are of the rank of senior sergeant or below but receiving a salary at a higher level than that payable to a senior sergeant. This provision comes into operation from the commencement of the principal Act.

Clause 4 amends section 17 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) makes it clear that contributions will be based on the contributor's actual or attributed salary. Paragraph (b) modifies subsection (2) (b) (ii) of section 17 to tie in with new section 4 (3). Paragraph (c) replaces subsection (3) with two new subsections that retain the substance of the original provision but make it clear that where a contributor receives worker's compensation payments contributions must be based on what he or she actually receives. These amendments are required for conformity with section 4 (3) and also come into operation from the commencement of the principal Act.

Clause 5 amends section 32 of the Act for the reason already given.

Clause 6 inserts subsection (11) into section 34 of the principal Act. The new subsection defines resignation to be any termination of employment except termination on invalidity, retrenchment or death.

Clause 7 amends section 37 of the principal Act. Paragraphs (a) and (b) restrict the application of the section to a permanent return to work. Paragraph (c) sets out the effect on a pension of a return to work on a temporary basis. New subsection (1a) inserted by paragraph (d) replaces the substance of subsection (1) (a) with an expanded provision which deals with the question of a lump sum paid on the previous termination of employment.

Clause 8 replaces section 38 of the principal Act with a provision corresponding to section 43 of the Superannuation Act 1988.

Clause 9 inserts a new section requiring the rounding off of the amounts of contributions and benefits to the nearest five cents.

Clause 10 inserts new clause 8 into schedule 1 of the principal Act. This clause provides for the calculation of contributions in the first year of operation of the principal Act to be on the basis of the actual salary received instead of on the highest level of salary received by the contributor in the highest grade achieved by the contributor. It has taken the first year of operation of the Act to determine this level of salary in respect of each contributor.

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

RACING (DIVIDEND ADJUSTMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Racing Act 1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill proposes amendments to the Racing Act 1976, to permit the South Australian TAB and authorised racing clubs to use the commission deducted by them from any particular race pursuant to section 68 of the Racing Act 1976, towards the payment of dividends where a racing totalizator pool is insufficient to pay winning bets dividends of 50 cents and in the case of a dead heat a minimum of 25 cents.

It is also proposed that where the commission deducted, pursuant to section 68 of the Racing Act has been used to pay winning bet dividends, the loss be met as follows:

- Where TAB is involved the loss be shared equally between the racing codes and Government, the same way as profit is shared;
- Where an authorised racing club is involved, the loss be met fully by the racing club concerned.

On 7 May 1992, the Racing (Interstate Totalizator Pooling) Amendment Act 1992, allowing for the amalgamation of South Australian win and place totalizator pools with an Interstate TAB was assented to.

The amendments provided, inter alia, that TAB enter into an agreement with an interstate TAB to accept bets for pooling with those placed in another State or Territory. That agreement states that the calculation of dividends shall be made in accordance with the totalizator rules of the interstate TAB, that is, Victoria.

Consequently, some changes need to be made to this State's rules so as to be compatible with those of the Victorian TAB. Draft amendments to the On and Off-Course Totalizator Rules were made, but found to be ultra vires the Racing Act and therefore invalid.

At present, in all cases except for place dividends where the totalizator pool is insufficient to pay a minimum winning bet dividend of 50 cents, the TAB or authorised racing club can, as the case may be, to the extent necessary to enable it to pay those dividends, draw upon—

- firstly, fractions accruing to it on the day; and
- secondly, from the Dividend Adjustment Account held at Treasury.

Similarly, at present, in the case of place dividends, where the amount is insufficient to pay a minimum winning bet dividend of 50 cents, an amount shall be deducted from the remaining horse or in equal proportions from the remaining horses before any dividend is calculated.

The proposed amendments to the win and place rules require the TAB and authorised racing clubs to use the commission deducted under section 68 of the Racing Act to enable a minimum dividend of 50 cents to be declared.

In the case of the proposed place rules, the commission deducted shall be used first, and if there are still insufficient funds an amount shall be deducted from the remaining horse or in equal proportions from the remaining horses before any dividend is declared. These rules would then be compatible with those of Victoria.

The proposal that the racing clubs meet the loss in full, where commissions have been used to ensure a minimum winning on-course bet dividend, is supported by all of the Racing Industry. The anticipated loss from this source in a full year is expected to be no more than \$5 000. However, this amount will be more than offset by the additional revenue to be gained from the amalgamation of win and place totalizator pools, which is expected to commence operation during mid-September.

The use of fractions and the Dividends Adjustment Account to make up minimum dividends will no longer be required.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 amends section 69 of the principal Act. This amendment ensures that the loss involved in making up a deficiency in winning bet dividends is shared equally by the Hospital Fund and the codes.

Clause 4 makes a similar amendment to section 70 of the principal Act in respect to amounts deducted by a racing club under section 68. In this case the loss falls solely on the racing club.

Clause 5 replaces section 75 of the principal Act with a provision that requires a deficiency in winning bet dividends to be made up from amounts deducted under section 68. A

consequence of this provision is that the Dividends Adjustment Account has no further role to play.

Clauses 6 to 9 make consequential amendments.

Clause 10 inserts a transitional provision.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 12 August. Page 127.)

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I am delighted to be making this contribution in response to Her Excellency's speech opening this session of Parliament. I have had the opportunity over the past three months to meet Her Excellency on a number of occasions, including in my own electorate, and I am impressed with her grasp of issues confronting the community at present. I am particularly impressed with her willingness to go out and participate in community activities. I commend her on her speech and particularly on the way that she is going about her tasks.

Unfortunately two former colleagues of this House have passed away since the last Address in Reply to the Governor's speech. Joyce Steele was a member of this House first as the member for Burnside and then as the member for Davenport, in which latter capacity she immediately preceded me. Joyce Steele was a person with tremendous determination. She was the first woman member of the House of Assembly in South Australia and was privileged to be the first woman Minister in South Australia. She was a woman who achieved great heights not only for her electorate of Davenport (which includes Burnside) but also for the cause of education and for this Parliament. I particularly pass on my condolences to Christopher, whom I know on a personal basis and who I know was close to his mother.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And to Jane.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, and to Jane, although I know Christopher particularly closely. Another member who passed away was Bert Shard, who was a former Minister of Health. He was a personal friend of my father in that capacity. My father had the greatest regard for him, as I did also, although I did not know him as well. Bert Shard was a character and added to the colour of this Parliament in another place.

I also acknowledge the retirement of two very experienced members of Parliament: the member for Alexandra, Ted Chapman (to whom I will refer shortly) and Roger Goldsworthy. Roger Goldsworthy was Deputy Leader of the Opposition for many years and was also Deputy Premier, Minister of Mines and Energy and the one man to whom this State could be most grateful for Roxby Downs and the petrochemical development at Stony Point. Roger worked tirelessly over those three years to bring about those developments, despite opposition from the Labor Party in this Parliament. I also had the privilege to work with Roger for three years as one of the members of the Budget Review Committee. Roger had and still has a great sense of humour.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: He has a great sense of humour and worked very hard for the people of Kavel. I wish him all the best in his retirement. As the new member for Alexandra I would like to pay tribute to the role played by Ted Chapman as a former member of this House for 19 years and one day. In fact, Ted and I came into the House of Assembly on the same day in March 1973. Ted Chapman had a particular distinction: he was the first islander anywhere in Australia to be a member of an Australian Parliament.

Ted was self-educated and was educated in the school of hard knocks. At the age of 12½ he left school and went out and cut yakka gum, trying to earn a living and at the same time trying to clear some pretty rugged country at the western end of Kangaroo Island. He went from there to become a shearing contractor and then to be a member of Parliament and then a Minister of Agriculture.

As Minister he had a real flair for the role that Australian agriculture could play in helping to develop agriculture in less developed countries. In particular, he visited countries like Nigeria and Iraq on a number of occasions and did a great deal, especially in northern Iraq, in helping to develop agriculture, including irrigation and sheep herds. At the same time Ted Chapman was very interested in the individuals in his electorate and I have always been amazed at the huge number of people he knew on a first name basis.

In fact, his first instructions to me after I became member for Alexandra were, 'Well, Brownie, you had better get to know at least 5 000 of them on a first name basis as quickly as possible.' I thought he was pulling my leg a bit until I moved around the electorate with Ted and found how many people he knew on a first name basis. He had known them from his first days when he ran for preselection, a system that allowed the then candidate to get to know as many people as possible within the electorate. He kept a close register and I think he personally called on three-quarters of the people within his electorate.

He got to know them and ate meals around their dinner or breakfast tables and, on many occasions, actually slept in their homes. So, I pay tribute to what Ted Chapman did for people and also for what he did for the broader community in Alexandra. In particular, I note that Alexandra had twice the number of new school buildings put into it than any other electorate and those school councils are appreciative of the role that Ted played in achieving that development for them.

I am pleased to be part of the electorate of Alexandra and I am pleased about the warm welcome that those people have given me. Alexandra covers an interesting area including the Southern Vales, with its vineyards and almond orchards, with Willunga and McLaren Vale, the southern Mount Lofty Ranges, with its dairy cattle, sheep, beef and developing horticulture industries. It also encompasses the South Coast which, apart from Labor Party conventions and meetings, more importantly hosts whales, which are becoming a boom industry and putting about \$2 million a year into the district, and tourism, but I also refer to the raw nature of the district and the tranquil beauty that exists there.

Further east we have Strathalbyn, that small town nestled on the edge of the Mount Lofty Ranges, and then

the Strathalbyn plains, including Langhorne Creek, Milang and Clayton on the edge of the lake. There is then Kangaroo Island and I am pleased and privileged to have Kangaroo Island within the electorate. I am disappointed that after the next election Kangaroo Island will no longer be part of Alexandra or the new Finnis.

Mr S.G. Evans: It will come back.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member interjects that it will come back. That is exactly the point that I now wish to raise. I give an undertaking to the people of Kangaroo Island that I will work hard to make sure that Kangaroo Island is included in the Fleurieu Peninsula after the next redistribution. It should never have been separated and, as I say, I will work hard to convince the Electoral Commissioners of the merit of keeping Kangaroo Island with its natural community, which is the Southern Fleurieu Peninsula.

I now wish to turn my attention to the development of South Australia and what this State faces in the future. It would be easy to talk about the state of depression, the mismanagement of the finances of the State Government, the State debt of over \$7 billion, and I will give more detail on that shortly, the huge interest payments that now need to be made every year to cover the State debt—payments of more than \$700 million a year—the breakdown in public accountability that has obviously occurred within the State and, as a result of that, the royal commission that is costing us \$25 million simply because, starting from the Premier down, there was not adequate accountability within South Australia.

I could talk about the economic and industrial decline and the savage impact that that has had on jobs and the high level of unemployment here in South Australia, the highest level until recently in the whole of Australia at 12.5 per cent. I could talk about the excessive Government expenditure that has occurred here in South Australia compared to other States, or the breakdown in the health system to a point where now the health system is in decay, or the rise in crime.

We have heard something about that in Question Time today and, finally, the actual paralysis in Government that now exists within South Australia. However, these are issues that depress everyone in this State and I do not wish to talk about them further. Where we stand is not so important as the direction in which we are currently moving and the fact that we are moving somewhere, so today I want to talk about where South Australia is looking for a new direction.

The Liberal Party will give hope to this State by rebuilding the economy and creating real jobs, by establishing confidence in South Australia again and making sure that we do have a future. The Liberal Party is determined to give South Australia a new clear direction, a direction that has been so badly needed that the community is now crying out for it.

Even recent polls have shown that only one in five people in South Australia now support the direction in which the Labor Government has taken them over the past 10 years—a mere one in five people. The other four in five people are looking for new leadership, new Government and a new direction for South Australia. Therefore, I am proud of the fact that the Liberal Party has laid down a clear set of strategic directions in which this State would head under a Liberal Government.

Mr Atkinson: Let's hear it.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: You are about to hear them all. The first is to give first priority to economic development and the creation of real jobs. Sir Thomas Playford immediately after the Second World War had a vision for South Australia, a vision that this State could become industrialised by producing consumer goods and domestic appliances for a rapidly growing Australian market which was going to expand as a result of immigration.

He saw that there was a need to establish housing throughout Australia and that those houses would need domestic appliances, and so he encouraged companies like Pope, Simpson, Kelvinator, Philips and many others to establish manufacturing bases here and to produce those goods. For about 20 to 30 years the State flourished under the policies laid down by Sir Thomas Playford. When we look at the future, we find it holds quite a different opportunity for South Australia: no longer will we have the chance to have rapid growth and housing development like we had in the past, because the population is just not there to achieve that.

The growth and opportunities in the world now lie in the East Asian region, and South Australia, as part of Australia, is on the periphery of that rapidly expanding area, but it is part of it. It needs to understand and seize those opportunities. The scope for South Australia in the future involves ensuring that it supplies the manufactured goods, the services, the advice and the back-up materials to allow the infrastructure to be installed in those rapidly growing communities, where the standard of living is expanding and, as a result, there is a demand for the same services as those provided in western developed countries.

A place like China, where there is a population of 1 200 million people, is growing at the rate of about 5 or 6 per cent a year. As these places grow, they need sewerage systems for their towns, like Shanghai, where a South Australian company is helping to install the pumps for the sewerage system. They may also need transport systems and hospitals. They need not only the design of the hospitals but also advice on how to set them up and establish medical services. In fact, Dr David David has set up a cranio-facial unit in both Beijing and Shanghai. That is only one small example of a huge demand that exists for this vast population that is approximately 100 times larger than the total population of Australia. So, South Australia has a chance to take on markets not just in China but also in Vietnam, Malaysia and Indonesia. We must focus our entire economic development towards those opportunities so that we can produce our manufactured goods there.

Some people are rather sceptical and would ask, 'Is there really a chance to compete against those countries that have very low wages?' Unfortunately we have the wrong perspective of the industrial base of those countries. They are good at producing very good cheap and simple consumer items that we import into this country. They need, but do not have the expertise of an industrial base, to produce the goods for engineering, medical and educational activities. At present they are buying most of that from high wage countries such as Austria, Germany, Japan and, to a lesser extent, America. There is a golden opportunity there for Australia's

manufacturing industry, which can compete if it wishes. I have been part of that industry for six years and I have seen how it can succeed. It needs to go into that area to ensure that it participates. That is the opportunity and the direction on which we should be focusing here in South Australia.

The second important direction we should concentrate on is establishing a competitive edge for South Australian industry, with the Government leading by example through lower taxes and charges, reform of WorkCover and reducing other imposts on business and scrapping unnecessary red tape and regulation. A competitive edge is vital to encourage industry to put new focus on the export market opportunities to which I have just referred. They must be competitive if they are to succeed.

Let us consider some examples. WorkCover in South Australia has an average premium of about 3.8 per cent. In New South Wales that premium is about 1.8 per cent. This State cannot afford to have a WorkCover system that is so inefficient and with so many abuses, which the community itself recognises and which this Parliament has recognised for a number of years, that it places all of its industries—and particularly its small businesses—at such a disadvantage compared even to the eastern States of Australia. We need to ensure that Government services are at least as efficient as services provided in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. Let us look at electricity. In South Australia power costs about 8 cents a kilowatt. In other States it is somewhere between 4 cents and 9 cents. South Australia's charge is the second highest in Australia.

Members should look at the complete breakdown of planning approvals for large projects here in South Australia compared with those in States such as Queensland. Look at the enormous infrastructure development that is taking place in tourism in other areas like Queensland, simply because that State is able, through its legislative system and the support of its Government, to get the projects through and completed. Compare that to the situation in South Australia, where project after project, listed at well over \$1 billion by the *Advertiser* in a recently published list, has fallen over. That has happened simply because we have a Government that does not understand what is necessary to achieve such development. Developers want balance between development and the environment, and certainty and speed in decision-making. This Government has failed to deliver on all three counts.

We could look at the Government bureaucracy that continues to exist in South Australia. The new member for Kavel and I recently attended a meeting of small business people at Willunga at which 70 people were present. We heard horrific stories about the extent to which these people are bogged down by Government red tape despite a promise by this Government in 1985 that it would introduce a one-stop shop to eliminate red tape excesses. Yet, we still hear that same bland promise in Her Excellency's address on behalf of the Government.

Those small business people quoted examples such as the slate quarry at Willunga that had to have five separate licences sent out by exactly the same Government department on five separate occasions each year for which the business had to write out five separate cheques and pay BAD tax on each cheque. That is the sort of

inefficiency that has continued to exist despite plea after plea. One could go on and look at the sort of excesses that have occurred as a result of Government regulation and red tape in other areas.

If Australian companies are to achieve a competitive edge compared with the rest of the world, we must consider the crucial issue of payroll tax. Australia is the worst country in the world in terms of imposing a tax system on employers for employing people. The average tax level across Australia is about 5.4 per cent. The average for all other OECD countries is about 1.2 per cent. How can companies in Australia compete when they have this tax imposed on them that must be passed on to Government? The tax penalises companies for employing people, yet there is an unemployment rate in this State of over 12 per cent.

I recently visited a very large factory employing about 600 people here in Adelaide and I met with the shop stewards. The very first question they asked me was, 'How can the Government here in South Australia continue to justify the imposition of a 6.25 per cent tax for employing people? Why is not payroll tax removed?' Of course, with the Federal Fightback policy offered by the Federal Liberal Party and Dr John Hewson, for the very first time in Australia we have the chance to bring about, on a national basis, major taxation reform, which is so urgently required if Australian companies are to compete in those vital East Asian markets.

Members opposite ridicule the so-called GST. In fact, they do not logically look at the even greater cost of maintaining the payroll tax, which is the alternative tax. However, they ridicule GST when virtually every other developed country in the world—and particularly those countries that are competing so successfully in Eastern Asia—have a GST. They have a GST because they realise that it is the only way that one can establish export industries.

The third area I wish to refer to in terms of a new direction for South Australia that a Liberal Government would offer is delivering essential Government services to the community to improve the quality of life. The key services are education and training, health, community security and public transport. This will include facilitating services with broad community culture. It distresses me greatly to see the constant cutbacks in Government services that have occurred in South Australia over the past few months as a result of the financial mismanagement of this Government. Let us consider some of them. Only yesterday I announced to this House that in one hospital alone 50 beds are to be cut, there is to be a 25 per cent cut in short term surgery and extended closures of parts of the hospital over Christmas, New Year and Easter.

In education we see that this Government, together with the Federal Labor Government, has failed to deliver the education and training which will be so important if we are to have the work force to tackle export markets. We have had a 5 per cent reduction in the number of people involved in our TAFE training system over the past four years, at a time when there is record unemployment, particularly amongst the young. The education system has failed to keep up with the standards now applying in the rest of the world. For example, Germany has been most successful in bringing vocational

training into the school and TAFE training system. From year 10 people in Germany are trained to take on the computer skills that are needed within companies. Here in Australia, based not on my judgment but on the judgment of those teaching computer skills, our system fails completely to match those international standards.

Turning to the transport system that is maintained by this Government, the operating costs in our ports are 35 per cent higher than in OECD countries. In our public transport system we are having to cut services because of the inefficiencies that occur. I could go on and on. The community is suffering. This Government has no concept whatsoever of what community services need to be, how they need to respond to be equal to world standards and to make sure that there is quality in the delivery of those services.

The fourth important direction that a Liberal Government would offer is increased productivity and incentives for better work practices through major industrial relations reforms. The Government would set the standard with improved productivity within the public sector so that we may have a Public Service of which all South Australians can be proud. We need a lift in productivity within Australia of between 40 per cent and 100 per cent for our industries to start to become competitive with other developed countries. In the building industry we need a lift of 40 per cent to match the United States of America or the United Kingdom, but we would still be well behind Germany or Japan. In the abattoir industry we need to lift productivity by at least 100 per cent. New Zealand, which three years ago was 25 per cent behind Australia, is now 30 per cent ahead in the abattoir industry.

If we go through industry after industry, we find that the same standards apply, and that is why we are so far behind the rest of the world. In fact, for the past 23 years Australia on average has been falling behind the rest of the world by at least one percentage point per year. The Federal Government and the State Government seem to be proud of achieving productivity gains of 1 per cent per year. The rest of the world is gaining by 2 per cent per year, yet our Federal and State Governments are willing to sit back and rest on their laurels believing that they are bringing about fundamental reform. Day after day we hear the Prime Minister talking about the micro-economic reform that he has achieved. The fact is that the rest of the world is lifting its productivity at a faster rate. It is reforming and becoming more competitive than we are, and we are well behind the rest of the world to start with.

Improved productivity will be achieved only by the introduction of enterprise bargaining in the workplace—a policy which the Liberal Party has already outlined that it supports in South Australia—together with an appropriate safety net to make sure that there is no abuse of employees within the workplace. We have promised minimum wages and minimum standards in terms of sick leave, annual leave, maternity leave and other industrial practices like that. We are offering a choice of maintaining the present industrial award system within the workplace or for employees and employers to make the crucial decision to adopt enterprise bargaining.

The Minister of Labour, who is in the House now, yesterday claimed that the present system is allowing enterprise bargaining within South Australia. Yet, on the

same day, we had the President of the Industrial Commission pointing out that only four workplaces under State industrial awards had enterprise bargaining in South Australia. Why? It is because there is a fundamental flaw within our legislative system. Yet the Minister is not even prepared to acknowledge it. He is not prepared to give South Australian companies, which work under State awards, the opportunity to become competitive by being more flexible in their work practices.

A company that I visited the other day pointed out that, in consultation with its employees, it had worked out a range of new work practices to suit their workplace and which would lift their productivity significantly. It has had to abandon those work practices because they are in direct conflict with the industrial award, which, for instance, lays down that at 12 o'clock everyone must stop for lunch. Therefore, the company cannot keep machines working over the lunch hour. Because it is against the industrial award, it cannot have half the work force stopping for lunch at half past 11 and the other half at half past 12. This Government, in its blind adherence to the trade union movement and the practices that it has supported in such an inflexible manner, is crippling the industry of this State and not allowing it to start to become internationally competitive. A future Liberal Government will tackle these issues and the sacred cows. We will make sure that our industry has the choice to negotiate with employees to lift productivity and increase flexibility.

Let us look at an example of what happens when one does that. SPC, the cannery in Victoria which was about to close through financial troubles and not being internationally competitive, asked for financial assistance and the Federal Government turned it down. Its last hope was to achieve an enterprise agreement with its employees, which it did after a bitter battle. Twelve months later, SPC has lifted its productivity by 40 per cent and the employees are back on the same wages as they were before. That is the sort of reform that we need in Australia, especially in South Australia. Yet this Labor Government, for the sake of the trade unions, is prepared to stop that sort of reform being introduced. The fifth key direction that a Liberal Government would take this State in is smaller and more efficient Government so that taxes and charges can be kept lower.

Mr Atkinson: How is that consistent with the second point that you made?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Highly consistent. We cannot start to lower Government taxes and charges until the Government is efficient. This Government has failed miserably in making sure that it runs its enterprises on an efficient basis by negotiating enterprise agreements. Since 1965 the population in South Australia has increased by 34 per cent. In the same time the number of people working within the State Government has increased by 100 per cent. That shows the way in which the resources of this State have been ploughed into the Government sector at the expense of the private sector. Between 1985-86 and 1989-90 South Australia committed 20 per cent of its gross product to the Government sector. The average for the rest of Australia was only 18.4 per cent. In other words, for that entire period more than 9 per cent of this State's resources were pumped into the Government than into the private sector. That is why this State has a failing

private sector and higher taxes and charges than other States in Australia.

The figures that I have quoted have been made considerably worse in the past 12 months because of the sharp decline in the economic and industrial base of South Australia. The figures that I quoted, which show that we put in a higher percentage compared with other States, were before the sharp decline in this State's base. With that sharp decline and the continued rapid expansion of Government expenditure—an expenditure for the past two years which has been at twice the inflation rate in South Australia and approximately twice the rate that other Governments in Australia have adopted—I believe that figure of 9 per cent more in this State will prove to be considerably greater than that by the time we get the figures, and perhaps up to 15 per cent more.

The sixth key area that the Liberal Government will address is to increase Government accountability, with greater community input to decisions and more individual freedom. The lack of Government accountability has cost this State dearly—\$2 300 million for the State Bank alone and an interest cost alone of \$650 000 a day for the taxpayers of South Australia. But it does not stop there. We have Scrimber, with a loss over \$60 million; we have SGIC; and we have \$100 million worth of consultancies, with a complete lack of accountability. As a result of that lack of accountability, at present we have a royal commission, which is costing this State more than \$25 million.

The Liberal Party has already laid down a series of measures to reintroduce accountability, and that accountability must start with the Premier and his Ministers. After all, we have seen the demise that can occur when the Premier appears to have complete disregard for any standards of accountability. Why worry about a Government guarantee: what does that mean, anyway? We all think that a bank is as safe as a bank. What the Premier does not understand is that the taxpayers of this State ultimately must pay the price for that lack of scrutiny and unwillingness to intervene to protect the interests of the South Australian people.

I have already laid down a number of the measures that we as a Liberal Government would undertake to achieve that accountability. Let me just touch on them very briefly. First, there would be a code of conduct for the Ministers. Secondly, the major Government trading organisations would be required to have their directors comply with the same laws that apply to private companies. If it was good enough for the Alan Bonds, the Skases and others, why is it not also good enough for the directors of Government instrumentalities?

When we look at the evidence that has been presented to various people in the community, it is quite clear that those directors felt that they had no obligation and no requirements under accepted corporate standards to apply those standards to the organisation they were supposed to be directing. So, they thought it floated up to a higher authority which, ultimately, was the Premier of this State. Again, we have paid dearly for that negligence. Government trading organisations should also have to appear before the public through their directors and be accountable for their services and financial records.

I see no reason why Government trading organisations should not be subject to the same scrutiny as large public

companies, which are subject to public scrutiny by their shareholders. I believe that there needs to be greater accountability by independent officers such as the Auditor-General and the Ombudsman and, therefore, that this Parliament has a role to play in making sure that the people appointed to those positions are not seen to be Government appointees but appointees of the people and the Parliament of this State.

The seventh crucial direction laid down by the Liberal Party, and one that members opposite perhaps would not comprehend, is to stabilise and then reduce the State debt, ensuring that the Government lives within its finances so that we can keep taxes and charges down in the long term. The State debt in South Australia is now \$7 billion yet, when this Government took over in 1982, it was only \$2.6 billion. By 1989 it had grown to \$4.4 billion, and by June 1991 it was \$6.6 billion. It is now believed to be well over \$7 billion, and the cost of that is horrendous. It is costing us over \$700 million a year in interest payments alone; that is, 47c in every tax dollar collected by the South Australian Government now goes towards paying that interest Bill on behalf of South Australians.

Imagine what could happen if we did not have that State debt hanging around our necks. It will be our children and, possibly, our grandchildren who will suffer finally as a result of that State debt. It has had further major impacts: Moody's and Standard and Poor's have downgraded our credit rating from AAA to AA and put us on a negative outlook. Most people would argue: what is the importance of that? I seem to recall a response from the Premier that going from AAA to AA was insignificant. The important thing is that international and interstate companies are not prepared to come to a State that has a AA rating only and is on a negative outlook, because they know that that State will need to pay higher taxes and charges because of its higher debt. Why set up in a place such as that?

All this has a very familiar ring to it when we look at Argentina. At the turn of the century, Argentina had the highest standard of living in the world. Australia, incidentally, had the second highest. Last year Argentina again became eligible for World Bank loans, which means that its income fell below \$US1 400 *per capita* per year. It is now a poor and devastated country. I have worked for the past six years with people who have a very close knowledge of Argentina and the directions it has taken, and the warning they issue is that South Australia and Australia are heading in exactly the same direction as Argentina, although we may be five to 10 years behind.

The only way of correcting that situation is for this State to take a new direction. South Australia must aim to produce at least 200 000 jobs, create and maintain a 4 per cent annual growth rate and increase our export share over the next 10 years. Whilst that is undoubtedly a very big task, it is achievable with new policies that give the highest priority to economic development and the creation of real jobs.

Fundamental structural reforms must be made in Government, in taxation and in industrial relations, and I have outlined those. These reforms will lay the foundation of a Liberal Government's new directions for South Australia. A 4 per cent annual growth rate in our

gross State product and 200 000 new jobs over the next 10 years to halve the current unemployment rate represent no more than double the rates of job creation and economic growth we have achieved in the past 10 years under this Labor Government.

As the alternative to this, we have the option laid out in the Arthur D. Little report; that is, if we as a State go in the same direction in which this Labor Government has been taking us for the past 10 years, we will lose 130 000 jobs rather than creating 200 000 new ones. The Liberal Party's target is realistic and will be instrumental in the task of rebuilding our economy and our confidence in the future of our State. For example, 15 000 jobs could be created if this State achieved the same *per capita* share of Australia's exports as its population should have. Whilst South Australia has been stagnant, other States have been forging ahead, particularly in exporting to the South-East Asian area.

Over the past 10 years, more than 355 000 jobs were created in Queensland. Remember, we are trying to create 200 000 here in South Australia over the next 10 years, and that is a commitment that we as a Liberal Government will give. Queensland has created 355 000 jobs over the same 10 year period, four times the rate of job creation here in South Australia. In Western Australia almost 200 000 jobs were created, more than twice the South Australian rate.

If these States can do it, why can't we? Of the mainland States, only Victoria has a poorer record than South Australia's record for job creation over the past 10 years. The particular concern about these 10-year trends is the collapse in job opportunities for family breadwinners here in South Australia. The number of men with full-time work is only 3 600 more than it was 10 years ago.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is, when we have States such as Queensland creating 355 000 extra jobs in the same period. That is a social and human tragedy which must be tackled with both social and economic policies. The State Government policies to confront this jobs crisis must emphasise, first, lower business costs to increase competitiveness, a new industrial relations framework based on enterprise bargaining to boost productivity and, finally, the linking of our education and training systems to industrial needs. These priorities will give our industries the incentive to grow through exports. A Liberal Government will encourage our industries to produce more for exports, to seek out markets for specialised products, to ensure that the efficiency and speed of services delivered by the Government are the best in Australia and to develop innovative marketing strategies to capitalise on these opportunities. To create a climate for economic growth through exports, major policy changes must occur to reduce business costs in South Australia. Our export performance has lagged well behind the national level. On a *per capita* basis, we should be contributing 8.4 per cent of Australia's exports, but our performance has hovered around 6 per cent for a number of years. In fact, for 1990-91, the latest financial year for which figures are available, South Australia achieved a mere 5.6 per cent of Australia's exports.

If we achieved 8.4 per cent alone, that is, equal to our share for the rest of Australia, we would add more than

\$1.4 billion a year to the value of South Australia's export effort. Translating that to job opportunities, it would mean an extra 12 500 to 15 000 jobs in South Australia. Key export opportunities in a number of industries were identified in the Little report. The Liberal Party supports that report and its aims. It is up to Governments to help create the environment for these industries to grow and to provide long-term jobs for our unemployed.

In business visits to eastern Asia, in which I was involved for the past six years, I have seen first-hand the golden and vast opportunities that are available for South Australia if we tackle that market. We must build on the strengths of wine, education services, tourism, pharmaceuticals, motor vehicle parts and processed foods and vegetables. New industries must be encouraged to grasp other export opportunities in areas such as precision engineering, machine tools, process equipment, commercial refrigeration, cold storage and food handling.

As the Little report states, without positive action to change the economic structure, our unemployment rate would probably remain at around its present level—an unacceptable level of 12.5 per cent. The Liberal Party offers new direction and new hope for all South Australians.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): It disappoints me to record that Shakespeare obviously had the opening of this Parliament in mind when he wrote, in connection with the opening speech: 'It is a tale full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.' Less than 24 hours after the last election, our television sets were filled with a new vision: a vision new to South Australia, a vision which we could style 'Bannon repentant'. He said that he had clearly got the message and that he had promised unequivocally to the people of South Australia flair and light. This Government has had almost three years, and the lights of South Australia clearly remain switched off. There most certainly will be flair, and it will be the brief flash that comes with our own destruction. It is a pity that this Government's performance has been so abysmal as to prove T.S. Elliot's words, 'That is the way the world ends, not with a bang but a whimper.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Both sides of the House will come to order. I am surprised that the honourable member's colleagues are interrupting in this way. The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: In many ways, I must congratulate this Government. Shakespeare wrote four great tragedies, and it took him a life-time to do it. In one Parliament, this Government has performed all Shakespeare's tragedies. For the benefit of the House, I will remind members that Shakespeare's first tragedy was *MacBeth*. It was a tragedy of ambition and usurping of powers that rightfully did not belong to them. Lest members opposite doubt that this Government has no mandate to rule, I would remind them that the member for Kavel this morning clearly laid out the statistics on a two-Party preferred basis from the last election. They are here by a fault in a system which we now seek to correct, and they will not be here for long.

But let us not dwell on the past: let us look at the present. And let us look particularly at the most recent

Morgan polls, which indicate that four out of five South Australians clearly do not believe that this Government is taking this State in the right direction. Once, all the apparatus of the Premier and the Minister trumpeted to South Australia about Mr 70 per cent. We do not hear much about Mr 24 per cent; we do not hear much about the Premier whose rating in this State equates with that of Premier Kirner in Victoria and is very much lower than that of Dr Carmen Lawrence in Western Australia.

Perhaps it is time that this Government took its future into its own hands and put somebody with a little bit of flair and light, such as the Minister who is sitting at the table, at its helm. In other States, it has been proved that women can successfully lead the ragtag of the Labor Party, and do it much better than has this Premier. I am quite sure that, if the Minister at the table, with her many skills, were the Leader, the approval rating of the Premier would certainly exceed 24 per cent.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I know one should not reply to interjections, but give him credit where it is due: he is hardly crawling. The Government has usurped power, has wrongly taken power, and continues to seize upon it. A minute ago, I heard the member for Mitchell say quite clearly, 'Give us some quotes.' I will: in particular, I will quote Lady MacBeth, because she is most applicable to this Government. She said:

I am in blood stepp'd in so far that, should I wade no more, returning were as tedious as go o'er.

That is exactly the position of this Government: it is steeped so far in blood that it does not know which way to turn; it does not know how to get out of it; it is stuck in the morass; and all it can do is to sit and pray that some God given event will lead them through the morass, and that will be the next election.

Dr Armitage: Out damn Bannon!

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Adelaide is very cruel. 'Out damn Bannon' Shakespeare never wrote: I do not think he knew the Premier. From *MacBeth*, we move to the true core of this Government's performance. It is, of course, perhaps Shakespeare's greatest tragedy, *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. What made *Hamlet* a tragedy was the fact that he could never make up his mind about anything. He had a course of action clearly laid out for him but he was never capable of pursuing that course of action. Indecision brought down *Hamlet*, his family and the State. Does that not epitomise this Government and in general the Ministers who have been forced to serve this Government? There are a few exceptions—a few genuine Ministers who have tried to fulfil the responsibilities of their duties, but unfortunately they are few and far between. Were I to have only three fingers on each hand I would still have one spare one.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Somebody suggested that one of the members opposite was named 'Piglet', and that is very unfair. I remind the member for Spence also of a line of *Hamlet*, 'Foul deeds will rise, though all the earth o'erwhelm them, to men's eye's. We have at present a royal commission in which all South Australians are interested and which seems to be exposing a few foul deeds of certain people in this city.

We also have, thanks largely to the independent members, a new committee system in this Parliament. It

might be said that that committee system is going a long way, and will go even further, towards exposing some of the inadequacies of Government in this State. It is a good system because one day we will be in Government—very shortly I hope—and I hope we will be called to account by the same committee system. All members should with me acknowledge that this Parliament is the paramount Chamber of government in South Australia and, whether it is the current Government facing the rightful inquisition of the Parliament or a future Liberal Government facing that same questioning of the Parliament, it is to be applauded by all members, and I am sure by every Liberal Minister who will not be ashamed to answer any questions that may be put to them by the Economic and Finance Committee or any other committee.

So, we move from the indecision of the Government, which I have said is perhaps the central piece, to the third tragedy. The third tragedy of Shakespeare was *Othello*, which was the tragedy of a betrayal—a betrayal by friends and by retainers. Again I contend that *Othello* is most applicable to this Government for, if it has been let down, has been betrayed, or has procrastinated and done nothing, none of those within themselves is culpable. However, those who should have served this Government very often have let down those whom they are paid to serve—the Ministers of this State—and put such Ministers and such Government in a position in which they do not deserve to be put. Very truly it can be said that this Government is subject to the tragedy of *Othello*.

Again a very good quote from that play was, 'Tis the strumpets plague to beguile many and be beguiled by one.' I could not resist that quote because when I read it I thought carefully about the State Bank and other large institutions. I thought about the Premier and the Government and wondered how many individual people have beguiled somebody who then came into this Chamber and continued to beguile the many. The quote from *Othello* is a very good and applicable one.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Mitchell reminds me of the *Merchant of Venice*: the quality of mercy is not strained. Justice is also a great quality. Before you have mercy you must have justice and there does not seem to be much justice done by this Government in this Chamber of late.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Henley Beach says that it is a funny interpretation. I commend the play to the member for Henley Beach. Some Ministers have tried to do a good job, but one of the problems is that they are culpable in the same way as the Premier who leads them. Many of them are my age and went to school when I did. At about 15 years they would have been subject to the *Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner* by Samuel Taylor Coleridge. The ancient mariner shot the albatross and the other seamen did not do what is normally expected and pitch him overboard so that bad luck did not befall the ship: they kept him on board and hung the albatross around his neck. The penalty was that in the end the only one who survived was the ancient mariner, while all his shipmates perished in a number of diabolical ways. The Premier has not one but a brace of albatrosses around his neck, and if Ministers opposite do not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: Unless Ministers opposite get smart and cast him into the deep, they might find themselves with the same fate befalling them as befell those ancient mariners. I would again, as a responsible member of the Opposition, urge the Government, if it does nothing else in this term, to get rid of the Premier and elect some effective leadership to this Parliament. The Premier is not effective and is not performing. The Premier is showing neither flair nor light, and it is up to members on Government benches to demonstrate their ability for leadership and dismiss the Premier from his seat in this place in terms of his leadership role and elect somebody much more competent. I am sure that if they scratch their heads and think carefully, even amongst their factional divisions, they can come up with a better solution to that to which South Australia is currently subjected.

The last great tragedy of Shakespeare was *King Lear*. In many ways that was the greatest tragedy of all because it was the betrayal by family and trusted relations. It was the greatest tragedy of all. I put to you, Sir, that this Government is also guilty of playing out that tragedy as over the past eight years the Government has promised much and delivered little. What is more, it is most disappointing that this Government has betrayed a group of people that form their traditional supporters and electors, and betrayed them badly. Two nights ago honourable members would have seen on television a lady from my electorate who has a disease requiring her to use oxygen 24 hours a day. For that purpose she has in her home a large cylinder.

She must have hospitalisation and constant medical treatment. To be at least partially mobile she has a portable breathing apparatus which hangs on a frame and which gives her the ability to get out, to go to the doctor, to go to the hospital and do other things. Because of the hospital cutbacks, she is being deprived of the portable equipment. She will be confined to her home for one reason and one reason alone: the hospital claims that it no longer has money to allow her a piece of equipment that enables her to live with some dignity in society.

If this Government has tried to do one thing (and I believe it has) and if at the end of this Parliament we could say, 'Look, we did not agree with what the Government did and a lot of what it said but there was one achievement it made,' that one achievement that I hoped I could say this Government made was that it did something in the area of social justice.

We have heard enough from every Minister and every backbencher in this Government about their concern for social justice. They constantly talk about the workers, the poor, the underprivileged, the handicapped, the ill and the disabled, yet we see such people in our offices constantly. I challenge members opposite to deny it, because I am sure that they get the same types of people through their doors constantly—people who are supposedly being assisted to live a normal lifestyle in their homes and who are in fact subject to every sort of disadvantage.

I agree with the interjection made a short while ago by the member for Adelaide. Are Government members proud of what the Government is achieving in the hospital service? Are they proud that there are elderly

people whom they are confining to their homes, whose quality of life they are destroying and whom they are inhibiting in the final years of their life? I do not think that is the case, because I know some members opposite and I do not think that any of them would be proud of that sort of thing.

I hope that as a result of my saying this they will put some pressure on the Deputy Premier to do something about the worst excesses of hospital closures. I understand the impact of the constraint of funds. I understand that we must do something and that sometimes we have to stop playing games in this place and admit that something has to be done and that we have not an unlimited bucket of money. However, when it comes to disadvantaging people who need our help, then equally we all must stand up and say, 'This is wrong and somehow we have to find the money for it.' If we do not do that, no matter what Party political games we play in here, we are failing the people of South Australia and I, for one, do not want to do that.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I have enough faith in some members opposite to believe that they do not want to do the same thing. The member for Mitchell again interjects and talks about my Federal colleagues. I would like to talk about some of the hypocrisy perpetrated on the people of South Australia by this Government. I believe that I heard on television, Sir, and I am sure you did as well, the Prime Minister of this country berating the Opposition for its suggestion of a youth wage—misquoting Dr Hewson—and saying that \$3 an hour was atrocious and was an abysmal amount to pay any human being, let alone a youth.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I acknowledge the Minister, who says, 'It is,' and she said it three times.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: No, I did not say that.

Mr BRINDAL: I apologise; it was the member for Stuart. I would like to refer to a copy of a letter sent to the Hon. Paul Keating by Bev Watts of Edwardstown. Part of that letter is as follows:

I am an approved care provider for family day care. This is a service offered by the Children's Services Office. This service is funded by the Commonwealth Government. There is no distinction of any class or person that this service is available to—it is available to anyone in the community. Government subsidy is available to most families and in most cases the fees are minimal.

This is a good service provided by the Government. The letter continues:

It is the belief of family day care and care providers that all children have the opportunity to develop a love for life and a love of learning. All children need a safe, secure, happy environment and it must be clean and healthy and safe. Care providers and their families are thereby screened by the Children's Services Office as well as the police. All care providers must hold current first-aid certificates, they attend monthly workshops and child care courses. They have excellent field workers who work tirelessly with care providers to ensure that family day care offers the high quality care that is equal to none.

In other words, they are not just people off the street; they are competent, trained professionals who are nurtured by Government departments to see that equality is maintained. She goes on to say that she could fill many pages telling about the philosophies and policies of

Family Day Care. We then get to the nub of the matter, because she then lists the fees paid to care providers.

Members should remember that the fees are paid by the Commonwealth and administered by the State. These fees are paid to care providers but are set by the Government and subsidised where appropriate by the Government. The fees are as follows:

Mondays to Fridays:

Hours 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. \$2.06 per hour

Hours 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. \$2.75 per hour

So, we have a Prime Minister in Canberra and Ministers on the Government benches here, all of whom are saying that no-one should be paid less than \$3 an hour and that it is an inhuman wage.

Mr Holloway: That is the rate per child.

Mr BRINDAL: They are paying \$2.06 an hour and \$2.75 an hour. The member for Mitchell babbles that that is the fee per child. I agree with the member for Mitchell, but there are many occasions when a care provider is asked to look after one child and, if the care provider is looking after one child, she gets \$2.06 an hour. I ask the member for Mitchell whether he would dispute that fact. So, Family and Community Services asks a provider, 'Will you have a child?' She says, 'Yes', and she gets \$2.06 an hour.

That is from a Prime Minister who goes on air and from Ministers opposite who take every opportunity to berate this Party about wages of less than \$3 an hour for trying to get people back into the work force. If that is not hypocrisy and absolute and arrant deceit, then I do not know what is, because they say that they always abide by the philosophy 'Do as I say, not as I do.' If ever there was a good example, I have tabled it in this House today. Lear said, and it is most applicable to this Government:

Plate sin with gold and the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks. Arm it in rags, a pigmy's straw doth pierce it.

That is true of this Government, this champion of social justice, this great rhetoric group who trumpet daily how they care for the people who put them there. They are soundless gongs, brass instruments, who are all noise but not much action. That is the best that can be said of this Government. In a sense—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: In a sense we ended where we began. The Minister will know that the final scenes of *King Lear* are the King upon the blasted heath with the tempest raging around. I acknowledge that all Australians have degraded the soil in this country and that we have a great problem with soil degradation. However, only one group of South Australians—namely, the Ministers—have degraded this Chamber and left it as I have just said—with the sterility of a brass gong. The sterility of this Chamber, as I have said before, must be blamed on the Ministers who sit on the benches opposite. So, you and I, Mr Speaker, like Lear, sit in the blasted heath and the storm rages around us. The storm of all South Australians is the anger of people who will not be denied justice at the next election; 80 per cent of whom will see members of the Government so far out of office they will wonder what has happened.

I suppose that standing up to the gale and trying to shout in the wind is very difficult because the wind carries one's voice to the four winds. In a sense, I have

the feeling today from members opposite that the gale is raging and I am yelling but they are just not hearing what I am saying. I would like to leave members opposite with two simple words from Gough Whitlam—'It's time.' I hope those words will carry to all South Australians and that they will carry this Government well and truly out of office.

Mr HERON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.2 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 18 August at 2 p.m.