

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 August 1993

The CLERK: I have to advise the House that, owing to absence interstate on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business, the Speaker will not be able to attend the House this week.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I move:

That, pursuant to section 35 of the Constitution Act 1934 and Standing Order 18, the honourable member for Henley Beach (Mr D.M. Ferguson), Chairman of Committees, do take the Chair of this House as Deputy Speaker to fill temporarily the office and perform the duties of the Speaker during his absence on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson) took the Chair and read prayers.

BENEFICIAL FINANCE

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Last Wednesday the member for Hanson asked me a question regarding severance payments to eight former Beneficial Finance Corporation executives. Investigation has revealed that the information on which the question was based has come from a confidential schedule of retrenchment arrangements provided to the Economic and Finance Committee of the Parliament. The committee has not reported on the relevant reference for which the evidence was taken. Members are aware of Standing Order 395 which states:

The evidence taken by any select committee of the House and documents presented to such committee which have not been reported to the House shall not be disclosed or published by any member of such committee or by any other person.

Members are also aware of Standing Order 320 which states:

No notice may be taken of any proceedings of a committee of the whole House or select committee on a Bill until such proceedings have been reported.

The member's question asks me to contravene these Standing Orders, which I have no intention of doing. The committee will have the opportunity of examining and reporting on the appropriateness or otherwise of the severance arrangements. As to the innuendo contained in the question of possible criminal activity by former BFC executives, those are matters which are currently being investigated under the fourth term of reference of the royal commission. If the member for Hanson has any new evidence on these matters he has an obligation to provide it immediately to the royal commission.

LOTTERIES COMMISSION

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Deputy Speaker, in a ministerial statement that I made on 26 November 1992 I referred to issues raised by the Deputy Auditor-General in his report on the interim audit of the Lotteries Commission for 1991-92. These issues included matters of potentially unsatisfactory practice within the commission which arose in

the following areas: conflict of interest, operating practices, insurance, capital expenditure and internal audit. As I explained in my ministerial statement, these issues were the subject of extensive consultation between the Auditor-General's Office and the Chairman and the General Manager of the Lotteries Commission. I tabled all relevant correspondence and reports on these matters at the time of my statement and advised that the Auditor-General had indicated by letter of 19 October 1992 that he was satisfied with the response of the commission on these matters.

I further advised the House that I had referred that correspondence to the Attorney-General. I did so and I now have his response in the form of a report from the Crown Solicitor, which I shall table.

In brief, Mr Deputy Speaker, the Crown Solicitor reports that his officers have investigated issues in areas of conflict of interest, operating practices and insurance. That investigation was conducted as part of a larger investigation involving certain anonymous allegations against the General Manager of the Lotteries Commission.

While one allegation is still being investigated, it is fair to say that the investigators found that the large majority of the other allegations, including all the more serious ones, were without foundation or unsupported by any or sufficient evidence. However, as disclosed in the Crown Solicitor's report, another group of allegations, those concerning preference given to relations of the General Manager, were found, while relatively minor, to be of substance.

Therefore, in the view of the Crown Solicitor, these are not matters which warrant any disciplinary action, but are matters which are properly the province of discussion between the board of the commission and the General Manager. The Crown Solicitor has recommended that the General Manager give certain assurances about the management style and practice within the Lotteries Commission. The Crown Solicitor observes that a number of these suggested practices have already been put in place by the General Manager, not only in respect of himself but generally in respect of the commission. I now table the Crown Solicitor's report.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Report on proposed land division, Hundred of Coneybeer.

Corporation By-laws—

Noarlunga—No. 17—Boat Ramps.

District Council—By-laws—

Crystal Brook—Redhill—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties.

No. 3—Vehicle Movement.

No. 10—Repeal and Renumbering of By-laws.

Karoonda East Murray—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties.

No. 2—Streets and Public Places.

No. 3—Animals and Birds.

No. 4—Dogs.

No. 5—Bees.

Port Elliot and Goolwa—

No. 6—Sted Scheme.

By the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Construction Industry Training Fund Act—Regulations—Various.

By the Minister of Business and Regional Development (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Road Traffic Act—Regulations—Approved Photographic Detection Devices.

By the Minister of Primary Industries (Hon. T.R. Groom)—

Wine Grapes Industry Act—Regulations—Production Area.

GRAND PRIX

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Business and Regional Development): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have recently signed and sent a submission to Graham Richardson, Federal Minister for Health, requesting that the Australian Formula One Grand Prix be granted an exemption in accordance with the Commonwealth's Tobacco Advertising Prohibition Act. There is no automatic exemption for events such as the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. However, the Commonwealth legislation does provide the Federal Minister with the power to grant an exemption to sporting and cultural events of international significance.

As all honourable members would be aware, the Australian Formula One Grand Prix has been conducted in Adelaide since 1985 and brings substantial economic, employment and social benefits to this State and Australia as a whole. Unquestionably, the Australian Formula One Grand Prix is Australia's largest and most successful international sporting and entertainment event. The event combines world class motor sport with a full program of entertainment, on and off the circuit, which attracts approximately 300 000 patrons over the four days. Its value for Australia can also be measured through tourism promotion of our State, interstate and overseas, as well as economic and employment benefits.

Apart from the television coverage, through the direct and delayed broadcasts of the two-hour race to some 518 million viewers in 102 countries, many of the international media which cover the event in Adelaide also produce features on the City of Adelaide and South Australia. The Price Waterhouse study, tabled in this House earlier this year, concluded that the 1992 event conservatively generated \$37.4 million for the South Australian economy. This independent economic evaluation of the event was documented proof that the Government's investment in the Grand Prix is totally justified considering the immediate return to the State, particularly in terms of tourism and business opportunities.

The event also generates 97 full-time and 1 600 part-time jobs each year. It sells 70 000 bed nights in South Australian hotels and provides an ongoing boost to South Australian industry. The Australian Formula One Grand Prix is an Australian success story which benefits all Australians. Neither this State nor our nation can afford to take our Grand Prix for granted. There are plenty of cities and countries who want to take our Grand Prix away from us. This is no idle threat. New formula one circuits are being constructed in the Asia/Pacific area, including Indonesia, Malaysia and China.

One only needs to look at the controlling body's (FISA) reaction to restrictive advertising laws when in December last year, following changes to French laws to ban all forms of cigarette advertising, the French Grand Prix was struck off

the 1993 calendar. The event was only re-scheduled after a compromise agreement was reached to allow tobacco advertising for formula one events. This reaction leaves the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board and the State Government in no doubt that any restrictions placed on tobacco advertising at the Australian Formula One Grand Prix will put the future staging of this event at serious risk.

This Parliament recognised the importance of this international event by specifically exempting the Australian Formula One Grand Prix in our own Tobacco Products Control Act. I have told Minister Richardson that Australia would lose its Grand Prix if an exemption is not given. Our job is to secure this event in Adelaide for the long haul. I hope I have the support of all members in doing so. I table in this House a copy of the Government's submission and seek the support of the House for it.

HEALTH BUDGET

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I am pleased to outline to the House the details of the 1993-94 health budget. As part of the normal budgeting practice in this sector every health unit in the State will this week be informed of its budget for this financial year. This health budget is responsible and provides for the ever increasing demands on our health services. This budget very clearly will maintain and provide new health services for the people of South Australia.

Despite the stringent economic situation, the Government will continue to provide our patients with some of the best health services in the country. This budget was framed within the context of the Premier's economic statement, Meeting the Challenge, and is the first of a three year forward commitment to meeting the Government's economic targets. We are committed to ensuring that we continue to provide excellent treatment to the growing numbers of patients in our system, while keeping total health costs under control.

To cater for this growing demand, total health spending in South Australia this financial year will increase by \$110.7 million to \$1.4 billion, a real increase of 5.3 per cent over last year. This increase includes an unspent \$34 million from last financial year which will be carried forward by health units to meet known commitments and future cost pressures. Each health unit will be required to pursue general efficiencies and absorb inflation and any salary increases that occur throughout the year. The reforms of the past two years and the effect of targeted separation packages, which have been centrally funded, will assist with this process.

This Government's record on health spending is clear. Health expenditure in South Australia has grown steadily in real terms in recent years, up by 8.8 per cent since 1989-90. This year's health budget reflects increases in funding from the Commonwealth, including funding of \$26.4 million for disability services transferred to the State from the Commonwealth, as part of the Commonwealth State Disability Agreement. South Australia will also receive new funding of \$5.8 million to increase services to people with a disability.

Under the new Medicare agreement, South Australia stands to gain up to \$22 million depending on the level of public activity in our hospitals. This includes funding for a number of new initiatives, as follows:

- \$5.2 million for booking list initiatives, including moves to reduce the time people wait for elective surgery;
- \$1.5 million for mental health services;
- \$800 000 for an in-patient psychiatric unit at the Women's and Children's Hospital;
- \$1.2 million to open a 16 bed ward at Modbury Hospital;
- \$1.6 million to increase surgical procedures at country hospitals.

The Government has also decided to extend eligibility for concessions on spectacles, dental services, ambulance transport and other health concession schemes consistent with fringe benefit entitlements provided by the Commonwealth. The budget includes spending of \$67.7 million on capital works, including:

- \$15.6 million at the Women's and Children's Hospital;
- \$11 million for the new Gawler hospital;
- \$3.4 million for mental health wards in general hospitals;
- \$1.2 million for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, for ward upgrades, including cardiothoracic;
- \$1.4 million for a replacement aircraft for the Royal Flying Doctor Service; and
- \$5.6 million for the upgrading of country hospitals.

Continuing efficiencies in major metropolitan health units will enable the reallocation of existing funding to a number of high priority new initiatives for all South Australians. One of the most important is a major new initiative to combat child sexual abuse and domestic violence. Nearly \$750 000 will be directed at boosting child protection services at the northern and southern offices of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service based at Flinders Medical Centre and also at the Women's and Children's Hospital, a sum total of \$350 000.

This funding will provide for a combination of medical assessment, treatment and therapy for victims of child abuse; increasing funding for domestic violence programs (by placing extra staff in community health centres), which totals \$200 000; and extra funding for a sexual offenders treatment program, to help prevent reoffending, at a cost of \$194 000.

Further funding is as follows: a \$700 000 increase in funding to the Lyell McEwin Health Service in recognition of an increase in activity; a \$500 000 increase to Modbury Hospital in recognition of further increases in activity there; \$360 000 for 240 public lithotripsy patients to be treated at Calvary Hospital; and \$63 000 for the employment and training of Aboriginal health workers. Health units met their savings targets during 1992-93, and the boards and staff deserve tribute for their dedication and commitment to increased efficiency in the context of continuing high standards of public health care. I am confident that this budget will create a framework for them to continue providing an excellent service to the people of South Australia.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC SECTOR APPOINTMENTS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier immediately stop the appointment of ministerial advisers to Public Service positions, because these and other recent appointments politicise the Public Service shortly before an election? I have been made aware that several significant contractual appointments have been made recently to the Public Service. These positions are in many

instances senior and politically sensitive. They include the following:

- former Labor MP Derek Robertson, who has been appointed to the policy section of the Department of Environment and Land Management;
- Di Gayler, also a former Labor member of Parliament, who has recently been appointed Policy Director of the new Environment Protection Authority;
- Wendy Chapman, a former ministerial assistant to the Treasurer (Mr Blevins), who has been appointed as Manager of Corporate Services in the Correctional Services Department;
- Barbara Ferguson of the ALP Centre Left faction, who was Manager of Human Resources in Correctional Services, has just been promoted to Director of Support Services in Correctional Services; and
- Doug Melvin, a former organiser of the Timber Workers Union and a ministerial assistant to several Government Ministers, who was appointed as Manager, Industrial Services and Policy Branch of the Department of Labour.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: For a start, the Leader is being exceedingly partial in the way he is approaching a matter such as this, and he is choosing to be entirely selective to say—and notwithstanding anything that might be in the Anti-Discrimination Act—if you happen to be on the Labor side of politics you should not be entitled to anything at all under this Government. I notice that he does not make the same reference to anyone who may have Liberal Party connections, and yet I know for a fact that, not only during my term as Premier but during that of my predecessor, on a number of occasions people who were known to us as members of the Liberal Party were appointed to positions on Government boards and Government committees.

Indeed, former Liberal members of Parliament were appointed to such positions. That did not happen under a Liberal Government: those appointments were made under a Labor Government. I can very easily give the assurance that any position that is advertised by the Public Service is dealt with in an appropriate and proper way, under the rules that the Commissioner for Public Employment administers. Everyone is entitled to make application for positions on their own merits, and they will be tested on their own merits. A number of the names—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. This Question Time will have to be conducted in accordance with Standing Orders. I hope that both questioners and those who are answering the questions are given the opportunity to do so without being drowned out by interjections. The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Amongst other things that the Liberal Party did when it was in government was to promote a former member of Parliament, who was no longer a member of Parliament, straight into the Cabinet room by making him a Cabinet Secretary. That was Ross Story. That seemed an odd thing to do at the time—to have Executive Government, Cabinet Government suddenly having brought into it somebody who was then outside the political process. A number of the people that the leader has mentioned, saying that somehow or other they should not be entitled to Public Service positions, have been for some considerable time permanent members of the Public Service.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Goyder to order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In other words, they are already in the Public Service. Is he suggesting therefore that they should be summarily dismissed from the Public Service? Is he suggesting that? Is he suggesting that those people are no longer entitled to employment in the Public Service?

An honourable member: All women, incidentally.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, the names he was referring to are all women. We know his policies in that area; he does not have any equal opportunity issues involved at all.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Is he then saying that those people who are already in public sector employment should somehow tie their hands behind their backs in an opportunity sense within Public Service employment so that they cannot apply for any job? Is he then saying that I as the Premier and the leader of the body politic should interfere in the Public Service selection process (which does not happen) and say, 'That is not to happen; that appointment is not to take place'?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I reject that roundly.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am not interfering in the appointment system, and neither is anybody on this side of the House.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the Parliament wants to put a lot of very important questions to Ministers, and we are taking up Question Time. Already this question has taken five minutes, and I would hope that the Parliament will be able to hear the questions that are put and the answers that are given so that we can use this Question Time productively. The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: One of these names—Ms Barbara Ferguson—has never been a Labor member of Parliament, yet, apparently because she happens to have Labor credentials, she is not entitled to have any part in the Public Service in South Australia, notwithstanding that she has already been in the Public Service of South Australia.

So, what does the Leader expect me to do? Am I expected to say, with regard to any Public Service appointment between now and the next election, that no Labor Party supporter is eligible for such a position? In any event, it would be in breach of the Government Management and Employment Act that I should be interfering in this way—quite improper on the basis of the legislation—and I would certainly not want to do anything improper, and I do not do anything improper, but I am being asked to interfere in the way our legislation runs and then to say to people, 'Tell us what way you vote; tell us the way you mark your ballot paper when you put it into the box'—I am interfering in their rights to have a political affiliation, whether or not they are financial members or just active supporters of any Party or simply people who have a tendency towards one Party or the other. The Leader says, apparently, that that is not on.

I do not know how many positions will be filled over the next few months as a result of retirements from positions that will be filled in an ongoing sense, and I know some of them will be filled from outside the public sector employment.

Of course, many are filled by movement within the public sector but, to the extent that there are positions filled from without the public sector, is the Leader of the Opposition saying that for every one of those positions I have to do some

sort of star chamber exercise and grill the people who are applying for the positions to ensure that they are not or never have been a supporter of the Labor Party? That is ludicrous. The work of Government will have to go on; positions that are created in the normal effluxion of business will have to be filled; and those positions will be filled according to the law. They will be filled quite properly.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

HEALTH BUDGET

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Can the Premier please explain to the House the approach his Government is taking in maintaining essential health services, and does this contrast with the measures being taken in other States where budgetary restraints have had to be applied?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can certainly provide information on this matter. It is an important question. I have given assurances time and again that this Government is not about cutting back or imposing cuts on front line services to people in South Australia—that as far as possible everything we do within the financially difficult times in which we live will be done with an awareness that those front line services should be kept to the highest possible level. I made those statements earlier in the year in my Meeting the Challenge statement delivered in April, and today my ministerial colleague the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services affirmed that by virtue of the announcements with respect to this coming year's health budget.

I would remind members of those figures. Total health spending in this financial year will increase to \$1.4 billion, by an amount of \$110.7 million, an increase of 5.3 per cent in real terms over last year. That is a good increase indeed and puts the lie to the statements made by a number of members opposite that we have been cutting back in our health budget. Indeed, I can say that since 1989-90 we have increased health spending in South Australia by 8.8 per cent in real terms. On top of that, we have things that have come out of the Medicare agreement, whereby South Australia stands to gain up to \$22 million, depending upon the level of public activity in our hospitals.

That includes funding for a number of new initiatives, including \$5.2 million for booking lists, and that will mean a reduction in the waiting time for those who are after elective surgery. We will also receive new funding of \$5.8 million to increase services to people with disabilities. We must remember how meagre the health capital works program was when the Liberals were in power in this State, when the member for Coles was the Minister of Health in South Australia—it was about \$10 million in the final budget.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: They even took the biscuits away.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, they even took the biscuits away, as we are rightly reminded. This year we will see \$15.6 million for the Women's and Children's Hospital, \$11 million for the new Gawler hospital, \$3.4 million for mental health wards in general hospitals, \$1.2 million for the Royal Adelaide Hospital ward upgrades, and \$1.4 million for the Royal Flying Doctor Service. Many of these other initiatives have been built on the work we have done in the years gone by. We have some special programs (and there is a reason for mentioning this one): \$750 000 will be directed towards a new initiative to combat child sexual abuse and domestic violence.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: What has been happening interstate? I know the member for Adelaide says we do not need these things. Let us look at what the Liberals in Victoria have done. They have really followed the example of the Tonkin Government in South Australia back in the early 1980s, a Government of which the Leader was a ministerial member. In April 1993 the Victorian Liberal Government imposed a 12 per cent cut in the health budget in that State. Job losses were built into that of 4 800 positions, just in the health system in Victoria—almost 10 per cent of all State hospital staff—and that was on top of a 4 per cent cut in November 1992-93.

As to aged care, disability, child and family and psychiatric services, these are to be cut by 10 per cent in Victoria over the next two years. As to the \$750 000 initiative I mentioned in regard to child sexual abuse and domestic violence, what was the Kennett answer to this situation? What was the answer of the Liberal colleagues of the Leader of the Opposition here? They imposed a \$600 000 cut on child protection agencies. I quite agree with the member for Victoria, who shakes his head, because it is a shame and an indictment that that sort of thing would be supported.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order. The Premier is debating the issue and his remarks are not relevant to this State at all: they all relate to Victoria.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot accept the point of order as to relevance; however, this answer has now been going for three minutes and I would ask the Premier to wind up his remarks.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will certainly wind up.

Dr ARMITAGE: I rise on a point of order. The Premier is being repetitive and doing nothing more than re-reading—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have been trying to detail, not repetitively, separate issues of cuts that have been imposed in Victoria. We will detail a number of other cuts in due course, because members opposite will not be allowed to forget what their colleagues are doing in another State. There is a simple message to South Australians out of this: if the Liberals and Dean Brown get elected in this State, it will not be a State to get sick in. If the Liberals get in, do not get sick.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to call the next member until we get order.

PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE UNIT DIRECTOR

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety. Will the Minister confirm that the Government has ignored advice from the Department of Labour in creating the position of Director of Public Infrastructure? I have been informed that there has been feverish activity within the Public Service over appointments and transfers prior to the forthcoming election. Since January more than 20 new executive positions have been created and, as demonstrated in the Leader's question, some of those positions have gone to political supporters of this Government. I have also been advised that there are current moves within at least five offices to provide permanent positions in the public sector for ministerial advisers, as well as upgrading levels of permanent staff.

In one such case, the Minister of Public Infrastructure approached the Commissioner for Public Employment, Mr Strickland, proposing the creation of the position of Director of Public Infrastructure at an EL1 classification. The Commissioner received departmental advice that such a classification could not be justified on the job specification provided. The department was then told to beef up the job specification for the person concerned. However, the position was created at an EL1 level and given to Mr David Abfalter, principal adviser to the Minister of Public Infrastructure and a long-time activist within the ALP, including a term as a member of the ALP State Executive. The salary for the position is almost \$20 000 more than Mr Abfalter was receiving as a ministerial officer according to the most recently published list of ministerial officer salaries.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the Minister to resume his seat. I will not call the Minister until there is absolute order.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The inference from the member for Mitcham's question is that the Government and we as Ministers are interfering with the selection of people for executive positions within the Government.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Leader interjects by saying that it is not an inference. What I want to say to the Leader is simply this: if he has one skerrick of truth, go to the PSA, because they will take it up. What the Leader was saying in his earlier question to the Premier was that the Government Management and Employment Act has certain rules and that the Government has torn it up and not acted in accordance with an Act of this Parliament. It is all right for the Leader to grin, but the reality of that situation is a fairly serious conflict with the Acts of this Parliament. If he thinks that we are into that racket, he had better put it on the table instead of coming into Coward's Castle and saying such a thing.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The next thing I want to say to the interjecting member for Mitcham is simply this: the Leader made some references about Barbara Ferguson. I know a little about membership of the ALP, because I get around and I see people, and I actually know the person concerned but have not seen her at meetings. We asked her whether she had been a member of the Labor Party and she said, 'Not since 1984.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The question was asked about Mr Abfalter; it was not the question that was addressed to the Premier.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: It just demonstrates that when they get to muckraking they cannot even get their facts right. In relation to Doug Melvin, and I do know a little about him, he has never been an organiser in the Timber Workers Union in Mount Gambier; I do not think he has even been a member of their union. When he sought that position within the Government he was a public servant. Members opposite should get their facts right before they come in here and start bucketing people's names around.

It is not something new with this Liberal Party. Years ago, when Bob Menzies got up and decided to do a job on trade union officials, he was wrong and had to apologise. All I am saying to the Leader and the Deputy Leader is that if they have got their facts wrong have the guts to get up and apologise to public servants who cannot defend themselves

from accusations of wrongdoing by people who ought to know better.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the Deputy Leader to order.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Albert Park to order.

HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services outline to the House what measures are being taken to reduce patient waiting times for elective surgery operations in country South Australia?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I am very pleased to inform the House that this year there will be some 300 extra elective surgery operations in country South Australia. This is part of the overall \$5.2 million of Federal Government funding, which is available to South Australia this financial year to pay for the initiatives to better manage booking lists and for operations on those people who have been waiting the longest, including those on country booking lists for non-urgent surgery. These operations, of course, are on top of the normal workload performed in our country hospitals.

It is worth remembering that throughout the State more than 30 000 elective surgery procedures are performed each year, and I think in answer to the honourable member's question I should provide a little detail of that. At the Clare District Hospital, for example, there will be some \$40 000 to pay for eight joint replacements for people who have been waiting for orthopaedic surgery; and Mount Gambier Hospital, \$100 000 to pay for some 60 cataract operations. Northern Yorke Peninsula has an allocation of \$30 000; Port Augusta Hospital, which will be of particular interest to the honourable member, will have an allocation of \$40 000 to pay for 50 ENT procedures; Port Lincoln Hospital, an extra \$30 000; Port Pirie \$120 000 for 50 joint replacements, 10 urology and 15 cataract operations; Riverland Regional Hospital, \$130 000; Whyalla Hospital and Health Service, \$20 000; Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital, \$60 000, which will cover an additional 20 cataract operations and provide funding for an innovative initiative to better manage booking lists at that hospital; and \$30 000 for the Millicent District Hospital to pay for similar initiatives in relation to their overall booking list procedures.

I think this funding throughout country South Australia will contribute to the overall effect, which that additional Federal funding has had in reducing booking lists in South Australia and, in particular, tackling the longest waiting end of the booking list, which is the area I am sure all members will want to see addressed first.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services say how many people currently on waiting lists for surgery could have received their treatment if the \$34 million of money unspent in the health budget last financial year, as identified in the ministerial statement given earlier today, had been allocated to public hospitals in order to reduce their waiting lists?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: It is a pleasure to answer that question. The \$34 million, of course, has first to be seen in the context of the overall health budget of \$1.4—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: First of all, Mr Deputy Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. EVANS:—the \$34 million has to be seen in the context of the \$1.4 billion—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS:—figure involving public hospitals in this State and, therefore, when hospitals are given the responsibility to manage their budgets, which after all is a very appropriate initiative in the 1990s—to guarantee that the managers of those institutions have the right and the responsibility to properly manage their funds—of course, they are also responsible for the cost pressures on that health unit. That includes areas of inflation, salary increases and increases in costs of equipment, and the like. All of those figures must be budgeted for, and when you look at the massive size of that budget, \$1.4 billion, individual health units to which that money was allocated last year naturally will set aside funding for potential increases. Failure to do so would be quite financially irresponsible and would be roundly condemned by all members of this House.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the member for Adelaide to order.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: Naturally all of that funding is not always spent, and to run their budgets right down to the wire would have been quite irresponsible. Therefore, they put money aside for those contingencies; not all of it has been spent, and in the certainty of ensuring that they do not overspend that money can be carried forward by those same health units, where the money has been saved, and spent in this financial year. And, of course, there will always be an element of carry forward expenditure if that is properly managed. If in the event that those inflationary pressures, cost pressures or wage pressures are higher than those health units expect, they will carry forward a deficit just as some of them have carried forward a surplus. In the overall context of that budget that is perfectly reasonable. The funding is being directed to those operations.

I have just detailed what is taking place in the country: more than that indeed will occur in the metropolitan area—millions of dollars extra to address that particular need, and it will address that need. Patients are being treated now, but we must have responsible financial management at our health units.

I would have thought that the member for Adelaide would support that, or is he advocating centralised budget control with all decisions being made by the Health Commission? I doubt that. He would understand the need to ensure that managers manage and that they manage properly. That is what this budget process does.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services outline to the House what action the Government has taken to cope with the increasing demand on the services of Modbury Hospital?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I am pleased to inform the House, the member for Playford and indeed other members with an interest in the Modbury Hospital—and I know that would include members opposite—that the State Government has committed an extra \$1 million to Modbury Hospital to enable it to reopen a ward to cope with increasing demand for services. This means that the hospital has been able to open an extra 16 beds through funding of \$500 000 this financial year, on top of the \$500 000 last May for the other 16 beds. This extra money is in recognition of the large increase in activity experienced in the hospital during the past 12 months.

Admissions through casualty have increased by 18½ per cent, a very substantial increase and certainly not one for which the hospital could reasonably have expected to provide. Overnight stays are up 3.7 per cent, day only patients up 15 per cent and overall admissions up over 7 per cent for 1992-93 compared with last financial year.

The staff of that hospital have coped very well, as have the management in planning for these changes, but inevitably as activity levels increase—as they certainly have in the north in the last financial year, and as we expect them to continue to do so—clearly the central system has to provide additional funding for that. We have allocated an extra \$1 million to Modbury Hospital and those beds will continue to remain open and continue to provide a high standard of service for the people of that area.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Newland has a question, I will put her name on the list.

POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENTS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Premier stop the practice, which is developing among his Ministers, of using taxpayer-funded advertisements to boost their political profiles? The most recent of a series of expensive press advertisements carrying studio portrait photographs of Ministers was inserted last week by the Minister of Environment and Land Management. The advertisement, ostensibly only to highlight that the information kit—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:—on the Environment Protection Bill could be purchased from the department for \$15, includes a photograph of the Minister, which takes up a third of the advertisement space, and the Bill has not even been passed by Parliament. I am reliably informed that the insertion of these advertisements twice last week cost the taxpayer a total of \$587. This follows similar advertisements—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I meant what I said about members being heard in silence when asking questions. I would ask that the House respect Standing Orders and allow the question to be asked.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: This follows similar advertisements placed by the Minister of Primary Industries and the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services, and

it raises questions as to whether we can expect an increase in this kind of political advertising at taxpayers' expense between now and the next election.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It certainly shows the paucity of questions on the other side of the House when we are getting down to scanning through the daily paper and looking for photographs. It also shows the great sensitivity of the other side to photographs. I recall when the other side won Government in 1979. There were in Government a number of documents that contained photographs of former Ministers and Premiers. I think there was one with Des Corcoran concerned with industry promotion which was being used to promote South Australia in other parts of the world. Apparently, if I recall rightly, there was quite a stock of these brochures in place. The first thing that David Tonkin did was to take horror at the photograph of a Premier or Minister from another Party than his own and he had them all pulped at public expense. These expensive documents were all pulped.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Petty.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It was petty. I should like to describe what happened when we took over from the Tonkin-Brown Government in 1982 and came across large bundles of similar documents. We did not pulp them. We simply inserted a letter in the front of them from the new Premier, the member for Ross Smith, indicating that there had been a change of Premier. We were still quite happy to circulate those documents containing David Tonkin's photograph, because we do not get paranoid about photographs; we do not get uptight about that sort of issue.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Heysen to order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I note that some of the questions coming from the other side today have related to a letter that I received from the Leader of the Opposition. He has asked for a number of points or positions to be clarified or taken by me, and one is that referred to by the member for Heysen. I noticed with great interest when reading the Leader's letter that he talks about what should happen when an election is called; and he talks about the Westminster procedure. As we know, at the last Federal election there was a certain date at which ministerial decisions were no longer made. The administration of Government went on without political decisions being made, and that is quite right. But this is signed by a person who was a member of the Tonkin-Brown Cabinet and who deliberately ignored those self-same rules.

The Leader might well laugh, but the member for Mount Gambier knows full well what I am talking about. When I came into office as the newly sworn-in Minister of Education I discovered that the Liberal Government had approved some significant appointments to the South Australian College of Advanced Education board just days before the election. I took issue with that at the time. I said that it was quite improper that that kind of activity should have taken place while we were in an election mode. That is the kind of way that this Leader operated when he was a member of a Cabinet in this State. Therefore, I find this kind of letter to be very cynical. I can assure him that he will get a response to the letter, and that response will go through exactly how members opposite operated when they were in Government in their election period. We will detail the sorts of things that they did not do with any degree of repute at all. Neither I nor

my Government will bring into disrepute the Westminster system. We will operate in the appropriate and proper way.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Now the Leader is talking about it having been 10 years ago. He is saying, 'Forgive me, it was 10 years ago. I was younger then. I got it wrong then, but I have learnt a bit in between.' He says, 'I got thrown out of Parliament when I lost my seat and I learnt a bit when I was out on the street. Now that I am back in Parliament I will not behave like I did before.' He cannot get away with that kind of excuse. This Government behaves very properly in these matters and it will continue to do so.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety advise the House what impact the Liberals' proposed minimum hourly rate of pay will have on employees in South Australia? I have been approached by a constituent in my electorate who has indicated her concern about the Liberals' industrial relations policy. In particular, my constituent was concerned that under the Liberals' policy she will be forced onto an individual contract and the only protection provided to her will be minimum standards. She was also concerned that all other conditions of employment could be taken away at the employer's discretion.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Napier for his question. Whilst he was asking the question, the member for Bragg interjected and said, 'We do not have one. Read the policy.' I want to lead into that because the member for Bragg is the Opposition spokesman on industrial relations. He has said at a public meeting that when the Liberals get into power they will deregulate the industrial relations system.

Mr Ingerson: I did not.

Mr Hamilton: You did, too.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Albert Park to order.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Bragg interjects and says that he did not. All I can say is that the advice that I got from three different people who attended that meeting is that that is what he said. The mistakes that we have in this House from the other side are evident today from their Leader who could not even get names right. I suspect that he had an old membership list that may have been given to him by somebody when they went into Government in 1979. I suspect he was going back on that. He was blackening the name of a public servant who is unable to defend herself. Members opposite should be ashamed of themselves. Their policy will take away from people a whole number of things that they regard as fairly important.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: It is all right for the member for Goyder to say that I am wrong, but on one occasion in a question in the House to Jack Wright the honourable member asked him to relax occupational health and safety standards in a factory in Maitland, which would mean that more people would get injured.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: You don't care.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Goyder to order and I request that the Minister not be drawn by interjections and direct his answer through the Chair.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I apologise, Mr Deputy Speaker, if I was distracted by the inane interjections of members opposite. What is going to be their minimum rate? What will they do to young people? Will they go with Dr Hewson's prescription of \$3 or \$3.50 an hour? Will they strike an artificially low minimum rate that nothing can fall below? Will they allow employers to negotiate away penalty rates, overtime rates, shift allowances and holiday loadings? It is all right for the member for Bragg to interject and say, 'Read the policy,' but he is the one who got up at a public meeting and said, 'We are going to deregulate industrial relations.' He is going to take away from people the safety net that we provide with our enterprise agreements. That is what he has admitted to doing now, and that is what he said at a public meeting.

When it comes to delivering on this, the member for Bragg had a letter read out at that meeting which said that after two years in Government they would consider shopping hours. At the end of the meeting he said, 'In our first four years we will not be regulating shopping hours.' However, another shadow Minister, doorknocking in his supposedly new electorate, said to one person, 'We will deregulate shopping hours forthwith when we get into Government.'

They cannot make up their mind. Who is telling the truth amongst this lot? How can working people take their guarantee when Kennett in Victoria and Court in Western Australia prior to the election in both those States said, 'People will not be worse off'. All we have to do is look at the record. My supposition is that those here are the same.

SALES TAX

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): In view of the crucial importance of the motor vehicle manufacturing and wine industries to the South Australian economy, what assurances has the Premier sought from the Federal Government, and what assurances has he received, that there will be no increase in sales tax on new cars or wine in next week's Federal budget?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: One thing I do know is that both industries are substantially better off as a result of the election of the present Federal Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, the Leader of the Opposition has been making some statements about people not making investment decisions in this State—that simply is not correct. He says they are not making these investment decisions because they are waiting for a State election. That is not correct, but I can certainly say it was correct that people were holding off investment decisions before the last Federal election. They were certainly holding them off because they could read quite clearly what was the difference between a 15 per cent tariff and a negligible tariff, that quaint word that members opposite often used. The rest of industry was also looking at the difference between a zero per cent tariff and the levels of protection that were being offered in other sorts of industries. There certainly has been a big difference as a result of the Federal election this year.

I note that, in the rumour mill that produces many stories as to the sorts of things that might be contained in the Federal budget, there has been a reference to some possible tax imposts that could affect the automotive and wine industries in South Australia. That is part of the rumour mill at this stage, but I take the point that that could well be a disadvantage to those industries in South Australia, industries that are

very important to South Australia. I am pleased to hear that the member for Chaffey is prepared, by asking this question, to stand up for those two industries. I am also pleased to note that at long last he is prepared to stand up for the automotive industry in this State.

As a result of having heard those rumours around the place, I have written to the Federal Treasurer on this matter because I am concerned that, if imposts were put on those industries and they had a detrimental effect on South Australia, we would all be concerned about that, and I would hope that all members of this place would share that concern to make sure that those industries do get a fair go. So, I have written to the Federal Treasurer. The rumour has only just hit the streets, so to speak, in the past couple of days, so I have not yet received a reply to my letter, but I will certainly ensure that we follow it up with the Federal Treasurer.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): Can the Premier please advise the House of the current state of the automotive industry in South Australia and whether there are any signs of renewed investor confidence following the rejection of the zero tariff policy by the Australian public and industry?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We have seen, I think, significant improvements in the health of the automotive industry in this State, certainly in recent times, now that we are coming out of the recession and, technically, the recession has been over for some time. We have seen that the automotive industry has played a significant part in that area. Indeed, we can see that the domestic market share of the South Australian producers, Holden's and Mitsubishi, is picking up. It was not that many years ago that those two manufacturers produced not much more than one in four of the cars in Australia. Now one in three cars sold in Australia comes from the two South Australian producers, and of course the automotive component manufacturers are still making about 40 per cent plus of the automotive components that are needed by the Australian automotive industry.

So, we have seen a pickup, and that has certainly been helped by the re-election of the Federal Labor Government. It certainly would have been damaged by the election of a John Hewson Liberal Government. We would not have had the talk by the International Strategy Board of General-Motors, which visited South Australia recently, about expanding that company's output in this country and expanding its output for export.

We would not have had the discussions by Mitsubishi, even considering what was going on. In fact, when I met with the Mitsubishi people in Japan they wanted to know what this State Government's attitude was to tariff reductions because they were concerned about that issue. They made the point to me that, had there been a zero tariff, that would have been a serious problem for them in terms of their investment decisions. They were concerned about those issues and they were satisfied and very happy with the response from me on behalf of the State Government of South Australia. The question is: what has been the success rate in the automotive industry? In the last financial year, to 30 June, employment at Holden's and Mitsubishi rose by 6.7 per cent. I heard a bit of laughter from members opposite when I said we were technically out of the recession, and yet here we have those two major manufacturing companies now employing around 9 000 people, which is an increase of 6.7 per cent on last year.

What has been the situation with exports? In the 11 months to May 1993 South Australia's overall exports were up 8.6 per cent compared with the previous year. We were the third highest of all the States, and half the growth that we had in South Australia was in the automotive sector. The automotive sector has had an increase of 104 per cent in the 10 months to April this year. In fact, automotive exports from South Australia have gone up—and I ask members to listen carefully to these figures—from \$31 million in 1985-86 to \$192 million in 1991-92. That is a phenomenal increase, and that increase has taken place in a State with a Government that has shown its support for the automotive industry not just in nice sayings of warm sympathy to them but also in real money. State Government money has gone to help the automotive industry consolidate itself and help automotive component makers modernise themselves and locate and export into new markets. The State Government has led the country in respect of our response to the automotive industry, and figures like the increase from \$31 million to \$192 million since 1985-86 show the results.

HIGHER EDUCATION CONTRIBUTION SCHEME

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Will the Premier take urgent action to oppose any fee increase for tertiary students proposed by the Federal Labor Government to the Higher Education Contribution Scheme; and does he agree that in the current economic climate with high unemployment such an increase is, in effect, a tax against learning and jobs?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The State Convention of my Party has opposed the higher education fee, and as a State Government we have indicated our position. I have done it as the former Minister of Employment and Further Education, and my colleague the Minister of Business and Regional Development has done likewise and, for those months that my colleague the Minister of Emergency Services was in that area, he did likewise. Our record is very clear on this matter. A very big problem that we may have is that, as the Federal budget is being prepared in Canberra, it is framed under the context of the political climate that exists there in respect of the issues considered likely to be supported by the Parliament in Canberra. What is the climate in Canberra? It is a climate where the Federal Liberal Party wanted to have user-pays principles put in place for higher education.

That is the argument put up by the Liberal Party. That is what it put forward at the last Federal election. It wanted to charge higher education students in this State much more than the present HECS fee. It wanted to charge full tote odds. That is what the Federal colleagues of members opposite have done in Canberra, and they have moulded the political climate accordingly. If that fee is to be increased, which we would oppose, members opposite should be ashamed of themselves for not having spoken up louder with their Federal colleagues to get them to change their policy. They have created the climate that may have allowed that to happen. Where have they been?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. Baker: It's your Government.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I hear the member for Fisher piously talking about this tax on education. Where was he during the last Federal election? I did not hear his statements being made as he was campaigning on behalf of

Federal Liberal Party candidates at the last Federal election. There was a deathly silence from him, just as there was from the Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—in refusing to stand up for the automotive industry. I find the question very cynical indeed. This Government stands by the policies we have expressed on this matter and we will continue to do so. That Party opposite has no integrity about its policies. It will do anything at all to grab some support. It will unashamedly change its direction, and the member for Fisher is a classic case in point.

ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Mr BECKER (Hanson): My question is directed to the Minister of Tourism. Does the management of the Adelaide Entertainment Centre retain his confidence and, in particular, does he endorse the dismissal of employees of the centre because they want to join another union? I have been approached by employees of the centre who were effectively dismissed last week because they wished to transfer their union membership from the Liquor Trades Union to the Media Alliance. This dispute has already cost the centre revenue from at least one event.

Employees have told me that management of the centre is an absolute shambles. The current manager is Mr Ian Fraser, who last year was paid \$33 780 as a consultant to review the activities and operations of the centre and whose management style appears to be a major cause of the current problems at the centre.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for the question and the fact that I was tipped off that he would be asking it. Certainly, there is currently a demarcation dispute under way at the Adelaide Entertainment Centre, but I am sure that all parties are working to resolve the problem. Demarcation disputes are often complex and difficult and there are established mechanisms for dealing with them. In this case it is expected that the State Industrial Commission will have before it on Thursday a section 26 dispute. That is the proper place for these matters to be dealt with.

I have been advised by centre management that no further disruption is expected to the centre's operations due to the dispute. And yes, the Grand Prix Board, as I would have thought the honourable member would have learned from my ministerial statement today, does have my confidence.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Does the Minister of Mineral Resources see any advantage in a hands-on approach in the area of exploration and mining? Through programs such as the \$16 million South Australian exploration initiative, we hear of the high-tech work being done to better 'see' the State's mineral potential through seismic testing and aerial magnetic surveys but we hear very little about local knowledge and experience.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Stuart for her question, which is a very important one, because I confess that I have gone on at great length in this place and outside about the technical expertise we in the Department of Mines and Energy have developed and the very valuable work we are doing under our exploration

initiative, and I have failed to talk about the human side of mining, particularly exploration, as much as I could have done.

Not only does the department have a great deal of technical expertise but it also puts a great deal of effort into its human relationships, within the mining and exploration industry and particularly in the interface of the department and the mining industry with our Aboriginal community. There is no doubt that there is a tremendous amount of expertise out there within the Aboriginal community about the more remote areas of our State and the interest that we may have in exploring and mining them.

I do not want to confine my appreciation of this by merely talking and thanking Aboriginal people for the assistance they have given us; I am announcing today that in the department we will be employing three Aboriginal trainees who will work with the department at Coober Pedy, Mintabie and Peterborough. The trainees will assist the department's role in providing advice on land management practices relevant to mining, through their understanding of Aboriginal culture and the intimate knowledge they possess of local areas significant to their communities.

That deep local knowledge from people on our staff will assist the mining industry enormously. The day-to-day work of these new officers will involve advising and liaising with local miners, pastoralists, landowners and the local communities. The trainees will be able to advise these groups on matters that deal with the orderly development of mining within the region. Unfortunately, in some areas and among some communities there is a fear of exploration and mining. That fear is unjustified, and the knowledge that can be imparted by our Aboriginal employees will, I think, reduce that fear and increase cooperation between the mining industry and the Aboriginal communities, in particular, although not just Aboriginal communities.

Each trainee will work under the guidance of departmental field officers to learn about the conduct of field inspections, mining tenements, operations and site rehabilitation. The Department of Mines and Energy is to be commended for following through on this initiative. It is easier just to ignore the local needs of the area, to assume that everything can be done, particularly with high technology flying hundreds of metres above the ground with all the high-tech instruments, and that means that we know it all. Of course, that is of enormous assistance to us, but we do not know it all.

The people who lived in those regions all their lives, and whose ancestors lived there for hundreds of years, know far more about the local customs and local areas that are worth surveying than any machine flying hundreds of metres above the surface. So, it is a credit to the Government and to the department, and I wish these new officers well in their new role.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I apologise to the House. I did call two members on my left in succession so, in order to square it up, I must now call on the member for Mitchell.

HOUSING INDUSTRY

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations inform the House of the current prospects for home buyers and the housing industry in South Australia? Yesterday's *Advertiser* carried a story entitled 'Home owners \$270 better off'. What is the outlook for housing in South Australia?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I also read that article in yesterday's *Advertiser*, and I believe it should have been a front page article, because it stated that the average South Australian home buyer was \$270 a month better off compared with their outgoings three years ago. That is more than \$65 a week extra in the pocket of an average home buyer in this State. That is an enormous fillip to the ordinary family's budget and it follows the release of housing approval figures last week which showed South Australia leading the nation in housing activity and one of only two States to record an increase in activity.

This is very good news for South Australia and deserves to be recognised in this State, not hidden away in a small article in the paper. Indeed, over the past 12 consecutive quarters, dwelling commencements in South Australia have varied by not more than 8 per cent. This means that the number of houses built in each quarter over the past three years has not been less than 2 600 and not more than 2 850—not a bad result, keeping in mind the fact that variables such as the weather, materials supply and all manner of things can upset those figures.

What is important about those figures is that this provides a very stable housing industry, which means constant work and regular income for housing workers and stable house prices for home buyers in South Australia. By national standards South Australia has done very well in this area. Over the equivalent period, for example, the New South Wales housing industry has varied by a massive 43 per cent. This, of course, is the reason why New South Wales has such high housing costs and, unfortunately, such a high level of mortgagee sales.

I was pleased to see the recent articles make some recognition of the important role that Government has to play in creating the right economic environment for a healthy and stable housing market. Indeed, Dr Ron Silberberg of the Housing Industry Association is quoted as saying that the lower costs of developing land and houses in South Australia helped bring in this good result and, further, he said that the most buoyant States in housing terms have been Queensland and South Australia, which have had growing employment also. That is praise indeed from someone who engineered a very vicious political campaign against the Federal Labor Party at the last election. It is interesting to see that attribution given to the lower costs of developing land in this State, undoubtedly due to the work of the South Australian Urban Lands Trust which, I was interested to hear last week, the Opposition has indicated it will abolish.

RENT RELIEF

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I address my question to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. Why is there no liaison between the Housing Trust and the Residential Tenancies Tribunal to put a stop to the issuing of cheques to rent relief recipients who are known by the tribunal to have vacated premises to which subsidy cheques are still being posted? I have in my possession photostats from a land agent and the Residential Tenancies Tribunal which indicate that a tenant on six months tenancy with rental subsidy vacated a flat half-way through his tenancy in mid-December, leaving some \$500-odd owing in unpaid rent, despite the trust having already paid out \$450.

A notice of termination was issued in December. The application for an order of the tribunal was dated mid-January 1993, and the order was made and stamped on 8 February

1993. On 23 March, another 6 weeks later, the land agent was clearing out the letterbox at the flat and noticed a rent relief cheque in the name of the tenant who had shot through. The trust was advised by the agent that the tenant had left 12 weeks earlier and that cheques were still being issued. A Housing Trust officer advised the land agent that this was not unusual, because the trust now requires tenants to furnish particulars only on a six-monthly basis, where formerly a check was made every three months. I am also advised that this procedure is costing taxpayers thousands of dollars a year.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: First, I would like to have the opportunity to investigate the facts of the matter. It is indicated that there may well be fraud in the circumstances outlined to the House, although that would need to be investigated. Further, it is interesting to note that a person obviously opened the mail of another person in order to detect that situation. I would be very surprised if—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:—one could provide the specific details of a matter of that type. So, if it is a matter of such importance that it is to be raised in the Parliament, and the honourable member makes allegations that this is widespread in the community and that it is costing the taxpayers enormous sums of money, we should at least be afforded the opportunity to investigate the individual circumstances that he raises in the House. I may say that the Housing Trust does have very good liaison with the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, and the Government has indicated it proposes to bring in legislation in this session of the Parliament to apply the residential tenancies legislation to tenants of the Housing Trust, and there has been a great deal of cooperation between those two agencies in order to afford Housing Trust tenants the protection provided by that legislation. So, I believe that there is a very good working relationship between those two Government agencies; whether that cooperation is sufficient to overcome circumstances which the honourable member raises will depend upon the investigation.

PREMIER'S REMARKS

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

Leave granted.

Mr BECKER: This afternoon the Premier made a most cowardly, unsubstantiated allegation against me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Walsh has a point of order. The member for Hanson will resume his seat.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, in using language of that nature the honourable member is deviating from his personal explanation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The purpose of a personal explanation is to explain to the Parliament where the member has been misrepresented, and I would ask the honourable member to do that. The member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The allegations against me concern severance payments to eight

former Beneficial Finance Corporation staff. The Premier said:

Investigation has revealed that the information on which the question was based has come from a confidential schedule of retrenchment arrangements provided to the Economic and Finance Committee.

I deny this allegation and challenge the Premier to reveal his source or withdraw such an allegation. The Premier said today that my question would request him to transgress Standing Orders 395 and 320. Standing Order 395 provides:

The evidence taken by any select committee of the House, and documents presented to such committee which have not been reported to the House, shall not be disclosed or published by any member of such committee or by any other person.

Standing Order 320 provides:

No notice may be taken of any proceedings of a committee of the whole House or a select committee on a Bill until such proceedings have been reported.

I contend that those Standing Orders relate to a select committee and not to a standing committee of the Parliament. Section 24(5) of the Act which covers parliamentary standing committees and which establishes the Economic and Finance Committee provides:

Subject to this Act or any other Act, the committee may conduct its business in such manner as it thinks fit.

In other words, the committee is not subject to the Standing Orders of the Parliament. As you well know, Mr Deputy Speaker, you and I have been members of the Public Accounts Committee and the Economic and Finance Committee, and I have never used confidential information in any way other than for the benefit of the committee. The committee has not collated, to the best of my knowledge—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER: I have never used any confidential information. The security of the documents of those committees always concerned me, especially when I was Chairman. Not only has the Premier reflected on me but he has also reflected on the staff and all members of that committee, because the documentation is retained, as far as I know—certainly in my case—in the offices of the Economic and Finance Committee at the Riverside building.

We have not extrapolated any information in relation to Beneficial Finance staff. I can only assume that the estimate in the question which was provided by outside sources must be very near the mark or spot on, and that is why I reject the allegations and innuendo. I will not be intimidated or bullied by anybody, particularly a Premier of this State in trying to score cheap points when he is unable to answer questions put to him by the Opposition. As he was recently recorded as saying in the *Australian*, his Government failed to recognise the questions put by the Opposition.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not debate the issue.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): As I have explained in my personal explanation, the Premier made a complete fool of himself this afternoon in referring to the Standing Orders

whereas the Economic and Finance Committee is subject to legislation of its own, of this Parliament. When a Premier of this State decides to take on a backbencher of the Opposition, I think it is a very good sign. What will happen to the cricket team of the Labor Party?

The issue that concerns me is the disgusting and disgraceful situation that we have again witnessed through the management of this Government of statutory organisations or Government-owned enterprises such as the Entertainment Centre.

We had to have an Entertainment Centre. There was a strong lobby for it and the Government agreed to it and built it. The original estimate was \$35 million, but I believe the final cost was about \$50 million. No matter, the State has benefited from having an Entertainment Centre.

Certainly, it would benefit if the centre was used and managed properly, but the Government has used the Grand Prix Board to do that. Why everyone believes the board is the most successful operation in this State is something about which I have yet to be convinced. The board loses about \$4 million a year, and other organisations could pick up the management of the Grand Prix and operate the race at a profit. I will not be bullied and intimidated by Mal Hemmerling or anyone else. If he can earn as much money or double his income overseas, I suggest he should go, because plenty of other people can run the Grand Prix for this State. Let us look at the Entertainment Centre, where three unions are involved. First, there is the Liquor and Allied Trades Union, although I do not know what that has to do with the centre: people cannot even buy a bottle of Coke there, and Schweppes won the contract for the Grand Prix. That is how crook the deal is. Then we have the Shop Assistants Union, which has to be there because its members sell the programs, and then we have the Media Alliance and Arts Union, which I believe ought to be the one involved, because it is directly involved in the whole operation of the Entertainment Centre, theatre or whatever.

Back in 1991 there was agreement between the Liquor Trades Union and the Shop Assistants Union about a 24-hour day, seven day a week operation before a single worker was employed at the centre. Several unions, including the Media Alliance, opposed the application to register the agreement. As I understand it the UTLC asked the Liquor Trades Union and the Shop Assistants Union not to proceed. We had the most powerful body in this State—the UTLC, the all-governing union body in South Australia—making that request. I have no argument with the UTLC and I have no argument with anyone wanting to join a union.

I have no argument with anyone being a good, honest, loyal member of a union, but I certainly expect that, if a person is a member of a union, as are the 12 people who have been dismissed at the Entertainment Centre, they should be treated fairly. They have been dismissed because they want to transfer their membership from the Liquor Trades Union to the Media Alliance Union and have been barred from working at the Entertainment Centre.

I refer to the facilities people, the maintenance people, the people who erect staging—those who really put up the whole show. They are not front-of-house people but back-of-house workers in the Entertainment Centre. What annoys me is the pig-headed management attitude that, because these people want to transfer to another union, the management de-rosters them and denies these people a fair and equal opportunity to earn an income.

Most Entertainment Centre employees are permanent part-time workers. That in itself is a disgrace and a blight on the Government. One person I spoke to yesterday has four part-time jobs. What a blight on any Government—what a blight on any system—that a young man has to take on four part-time jobs so that he can earn a fair and reasonable wage to support himself and his family. My mind just boggles about this and about what is happening in regard to industrial relations in South Australia.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The member for Albert Park interjects but knows the position as well as I do, because he was a union representative. When the member for Albert Park was a union representative a man's wage was awarded in order to support a family and two children, and that is how it should be, but the unions lost control. One should have the right to join whichever union one wishes, and if a closed shop is involved one should not be denied the opportunity to work.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): In the personal explanation that followed Question Time this afternoon comments were made about a committee which I have the pleasure of chairing. Indeed, the matter which related to the Premier's statement earlier to the House was going to be a subject that I intended to bring up tomorrow at the committee meeting. Points were made about the various Standing Orders in respect of select committees but advice I have received from the Clerk, with whom I had occasion to check out the position concerning evidence, documents and committee procedures some time ago (and I will go into that in a moment), clearly indicates that the Economic and Finance Committee—and, for that matter, the three other standing committees of the Parliament—are not encumbered by such Standing Orders.

However, the committee has made a practice in its time (indeed, based on advice from the Clerk which was accepted unanimously—and I can check the minutes about that) regarding certain confidential documents presented to the committee. In fact, three sets of documents have come before the committee in my time in the Chair where confidentiality was agreed by all members of the committee. It was agreed that those documents would be handed back to the Secretary and kept by the committee in confidence.

At the end of last year the first breach of that agreement took place in this House in the last sitting week when Opposition members asked questions clearly sourced from a schedule of salary details that was declared confidential by the committee but supplied to all committee members. Questions asked by Opposition members contained precise details. I am not reflecting here on the member for Hanson about that, because he is a member for whom I have considerable respect, and I have always found him to be an honest and fair individual.

In that instance, Opposition members asked those questions and told me that the information came from the research section of the Liberal Party. In fact, I will name the member for Bright—the member to whom I spoke afterwards about the information he had. Indeed, two other documents, as requested, were treated as confidential because of their commercial nature and sensitivity. That confidentiality was voted on by all members of the committee but one of those documents was referred to last week by the honourable member and by another honourable member who asked the question. I can only surmise that that information also must

have come from either private sources—as one member described it to me—or from the Liberal Party research section. I will tell the House how they got their information in a moment.

I can only surmise about it, because that document was collected at the Economic and Finance Committee meeting, incorporated in the evidence, and given the protection of a unanimous committee vote. One member who received his documents at that meeting on the Wednesday morning opened them and was concerned about the document being collected by the Secretary. I saw him put the document in a folder and leave that meeting (supposedly, from what he told us, to make a telephone call) for five minutes, and then he came back in. I said that I wanted to collect the documents there and then. With my own eyes I saw the document being taken out of the folder. I spoke with that member in the presence of another Opposition member and said, 'So long as I am in the Chair of this committee, I do not want to see that sort of conduct happen here again.' Certainly, I do not want to see that sort of thing happening.

Confidential information was taken out of the room in front of my very eyes. It disappeared for five minutes, no doubt photocopied, brought back and then handed in. If members want me to name the member concerned, it will be a pleasure for me to do so. Let me say to the two members involved—the one who took the document and the other I called as a witness—that I was disappointed about that conduct, which is a gross breach of trust against the committee. The Premier was right: information from those questions came from that document, and I do not believe the member for Hanson is responsible: I believe he was put up to it.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): It is heartening that Highway 1 is being extended as a dual lane highway north of Two Wells. Currently it is a dual highway through to Dublin. As a member who uses that highway regularly, the upgrading certainly makes travelling so much easier and, more importantly, so much safer. Unfortunately, however, there are some problems that go along with such a construction project.

It is not with the construction firms. In fact, I would like to compliment the two firms employed to construct the highway—McMahon Constructions and Roche Bros Pty Ltd—on their work. One of the negatives is that the Telecom pay phone at Wild Horse Plains has been removed because the new highway passes over the original location of the telephone. Unfortunately, at this stage, Telecom has not relocated the telephone to another position within the vicinity of Wild Horse Plains. I have been approached by several constituents who have pointed out the absolute necessity for a telephone in that area. In fact, one lady wrote to me as follows:

It is very annoying, and stressful, when a woman alone, in an isolated farmhouse, has people knocking, banging, some asking, others demanding, to use a phone, because of a breakdown. We do not normally ask the people inside; but then one gets the case of a distraught baby, and so you ask them in. Even when they look genuine, you wonder, as they use the phone, and then ask for the toilet. One gives a sigh of relief, as they depart.

These types of instances are occurring with increasing regularity since the removal of the pay phone. In fact, there are many occasions where people are in genuine need of help, but there are other people who use that approach to gain entrance to a house in order to survey that house with an

ulterior motive down the track. I would urge Telecom to reconsider its decision and place a pay phone in Wild Horse Plains. I have already written to the Minister of Transport Development (Hon. Barbara Wiese) in case my approach to Telecom is unsuccessful. I have asked the Minister whether she will provide an emergency highway telephone, similar to the phones that are on the freeway, in Wild Horse Plains. I will leave that with the Minister, and I await her answer in due course.

The second point I wish to raise is the entrance into Windsor. Several years ago it was proposed that only one entrance would be provided. I was very thankful that the plans were changed to provide two entrances. The current owner of the store, Mr Perry, has pointed out to me that the proposed entrances, which are already pegged out, will not facilitate easy entrance into Windsor because they are not of a flow-in type. However, a flow-in type entrance is being provided into Dublin; the reason being that Dublin is apparently classified as a town whereas Windsor is classified as a settlement. Mr Perry's argument is, and I believe quite correctly: why should there be discrimination between a town and a settlement, particularly if that settlement may, in the future, become a town? This is very important because the proprietor of the service station at Lower Light (another small settlement along that highway) has lost 10 000 litres of petrol sales per week since the highway deviation occurred. In fact, according to one report, that has halved his income.

It is these small businesses that we must consider. I am taking this up with the Minister of Transport Development as well, seeking an urgent reconsideration so that the people of Windsor are not disadvantaged to a greater extent than people in other areas. I believe it would be very simple to provide a flow-in entrance, rather than to have a T-type junction into Windsor. I urge the Minister to use her intervention powers to seek such a change.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): Over many years, indeed it probably goes back a century or more, Parties and Governments of all political persuasions and attitudes have been attempting to ensure that discrimination is eradicated in our community—discrimination in all its many forms and manifestations as it affects employment and as it affects general social and other living conditions.

One by one the tests that used to be applied have either been made illegal or simply become redundant through changed community attitudes. Today in this place we had the Leader of the Opposition—the recycled former Tonkin Minister who has come back here and who aspires to be the Premier of South Australia—reintroducing discrimination in a test in the most outrageous way.

At one stage religion used to be a test for Public Service office and if you were a Catholic, under the various Acts passed by the British Parliament, you were specifically precluded from holding public office. If you converted to that religion, as a holder of an office, you would have to relinquish that position. Clearly, that is an outrageous situation which no longer exists, and race, sex, age and property—all of these tests, one by one, have been eliminated.

But the Leader of the Opposition has signalled today, loudly and clearly, that he wants to introduce a political test. It is not even an affiliation test, necessarily, because some of the examples he gave did not involve affiliation. Rather, it is a test of political sentiment or leaning and this is to be apparently the qualification for office in the Public Service,

irrespective of the talents, abilities or professionalism of the professionals involved.

Over the years, quite appropriately, former members of Parliament have taken their place on committees and boards established by Government. They have been drawn from both sides of the House. They have been people who have particular talents and skill to offer, and I think it would be generally accepted on both sides of the House that it would be a great waste not to so use the talents and energies of retired members of Parliament. But the Leader of the Opposition ignores that aspect; there is no political test applied there.

I think it is fair to say that those persons so appointed have in fact transcended any particular political affiliation they have in the way in which they have discharged their duties. But when one gets to the professionals in the Public Service it appears that this political test is to be applied. If you were a candidate or if you had been a member of a ministerial staff then, somehow, that precludes you from in fact seeking and obtaining a position on your merits. This is the important point: the Leader of the Opposition was not, as I understand it, criticising the procedures. He was not saying that the Government Management and Employment Act and the selection committee process had been overridden. He did not make those allegations because, of course, he cannot in any of the cases he cited. It was simply the fact that the appointment was made; that in itself was sufficient. And if such people with such a background, on their merits, by those appropriate selection processes manage to land the job that is bad luck, according to the Leader of the Opposition: they are ineligible for that appointment. They will be named in Parliament and therefore their whole career and their standing will be jeopardised.

The Leader's perspective is that no Government ministerial assistant or anybody with that kind of perspective can get a job; he forgets his own ministerial experience. But equally no public servant therefore dare have political preference or offer themselves for Parliament and that will further demean the political process and close off many persons of talent from seeking office as they appropriately should.

It can have sinister connotations. Look at the Bjelke-Petersen Cabinet and Police Commissioner Whitrod and the speculation, I understand, about his political leanings. Worse than that, the Leader compounded his sin in proposing the political test by going further and naming people and getting his facts wrong. Surely that must cause considerable uneasiness among his colleagues who purport to seek office and among the Public Service.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I can assure the member for Ross Smith that we are totally behind the Leader of the Opposition and he will be the next Premier of South Australia. I can assure him of that matter right here and now. I might say that, as the honourable member said, you may have to start learning to play baseball because there are only nine in a baseball team; you will not be able to field a cricket team after the next election. However, returning to my grievance, Mr Deputy Speaker, I have been in politics for only seven years and there is one department—

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER:—and I might share the view of the honourable member over there—that seems in every case to be trying to stop people getting on with their business and creating some wealth for South Australia. Like the member

for Ross Smith, who was complimenting the Leader of the Opposition on naming people, I name that department as the Department of Fisheries. It seems to me that they spend an inordinate amount of time trying to stop people carrying on with their business in a sensible way that gives benefit not only to them but to the State of South Australia.

This morning I went to see the Minister about one Jamie Matheson who held a Commonwealth fishing licence, but unfortunately the Minister was not very well briefed so we did not get far. If you hold a Commonwealth fishing licence that means that you can long line and drop line and fish for any species outside State waters. Jamie Matheson, after a considerable period of time experimenting, decided that he would fish for king crabs. He paid \$8 000 for his licence; he spent some \$50 000 making up pots so that he could go king crabbing. He not only wrote to the Commonwealth people to say what he was going to do but also wrote to the State people to say that he was going to specialise in catching king crab.

It was a Commonwealth licence, and it has been decided that the permit for king crab will be handed back to the States. There is nothing wrong with that at all, but when the person concerned tried to renew his licence in February 1993 he sent the money off in January and received the reply and the new licence from the Federal department on 21 June 1993 but they did not have the endorsement about king crabs because they said it was going back to the State.

I had a meeting with the ex-Director of Fisheries, who said, 'Yes, I remember that. We can fix that but I am no longer the Director. It can be done with the stroke of a pen.' I rang the new Director or Acting Director and he said, 'It's not that easy. I will have to see the Minister.' In the meantime someone whose livelihood is at stake has not been able to fish because the stroke of a pen cannot be put to that bit of paper. I went to see the Minister, hoping that it could be fixed immediately. Here we have a gentleman who could go bankrupt because we cannot get someone to put pen to paper.

Do you think I got any further this morning? I did not. The Minister said, 'I can't do this.' I said, 'This guy will go broke.' He said, 'No, I cannot do this.' I lined up the ex-Director of Fisheries and said, 'Do you remember the conversation that we had in my office a month ago?' He said, 'I remember it but we cannot do it now.' And someone in South Australia, who is a small business person, will go broke because the Minister does not have the guts to give him an interim licence for 12 months while the matter is sorted out. The Treasurer may look worried as an ex-Minister because I am sure that he would have fixed it up.

I rang Mr Matheson today and he was in tears because his livelihood has been put at stake, and my advice to him was: 'You will have to test the system. Go out and get your crab pots, because if you don't test the system I cannot bring it to a head.' I put on notice concerning those people involved in fisheries and the Minister that it is a total injustice to this person to force him into this position because the Minister does not have the guts to make a decision.

That is the problem we have in primary industry at present. No-one can do anything. We cannot get the Minister to pay for the strychnine to fix the mouse plague because he cannot make a decision. Farmers are going bankrupt through want of a decision; fishermen are out there potentially going broke because he cannot put the pen to paper, and he is being aided and abetted by the people in the department who will not put the facts in front of the Minister so that he may be goaded, with parliamentary privilege, into doing something

to help this gentleman. Jamie Matheson may be a scapegoat but I am going to make sure he does not go broke.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Business and Regional Development): I rise to speak on a local electorate matter and it is one concerned with a survey that I have conducted in the Salisbury area in terms of crime prevention and sentencing. I think all members will be aware of my very strong support for Neighbourhood Watch, School Watch and also my plan for a Business Watch for the John Street and Parabanks area.

Recently I attended a public meeting in Salisbury with local police and business people to try to engender some support for a business watch plan for the John Street-Parabanks area. I was keen to ascertain what support there was locally for an expansion of Neighbourhood Watch and was pleased to see massive and overwhelming support from my survey of 200 respondents in the Salisbury area for Neighbourhood Watch and other local crime prevention initiatives. There was also very strong support for the recent legislative changes in juvenile justice, including stiffer penalties for repeat offenders and for the Crown's appeals against lenient sentences handed down by the courts.

However, I was most concerned about the very negative attitude found locally against judges. It is clear that many locals believe that magistrates and judges are not in touch with the concern of the public, the Government and, indeed, Parliament about crime and sentencing. During the past 10 years many legislative changes have involved much stiffer penalties for major crimes—drug dealers, and so on. However, those who were contacted by my survey felt that judges were ignoring the stiffer penalties approved by Parliament. There was also a very strong view locally that judges and magistrates had little contact with citizens in our northern suburbs and little understanding of local concerns.

I want to make it clear in this House, speaking as a local member, that it is vital that the community should maintain its respect for our judicial system. Indeed, it is very important, too, that there should be strong community respect for the rule of law which underpins our democratic society and the values that we hold dear. It is important that the judiciary should maintain its absolute—I repeat, absolute—independence from political interference. However, independence does not necessarily equate with being out of touch. Certainly there are remedies that we can all take to try to build bridges between the community and the judiciary.

After contacts and discussions in my office with several local Neighbourhood Watch chairpersons, I have written to the Chief Justice, the Hon. Len King, inquiring whether a judge and a magistrate would be willing to address a combined meeting of Neighbourhood Watch committee members in the Salisbury area. I hope that Chief Justice King and his colleagues will view such a meeting as being both useful for Neighbourhood Watch and for the judiciary to hear constructive straight talk from locals. Indeed, I have to say that it was very clear from views expressed locally that people believed—

Mrs KOTZ: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I move:

That for the remainder of the session Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable standing committee reports, except those relating to subordinate legislation or supplementary development plan matters, on presentation to be dealt with in accordance with Standing Order 346.

Motion carried.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That for the remainder of the session Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable private members' business to be conducted in the manner set out in the paper I have distributed.

With the indulgence of the House, I will not read it because of its length, but it is in precisely the same form as the previous session.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am well aware that the Deputy Premier mentioned that these are the same sessional orders as those that applied in the last session. I sought to take a point of order during one of the private members' sessions when we were noting committees on the time allocated for members to speak to motions. I was referring to Standing Orders under which we are entitled to speak for 20 minutes. It was pointed out that under private members, because of what this Parliament decided, we were entitled to 15 minutes only. I was a little upset at the time. I feel that now is the opportunity for me to bring this forward and put it to the Parliament that private members' time is to allow members to bring forward matters of particular concern to themselves. We have been cut back by five minutes from the normal 20 minutes to 15 minutes according to the proposed sessional orders. I hope that it might be possible for an amendment to be accepted to the effect that we agree to these sessional orders with the exception that, where the speaking time for a mover is 15 minutes, we should insert 20 minutes.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I understand the point being made by the member for Goyder. I oppose his proposition, not because I am necessarily against it but because the sessional orders run the gauntlet of the Standing Orders Committee. I understand it was a unanimous decision of the Standing Orders Committee. If there is to be any variation, I suggest that the proper way is to refer the matter to the Liberal Party's representatives on the Standing Orders Committee and for them to take it up. I may or may not agree with what is proposed in its entirety, never mind a small point about the length of time, but I concede that the proper way to do this is through the Standing Orders Committee and I can only urge the House to reject any alteration prior to the matter going to the Standing Orders Committee.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 5 August. Page 127.)

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I welcome the opportunity to participate in what I expect to be the last Address in Reply debate before the election. In doing so, I acknowledge the continued distinguished public service of our Governor, Her Excellency. I always find that she is so refreshing and that she does such a superb performance at any public function she attends.

I think today is an appropriate time to reflect on the performance of this Labor Government in its dying days. Twelve months ago we had a Premier who was forced to resign in absolute disgrace after the biggest financial disaster that this State, in fact this country, has ever seen from a Government. Members will recall the absolute disgrace that the then Premier stood in—that is, the member for Ross Smith—and the fact that he was actually pushed from office by his own colleagues and was forced to resign.

In his place we have the present Premier who promised a new start even though, largely, the same tired old faces still remained within the Cabinet. He promised to all South Australians decisive leadership. He wanted to be different, and he certainly was. I mean, after all, who but he could say, within the space of one short press conference, that the untenable was now quite tenable? Who but he could say that he was going to introduce a new era of political stability for South Australia when he has a Cabinet Minister who says publicly that the factions control the Government—factions with slush funds, which hate each other more than they hate the Liberal Party?

Mr Holloway: That is not true.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, that is what the now Minister for Primary Industries has said publicly—that there are factions running this Government and that those factions have slush funds. We would like to know what the slush funds are used for and where they come from. He went on to say that the factions themselves hate each other more than they hate the Liberal Party in this State. He is the first person to claim that we now have a new confidence in South Australia when our State has almost 34 000 people unemployed for 12 months or more. He really is a unique Premier in making those sorts of claims and he seems to actually believe them.

I would like now to issue a challenge to the Premier to come into this debate and respond to the following facts that I am about to put before the House. They are facts that show quite clearly that Labor has failed and that he, as Premier, has failed this State. They are facts that show that Labor must go before we can rebuild confidence in the future of this State. In an interview published in the *Advertiser* of 16 December 1992, the Premier said:

South Australians should give him until the middle of next year—that is, the end of June 1993—

before making up their minds about his performance. The first half of next year is a very important time in which either the opportunities will be taken up or they won't be.

Another fundamental statement by the Premier. It goes on:

I think the electorate at large will be asking some questions mid next year as to how we have done in the first nine months.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I would like to point out to the House that I think that those in the electorate have made up their minds. We need only look at the opinion poll from *Time* magazine that was published over the weekend. It would appear that the Premier is quite right—that he should be given until the end of June this year when people can pass judgment upon him—and it would appear that they have made their judgment on this Government and done so in a very resounding manner, judging it not fit to be returned to office no matter when or where the election is held.

Mr Venning: It is time to go.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is certainly time to go, and the Premier himself has simply asked the people to pass this

judgment. I pick up the other very important point: he said that there are opportunities to be taken up and either they will be taken up or they won't be by the middle of this year. In other words he himself has put down the conditions and the timeframe under which he and his Government wish to be judged.

Let us look at whether or not those opportunities have, in fact, been taken up by his Government, and the obvious answer is they have not been taken up. What has changed? Absolutely nothing. Before looking at the Premier's performance and that of his Government, I remind the House of what the Premier has promised since last September when he first became Premier—what standards he set for himself to be judged by. On the day the factions decided that he should become Premier (3 September 1992) he had this to say:

Today marks a new beginning for the Government and the people of South Australia—I will lead a renewed, reinvigorated Government committed to overcoming South Australia's recurrent problems.

I ask all members whether we have overcome our problems? Has it been a renewed and reinvigorated Government? Certainly not. We will find that the current polls are actually lower than when the Premier took office on 1 September 1992. They have actually declined during that period and you, Mr Acting Speaker, sit there obviously embarrassed as a member of that Government. Then on 17 September 1992, the Premier promised 'a new era of cooperation between the State Government and the private sector.

Again, I put to this House, what has occurred? What is now the assessment of the private sector regarding this Government? The answer is that people have completely lost confidence in this Government. It has gone into a freeze in decision making which is now costing the private sector in South Australia very dearly. On 29 September 1992, the day on which the Premier announced his so-called coalition agreement, he said:

South Australia's historic coalition will provide a new era of political stability and achievement for the State.

Some coalition of political stability! Look at the situation in Napier where we saw the Premier out in front of a kindergarten reading a book with the headline 'Decision Making' and there at the back of the room we had the now Minister of Primary Industries sitting one seat away from the endorsed Labor Party candidate for the seat of Napier, Annette Hurley. The two are fighting with each other like cat and dog, and there was the Premier, in front of kindergarten children, talking about decision making. Some decision making when, in fact, this Government is in absolute tatters as we all know! On the day that the Premier introduced the economic statement to this House (22 April this year) he promised:

A new confidence in the future of South Australia will be generated by the Meeting the Challenge package of policy announcements.

I point out to the House and to South Australians that, since the Premier made that profound announcement on 22 April this year, confidence in South Australia has been on one continual downward slide, almost like a long and continuous slippery dip that will obviously continue until we get to the election.

I have heard this Premier promise to South Australians a new beginning, a new era, a new confidence in the future and, apparently, his very presence alone was going to guarantee this. But behind the words there has been nothing fresh, nothing new from this Labor Party whatsoever. It is the same tired old rhetoric. Indeed, this is the ultimate tragedy for the

people of South Australia—that nothing has changed except the Premier, the naming of the Ministers and the formation of the coalition. Since Labor's election almost 11 years ago, the rhetoric has never stopped and the action has never begun. Words and more words—and precious little else.

More words have come from the lips of this Premier than from perhaps any other member, with the one exception, of course, of the previous Premier, the now disgraced member for Ross Smith. And some disgrace he is. He creates a real anger throughout the whole of South Australia—anger that he should still be sitting in this Chamber despite the misleading of this Parliament and despite the loss of \$3 150 million of taxpayers funds, and receiving his salary and building up his own superannuation. It is a disgrace and an embarrassment to members opposite.

He has no right whatsoever to sit in this Parliament and continue to receive the perks of being a member of Parliament in the form of salary and other benefits, when he has inflicted upon South Australians the worst financial disaster of Government in the whole history of Australia. He should leave this place in disgrace and apologise to South Australians. We do not wish to see him again.

Mr S.J. Baker: And he should take some of his mates with him.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: He should take all his mates with him; we do not wish to see them either. It seems that merely by the use of words our present Premier believes he can change things. Of course, he has gone from the untenable to the tenable. He has talked about the new era that will begin and about political stability when, in fact, nothing whatsoever has changed. I would like to put to the House a number of the key facts about the performance of South Australia during the period in which the Labor Government has been in office.

We have lost a share of national population. If we had maintained a growth rate equal to that in the rest of Australia, we would have been far better off in population than at present, but the fact that we have been below that national growth rate means that we have lost a share equivalent to the total population of the following cities in this State: Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Port Lincoln. All those towns have been lost in equivalent population over the past 11 years because we have not been able to maintain a growth rate equal to that in the rest of Australia.

That is a real tragedy for this State. I referred to Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Port Lincoln. I wonder whether the Deputy Premier will have the hide to go and tell his own electorate that. I wonder whether you, Madam Acting Speaker, will notify the people of Port Augusta of that fact, or whether the people of Port Pirie will ever find out before the next election, from this Labor Government, what it has done in terms of reduction in population within this State. Over the past 11 years, our population growth rate has been less than half that of Western Australia and Queensland.

The real tragedy underlying these figures is that young people, in particular, have been forced to go to other States in Australia and, in some cases, to other countries, simply to find a job opportunity. That is the real disgrace of the lack of economic development and economic activity here in South Australia.

I now turn to the economy and to jobs. In the mid 1980s, our economy was about the same size as that of Western Australia. Now, it is forecast that, by 1995, the Western Australian economy will be 43 per cent greater than the South Australian. In other words, in the short space of 10 years under a Labor Government in this State, our economy is now

about 43 per cent smaller than that of Western Australia. What a disgrace to be hanging over the head of any Government!

Let us look at some more facts. During the life of this Government, employment in Queensland and Western Australia has grown by at least three times the level here in South Australia: three times the job opportunities for young people, compared with South Australia. The loss of our State—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is not just that we are turning into a rest home, but I point out that we are turning into a retirement village under the Labor Government, with a huge debt hanging around its neck. The loss of our share of national employment equates to 26 000 jobs over the life of this Government—almost seven jobs a day for every day that it has been in office over the past 11 years. South Australia's unemployment level has been above 10 per cent since July 1991 with no sign of its easing back below the double digit figure.

Over the life of the previous Liberal Government, unemployment was below 45 000. Under this Government, it has averaged more than 60 000, and this is increasing every month. Over the past four years alone, the number of long-term unemployed in South Australia has almost doubled. The number of those without work for at least a year has increased from 17 300 to 33 900. What a disgrace: a doubling of the number of people unemployed for 12 months. Only South Australia's low population and low labour force growth rates prevent this unemployment level going much higher. In other words, people have left the State to look for jobs.

Currently, only three of Australia's top 50 companies have their headquarters in Adelaide—only three of 50. In 1980, 88 South Australian based companies were listed on the Stock Exchange. Now that figure has been reduced to 39, even though the number of companies listed has actually increased. The growth of incorporation of new businesses in South Australia is only 5 per cent of the national total when, in fact, we share 8.5 per cent of the national population. Our share of Australia's exports is slipping. In the past 10 years it has slipped from 6.9 per cent to a current level of 6.2 per cent.

This financial year new private capital investment in South Australia was 3.6 per cent lower than in the previous year, compared with a national growth rate of 5 per cent. We are the only State to have actually recorded a decline. While new private capital investment has declined by 3.6 per cent, the level in the rest of Australia has grown, and grown fairly significantly.

The loss of our share of national retail sales over the past 10 years equates to about \$450 million a year. Consumer confidence in South Australia remains lower than that of any other State, as measured by movements in retail sales. In the March quarter they were 3.1 per cent lower than they were in the same period 12 months ago. In other words, while retail sales in the rest of Australia are increasing, here in South Australia they are actually continuing to decline on an annual basis.

The last fact is that over the past 10 years South Australia's annual motor vehicle registrations have actually declined from 46 500 to 37 500, yet we have a Premier who talked today about renewed confidence in the motor vehicle industry. I point out to the Premier that this State is not playing its part in that renewed confidence in the motor vehicle industry, because our sales have actually declined by almost 10 000 in that period.

I now turn to this Government's financial record. Under this Government, public sector debt has grown at the rate of more than \$1.4 million a day for every day this Government has been in office. We are paying almost \$2 million a day in interest payments alone on that debt: that is more than 50¢ in every tax dollar collected from South Australians. The Government attempts to perpetuate the myth that reductions in Commonwealth funding are a major cause of this budgetary problem that we face in this State. In fact, if we look at the detail, we find that Commonwealth funding for South Australia has kept pace with inflation ever since this Government was elected, so the debt problem is not due to a cut back in funding from Canberra. At the same time, this Government has increased its revenue from taxes, fees and fines by a real 173 per cent in that 11 year period. Looking at the State taxes alone, we see that the growth rate in taxation over the past 10 years has been the highest of any State in Australia.

So, here we are with the highest unemployment, this huge escalation in debt, brought about by this Government, and this huge payment each day of \$2 million in interest payments. In addition, we find that this tax grab by this State Labor Government has been the highest increase of any State in Australia. Just listen to these figures. Annual State taxation *per capita* has increased from \$396 in 1981-82 under the Liberal Government to \$1 141 now, under this Labor Government. That is how expensive to South Australians 11 years of Labor Government have been; it is almost a threefold increase in the level of taxes grabbed by this Government. In 1981-82, *per capita* State taxation in South Australia was 79 per cent of the average for the whole of Australia. It is now 86 per cent, and this equates to an additional \$90 per year for every man, woman and child in this State. I am delighted that the Deputy Premier and Treasurer has come into the House, because—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: I have been here all the time. I have great patience.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I apologise if you have been hiding while you were here, but I point out that as Treasurer under this Labor Government you have a hell of a lot to answer for, despite the statements that you continuously make, trying to mislead people. It is quite clear—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison): Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The Deputy Premier has a point of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: My point of order is that the Leader is making an accusation that I misled the House. I would suggest that that can be made only by way of a substantive motion, and I request that you draw Standing Orders to the attention of the Leader and ask him to withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I understand the point of order, and I point out to the Leader that he has the facility to use a substantive motion to make those types of allegations.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I withdraw the word 'mislead', but it is quite clear that the Deputy Premier has made many statements that give a false impression of the taxation record of this Labor Government. Let me summarise—

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On a point of order, the Leader has again made an accusation that impugns my character. He is able to do that only by way of substantive motion, and I request, Madam, that you ask him to withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I would like a clarification from the Deputy Premier: what did he wish to be withdrawn?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I wish him to withdraw the accusation that I have misled the House by giving a false picture of the Government's taxation record.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold that point of order, but I ask the Leader to watch his wording, and I would ask him to address the Chair.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Certainly, Madam Acting Speaker. In summary, let us look in human cost terms at what 11 years of Labor Government has meant to our industry. This is not my assessment. Listen to the damning words of the former State ALP Minister and former Federal ALP Minister, Peter Duncan, in his foreword to journalist Chris Kenny's recently published book. This is the Labor Party's former Minister passing his view on what he thinks of this Bannon/Arnold Government over the past 11 years. He states:

South Australia's whole history has been a struggle against the odds to provide a reasonable standard of living for the people of this State. . . now, our past achievements have been virtually wiped out in just one decade.

Here we have the Labor Party damning the Labor Government of South Australia, with a former State and Federal Minister saying that this Bannon/Arnold Government over the past decade has virtually wiped out all that this State has achieved over more than 150 years of its history.

Under Sir Thomas Playford we had an unparalleled period of economic growth. Under the Hall and Dunstan Administrations, the State modernised and embarked upon a number of important social reforms. During the life of the last Liberal Government, our achievements were substantial. Let me run through that list of achievements. In just three years of Liberal Government this is what was achieved. We ensured that the Roxby Downs project proceeded in the face of Labor Party opposition. We ensured that the O-Bahn was developed, first as a concept and then as a reality, again against Labor Party opposition. We ensured that Technology Park, Adelaide proceeded despite its rejection by the Labor Party when I first announced it. There were 1 000 jobs involved in that development. Every good idea that was put forward by the Liberal Party, even though it was widely accepted by the community, was opposed by the Labor Party.

We developed the Stony Point gas/liquids scheme. We facilitated Adelaide's first international hotel, something that Labor in the previous 10 years could not achieve. We secured Federal Government support to build the first international air terminal at Adelaide Airport and gained Adelaide's first international flight. We initiated the River Torrens Linear Park. We commenced the redevelopment of cultural institutions along Adelaide's North Terrace. I ask what has occurred to that redevelopment over the past 10 years. Absolutely nothing! We negotiated a fair and far reaching land rights agreement with the Aboriginal people, something that the previous Labor Government could not achieve.

In three years, the former Liberal Government made major decisions and gained major achievements that this Government was not able to match over a 10 year period. We did all those things in a short three year period, and importantly they allowed this State to progress. Yet, over the past three years this Government has not even been able to allow the seagrass industry at Kingston to get approval to expand its operations. It has not even been able to give approval to one small industry to expand over the past three year period; yet, over

a three year period the Liberal Government achieved so much.

Through all the disasters of this Government only three Cabinet Ministers actually sat around the table for the full time. The present Premier is one of those three. He wants South Australia to believe that the only member responsible for the disasters of the State Bank, SGIC and Beneficial Finance is the member for Ross Smith. I agree that the member for Ross Smith has a great deal to answer for, but equally this Premier that we have at present has as much to answer for. After all, he was warned as early as 1987 about the impending crash of the State Bank.

He was warned that the board was inadequate, that the board did not have control over the dazzler Marcus Clark. He was warned, as we now find out, about some of the problems going on within Beneficial Finance. But what action did he take? Absolutely none! Before examining the present Premier's record in further detail, let me quote some of his own words from the 1993 Cabinet handbook. This is a book produced under his own hand as to how Cabinet should operate:

Central to the system of Cabinet government is the convention of the collective responsibility of Ministers for Government decisions.

So much for the present Premier's attempts to treat his predecessor as a leper. They both have the same disease. They have both been incompetent. They have both been negligent. The Premier must accept responsibility along with the former Premier, the member for Ross Smith. They have tried to dupe and deceive the people of South Australia. If the Premier's words in his Cabinet handbook are to mean anything at all, then he is infected with these failures just as much as the former Premier and he deserves the political judgment coming to him just as much as the member for Ross Smith has to cop his own political demise.

Of course, the present Premier began as Minister of Education in 1982. A child beginning his or her school life at that time is now looking at further education or employment opportunities, and what options do they have? Having personally benefited himself from the expanded university system made possible by the previous State and Federal Liberal Governments, the legacy of this Premier and his Party to future generations is less opportunity in education and less opportunity in employment.

This Premier, as Education Minister, set in train the policies that have reduced standards in our primary and secondary schools. More recently, as Minister responsible for industry, he has presided over an unprecedented decline in South Australia's manufacturing base. In the past two years alone he has lost 21 000 manufacturing jobs: the equivalent of five Mitsubishi plants. Yet, he had the hide to stand in this House today and boast about how there have been a few hundred extra jobs created in the car industry of South Australia, when he has lost 21 000 manufacturing jobs—the equivalent of five Mitsubishi plants.

Again, members do not have to accept my words about this to conclude that as industry Minister the Premier was a complete failure. We can look at the conclusions of the Arthur D. Little study and its reference to the economic development policy of this Labor Government:

. . . has been one of 'shooting any bird that flies past' rather than planning for the future economic well-being of the State.

We can look also at the conclusions of the Centre for Economic Studies assessing the record of this Government over the past decade:

... looking back over this period, what is remarkable is the absence of any clearly enunciated economic development strategy for this State.

For 11 years the Labor Government has driven this State's economy without any central strategy whatsoever, and we have suffered as a State. An examination of the Premier's track record on his overseas trade missions bears out the point that this Government has had no strategy whatsoever but has simply tried to grab any opportunity passing by without any coherent policy to attract interest and investment on a sustained basis. By my own account the Premier has made at least nine overseas trips since 1987 and they have cost taxpayers more than \$200 000. They have produced many press reports promising investment in South Australia but little else.

Let me remind the House of some of the things that the Premier has promised during or immediately after these trips: greater access to China's technology market, the establishment of a manufacturing plant by Hyundai Corporation of Korea, a joint venture between South Australia and Thailand to market computer software, heads of agreement for a \$40 million engineering project in Thailand, supply of major railway telecommunications and signalling system for Thailand, South Australian involvement in a multi-million dollar consortium for the design, supply and installation of computerised irrigation systems in Turkey and Iranian contracts based on South Australian expertise in automotive components, shipbuilding and agricultural research.

An honourable member: Where are they all?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Exactly. Where are they? These are actual announcements made by the present Premier as a result of various overseas trips since 1987: trips that have cost \$200 000. I have found that all these announcements have two common features. First, there has been the press publicity for the Premier suggesting that these things are to happen merely as a result of the fact that he has gone overseas. Secondly, I have found no follow-up evidence that any of these projects have materialised on the scale promised. In fact, I know from firsthand experience that they were ranked tenth in the world when it came to the irrigation project in Turkey, and there has been no subsequent announcement.

In fact, I happened to hear the original announcement by the Premier when he was going for that project, and it was couched in words that they had actually 'won the project'. That is how he put it: the clear implication was there that South Australia was in this era of exporting its irrigation technology to Turkey, because there were these huge irrigation dams going in. I was not here in Parliament at the time. I happened to be director of a company called AACM; a company that had actually completed very successfully two major contracts in Turkey.

Do members realise that this Premier, as Minister responsible, specifically excluded AACM from the consortium from South Australia which was to go for that project? It actually excluded the only South Australian company that had had two successful contracts in Turkey. It was interesting to see, because initially AACM—forced out of this State to go with someone else—was ranked in the consortium that it went with as number one for this particular project, but eventually lost it to a British company after some quick deals from England. And here was the now Premier's own attempt,

and that was ranked tenth. That is how dishonest this man has been in telling the truth to the people of South Australia.

We also know how little has been achieved by him in export markets. I know that from personal experience, particularly in China and in some other areas. He keeps announcing these heads of agreement that he has signed. Having been involved in negotiations in China and in the Middle East, can I point out that heads of agreement are a dime a dozen. Anyone can sit down and sign a heads of agreement. In fact, the Chinese would always want me to sign at least a heads of agreement, regardless of how well the negotiations were going, so that they could take back to their principals the fact that they had made some achievement and headway in the negotiations. I point out that, legally, they had no standing whatsoever; but this Premier stands up and announces these heads of agreement that he keeps signing as though they are going to lead to some benefit for South Australians.

There is only one thing that counts, and that is the final completed contract, the commencement of that contract and the money being paid for it. Anyone who thinks otherwise is a fool, and I am afraid that, frankly, we have a Premier who is a fool because of the way he constantly announces these heads of agreement without any final contract. In all the words of promise that this Premier has uttered over the years about success to follow his overseas trade missions leading to firm contracts, South Australia would have been well ahead in the export race if just a few of those major contracts had come off. In Shandong Province, with which we have a sister relationship and to where this Government has made numerous trips and literally now poured in millions of dollars, the only very large contract signed by Shandong Province is one that I happened to sign, worth \$A6.5 million, and it was signed with no help or assistance from the South Australian Government at all.

We all recall the Premier's bungling of the Marineland project, which has cost the State so dearly in terms of our reputation in China. The Premier promised it would produce \$35 million in investment in South Australia. Instead, the taxpayers had to fork out \$11 million. Despite Labor's rhetoric about exports over the past 10 years, Australia has actually gone backwards in Asia. Take countries like China, Malaysia and Hong Kong. We have lost half of our market share in percentage terms over the past 10 years. Our record is abysmal. It is hardly surprising that the Premier was such a failure as a Minister, particularly since he has been unable to manage the factions within his own Party.

It was this Premier who said, on the day he was elected to the position, that he would persuade the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services and the Minister of Primary Industries to return to the Labor Party. I am delighted that the Minister of Primary Industries is here because we know what he has said about the Labor factions. I am delighted to see the extent to which he is sitting here smiling and nodding his head in agreement with what I am saying. When I sit down the Minister might like to participate in the Address in Reply debate and tell us in somewhat more detail the exact nature of the hatred between the factions of the Labor Party. Could he also explain to the House the nature of the slush funds that he mentioned? What are the slush funds used for, and where does the money come from? Is the Minister willing to give us these sorts of details?

Members of Parliament are required to clearly set out their pecuniary interests, so I believe it is time that we were made aware of the pecuniary interests of the various factions of the

Labor Party. If members opposite are controlled not by their own conscience but by their factions, and if the factions have substantial funds, perhaps we should have a pecuniary interests register for Labor Party factions and an annual declaration about what moneys have been received. I thought that the Government of Japan was one of the few remaining Governments, up until several weeks ago, that relied on slush funds. That Government has been brought into public disgrace over the maintenance of that system. The Minister of Primary Industries himself said that the South Australian Labor Government (now that the Liberal Government in Japan has fallen) is one of the few remaining Governments in the western world which maintains a system controlled by factions and slush funds. I challenge the Labor Party to come clean on where this slush fund money comes from, how it is used and where it is spent.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Who is controlling it?

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That was a very telling interjection from the Minister of Primary Industries. He said the slush funds are being used in the seat of Napier, and they are being organised by the present member for Napier. Let the present member for Napier stand up and tell the people of South Australia exactly how much money is being spent in these slush funds, where they are being spent and how they are being spent in Napier. I think it is about time this Parliament and the people of South Australia heard the truth on this matter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I admire the courage of the Minister in coming out and telling the truth about this matter. All of us on this side issue a challenge to the member for Napier to tell us, first, how big the slush fund is for Napier, secondly, where it has come from and, thirdly, how it is being spent. I want the member for Napier to have the courage and commitment to stand up and tell the people of this State the details of the slush fund.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has the floor—I think.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I was welcoming the interjections, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will determine whether they are welcome.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am sure that it is important that the House spend some time and hear the truth. As Leader of the Opposition, I am prepared to make sure that we always give adequate time for the member for Napier to stand up and give us an honest and full disclosure about the slush funds—where they come from and where they are spent. Of course, it was this Premier who promised to accommodate the member for Torrens in the Legislative Council; and it was this Premier who humiliated the Government Whip and the member for Henley Beach in particular by decreeing that none of the Labor backbenchers was suitable for appointment to the ministry—he had to go off and find two independents instead. As recently as 23 June this year—and I am sure the Minister of Primary Industries has heard this before—the Premier said this of the situation in Napier:

I believe it's not a sustainable position for the Party to go divided to an election and that will not happen.

This was the Premier's untenable position. But, only a fortnight later, in that infamous press conference, suddenly the untenable became tenable. The Premier said that he had made the Minister of Primary Industries an offer but the Minister had declined it. Let us look at what the Minister of Primary Industries said about this offer.

The Hon. T.R. Groom: There was no offer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Premier told a press conference that he had made an offer to the Minister of Primary Industries, and we now have the Minister of Primary Industries interjecting across the House and saying that there was no offer. There is nothing new about that, because what the Minister had to say shortly after that infamous press conference was this:

There were no options put to me of any significant nature and even if they were I would have rejected them if it meant me joining the Party. For me to even contemplate rejoining the Party there would have to be a return to democracy and that's not the case. They started a reform process after the preselection fiasco of last year but they've never done anything about bringing about reform.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, the factions are hovering around. Notice how they keep their hands in their pocket, clutching the slush funds.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader must not refer to people in the gallery.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They put their hands in their pocket and they clutch those slush funds. The Minister of Primary Industries also said:

The factions are a curse on the Labor Party. I think what's occurring with regard to the parliamentary Labor Party is you are seeing South Terrace running North Terrace.

There is even more. I quote further:

The factions hate one another more than they do the Liberals—they are parties within parties. They have slush funds. They require levies from people who are members of the factions. They are always fighting one another. I've got no doubt that there will be Federal intervention in the affairs of the Labor Party at some stage.

All this, Mr Deputy Speaker, from a member of the Cabinet; all this from a Minister of the Government. So much for the Premier's so-called political stability and Cabinet solidarity. This is a Cabinet Minister saying that the factions—not the Government—are in control; this is a Minister saying that it is all run by slush funds, not by the Cabinet. What a shame! This indictment of Labor comes from a Minister who has been the most competent of a very bad bunch since his appointment in September last year.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will say that again, for the Minister. All these quotes about dissension, slush funds and factions of the Labor Party come from a Minister who has been the best of a very appalling bad bunch of Ministers.

Here is a Cabinet that is now completely disregarding what South Australia requires. It has ignored the needs of South Australia; it is looking after itself. These people are even starting to put their own kind and their own supporters into key positions within the ranks of the Public Service on long term tenure under various contracts.

We have a Premier who is now incapable of providing any leadership to this State. Consider the issues and whether any leadership was provided. Mabo: the Premier has clutched the coat-tails of Keating throughout the Mabo issue. He is the last remaining Premier in the whole of Australia still to be

clutching those coat-tails of Keating, our Prime Minister. Every other State has now had the commonsense to desert the hopeless and untenable position put down by Keating on Mabo.

We have world heritage listing with our present Premier standing in no man's land looking like a fool. We have the failure to embrace any industrial relations reform in South Australia. Even the Federal Labor Party is arguing that non-unionists should be allowed to participate in enterprise agreements. Not the Labor Party of South Australia. Unless you happen to be a member of a trade union, no-one can participate in an enterprise agreement. It wants to specifically exclude 60 per cent of South Australians under State industrial awards.

Look at the failure of this Premier to establish any credible strategy to encourage investment and employment opportunities in South Australia. What has the Premier done to save the jobs that have been lost recently? What did he do over the SA Brewing incident? Absolutely nothing. In fact, I point out that the people who wanted to get to the Premier and put a case to him could not even get to the Premier until after the announcement had been made public; they could not get access to the Premier.

Who, from this Government, went off to save Homestake from moving its head office out of South Australia? The answer is no-one. Who went to ABB Power Transmission to save 80 jobs leaving South Australia? No-one. Who has been to Pirelli Cables to save the loss of something like 70 or 80 jobs out of South Australia? The answer is no-one. Who went to Email to stop the transfer of 400 jobs in the washing machine division from South Australia across to New South Wales? The answer is no-one. This Government has sat there on its hands throughout the royal commission and did nothing on the State Bank; it is doing nothing now to save the loss of jobs out of South Australia.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have already said that the Minister of Primary Industries is by far the outstanding Minister of a very bad bunch, although I do challenge him. What has the Minister done to curb the mounting primary industry debt and crisis in South Australia? Even he has done precious little on that issue. What has his Government done, for instance, to make sure there is tourism infrastructure developed in South Australia? Again, I say 'absolutely precious little'.

As I said earlier, the Government has now decided to start to appoint its cronies, the Labor Party cronies, to more senior positions within the Public Service, and put them in on five year contracts or permanent positions, so that when there is a change of Government members opposite have their Labor cronies in key positions throughout the public sector. That is an absolute disgrace. As a result of that, I have written to the Premier (he indicated during Question Time today that he had my letter) and pointed out a number of things, but I put a specific request to him that he immediately stop making such appointments, that he abide by the Westminster system of Parliament, and in fact make sure that no political appointments are being made to senior positions or Labor Party cronies being upgraded within the public sector immediately prior to the election.

I refer to the Minister of Business and Regional Development, who thinks he is really the dazzler, and is prepared to make a commitment of taxpayers' money via the Grand Prix Board of \$1.3 million to get Michael Jackson here in South Australia. What an appalling set of priorities, when in fact

that could supply 60 teaching positions within our education system. He would rather have one concert from Michael Jackson at a cost of \$1.3 million than have a further 60 teachers in our schools for 12 months. It is absolutely appalling!

Very quickly, in the few minutes left, I would like to go back and look at some of the promises made to South Australia by this Government.

Mrs Kotz: You haven't time enough to go through all the promises.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I cannot go through them all but I will list just some of the key ones. Listen to these actual quotes—in 1982:

We will not increase State taxes. We will not allow State charges—like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges—to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

In 1985:

Teacher numbers will be maintained.

What have they been slashing—over 1 200 of them before the most recent cutbacks. In 1982 they promised:

We will halt funding cuts to our public hospitals.

In 1982 they promised:

Our major goal will be to get South Australians back to work in a productive way.

What is the record? Something like 40 000 more South Australians are out of work. In 1985 they promised:

South Australia is up and running. With the people behind us, our recovery is a reality. It's all coming together.

I would suggest not only have the wheels fallen off, but the engine has fallen out, we have run out of gas and we have a discredited driver. In 1989 they promised the people of South Australia:

South Australia is widely regarded as a safe place in which to live and work.

In 1982 they promised:

We will work with our farmers to reduce costs and expand markets.

I could go on and on. This Government's promises have meant absolutely nothing over the past 11 years. I wonder what promises we are about to get as we face another election. You can almost hear the words coming through now: 'More jobs, new industry, new investment for South Australia, new golden opportunities, the golden era is about to dawn upon us. We will reduce the waiting lists in our hospitals. We will give you more teachers. We will give you better education.'

That is the sort of trifling stuff they have put up election after election, with no regard whatsoever for any credibility as to whether or not they will deliver. The facts are they will not.

This Labor Government, for the past 11 years, has been an absolute disgrace. It has let down South Australians; it has destroyed our economy; it has lost our money; and it has lost our jobs. The quicker it goes, the better it will be for all South Australians. I am sure that the quicker the election is brought on, the quicker South Australians can start to rebuild their confidence and the economy.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I support the motion. Before I move into the theme of my contribution to the Address in Reply debate, I put to the House that the Minister of Primary Industries and the Leader of the Opposition have one common problem: too often they have a rush

of blood to the head, too often they have a desire for publicity at all costs and too often they lose their marbles.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Deputy Speaker, you know that this is my last speech on the Address in Reply. I noticed that when you made your contribution, Sir, you started by saying that it was your last Address in Reply speech. However, you will continue in another place. Being a very fine advocate for the working class men and women of this State, you will be representing their views in the other place. This is my last speech on the Address in Reply: you will hear no more from me in this forum; it will be my final chapter.

Judging by the one minute that I have been into this debate, members opposite are quite pleased that this is my final Address in Reply contribution. Indeed, there are some members on this side—in particular, the Minister of Primary Industries—who would like to think that this is my last contribution. But I should like to think that there are others outside who would be saddened by the fact that no more will I be able to make speeches in this House. I should like to think that in two weeks, when those gentle readers of *Hansard* open the volume and read that this is my final contribution, their pulse will quicken, their heart will flutter and they may feel a little more than sadness. I should also like to think that they look upon the member for Napier as the one person who is not afraid to stand up and say in this House the kinds of things that they want to hear, not the kind of rubbish that we have heard from the Leader of the Opposition.

When I was thinking of what theme to work around in this debate, I was tempted, it being my last one, to be scathing of certain members of Parliament, very much in the style of the former Senator Walsh. The member for Kavel is well aware of the way that the former Senator Walsh could carry on. Indeed, it was indicative of the way in which he made his final speech. If I recall, he gave more curry to members on his own side of politics than to others. However, on reflection, it did not seem right.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader to order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It is not my style. So, for my last hurrah, my speech will be of a more whimsical and reflective nature in the hope that more members opposite—because there are a few members opposite who listen to what I say and view me in a kindly light—will pay heed to what I say.

I might upset some of my colleagues on this side when I start talking about why this Government is in trouble. I would like to think that it does not come as a surprise to members opposite that this is the first time I have stood up and criticised the Government. I do it on numerous occasions.

The Hon. Dean Brown: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, there was an interjection from the front bench of the House to the effect that, because they have got members—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I deviate from my—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Not from my prepared text. Anyone sitting in the gallery who heard the way the alternative Premier tried to capitalise on a throwaway line by the Minister on the front bench—I did not hear it, but it was

a throwaway line, I take it—and tried to get it into *Hansard* would know the kind of person the Leader of the Opposition is—the man who professes to be a future Premier of this State. In that regard, I am glad that I am going out of this place, because I could think of at least four others who could wear the mantle of the Leader of the Liberal Party with integrity, pride and credibility and, whilst I may not agree with their politics, I agree with the way they carry out their political and personal lives. I will not name those four, but they know whom I mean. We had the alternative Leader playing cheap political tricks to get into *Hansard* a throwaway line from the Minister on the front bench. I have no time for the Minister on the front bench politically, but I will back him up as a Minister. But he does not need it.

One would be completely deluding oneself if one did not think the Government's standing in the community at the present time was very poor. It has been dented very badly by events involving the State Bank, the SGIC and other corporate disasters. Putting aside who was responsible for those disasters, they reflect only the corporate greed syndrome that has engulfed not only this State or this country but the whole of the Western world since the early 1980s.

Respectable bankers became corporate cowboys. In the private sector, shareholders were very happy at the increased dividends and did not even question the motives of those people charged to invest on their behalf. It was likewise with Governments: as long as the dividends were coming in, Governments tended to overlook the warning signs. The property market became the key to massive financial killings. If a person was in the property market, banks fell over themselves to lend that person money.

Much blame has been put on Governments—in particular the Federal Government—because of the high interest rates. Yet, during hearings by the Select Committee on Rural Finance, which you, Sir, so ably chaired, we heard evidence that banks were going out to rural communities, to the farmers, and twisting their arms to have them borrow money and making no pretence—not looking at the reserves of caution that banks should have when dealing with the rural sector. They went out of their way to get farmers to borrow money. If anyone opposite does not believe me, they ought to talk to the member for Eyre about how the banks treated farmers.

Those bankers knew full well that the day of reckoning would come. Well, the day of reckoning did come and the results have been horrific. I am putting aside the private banks' bad debts, our own State Bank's problems that, as they were unravelled, became a nightmare. As a result the community wants revenge, and who can deny that? They want revenge and that revenge will be extracted at the next election.

Hopefully, as a Labor member of Parliament I would like to think that we could withstand that revenge and stay on this side of the Chamber. However, it is on the cards if one follows the latest opinion polls and believes implicitly that that will not happen. But that is the problem, because in extracting that revenge members of the community may find that those day to day services that they come to expect from Government will no longer be there. They will go.

What worries me is that if the Liberals do get in at the next election their policy will be debt reduction regardless of who suffers. It will be the little people, the disadvantaged, the weak and those who are not the Liberal Party's natural constituency who will suffer the most. Liberal Ministers will be judged to be the most successful by the way they slash

their individual portfolios. Jobs will go. We talk about the reduction in the number of jobs that is happening in this State at the present time, but that is nothing compared to what will happen if the Liberal Party gets into Government. All this will be done in the name of the new god: debt reduction.

Let me just pick on one area, namely, community health and family services. I could give the House, even now, countless examples of where services in the northern suburbs could be improved. The Minister responsible for those services would agree with me because he shares the seat adjacent but, if the Minister (and I was heartened to hear his ministerial statement of what has been spent in the community), as a result of this Government's attitude to reducing debt, is faced with cuts, I know that he will, at all times, ensure that essential services in the area of health and community services will be maintained at a reasonable level not just in the northern suburbs but throughout this State.

But, what would happen if the Liberals won? Let me refer to the Liberal spokesperson on health, who is a doctor, a wealthy person, with that impeccable Liberal background. I do not say that in a derogatory way; there are certain people who are natural entrants into the Liberal Party, as there are in the Labor Party. However, that person has all the impeccable credentials for being an administrator for health in a Liberal Government. But, to the member for Adelaide, if you are a young boy or girl and you have a speech problem you go to a private speech therapist. If you cannot afford it, hard luck: you will have a speech impediment for the rest of your life.

So, one of the first casualties in community health in the school system will be the speech therapy program. Now, I can argue that there are insufficient speech therapists throughout this State, but what they are doing is very good, and the Liberal Party have no reason to keep that on. That will go. Mark my words. I will be out of this place, but I will be writing to the *Advertiser* if the Liberals do get in to say, 'I told you so,' because there will be no speech therapy program in our schools.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Kavel to order.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: According to the member for Adelaide, you do not have to have public servants out there giving dietary advice to school children. If mummy and daddy had not taught you how to eat the correct food, if mummy and daddy could not put the right food on the table, hard luck because, according to the Liberals, they do not wish to intervene in the family. If you have a mother and father who do not know anything about diet control or the right advice about what to give children, then it is hard luck. Those public servants giving dietary advice to school kids will go; they will be on the job scrap heap.

Those members who disagree with that should remember the stories we had to endure from the member for Coles when she was the Minister of Health about how we had to eat an apple a day, wholemeal bread and citrus fruit and live with our windows open. We had to suffer it weekly and that was the way the member for Coles operated when she was a Minister.

Will women's health centres survive? Will they hell! The first thing the member for Coles tried to do when she became the Minister of Health was to close them down. When she found she could not close them down, she tried to change

their articles of incorporation so that they could not exist. So let us face it: women's health centres will get the chop straight away.

Again, according to the member for Adelaide—and most likely all his colleagues—if you cannot afford to send your kids to a private dentist to get some form of shape in their teeth so that they will stand a better chance in future life and not face ridicule, hard luck! So, all those school dental clinics will close.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Hanson laughs. But, as I said, I am on the record as saying what will happen if the Liberals get in. I would like to think—and I know I will—that I will be the one who is proved to be correct.

It is the natural Liberal view that all community services, whether they be health related or assist in providing educational advice on better social living, are always seen as pandering to the masses. It has never been on its agenda. To the Liberals, child-care has always been sending your little kiddies to the kindy while mummy goes out to get a job to buy a second car. If you cannot afford kindergarten or child-care, hard luck, you have had it. That is the Liberal Party's natural view of life.

I notice that the member for Bragg—who will following me, I think—has made a few notes. I would like him to stand up and say on behalf of the Liberal Party—and I do not know what portfolio he will have because he seems to have changed responsibilities quite often—that all the predictions I have made will not happen. I would like to hear him say so.

I would like to turn to the Leader of the Opposition. We all know about the Liberal's polling, which it got through Stokes King DDB and which has shown that swinging voters find the Leader of the Opposition as wishy-washy, phoney and to have no new ideas and to be negative. He is seen as having no guts, no policies and nothing positive to say about South Australia. He was described by some as being a cardboard cutout who was not a leader.

They are swinging voters. I do not necessarily subscribe to any of those opinions of him: I think he is a sight worse, but that is that. But the swinging voters did not say anything about the Leader's attitude to the unemployed. In his contribution this afternoon the Leader waxed lyrical about his concern for the unemployed. Let me say this: his past record belies that sympathy and understanding for the unemployed. I see two members opposite, the member for Kavel and the member for Mount Gambier, who were in the previous Liberal Administration. In 1979 under the South Australian Government, under both Dunstan and Corcoran, the State Unemployment Relief Scheme was run through local government.

The Leader of the Opposition was then the member for Davenport, and I recall that on one occasion he officially opened the Burnside Rugby Club's new premises, built under the SUR scheme, proudly applauding the program, the skills it gave the unemployed, the facilities for the community, etc. We also know that as local member he went out of his way to support those schemes when they were in his electorate, yet, at the same time, as the incoming Minister of Labour responsible for the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, he was busily dismantling it, putting submissions to Cabinet for the Tonkin Government, under his responsibility as Minister of Labour, to have nothing more to do with the State Unemployment Relief Scheme.

So much for his care for the unemployed, particularly the long-term unemployed. When he was Minister of Labour, our current Leader of the Opposition deliberately and wilfully wound down the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. I can only surmise that the member for Kavel and the member for Mount Gambier, who were in Cabinet at that time, agreed with that philosophy. If they did not, I would like to hear them stand up and say that their Leader was wrong when he dismantled that scheme. But when there were very limited funds under their control, where did those funds go? They did not go into the western suburbs; they did not go into the northern suburbs or into the southern suburbs; they went towards upgrading the Burnside Town Hall. That is where they went.

And where was the Burnside Town Hall? In the seat of Davenport. And who represented the seat of Davenport? The current Leader of the Opposition. That shows what the Leader of the Opposition thinks of the unemployed. He supported them openly when they were in his electorate but privately, as soon as he had the power, opposed them by cutting off the money and putting the unemployed on the scrap heap.

In my remaining seven minutes I would like to deal with an item that came up today in Question Time in regard to this fallacy that the Liberal Party is putting about that ministerial assistants or defeated members of Parliament are being given safe jobs in the Public Service. It seems that there are some very short memories around, and I would like to regale the House with the story of Lynton Crosby. The member for Mount Gambier will be aware of Lynton Crosby, who was the endorsed Liberal candidate for Norwood at the 1982 election. He was a member of the political staff of the then Minister of Education, the present member for Mount Gambier.

Lynton Crosby openly canvassed the electorate of Norwood. Not only was this in Government time and on the Government payroll but he actually drove a Government car while he was doing it. So, we have the Leader giving these outrageous examples of so-called abuse of the system on this side. But it gets worse. When Lynton Crosby had to resign to stand for the seat (and he was forced to do that because of the Electoral Act), what did the Liberal Government do? It took on his wife and appointed her to a ministerial position on the staff of the then Minister of Transport, the Hon. Michael Wilson.

I do not have time to go on to any more, but on the staff of the Minister of Education at that time there were about 30 persons. Whether those 30 people were considered sufficient to give the member for Mount Gambier advice or whether the then Minister of Education's portfolio was considered to be the bucket to put all their mates in while they were sorting them out, I do not know; perhaps we might be able to explore that at some other time. There is the hypocrisy. The Liberals abused every trick while they were in Government, in particular in the closing stages of the Government, but, in their attempts to denigrate this Government, they conveniently forget all that.

Now, I might telephone Lynton Crosby, who I understand is now Director of the Liberal Party in Queensland. I might phone up and say, 'Lynton, is it true?' But we know it is true. There we had a candidate working for the Liberal Party, being paid by the then Liberal Government, driving a Government car, all in the interests of democracy. Whatever the Liberal Party says I take with a pinch of salt, usually, but this time it stinks.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): In supporting this motion I would like first to pass on my personal condolences to Lady Laucke and her family. When I first joined the Liberal Party in Salisbury, we had a meeting in a restaurant and Sir Condor came along and addressed that meeting and, from that day on (and this is a measure of the man), every time I met him he remembered my name and recognised who I was and my involvement in the Liberal Party. Very few people have that attribute, not only to be able to recognise people but also to understand them and be a gentleman, as he was. I pass on my condolences to Lady Rose, because I had the privilege on many occasions of being involved with her and Sir Condor in ethnic matters, particularly as they related to the German community. Sir Condor did a marvellous job for the community. He was a fantastic man, a great politician for the Liberal Party and a marvellous representative of his community.

I also take the opportunity to pass on my condolences to the Hudson family. I knew Hugh only as a golfer, not as a member of Parliament. I had the privilege of playing against him on several occasions when he played for the Marino Golf Club. I think I won once and lost on the other occasion. I did not know him as a member of Parliament, but I take this opportunity to convey my condolences to his family as well.

The Address in Reply debate gives me the opportunity to talk about a few issues that relate to the electorate that I represent. Initially, I would like to talk about two principal areas: planning issues as they relate to urban consolidation and the difficulty currently being faced in my electorate regarding the CFS and MFS. First, in relation to planning, the Burnside area is principally made up of many large urban blocks which contain homes of a large physical nature. Those homes are slowly being sold and the land broken up under existing urban consolidation plans. Whilst that consolidation is supported in principle by the Government, one difficulty that it creates for the community is that these blocks, instead of being broken up into units of four, in some instances are being broken up into units of eight or nine. The Burnside council has no opportunity under the existing Act to control that type of excessive urban consolidation.

In some instances, the blocks are so large that breaking them up into units of eight or nine is fair and reasonable, but in other instances that is not so. In my view and in the view of the council that is causing some undesirable consolidation which could in the future have the opportunity to develop into urban slum. I do not believe that that will occur but the potential is there. This area of planning needs to be more closely looked at so that, whilst the principle of urban consolidation, which I support, may be continued, local government can have more flexibility in saying what should or should not occur within its own council district.

I know that can create problems in terms of overall planning, but it seems to me that in this instance there is the need for a little bit of commonsense, because in my view no local council would deliberately set out to enable development to occur in its area that is not to the long-term benefit of that area. So, urban consolidation, the way in which it is occurring and the lack of ability of local government to have a greater say is a major issue.

I now turn briefly to the issue concerning the CFS and the MFS. In the top end of the electorate of Bragg we have the CFS which principally controls the hills face zone. Members who were here on both Ash Wednesdays, particularly the first one, would remember the havoc that was created at the top end of Greenhill Road. It was the work of the CFS in

Burnside, Campbelltown and Mount Lofty that kept that devastation to a minimum. We all know that it was a tragic disaster but it was kept from being a maximum disaster through the magnificent support and involvement of the CFS in that area.

Unfortunately, in districts such as Bragg, which is on the edge of the suburban sprawl, we have this difficult situation with the MFS controlling about 90 per cent of the electorate and the CFS involving itself in less than 10 per cent. Local government, which does not want to put any more money into the CFS, is now also involved. So, there is this difficulty between CFS volunteers and the paid staff of the MFS. I do not believe that there is a disagreement between the volunteers and the paid staff on this issue, but the difficulty lies in the area of funding, and we now have the problem of the threat of possible closure of the CFS unit in the Burnside district.

It is my wish and that of all concerned that the CFS remain active in the area, but to do that a future Government will have to make sure that there is adequate funding for the CFS in its fringe area involvement. That is a major area of concern in terms of the funding and survival of the CFS as well as the maintenance of the MFS activity in the metropolitan area of the electorate of Bragg. It is a difficult situation and funding is principally the issue. I believe the State Government needs to be more involved in these difficult transitional areas.

I now refer to an issue that I brought before the House last week. It relates to the appointment of Dr Cullum to the WorkCover board. In his reply to the question last week the Minister stated that there were some members of the WorkCover board representing employers who supported Dr Cullum's appointment. I was surprised by that statement at the time and I made the effort to speak to all of the employer board representatives. I found that in fact 'some' meant one, and that, of the six people who represented associations on the board, five of those nominees through their employer associations supported the nomination of Margaret Farrow and a sixth person supported the nomination of Dr Cullum.

The Minister's statement in itself is not that important, and 'some' meaning one could be interpreted as not being all that far out of the ballpark, although it is my view that 'some' means a lot more than one. The interesting fact is that on 3 March this year when writing to all of the employer associations about the nominations to this rehabilitation position on the WorkCover board, the Minister said:

At present Miss Margaret Farrow is the deputy to Professor Smith and as she is a longstanding member of the board it is considered that Miss Farrow would be a suitable replacement for Professor Smith who has moved interstate.

The letter goes on to say that the Minister wanted their opinion. Here we have the Minister on 3 March this year saying that the person who had been a long serving deputy of Professor Smith should be the person nominated to the WorkCover board. It is interesting is it not how Dr Cullum suddenly became involved. A couple of weeks later the Minister again wrote to all of the nominating people, saying that suddenly Dr Cullum had come out of the woodwork, here is his *curriculum vitae*, what is your opinion? It was at that point that the five people wrote to the Minister and said, 'We believe Margaret Farrow, who has been an excellent deputy and on many occasions has appeared at the board, should be the nomination, as you have pointed out to us as Minister, and we support that nomination.'

I suggest to the House that what has happened is that the union movement has stepped in and encouraged the appoint-

ment of Dr Cullum to the Minister. I believe that that is the situation because in my investigations in the past few days not only have I found that five of the six employer representatives supported Margaret Farrow but I understand that at least two of the union representatives on the board also privately support Margaret Farrow because of her excellent work in the position.

I suggest that the UTLC has stepped in, wanting somebody appointed to that board who would see the involvement of the employees through a better light than the professionalism that Miss Margaret Farrow expressed with her position on that board. To back up my suggestion that that is the case and that the Minister has been implicated in some way in this matter, I point out to the House that in the past few years Dr Cullum has received in excess of \$250 000 in payments from WorkCover; his file has been and is still being investigated by the fraud section; and he was involved in a very special and deep investigation into thermography, which was practised by the late Dr Dale Thomas and found I understand by the court to have ripped off the system for millions of dollars. Dr Cullum's practises are questioned by the medical profession at the moment, and I believe that the Minister not only knew that at the time of the appointment but is now very much aware of the fact that Dr Cullum's appointment has been a wrong appointment and it should be reversed.

I do not very often receive letters from WorkCover employees. However, I received a letter this week, as follows:

I, like many other WorkCover employees, was appalled when Dr David Cullum was appointed by the WorkCover board. Dr Cullum was the subject of a major investigation by WorkCover in conjunction with other fraud investigation facilities, and for reasons only the WorkCover board can answer, the prosecution was not proceeded with. Dr Cullum was associated with the late Dr Dale Thomas of thermography fame. After many years of 'bleeding' millions of dollars from the workers compensation system the court finally decided that Dr Thomas's unorthodox medical practices of thermography and electromagnetic therapy were not compensatable pursuant to the Workers Compensation Act. . .

The letter continues in relation to other issues. As I said, there are not very many occasions that I receive letters from WorkCover employees saying that something smells in the system. I think that the Minister, instead of flippantly answering the question that I asked last week in this House, should instigate a major investigation into the role of Dr Cullum, as he currently practices in the WorkCover system, and he should make sure that as soon as possible he is removed from the board and replaced by a more suitable person, such as Miss Margaret Farrow, who was initially supported by the Minister, as I said earlier today, and supported by not only the employers on that board but also many people who are involved with the employee organisations that are represented on the board.

While I am talking about WorkCover, I would like to mention a couple of other issues that are causing massive concern in the community, and in that regard I refer to the Classification Review Panel. I received a letter this morning from a company that has had its request for review before that panel since January this year. I was absolutely staggered to see the first sentence of that letter, because it referred to an apology from the WorkCover panel, which said, 'Look, we have been a bit busy, and I am sorry that it is 6 months ago that you wrote to us, but we have now decided that we are not going to change your current status.'

What that means to that company is for the past six months it has had to pay of the order of \$2 000 into the WorkCover fund without it having any rights of appeal or

without it having any protection. The letter goes on to say, 'Your sales system, even though it is owned by a different company and has been owned that way for a long time, unfortunately has to be linked to your manufacturing plant and you have to wear the fact that they are in the same category'. I have spoken on occasions in this House about the whole classification system, and here is another example of a company which has two totally different businesses but has been forced by the bureaucracy of WorkCover into paying excessive levies on one of its enterprises.

The second issue that is still causing massive problems for business, and particularly small business, is the bonus penalty scheme. Three months ago when this scheme was changed I told the Chairman of the board that this whole system would work against the small businesses it was designed to protect. In fact, what has happened is that, if a business makes a small claim, its levy can increase by at least twice the amount it was paying before—far in excess of the claim that it made. We now have a system which is far more reactive to small claims than the previous one. When I said that to the Chairman of the board he said, 'That is a lot of nonsense; that is not the case.' In my office we receive up to 20 phone calls a week from individuals complaining about the bonus penalty scheme, a scheme, as I said, that is supposed to benefit small business but does nothing but work against it.

As an aside, one of the things that has been reported to me is that small businesses are not making claims because of this bonus penalty system. As you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker, from your experience in the workplace, some of these workers compensation claims are long term and really do not start to develop until 12 to 18 months after they occurred. They can be reported at that time, particularly as it relates to back injuries and other muscular-skeletal injuries, and they can become significantly worse. Here we have many small businesses taking a risk on that first small claim, potentially leaving themselves open to long-term claimants and risks because the bonus penalty scheme does not fairly reflect the small claims that quite regularly occur.

The other point I would like to make on WorkCover relates to the reporting of injuries. I have been involved for the past six months with a transport company in Whyalla that sent in an original claim form stating it did not believe the accident in question occurred on the date specified. The company wrote that on the original claim, stating that it did not believe that the accident occurred at work. Three years later that same firm has been told that WorkCover does not have a copy of that original comment. WorkCover is saying to the transport operator, 'Look, we accepted the claim some three years ago and it is irrelevant whether you dispute it. It is irrelevant whether you said to us that that person happened to be on jury duty the day that they claimed that they were at work. We are not interested in those facts because we do not have anything in our system that substantiates that claim'. Fortunately, the employer happens to be rather fastidious and has a filing system which shows he sent the claim in, and it is all there.

Unfortunately, with WorkCover this is not a one-off example, and it goes back to those horrendous early days when claims just used to disappear, when phone calls were never returned and when all sorts of difficulties were created for the employers in trying to work out whether there was a claim and what were their responsibilities. This sort of problem is still going on at WorkCover and is a major issue of administration that must be cleared up and will be cleared up when there is a change of Government.

I would like to make a few comments in relation to tourism and the razzle-dazzle Tourism Minister. In the past 10 years, the South Australian Government, through Tourism SA, has spent \$77 million—that is, about \$7 million a year—on marketing tourism in South Australia. That is a pretty fancy sum of money. But, when you spend that sort of money—and it is fairly normal business practice—you should measure the success of the expenditure, particularly when you are spending that money on selling South Australia. Three major measurements are used in the tourism industry, that is, international, interstate and intrastate visitor nights—in other words, people who tour from overseas, from interstate and from within our State. We will start off with the interesting ones, that is, the international visitor nights.

Having spent \$77 million on marketing tourism in South Australia over the past 10 years—and this involves three Ministers—our market share from international visitor nights has gone from an 8.5 per cent peak in 1985 to 4.9 per cent. A figure of 2.9 per cent of international visitors from Japan come to South Australia, yet nearly 40 per cent go to Queensland. We have spent \$77 million making sure that our market share has gone down 40 per cent. Our interstate movements are about the same; they are about 8.5 per cent and our intrastate movements go up and down between 7.9 per cent and 8.5 per cent. So, they are not too bad.

In terms of international visitor nights, where it is estimated that, for every visitor we have, we potentially create 17 jobs, we have dropped 40 per cent. In the same period, this Government announced \$600 million worth of failed tourism projects. Three times it has announced developments at Glenelg: Jubilee Point, Patawalonga and Marineland. Every single one has failed. We have had announced two quite fantastic developments at Mount Lofty, both with and without cable car, but neither one of them has got up. We have had St Michaels released so many times by the previous Minister of glitz and glamour that you would never know whether we will ever have it happen again.

More things have been announced in tourism that have never come about than is the case in any other portfolio in this Parliament. We have had developments mentioned for Sellicks Beach, Tandanya, and the Barossa Valley. There was talk of that magnificent OPHIX development at Wilpena. That has only another six months before it must be developed and nothing has occurred.

There are \$600 million worth of tourism projects and nothing has happened. With respect to marketing, \$77 million has been spent and we have gone down by 40 per cent in international visitors. What business in this State would spend \$77 million, go downhill and then say, 'Gee, we have a great Tourism Commission in South Australia'? It is an absolute joke. We are a joke in every State of this country. We cannot even convince the Australian Tourism Commission that it should spend money on promoting South Australia.

The last film done overseas did not even include South Australia; it included Queensland, Victoria, Western Australia, Tasmania and New South Wales but no South Australia. Yet we spent \$77 million in 10 years for no result, no accountability, nothing; it is a disgrace.

We have a Minister who races around saying, 'We will have ambassadors; we will have Lange.' Let me put the real story on the record. The Minister picked me up one night for a tourism convention and he said, 'Graham, it really upset me because when I was in New Zealand announcing Lange as the ambassador your face was on the front page and not mine.' That is what the real story is all about. It is not about me

interfering with international trade. It is about the fact that it was my face on the front page of the *New Zealand Age* and not the Minister's.

But fancy having a failed Prime Minister of New Zealand as the ambassador; a mate of the Minister trying to sell tourism when he [Minister] cannot even get it right in South Australia. Why would you have a failed New Zealand Minister bothering to do it? What is the real story behind the whole promotion of tourism. As far as ambassadors are concerned we have had Sir James Hardy; Maggie Beer, whom I recommended; Michele Fielke, whom I said he should put in some two to three months ago; and who are the rest? No-one would know.

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

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): In responding to the Address in Reply, I would like to join others in acknowledging the contribution to the South Australian community of Sir Condor Laucke, an eminent person and, as many have said during the proceedings of the House, a humble man but a man who earned the respect of his peers. For someone from such a humble start to finish up as President of the Senate, the third most senior position in Australia, is something for which he and his now surviving family can be justly proud. He served that position with great distinction as a South Australian and importantly as someone holding that high office in representing the Australian people. To Lady Laucke and her children I extend my sympathy and condolences.

I did not personally know Hugh Hudson but he was a giant not only in stature but in the way in which he bestrode the South Australian political scene. He left an indelible mark on South Australian politics and made a significant contribution, as many have said, in South Australia in signposting education in a new era. I pass on to his surviving family my condolences.

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

Mr OLSEN: We all realise that this is the last session of Parliament before a State election and the end, it is hoped, to more than a decade of Labor rule. Yet, listening to the Premier's speech last Tuesday delivered by the Governor, I suggest the one revealing thread to the copious and tedious dialogue was that even after a decade the Government has refused to face reality about our State's difficulties. It is obvious that Labor still refuses to see South Australia in anything but isolation. It does not yet accept that, to be part of the rest of the world, we have to put away our naive, amateurish, parochial and economic bumbings and play by the rules of the main game—not the domestic market any more but the international market. We have to embrace the future and not shrink from change. We have to strive for commercial success and profit, not consider them capitalists' profanities as Labor has done consistently, and we have to encourage our business as our one life line, not strangle or ignore it as Labor has done in equal proportions.

But this week of Parliament has already displayed that the Government has massive difficulty in coming to terms with what must be done to set the course which will chart economic recovery for South Australia. It has been said time and again about economic direction that, once you see the rocks, it is already too late for evasive action. It is being a realist, not a knocker, to state that in South Australia we have hit the rocks, sunk the ship and now we are clinging to the rocks by

our fingertips. If members want any proof of that, they should go and ask any small business operators in South Australia about the struggle they are having making ends meet. Yet still the Government is in a state of denial as to the economic circumstances facing this State.

I suppose a good analogy to use would be that of an alcoholic: if there is no admission of being in such a state, then the clawing back to sober stability cannot even begin, let alone be successful. That is where we sit today. But we have an added complication in dealing with Labor's stance—the weak excuses that Ministers make for our situation, excuses which avoid any responsibility for the damage that has been inflicted. These excuses also add up to blatant denial of the obvious. In the process, they are damaging in the extreme.

Only last week—and I am glad that the Minister of Recreation and Sport is on the front bench—I heard Minister Crafter discussing the decay of the State's racing industry in a television report. He made an outrageous comment which, to me, summed up Labor's attitude to South Australia. He had the audacity to say that, in a small State such as South Australia, we had to accept, and I repeat, 'had to accept', that the good people, the best people, in sport and business would seek to leave for greener pastures overseas and interstate. What an admission! The white flag is up. The Government is not prepared to battle for those people: it just accepts that they will go to other pastures, rather than make greener pastures here in South Australia to keep them and retain their expertise, their professionalism, within our own midst. He calmly accepted that as an inevitable fact.

Yet it is a symptom of what we have come to understand under Labor and something that I believe is totally unacceptable. I do not want my children to have to go interstate or overseas to get job security. Why cannot we create job opportunity for my children and their children in this State in a good, viable, stable economy? Why should we not be seeking to strive for that rather than just giving up and accepting as an inevitable fact that people will go interstate and overseas? As one of my colleagues said the other day, it will be cheaper to vote Liberal than migrate interstate and overseas, because only by voting Liberal will you get a change of economic direction in South Australia and start putting the foundation under the small business community in this State to create and maintain the job opportunities for young South Australians and future workers in South Australia.

If any politician accepts that South Australia should lose the best intelligence and skills simply because it is small, how does that person equate Singapore's economic strength with its size? It was both a damaging and ludicrous public statement to make and it displayed Labor's mentality of letting it all wash over because it is easier than doing anything about it.

As the Arthur D. Little report said, we have had 10 years of lost opportunity, 10 years of wrong policy direction, 10 years of ignoring reality and fact, 10 years of not looking after the small business community—the engine room, to quote former Premier, John Bannon, in election policy speeches, of the South Australian economy. Labor was prepared not to fuel the engine room but to suck it dry with taxes and charges and costly regulations. It was not prepared to back the theory that a profitable, wealthy business community is the way to create and generate jobs. Rather, the Labor Party, along with what is unfortunately the Australian attitude, believes that, if someone makes a profit, the first question to be asked is, 'Who did you rip off to make the

profit?', not, 'How did you do it? Perhaps if I follow that example I, too, can be successful and have a wealthy, profitable business which in turn will create jobs.' When businesses have been profitable, Parliaments in this country have introduced a host of consumer laws and a range of other legislation to make sure that one never has the chance to make a profit again. We have strangled business, in particular small business. That is why we have the high levels of unemployment and long unemployment queues in this State and country.

To return to the Minister's comment about people going interstate and overseas for greener pastures and having to accept that these people will leave South Australia, I point out that it denies world trends. An economic study from the United States indicates:

The greatest growth areas in commercial and residential real estate are probably going to increasingly be the smaller towns and cities outside the huge congestion of metropolitan areas. . . we will be seeing a new general trend in migration [to those smaller towns and cities]. We moved from the cities to the suburbs in the last technology cycle of the 1900s. In the cycle coming up we will see another migration to small towns and cities for safety, security, education, quality of life and quality of environment. New technologies are going to allow people to work more at home or to relocate divisions of companies—software divisions, financial divisions—out in smaller towns and outer suburbs so people do not have to live in New York City or San Francisco or their bedroom communities.

That is the trend overseas and undeniably it can be the trend that we establish in South Australia if there is a will to do it and the right policy direction to attract business and industry to this State as we did in the 1950s and 1960s. In the 1970s and 1980s, we destroyed that incentive by increasing the level of taxes and charges and regulations and costs in South Australia so that those businesses that were here manufacturing white goods and a range of other products servicing the domestic markets of Australia found it no longer competitive to establish their factories here: it was cheaper to establish them in the eastern States.

The member for Price shakes his head. Does he deny that we have lost 21 000 jobs in the manufacturing industry during the life of the Bannon-Arnold Government? He cannot deny that, because it is a simple fact. Like Email, we have exported them to the eastern States, because it is cheaper to run a factory there than in South Australia. If members do not understand that fundamental, they will never understand that any boardroom of any company in Australia will ever put South Australia on the map again while we have these high levels of taxes and charges and impediments to establishing a business in this State.

Labor's view is that, if it says something often enough, it will become holy writ and, therefore, need no action. The Arthur D. Little report clearly identified that fact. It was not always like that, as most of us here can recall. Recent statistics from the Centre for Economic Studies indicate that in this State we have lost 70 per cent of our listed companies since 1980. In the past 12 years, 70 per cent of our listed companies have gone. Worse, of the remaining 30 per cent, a third of those, according to the centre, are not paying dividends and 'are financially distressed'.

Does that look like the results of policies of a successful Government? Hardly. It concerns me that in the past five years particularly South Australia has come to be seen by others as irrelevant and a branch office halfway on the road to nowhere. I do not want that said of this State, and I do not want articles written in the Eastern States including South Australia in the rust belt of this country.

When it comes to business investment and development, we are not even on the fading edges of the radar screen: we are off the screen as far as those boardrooms are concerned. In many respects, we are not even in existence as far as they are concerned. We have become inconsequential, except for our small market share of goods, which is generally taken to be between 6 and 10 per cent. Until we face those facts, painful as they may be, how can we assess how we can recover? Until we accept that we must knock down the artificial barricades between us and the rest of the nation and the world, and see ourselves as part of a team, how will we ever be able to recover and put the right policy directions in place?

Let us take an example, Mr Speaker, to which I have referred publicly and in a question to the Deputy Premier and Minister of Mineral Resources. It relates to the ethane gas that is currently required to be stored in the ground in the Moomba gas region as a result of 1985 legislation. The Deputy Premier and Treasurer refuses to release our large gas reserves because he believes that we have 'unsecured long-term availability of gas'. He says, time and again, that it is ours. I agree with that: it is our gas in the ground. But we have not made any use of that gas for the past 20 years.

The Dunstan Government started talking about a petrochemical plant at Redcliff in the 1970s. The Government is still talking about a petrochemical plant in the northern part of Spencer Gulf. In the meantime, it is requiring the gas producers to store the ethane gas in the ground at a cost to those producers, and we as a State are not getting any value and gross domestic product out of it—when there is a buyer for that gas, who will generate something like 1 000 jobs in this State and a royalty income over the next 10 years of a minimum of \$25 million to \$30 million. What are we to do: sit on this gas, always looking to the dream? Well, it is about time we put the dreams to one side and put reality in its place, because it is reality that will generate jobs and economic activity for South Australia.

If the Government had not thrown away so much money on bodgie contracts, like Scrimber, it would have had the cash—an estimated \$80 million—to construct a pipeline to carry the gas from Moomba to such a plant at Whyalla. There was a proposal before the Government some five or six years ago that, if that pipeline had been built by the Government from infrastructure costs, we could have secured a petrochemical plant for South Australia. But the Government refused to do that. It spent money—some \$12 million—on the Central Linen Service buying tumble dryers, and on scrimber and a range of other activities, instead of putting it in key infrastructure build-up for South Australia, so we could value add, increase our GDP and our economic activity. As Arthur D. Little said, and I repeat: the economic priorities of this Government have been wrong. It is a decade of lost opportunities, and here is another example of a lost opportunity.

Since 1985 we have seen Malaysia building a major petrochemical plant to service the South East Asia region. That should have been our petrochemical plant, but it is not there because the Government would not put the infrastructure in. The Government sunk it into the timber corporation and other activities such as that. Now we have an opportunity to realise on that asset: first, to reduce the cost to the producers of having to stockpile it and store it in the ground. For what purpose? So the Government can go to an election and talk about another petrochemical plant, recycled how many times? Another dream—no reality to it. Secondly, should we

not be looking at value adding that natural asset of ours—our gas—in the ground in the Moomba basin?

Why not add 1 000 jobs to the employment areas of South Australia? Why should not the Government generate the royalties to start paying back some of the State Bank debt that it allowed to accumulate over the course of its stewardship of the Treasury benches in South Australia? But no, blind to reality, push on with the dream, not put in place the right economic path and direction for South Australia.

Mr Becker: They lost \$131 million each.

Mr OLSEN: Well, \$131 million would have built two pipelines from the Moomba gas region to Whyalla to enable a petrochemical plant to be built. It would have provided a lot of offsets for a business starting up in South Australia, but the Government has got it wrong. It has not got it, and now it is being built in Malaysia, and as a result of that the Government is not going to get a look in in that area.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Let the member for Kavel speak.

Mr OLSEN: Well, nobody can hold a candle to you and your administration, Minister Crafter, in terms of pouring money down the drain: \$3.15 billion of it. You were warned and warned, and you ignored the warnings. You walked away from it. Like most problems of this Government and this Administration, if you have a problem, you close the door and wait for the problem to go away. But it did not go away. It became worse because you abdicated your responsibility. Not only did you not have a majority of the vote in the 1989 State election—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: I rise on a point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! A point of order is being raised. The honourable member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: My point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, is that the member for Kavel is only too aware that he should not address people across the Chamber as 'You': he should address them through you, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order and request that the member for Kavel address members by their titles. The member for Kavel.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker; I take your point. I want to make the point that I had started before the point of order was taken: you are an illegitimate Government. You won Government on a minority of the vote, 48-52, and we well understand the screams from the Labor Party in the Dunstan-Playford era in relation to that.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: As it stuck in Don Dunstan's craw when the boundaries in the late 1960s worked against the Labor Party—

The Hon. T.H. Hemming: He took it better than you did, John.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: Well, the simple fact is that you were so embarrassed about the result of the 1989 election campaign that you did do something about the electoral boundaries because you knew that you were sitting on those Treasury benches as an illegitimate Government and the track record and performance of the Ministers and members have been such that you should have gone to the people. Given the identification of the appalling abdication of financial responsibility by Ministers and the Premier, and then Premier and Treasurer in particular, you should have surrendered this Government to the people of South Australia to enable them

to voice their opinion on your performance and your actions. But you did not do so, because you knew what would happen: you would be thrown out. So, Mr Deputy Speaker, the members and the Ministers decided that they would sit there as long as they could and ride out their four years on the Treasury benches because to do otherwise meant that they were coming over this side in very depleted numbers, and, given the most recent opinion polls, we would most probably need to get cardboard cut-outs to put over this side to make up a reasonable number of faces to look at after the next State election.

Mr Becker: There will be hardly any more people than a cricket team or baseball team and they will all be Don Dunstans.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: Well, the new member for Napier might well be the Leader of the Opposition, given the depleted ranks that we see.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: There is no doubt that if we are to change South Australia for the better we must make some fundamental changes to policy direction. There is no quick fix. There is no single initiative that will turn the South Australian economy around. It must be a mix of a range of policy initiatives covering costs such as WorkCover, looking at the industrial relations area, looking at enterprise agreements, reducing the costs of taxes and charges and regulations which impact upon business and employment opportunities.

We must also ensure that taxpayers get value for money in contracting out to the private sector those goods and services that can be supplied at a cheaper rate than that at which the Government currently supplies them. I believe that one of the main differences between our side of this Chamber and the Government's is that we are willing to deal with the true economic situation. For that reason we have far more chance of turning this State's economy around for the good.

If one looks at our side of the Chamber, one sees that the simple fact is that a number of people have been actively involved in the operations of small business. If one looks at the current ministry one sees that none of them has run a business or employed substantial numbers of people to the extent that they would have to worry about the pay packet of those people each week or each month as have members on this side, who have gained practical experience in doing so.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: We have seen the lawyers' jamboree over the past 18 months or two years.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: You might be successful as a lawyer and a law firm, but you are certainly not successful as an Administration in terms of creating the right economic environment for business operators.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: You are not and you know you are not. If you had any attachment to that firm of yours you would well understand—

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: So, there is no attachment. The Minister admits that on the one hand he has no attachments because of his ministerial portfolio, but on the other hand he claims that he has this great knowledge and personal experience in operating a small business. The Minister cannot have it both ways.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: You just contradicted yourself; you can't have it both ways.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I will return to the theme I want to establish. We are willing to give business a go and we are willing to stand up for the business community, because only by doing so will we create jobs. We do not consider it a hanging offence to state that profit is healthy and that a State with strong wealth creation in its private sector is what is needed, and badly needed, in South Australia. We are not like the Labor Party; we do not see profit as something to be stamped out as impure. Nor do we consider it impure to state that the public sector should have to face up to productivity gains.

Progress has been made in that area and I acknowledge that, but much more is yet to be done. It must also face up to the responsibility of service delivery in exactly the same way as does the private sector. We are not about to follow Labor's example of propping up the wrong industries for political safety rather than economic sense. For too long Labor's philosophical approach, baggage and cynical vote gathering have combined to present a very out of balance decision making process that must be redressed.

We should have been aiding and developing those industries in South Australia that offer the greatest long-term employment and export earning potential. That is a simple reality in anyone's terms. That is very much what the Government has been stating publicly, but a look behind the scenes shows that this has frequently not been the case. The conclusion has to be that, as I earlier stated, Labor does not recognise the true nature of our dilemma and does not understand what needs to be done to fix the predicament. Labor's philosophical baggage blinds it, and its determination to keep votes is more important than the hard long-term decisions that are necessary.

We need an affirmative industry policy so that we can target its fire power to long-term employment and export earning potential. That is the criterion that we need to establish and put in place. However, as we face this last session of Parliament before the election, even when absolutely desperate to keep its hold on power, Labor has been unable to exhibit any true understanding of our problems or take any hard action for recovery. The Governor's speech identified that in stark terms. After that and after a decade in power, it says it all: Labor does not have the answers; it has nowhere to go; it has no signposts, no vision and no blueprint. What is more, sadly for South Australia, it has not had them for a decade.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to Her Excellency the Governor's speech. I express my loyalty to the Crown and offer my condolences to the families of the late Sir Condor Laucke, the late Mr Dick Geddes, the late Mr Bert Teusner and the late Mr Hugh Hudson.

Tonight I intend to raise a matter in the public interest. In bringing this matter before Parliament I have weighed very carefully the merits of doing so against the possible injury that might result to the reputations of individuals or institutions. I take this course of action only because all other avenues to achieve a just or humane outcome for a family in my electorate have failed, and because I am convinced that only by addressing these issues openly can we hope to prevent a recurrence of the tragedy that has befallen this family.

The matter concerns the duty of care of schools for their students and of society for our children. These are the facts as outlined to me over the past four years by my constituent, Mrs Annette De Gregorio. I have Mrs De Gregorio's permission and that of her sons James and Matthew to present these facts to the House and to mention their names. Indeed, I do so at their request. Their story is without doubt the saddest and most horrifying case I have dealt with in 16 years as a member of Parliament. So far as possible, I will tell the story through documents that are on the public record or in the files of organisations. The individuals and institutions named in my speech have been advised that I intend to raise these matters, as has the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services.

Between August 1982 and April 1988, while they were attending Rostrevor College, both James and Matthew De Gregorio were sexually molested by Tony Zerella, an old scholar who had been appointed by the college, first as an athletics coach and then as an assistant dormitory master from February 1982, and as senior athletics master in February 1984. Mrs De Gregorio first came to me in May 1989 to seek my help in her efforts to have Zerella deregistered as a teacher in South Australia, following his conviction on eight counts of indecent assault in respect of both her sons. Zerella was sentenced to a total of three years and six months imprisonment with a non-parole period of two years. The sentence was suspended: there was no appeal by the Crown.

I read to the House extracts from a letter dated 21 February 1989 to the presiding judge from a social worker in the then Department for Community Welfare, as follows:

James Anthony De Gregorio came to the attention of the Department of Community Welfare in May 1988. During interviews with the family, that is Mrs De Gregorio, Mr De Gregorio, Matthew and most often James, the following comments and observations were recorded. James has stated that the assaults which Mr Zerella perpetrated upon him over the past seven years have impacted upon him in several ways.

(1) James's relationship with his family began to deteriorate due to his attempts to avoid the perpetrator during occasions when the perpetrator visited the household. The family had held Mr Zerella in high regard and James was too fearful of being disbelieved or of being considered guilty to tell his family of the assaults. James was told by the perpetrator that no-one would believe him, and James believed that to be so.

(2) James began to doubt his heterosexuality and after running away from home sought confirmation of his masculinity by engaging in a sexual relationship with a female. During this period James also used drugs and alcohol excessively. James has stated that since that episode he has been diagnosed medically as suffering from hepatitis B and has, on a number of occasions, been hospitalised in psychiatric care. James has also attempted suicide more than once.

(3) James had not advised his psychiatrist, Mr Kutlaca, or his drug counsellor of the assaults until after May 1988, due to his feelings of fear and anxiety, and had attempted to cope with these feelings and his feelings of anger and betrayal himself.

James's plan for his career had been to apply to the Australian Defence Force Academy, and he had sought entry forms. Due to his state of ill health and his failure to complete his secondary education, this option is not available to him. James now works casually. At college, James was interested and actively engaged in athletics. James's attempts to avoid the perpetrator, who coached athletics, and to be as unlike him as possible, included giving up athletics.

In May 1988 James discovered that Matthew had also been assaulted by Mr Zerella. James has said that this was the precipitator in his decision to take part in legal proceedings, as his feelings of love and protection towards his brother were stronger than his feelings of anxiety and fear. For James, the assaults upon Matthew were a vivid re-creation of his own suffering and the realisation that Matthew had been assaulted caused him tremendous agony.

Overall, in my assessment, the effects of these assaults upon James are grave and will always have some residual effect upon his mental and physical well-being. James's entire teenage life has been

thrown into turmoil, as is evidenced by his leaving school, his state of health and the impact of these events upon himself and his family.

Matthew De Gregorio has been seen less often than James. Matthew stated that he, too, was initially afraid of disclosing the assaults. Matthew was afraid of being disbelieved, of being labelled, of being ostracised. Matthew had been shown a burglar alarm in the home of the perpetrator and the method by which it worked. Matthew was told that, as he was now familiar with the system, he could be blamed for any future break-ins. Matthew perceived the comments to be a threat not to tell.

Matthew says he is constantly angry, has thoughts of dire revenge and has contemplated suicide. Matthew has spoken angrily to his school teachers regarding the perpetrator and this year is attempting to matriculate.

The letter was signed by the Community Welfare social worker. During the trial the boys were accompanied by their parents. Mrs De Gregorio tells me that no-one from Rostrevor College accompanied the family during the court case or provided any support or counselling during this period. Matthew's matriculation year was spent partly in court, hearing evidence in the Zerella trial. Mrs De Gregorio tells me that Rostrevor College suggested to her that, because of Matthew's disruptive behaviour, it may be better for him to complete his last two terms at another school, but he remained at Rostrevor.

James tried several times to take his life, once by hanging but usually by drug overdose. Matthew is now rehabilitated and is at university. James has a limited life expectancy, with chronic, active hepatitis and manic depression. He is on a disability pension. Earlier this year he married and he and his wife are now facing the future together. James and Matthew De Gregorio were not the only victims of the perpetrator. To my knowledge, there were others, one of whom at the age of 24 is now a psychiatric patient suffering from schizophrenia.

It was after the trial that Mrs De Gregorio first came to me to enlist my help in ensuring that Tony Zerella could not teach again. I would have thought that deregistration would be automatic upon conviction. The South Australian and Queensland teachers registration boards are the only teachers registration boards required by law to take into account a person's fitness to teach as well as the academic qualifications for teaching, and are therefore the only boards that deregister for this kind of offence. In other States this responsibility is left to the employer. I made representation to the board, but it took from late May 1989 until August that year for the deregistration procedures to be completed.

A social worker who was involved told me last week that this was the most appalling case she had ever encountered of failure by adults responsible for the care of children to respond in appropriate ways. She said:

As a social worker at the Campbelltown Community Welfare Office, following Mrs De Gregorio's reporting and James's and Matthew's statements, I spoke to between 15 and 20 or so young men who were students or former students of Rostrevor College. What they had to say indicated that they believed the staff of the college were aware of what was happening, as were many of the students.

'You'd get cement boots', was a comment one of them made about what would happen if anyone had tried to expose Zerella's activities.

What shocked the social workers involved in the case was the fact that the perpetrator was able to move freely about the independent schools system in Adelaide. In a letter dated 17 May 1984, he resigned from Rostrevor College. From Rostrevor he went to St Peter's College where he was dismissed in November 1984 after students had lodged complaints about indecent assaults. These complaints were not reported under section 91 of the Community Welfare Act.

From St Peter's College, he went to Pembroke School where the combined alertness of the principal and a parent who was a police officer resulted in Zerella's dismissal before any damage was done.

In March 1985, Zerella applied to manage the Rostrevor First XI cricket team. Aware that Zerella had been dismissed by Saints but having had no communication from Saints the then headmaster, Brother McMaster, refused Zerella's application and notified parents whose sons were being privately coached by Zerella that he had no status at the college. At about the same time Zerella was coaching young teenagers in football and athletics at various clubs in Adelaide. He later went to St Edmund's, a Christian Brother's College in Canberra, where I am advised he was dismissed following sexual assaults on students.

I am advised that on his return to Adelaide he sought a position as a home tutor with the Adelaide Children's Hospital, but before his application could be assessed he sexually assaulted Matthew De Gregorio. It was this assault that resulted in charges being laid against him for his offences against James between 1982 and 1988. I understand that Zerella went from South Australia to New South Wales and is now living in Western Australia, having never been kept in custody.

By the time Zerella left Pembroke social workers were so concerned that they wrote to the Child Protection Council. Their letter dated 20 September 1988 was given to me a fortnight ago. It states:

It has come to our attention that during the investigation of the alleged sexual abuse of two brothers by a member of staff at two private schools the following factors may have contributed to the continuation of the abuse and to the placing of other students at risk:

1. A failure by the schools involved to comply with the legal requirement of mandatory reporting of the allegations;
2. A failure to cooperate fully with the Department for Community Welfare in its role in investigating other students thought to be at risk; and
3. A failure to take seriously previous complaints about the alleged perpetrators made by other parents and students.

As a result of this, the alleged perpetrator has been able to move between three private schools and a number of sporting institutions and coaching facilities in Adelaide and between several private colleges and sporting bodies interstate with apparent impunity. This raises doubts about the quality of personnel practices within the private school system in South Australia and its willingness to protect students.

We also understand that currently there are allegations of child sexual abuse against members of staff in at least six private schools in Adelaide and that there is a question as to whether school authorities have complied with the mandatory reporting legislation.

We are concerned that this may be the result of a lack of awareness of both the importance as well as the necessity of notifying such allegations to the Department for Community Welfare and would ask that you bring this matter to the attention of the members of the board for further discussion.

The letter was signed on behalf of the North-Eastern Child Protection Panel members. The letter was also sent to the Chairperson of the Independent Schools Board. The board advises me that it circulated this letter to all member schools, asked the panel to address specific allegations to schools and contacted the Director-General of the Department for Community Welfare. After this contact, all heads of schools were advised by the Independent Schools Board that child protection training programs were available and ought to be used.

Following the conviction of Zerella in March 1989, Mrs De Gregorio issued initial instructions to her solicitor about the possibility of suing Rostrevor College for failure in its duty of care to her sons. As member for Coles I represent

Rostrevor College and I have always admired and respected the Rostrevor community. Mrs De Gregorio does not claim that the then headmaster, Brother John Marks, and staff knew that her sons and other boys were being sexually abused.

But she does claim that they ought to have known. She believes, from statements made to her and to her lawyers by some members of the college community, that there were sufficient warning signs in Zerella's behaviour and in the disturbed responses of some boys to justify suspicion and for action to be taken. The college denies this. I sought and have obtained from the college a statement which I will now read to the House, as follows:

Rostrevor College was shocked and dismayed that the lives of two young men were so severely affected, particularly because the care of children is our primary task. The staff, students and wider college community deplore and regret the incidents, as would any civilised person who has due regard for the dignity and right of all individuals, particularly children, to safety and respect.

To attempt to blame any person or institution for these incidents is easy with hindsight. No-one suspected the person concerned, not even the family, who continued to treat the perpetrator as a close friend.

Rostrevor College believes it is only through a system of trust and openness within a school community that such practices can be discovered and future offences prevented. With this in mind—and a year before these offences were revealed—the school began initiating a series of policies and programs aimed at educating the students, staff and parents of the college, on a range of issues including all forms of harassment, which add to and strengthen the rights of students and which facilitate dialogue between the various parts of the school community.

Later in 1989, at my suggestion, Mrs De Gregorio sought compensation from the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund. In July 1990 the Crown paid James \$20 000 compensation with \$1 166.70 costs. The money was paid directly to James who, with his brother, was in a highly disturbed state at the time. The result was that money that could have been used to fund legal fees was largely dissipated and their mother continued to support both boys as well as pay legal fees and substantial medical costs.

The case for civil damages against Rostrevor College continued until May this year. In early May, I advised Rostrevor College and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Adelaide that I believed I would be justified in raising this case in Parliament if the civil action did not proceed to trial. In the event, Mrs De Gregorio could not afford to proceed to trial. The case was settled. The terms of the settlement provided that the plaintiff's costs of the action be paid by the college's insurers on the basis that the college denied liability. The statute of limitations period has now expired and, under the terms of the settlement, James De Gregorio agreed not to issue any further claims against the college or its insurers.

Later that month there were reports that the Catholic Church in Rome had conceded abuse of boys in Catholic institutions in Australia and had taken out a multi-million dollar insurance policy to protect itself against claims of sexual abuse by priests. Mr Rod Stinson, a member of the support group Friends of Suzannah, was quoted as saying that he believed the insurance cover enabled the church to escape without acknowledging the truth. He said that the protocol developed by the church for dealing with sexual abuse did not address the anguish suffered by survivors and that it was unduly influenced by the legal requirements of the insurance policy.

A feature article on this subject in the *Bulletin* of 10 August 1993 published a standard range of excuses for not addressing or reporting sexual abuse. I believe these excuses have applied not just to the Catholic Church but to my own

church, the Anglican Church, to other churches and to every institution and individual in society concerned about protecting reputations. These are the excuses:

1. It all happened so long ago. Why do you want to stir it up now?
2. What if this causes a man to commit suicide?
3. He's a mate of mine. I know he's a good bloke.
4. You're being vindictive.
5. He's done a lot of good work for the church.

It is a grossly misguided loyalty that values the reputation of an institution more highly than the proper protection of children in its care. Having examined a great deal of the evidence and many statements about this case—far more than I have time to refer to tonight—I wish to emphasise the central facts that emerge. Child sexual abuse is a criminal act. When it is discovered perpetrators must be dealt with, and other children at possible risk must be protected no matter what the perceived consequences to any institution. The Community Welfare Act provides for mandatory reporting of even a suspicion that sexual abuse might have occurred. Since 1976 all registered teachers, not just those in Government schools, have had a statutory obligation to report not only maltreatment or neglect but also reasonable suspicion of such acts. Reports must be accompanied by a statement of the observations and opinions upon which the suspicion is based.

There are obvious reasons for this provision. Whether or not the perpetrator is brought to justice, the child needs continuing support to come to terms with the horrors inflicted by such violation. The child's personality and sense of identity can be all but destroyed by the profound emotional and psychological damage wrought by sexual abuse. A social worker involved in the De Gregorio case told me that James and Matthew had survived only by the integrity of their personalities and by their enormous moral courage. In these qualities they have had a model in their mother, who has been staunchly supported throughout these ordeals by her husband.

A letter written by a former neighbour which formed part of the evidence in the trial stated:

Both sons were brought up in a loving and disciplined environment. Mrs De Gregorio has maintained the highest standards of care throughout her sons' upbringing. As a role-model she has contributed the characteristics of honesty, courage, tenderness and common-sense.

For more than four years I have marvelled at Mrs De Gregorio's constancy and persistence in seeking to obtain justice for the monstrous wrongs committed against her sons. In addition to dealing with the boys' traumas, she has been resolute in approaching organisations ranging from Legal Aid, Parents Against Child Sexual Abuse, Victims of Crime, Rape Crisis, the Children's Interests Bureau, the Department of Education, the Catholic Education Office, the Teachers Registration Board and the Department for Family and Community Services.

The work of the department in this case has been praiseworthy. Needless to say, Mrs De Gregorio's capacity to earn income has been very much limited by the time she has had to spend on this case and by the sum she has had to spend to do so. All her efforts so far have resulted in a suspended sentence for the perpetrator, and the costs of James' legal action against Rostrevor College. The only monetary compensation for the pain and suffering endured by this family, and for the colossal and continuing financial costs resulting from the sexual abuse of her sons, has been the

\$20 000 payment from the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund.

By bringing this case before Parliament, I hope to achieve some recognition of the unspeakable wrongs that have been inflicted upon two innocent boys. These young men are not only victims: they are survivors. I hope that the details of the case will bring home to every school, especially to every independent school in Australia, the need to establish protocols for dealing with such situations. I am advised by the Department for Family and Community Services that, for the past two years, there has been cooperation by both Rostrevor College and St Peter's College in protective behaviours programs and mandatory reporting. The Anglican Church in South Australia is now addressing the ways in which it should respond to these situations.

However, I do not believe that the healing processes which are essential for the human spirit can commence for James and Matthew De Gregorio and their parents until there is public recognition of the terrible consequences of concealing child abuse in the misguided belief that it is in everyone's best interests to do so. That is why, as the member for Coles, I have devoted the whole of my last Address in Reply speech to this issue.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

I support the motion, and I take the opportunity of once again congratulating the Governor on the way in which she applies herself to the duties of office. I often reflect that people much younger than she would have great difficulty in maintaining the pace that she does. More importantly, the manner in which she conducts her duties is a credit to her and the institution of Governor. I would also like to pass on my condolences to the family of Sir Condor Laucke and to the families of Dick Geddes, Bert Teusner and Hugh Hudson, and we have made mention of that more recently in this Parliament.

Whilst the delivery of the Governor's speech was quite superb, it must have been a very trying time for Her Excellency. It is a great pity that the quality of the delivery is not reflected in the substance of the article. The Governor's speech as presented by the Government to be presented by the Governor is a very tired, lacklustre document and the worst that I have seen in the 10 years that I have been a member of this Parliament. No member of this House could help feeling despondent after reading the article and thinking what hope the State of South Australia has under this current Administration. Not only is the document bereft of new ideas, but it reflects a Government in turmoil waiting for the guillotine. It has failed to pass any test that 47 members of this House would have applied. It fails to excite. It fails to enthuse. It fails to give new direction. It fails to take a constructive view on how the problems are going to be addressed. It fails to take on the responsibility of a Government of this State. It fails in so many ways that it is one of the most forgettable documents that has ever come before this Parliament.

It is little wonder that the quality of the document is so bad because it reflects a Government which is now literally falling apart. As has been mentioned in the speeches, and particularly in the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition, the Labor Party is racked by factions, and infighting, and is incapable of addressing itself to the needs of Government. We can understand that the speech writers had difficulty. We can understand that, with the Premier's mind on other things, the speech writers would have difficulty putting together a

constructive Governor's speech that would actually show the way to South Australia for the forthcoming year.

There is no doubt that the Premier's attention has been diverted, not only by the problems that have been caused by the State Bank and other financial disasters, but by the fact that he has no support within his own Party. Every day in this Parliament I look at the Government bench and the same view keeps coming back. The people on his own side do not support him. The members of this Parliament do not get behind him. They are all working out how they will divvy up what is left after the next election and, of course, with the leadership aspirations of the Minister of Business and Regional Development, I can understand why the work is not being done, but there is certainly plenty of lobbying.

It is a sick and tired Government. It has been corrupted by its period in office. It has lost its cutting edge. It cannot even support its Leader and its Premier. The Party has really missed the tough practitioners. I remember how Labor was successful during the 1970s and enjoyed success during the early 1980s because it had people who were rough and tough practitioners. Members opposite can reflect upon the contributions made by those people.

I did not happen to like them very much. I did not have an enormous respect for some of the things they did, but one thing I can say is that they kept the Labor Party together, and they made sure that, if there was dissension, heads would be knocked. They made sure that, if the Leader was in strife, they would rally to the occasion, even though they might have disliked the Leader.

For example, there is no doubt that there were many moments of dissension between Des Corcoran and Don Dunstan because, as we know, there was one vote in the final contest, and Des Corcoran was the runner up. There was no doubting his dedication to the cause and the fact that he rose to the occasion, even though he might have disliked the incumbent. So, we have a Government which is not worthy of holding the benches for a whole range of reasons, many of which have been expressed during this debate. But, more importantly, those members do not believe in themselves and, until their Party is cleansed, they never will. We must reflect upon the contributions of the Virgos, the Hudsons, the Corcorans and the Jack Wrights to see how they made the Labor Party a power to be reckoned with here in South Australia.

The State does deserve better than a Government which cannot keep its eye on the ball and which cannot take on the responsibilities of Government. It has Ministers who are getting paid good money and who are simply not performing. They will not resign, despite their major contribution to the disaster that has befallen the State involving the State Bank, SGIC, and the list goes on. The Government cannot hang on any longer to a Premier who is incapable of holding office without the support of his parliamentary colleagues. It cannot possibly condone the leadership being shown by the Premier of this State in relation to such issues as Mabo and the Lake Eyre world heritage listing, where he simply hung onto the coat-tails of the Prime Minister of this country (who to my mind is a madman; the Prime Minister of this country is a mental case).

I have never seen anything so destructive in all my life as the current Prime Minister of this country. As a reader of history books, having delved into books back to 1788 and since then, I have not found a person so unsuited to the highest position in this country as the present Prime Minister who has decided that the only way he will maintain his hold

on power is to divide and destroy the very things that the people of South Australia and Australia hold dear. Every time the Prime Minister speaks, the Premier of this State falls into line, and it does not matter whether it involves the Mabo issue or other issues.

With regard to Mabo, all the other States are now coming to their senses and saying, 'Keating, you're nuts!' Even Premier Goss has said, 'Look, you're crazy!' But the Premier says, 'It will be all right; I will follow the Keating formula.' It does not matter that the Prime Minister cannot support the Alice Springs to Darwin railway. That is all right with the Premier of this State, too. It is also all right, according to the Premier of this State, that tariffs are being reduced but no other reforms are taking place, that our manufacturing industry is facing untold difficulty and that the Prime Minister can have a \$16 billion deficit. He can also offer tax reform and child care support, take it away and then impose a tax regime that will hit very hard the people of South Australia. There are also the broken promises.

It is all right, according to the Premier of this State, that we have just lost \$50 million in the last budget from the tax sharing and Medicare income sharing arrangement. That is all right for the Premier of this State, who has forgotten how to fight, who has forgotten how to be a Premier, who simply cannot get up to the mark and who makes a brave attempt on many occasions but simply is not cut out to be the Premier of this State, and neither is the rest of his Cabinet. The rest of his Cabinet simply cannot perform as a Government that South Australians should expect. The State deserves far better than it is receiving right at this moment. The sooner the election is called, the greater the relief felt by all South Australians.

I reflect on the fact that there were some interesting omissions from the Governor's speech. For example, I did not see any reference to submarines—no reference whatsoever. I found that very strange. Of all the things that have happened in the past five years, if there is one item that might produce one little spark, it is the fact that we are to have a submarine rolling off on 28 August 1993. I would have thought that the Governor's speech would reflect the fact that there has been a submarine constructed in South Australia, yet it did not.

I have recently been to naval receptions and it is interesting that senior naval personnel from around Australia have asked me, 'How is the Premier going to handle the submarine, given that he was the most vehement opponent of submarines being built in the State?' I was not aware that he was as vehement as the naval fraternity suggested, but it was interesting for me to note that they felt that the Premier of this State had done all in his power, when he was the Minister of State Development, to prevent the building of submarines here. That came as somewhat of a surprise to me but I can understand it, given that he has particular beliefs, which we all understand. Even when something a bit brighter happens for this Government, its reticence to utilise that particular item reflects the stance taken by the Premier of the State at the time the project was first mooted.

We are in need of absolutely drastic reform. We want to see people fighting for their ideals once again; we want people fighting for their futures once again and not accepting what they have at the moment; we want to get the heads of South Australian people off their chests so that they can start to feel more pride in themselves and their State; we want to give young people a chance; we want to give them a job; we want them to succeed; and we want to be the best State in

Australia but we cannot achieve that under the current regime.

Our kids deserve a chance; our families deserve a chance; and everybody deserves a chance to be part of a South Australia that is capable of achieving far more than it is currently achieving. That relates to some changes that must take place and the standards that we set right from the very beginning. We have to look at the moral sets and the moral values in which we deal and to which we relate, and we have to start at a very early age and reinforce some of those very strong, worthwhile, moral values that are so essential. It has to happen in the schools, in the homes and in the very Government itself.

We cannot tolerate the corruption that has occurred in more recent years, and it has been a corruption: it has been a corruption in Government. The results of the State Bank situation are a reflection of the arrogance of the Government and a lack of care applied to the responsibilities of Government.

So, there is a very special need facing South Australia, and it is a need that cannot be met with our current regime. We have to grab our opportunities and control our destinies: we have to capture our place in the sun.

Government plays a very important role in that process. A change of Government brings not only a change of morale but a cleansing of the system. I realise that all Governments have their day; all Governments after a while become tired. The next Liberal Government has a lifetime and, if we do win the next election and if we do not continue to change with the times, we will become poor servants of the people of South Australia.

That is what has happened over a period of time, particularly during the 1980s, here in South Australia. We had the same, tired personnel who were incapable of keeping up with what was happening in the rest of Australia and the rest of the world and using the smart, easy way to somehow survive without really reflecting on where the State was meant to be going. So Governments have to set new directions, and that is what the Liberal Government intends to do. It does mean that the Government has to operate honestly and fearlessly. It does mean that it has to operate without fear or favour. It does mean that it has to set the directions in which the State should travel, whether it be in the areas of transport or export, or in the delivery of hospital services or education; we have to set the standards as a Government and ensure that they are met. We have to reinforce the fundamentals and in many ways bring the world to us.

I am a passionate person in relation to my love of South Australia and its people. What has happened in recent times really grinds at my guts, and I hope it grinds at everybody's guts in this place, and I am aware of the impact it has had on our constituents. An overwhelming demand is being placed on a Government in perhaps some of the more difficult circumstances that we have found ourselves in during the past 60 years. Not only do we have to set the standards but we have to be able to motivate to achieve, to ask people to put in more effort, to aim for excellence, to care for each other, to help those who are less capable of helping themselves, to create wealth and to work for a better life.

These are the things that members of the Government must do. They cannot simply sit there, 13 good men and women—or 13 less than good men and women—and expect that, just by being there, just by administering Government, they will achieve some level of success, because it is not on. The world is changing so rapidly that we have to catch up in

a big hurry, and that means reform in the industrial area. Already we have seen statements from the Liberal Party in terms of running a parallel system—with enterprise bargaining and with the award system. It means that we get rid of anachronistic ideas of compulsory unionism and closed shops, and we get out and meet the challenges that the world presents. It means we have to get a lot smarter on our wharves and transport systems.

It means we have to deliver a better quality of education right from day one. It means we have to catch up on the kids who are being left behind at the moment. We have to catch up on the kids who are not getting the proper level of assistance at home, unfortunately, because, if we do not, we will continue to see the horrifying statistics that we have seen in recent times regarding the more serious crimes being committed by people in this State.

So a tremendous challenge faces this State. There is such a fundamental need to change that, when I read the Governor's speech, just how much this Government has failed this State and its people keeps coming back to me.

It is true that at one time Labor members hated the Liberals more than anything. Now they are beginning to hate themselves. But that is not the answer. The answer is to cleanse themselves of the rot. It is probably relevant that they should hate themselves for what they have done, but in terms of being potential future administrators of this State they have to go through some dramatic changes of their own.

It is worth reminding members of the missed opportunities. We can talk about the \$3 150 million and the servicing cost of that debt of about \$300 million a year, and we would be emphasising points that have been made well in the past. We have seen a build up to that situation. The scene was set long before the State Bank crash because of the blunders, the mistakes and the lack of application by the Government in trying to pick winners and not applying themselves properly.

We can list the underwriting of the Americas Cup challenge. It was absolutely amazing to me that South Australia felt that it could take on the world. With a population of 1.5 million people and yacht technology, which in some circumstances was very good but not in the area of that of 12-metre yachts, it suddenly had the audacity to say, 'We can take on the world; we can take on the big challenge.' That would have been fine if we had had an entrepreneur in South Australia willing to say, 'I am going to put my own dollars in and fight that fight.' But no, that little item cost South Australia \$1.8 million. I believe in initiative and getting out and doing something, but I do not believe that the Government should be putting money into exercises such as that.

We saw the 330 Collins Street debacle. SGIC said, 'It is not a problem. If the loans cannot be repaid, we will have the building.' Of course, we now know that the building, which cost \$550 million, has a current valuation of probably \$150 million. There has been a dramatic \$350 million bail-out of SGIC by the State Government. That was because they did not follow the fundamental rule of limiting their exposure on any one investment to less than 10 per cent of their liabilities, and now we must all pay the price.

Irrespective of whether the deal looked good, bad or indifferent at the time, the facts of life are that there were some rules to operate by and they were clear. One does not over expose oneself on any asset or liability unless one has the capacity to pay, and even then one should do it with a great deal of discretion. Again, the Government failed.

We have the incredible situation of the Myer-Remm centre. The total cost, capitalisation of interest included, is

probably in excess of \$760 million with an exposure of the State Bank of \$729 million. There are varying valuations on that building, some as ludicrously low as \$100 million. Again, the Government failed to do its homework. It was evident from the beginning that there would be difficulty with that project. Nobody in South Australia or interstate wanted to invest in it. I actually wrote to Myer-Remm and said, 'You will get cleaned up on the site because the unions have told me that they are going to use this as the next ASER site.' I received a reply saying that it was all under control, they had very good union relations and there would be no cost escalation due to disputation on the site. Of course, that was a joke—a sick joke—because ultimately it cost the taxpayer a huge amount of money.

However, even when I looked at that original prospectus, I saw that the price of the floor space in Myer-Remm, given the projected costs at that time, was three times the highest rental charged in Adelaide. Three times the highest rental being charged in Adelaide at that time would have to be recouped on that building in order to cover costs. I asked myself the question, and I asked a number of other people around Adelaide the same question: who would be mad enough to suspect that the return on the Myer-Remm centre, or whatever centre, would be three times the highest currently prevailing in Adelaide?

We can talk about the Scrimber timber project and about the adventures of SATCO and the State Bank in New Zealand, into timber and banking—

Mr Holloway: The only thing you can't talk about is your policies.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member will have to wait for that. As another area of failure, we can talk about the Marineland project, which all up cost the State about \$11 million; the \$28 million blow-out in the justice information system; the \$6 million blow-out in the computer system for the Motor Vehicles Department; the \$30 million blow-out in the Engineering and Water Supply Department for computerisation (and the Government is still intending to talk about amalgamations with a background like that); the \$11 million blow-out on the *Island Seaway*; the Government subsidy of the ASER project, which was meant to cost \$185 million and came in at double the price; and the blow-out in the State Aquatic Centre.

So the seeds of destruction were sown well before the State Bank incident, and it required only a little less diligence than was being applied at the time and there was no doubt that we were going to suffer. But I believe nobody could have envisaged the dramatic costs of the State Bank when we were concerned about the matter. We were concerned about it when the National Safety Council went bust; we were concerned about it when Equiticorp went bust. So, quite early in the piece the alarm bells were ringing but there was no action by the Government.

I reflect on all the missed opportunities, and I know that Governments will at various stages make mistakes. Governments that want to achieve will certainly make some mistakes along the way, just as I expect that a new Liberal Government will make some mistakes. That is inherent; if a Government wants to succeed it must ensure that it minimises its mistakes, but there will always be some. To do otherwise means that one will never realise one's ultimate potential.

However, the enormous catastrophe that has hit this State is not a minor problem. It was created because of people such as the former Premier, John Bannon, his minders who had no financial or economic expertise and the desire of the Labor

Party for secrecy. I can always remember that terminology: 'I am sorry, we can't give you the answers because it is commercially confidential.' It keeps coming back.

So, I am looking forward to the challenge on a change of Government, and I believe that South Australians are looking forward to the same challenge. I am sorry that the Government could not make the effort to produce a better paper than we have before us in this debate.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In doing so, I commend the Governor for her efforts for South Australia. As the member for Adelaide, I am lucky that a number of State-wide organisations have their head offices or annual general meetings or whatever in the central business district, and as such I see possibly more than most other members—other than the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition—just how much effort the Governor puts into going to and understanding and speaking about the many community groups in South Australia.

As members will know, this session started with two condolence motions. I can add nothing to the condolence motion in relation to Hugh Hudson other than to say that in my early days of politics I recognised that he was a fierce proponent of a side of politics with which I did not agree then and with which I still disagree. I have been quite taken by a number of the things that have been said about him in the various condolence motions.

However, I did, in fact, know Sir Condor in a capacity unrelated to the Liberal Party. I knew him as a member of a wine and food society called *La Confrerie des Chevaliers du Tastevin*, which is indeed a very grand name for a society of friends who do nothing more than celebrate the medicinal value of wine taken by the glass with food. This society, which I once imagined to be a venerable and crusty ancient brotherhood, turned out to be nothing more than a very slick promotional and marketing exercise for an area of France that produces wine and, far from being ancient and crusty, it had started not very long ago. Sir Condor was always greatly respected and liked by the members of the society, and this society indulged his passion for wine and all of the nuances of the growing and sale of it. To Lady Laucke, I extend my personal sympathy and thanks for her contribution to a job well done for South Australia.

Sir Condor was so highly regarded in the community that I felt it was interesting that I had three people contact my office to complain that commercial television chose not to cover his funeral. Indeed, as a former Lieutenant Governor and someone who had contributed a lot to the life of South Australia, I thought that the reaction of those three people was a very valid one.

In mentioning the wine and food society, I wish to draw the House's attention to such a worldwide marketing exercise that promotes wines from a particular area of France. It is my view that our wines are a real sleeping giant of export potential. Already, wine and wine industries form an enormous part of our export load and I would like to present to the House some figures for the last four periods for June in relation to the value of Australian wine exports.

In June 1990, the dollar value of exports of Australian wine was \$41 956 929—near enough to \$42 million; one year later it was \$57 million and a few hundred thousand; in June 1992 it was nearly \$79 million; and in June 1993, \$103 406 015. In other words, in the period between June 1990 and June 1993 the value of Australian wine exports has

increased from \$42 million to \$103 million. If this is continued, the projected sales can be seen in the sales forecasts, as follows: while in 1992-93 the total (in millions of dollars) for all markets for export is \$319 million, in 1996-97, which as we all know is not very far away—within the term of the next Government—it will more than double to \$751 million.

If I were allowed to display something in this House—which I know I am not—I would display a graph that is really quite impressive indicating that the values of export of Australian wine are heading from the bottom left-hand corner of the graph in a continual progression to the top right-hand corner, and let us hope they continue to do so. In fact, when one looks at these figures one can justifiably wonder where it will all stop. I suppose that, as passionate consumers of wine in South Australia and as people hoping to see our economy increase, we hope that it does not stop. My friends in the wine industry—and I have a number—tell me, however, that things are precariously balanced and we have to be very careful that the loosely termed 'cowboys' do not queer the pitch.

However, with this huge potential for wines and with South Australia unquestionably being 'the' wine State in Australia, for many reasons, not the least of which is the quality, but also because more and more people particularly from overseas are saying that our wine is an unpolluted entity—in other words, no effects from Chernobyl, and so on—this State could well be a jewel in the Australian export crown. As such, I believe we should look at marketing exercises such as the wine and food society, which I mentioned before and through which I came into contact with Sir Condor Laucke. The reason I say this is that large things grow from small acorns and I believe we should at least start a similar exercise.

Of course, the spinoffs to South Australia are enormous, not the least of which is tourism. It would be an advantage to South Australia if we were to be more supportive of these types of enterprises. Certainly, our wine quality is one thing that the other States do not have. We cannot compete against the Reef, we cannot compete against the Rock, we cannot compete against the Harbor, but we do have an unpolluted, world class magnificent product in wine, which can have many spinoffs for South Australia's economy.

Whilst talking on the subject of tourism, I wish to commend Mr Bill Spurr and his staff at ACTA who recently organised or were clever enough to have Adelaide chosen as the destination for the 1993 Malaysian Airlines mega-million-dollar award achiever's program. This entailed 56 Malaysian Airlines top agents, who handle some 40 per cent of the total Malaysian Airlines business, together with 15 Malaysian Airlines executives arriving for a short stay in Adelaide. The Lord Mayor, Henry Ninio, greeted the party with glasses of champagne—dare I risk repeating the wine theme—and later in the day they came along our cultural boulevard of North Terrace.

Because I am the member for Adelaide, Mr Bill Spurr asked me (and with the good graces of the Speaker I was allowed) to bring these top mega-million-dollar achievers into Parliament House, to discuss very briefly our parliamentary traditions and to welcome them to Adelaide on behalf of the South Australian Parliament. I am delighted to say that Mr Spurr has already communicated to me that these big sellers of business from Malaysia have already done business in Adelaide. That response was more rapid and more unexpected than they may have necessarily hoped for.

The enthusiasm and willingness to pitch in and make things work, which was exhibited by Mr Bill Spurr and his staff at ACTA, unfortunately is not reflected in the Government.

The people of South Australia, especially the 52 per cent who voted for the Liberal Party ahead of the Labor Party, but also the 48 per cent who voted for the Labor Party, are looking to the Government for some action, some enthusiasm and some willingness to pitch in and make things happen. And what does the South Australian population, whether it voted Labor or Liberal at the last election, get from its elected leaders? Paralysis, impotence, suspended animation and apathy. Not quite suspended animation, because within the ALP there is in fact furious activity. As the member for Hartley says, there are thugs at work continually. If one believes the present Minister of Primary Industries as he was quoted in the *Sunday Mail* of 2 February:

The Party has simply lost its way. It has forgotten that it is there to serve people and to promote causes and issues, rather than the factional bosses who are concerned only to maintain their power. . . it has been hijacked by a bunch of thugs who are using it to do nothing more than to serve their own ambitions.

While this information is galling for South Australia in general, it must be particularly galling for the unemployed, for those in hospital queues and for those with children whose education is less than optimal, and so on, because these people, business people and everyday loyal citizens of South Australia, want the Government to concentrate on the main game, but this Government unfortunately is occupied totally with its own petty bickering. I am happy to inform members opposite that, whilst it may be of great importance to them as they navel gaze in Caucus meetings, there are issues of greater moment being discussed in the electorate.

Statements by the member for Hartley who, as I indicated before, is now the Minister of Primary Industries, must be galling also for the member for Walsh, the member for Henley Beach and the member for Gilles. Why? On 4 September 1992, a mere three days after former Premier Bannon fell on his sword—which I believe had been honed for months by his colleagues—the *Advertiser* reported, and I paraphrase, that ‘Mr Trainer is the front-runner to fill the Cabinet vacancy left by Mr Bannon’s resignation, with Mr Ferguson the other declared candidate.’

It would seem there are different standards applicable, because, in a major rerun of the parable of the prodigal son, the members for Elizabeth and Hartley were welcomed back with open arms. Mateship, it would appear, is dead and buried forever in the ALP. The motto now is, ‘Anything for power’. I sympathise with the members for Walsh and Henley Beach: loyal service that they have given to their Party of choice (and I recognise that loyal service) has been repaid by a slap in the face with a wet fish! What does the hapless member for Gilles think of all these shenanigans? On 10 February the *Advertiser* read as follows:

Colin McKee warns if negotiations to find him a seat break down, he would have no option but ‘to pack my kitbag and move to the crossbenches. . . it would be untenable to sit with the Labor Government after the Labor Party has told me they do not want me.’

Further, on 16 February in the *Sunday Mail* the member for Gilles again stated:

If no seat is found for me by (the end of the month), then I’ll walk. . .

It is a bit like a person given out in cricket, no doubt, but he says:

. . . then I’ll walk—straight to the crossbenches as an Independent. . . I have to protect my integrity.

One can only conclude from the member for Gilles’ point of view that it is a pity he did not walk to the crossbenches, because if he had he would have been a Minister, probably since September last year, instead of being ALP factional cannon fodder.

Whilst looking at the squalid little dealings of the Government, I would like to review how our Premier must feel about all this. Our new Premier, who I think had been polishing the ceremonial harakiri sword for the member for Ross Smith for some time, approached the factional problem with all the zeal of someone who was faster than a speeding bullet, more powerful than a locomotive and able to leap tall buildings in a single bound. The problem for our Premier was that the building he attempted to leap was the State Bank building and that the factional problems of the ALP were like kryptonite; they left him powerless. Either that or he forgot to change his glasses in the phone box. He must have tripped over the building on the way over it and fallen flat on his face.

In the *Advertiser* of 30 September, the Premier said, ‘This issue will be resolved, I can assure you of that.’ Five months later, on 27 February this year, in the *Sunday Mail* the Premier said, ‘I remain of the view the issue has to be resolved before the next election, and I believe it will’—another failure. Whilst reviewing the contributions of various members in the Chamber in relation to the Address in Reply I was fascinated to read our former Premier’s contribution. The member for Ross Smith invited the Leader of the Opposition to ‘join him in doorknocking to pick up some opinions on the doorstep.’ I ask: who does the member for Ross Smith think he is deluding? Clearly himself.

Why do I say this? It is because I am in fact doorknocking in the seat of Ross Smith, part of which has been added to the State seat of Adelaide. I indicate to the House that I shall be proud to represent those people who live in the area which is presently represented by the member for Ross Smith and which after the next election (whenever that is called) will be represented by the member for Adelaide, and I am confident that that will be me. I will be as proud to represent those people as I am to represent the people in the State seat of Adelaide as presently constituted.

To return from my digression about electorates to the present member for Ross Smith, I would say that the views given by people to whom I am speaking at the door in his electorate are antagonistic towards the honourable member, not only because he ignored them as their local member (and that is the most common view that I have heard; as the incumbent in a safe Labor seat he did not bother to do the work locally) but also because of what he did to the State and how he did it. Many people, completely spontaneously, raised with me the home loan interest subsidy scandal, in which the then Premier used \$2 million of taxpayers’ funds to buy electoral support.

I put to the member for Ross Smith that if he believes that his constituents support him as strongly as he believes they do, he clearly is hearing only what he wants to hear. It is reminiscent of the well-known fable relating to the emperor’s new clothes. It needs only one constituent of the member for Ross Smith to tell the truth to his face for an unstoppable avalanche of criticism to be heard. A word of warning to the former Premier: keep doorknocking only your friends and

relatives, although one wonders how many friends the honourable member has left.

Mr Becker: Two?

Dr ARMITAGE: Possibly—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.H. Hemmings): The member for Hanson is interjecting out of his place, so I hope the honourable member will not respond.

Dr ARMITAGE: My attention was drawn to the state of the House and I did not see that the member for Hanson was out of his place; nevertheless it was an apposite interjection. Why are people in the electorate of Ross Smith so distressed about what has happened? It is because they have seen South Australia go backwards over the past 10 years.

Indeed, the member for Napier in his Address in Reply speech earlier today alluded to some of the problems facing this Government at present because of what has happened during the past 10 years. The reason this has happened can probably be seen in the Arthur D. Little report where an independent assessment of Labor's performance was given as follows:

By and large, the policy—

that is, the policy of the then Bannon Government and of the now Arnold Government—

has been one of shooting any bird that flies past rather than planning for the future economic well-being of the State which gives thought to both attracting strategic industries as well as to nurturing and fostering local business.

People in the electorate of Ross Smith and in South Australia are angry with the member for Ross Smith and with this Government because they did not want a Government that tried to shoot any bird that went past; they wanted a Government that planned and had the courage to achieve what it wanted to do.

If one looks at what the Government wanted to do and what it did not have the courage to do, one could read out a litany, and I intend to do so. The promised cost of the Marino Rocks marina was \$360 million; the Mount Lofty hotel and cable car, \$55 million; Jubilee Point, \$160 million; Wilpena, \$50 million; Marineland, \$39 million—the Premier was intimately involved as the Minister responsible, while with all the others he was merely the Minister at the table; the paper recycling plant, \$300 million; the southern O-Bahn and Tonsley interchange, \$170 million; the Woomera redevelopment, \$250 million; the Darlington bypass and third arterial road to the southern suburbs, \$50 million; the third unit for the Northern Power Station, \$450 million; and the petrochemical and coal gasification plants, \$1 000 million. Just imagine the effect that all those projects or even some of them would have had on the economy of South Australia.

I have left until now the three that affect my electorate, the State electorate of Adelaide, which of course contains the central business district and, as such, is a pivotal electorate in the future of South Australia. Which projects were promised and not achieved in the State electorate of Adelaide over the last few years of the Bannon decade and the Arnold responsibility? First, the Victoria Square facelift, which was to cost a mere \$200 million. I remember during the immediate pre-election period in 1989 great shenanigans and hullabaloo about what was going to be done, and I defy anyone to see one thing different in Victoria Square. Secondly, the O-Bahn tunnel under the parklands, which was to cost \$40 million—still another pipe dream. Thirdly, the Art Gallery expansion, which was to cost \$30 million. At least the Government has had the goodwill to put the Art Gallery

expansion onto its program as an election sweetener, but under this Government it will probably have exactly the same fate as it did before.

When I look at the economy I am continually told by people who wish for better things for their children that one failing in particular in South Australia is the fact that their children have basically been deserted by this Government in relation to education. Let us look at the role of this Government over the past 10 years regarding education. I would like to remind the House of just one fact. It is only a little quote but it meant a lot in the 1985 ALP election policy speech. I am pleased to see the former Minister of Education in the House, because the ALP election policy speech stated, 'Teacher numbers will be maintained.' Since then the number of teachers in State Government schools has been reduced by 1 200. So much for that promise. Is it any wonder that South Australian parents are angry when they see education in South Australia declining rapidly and therefore lessening the chances of their children being able to compete in an increasingly educated world.

If we look in general at Labor's promises in respect of education made and not honoured in the 1982, 1985 and 1989 elections, we find the following:

- To reduce the staff/child ratio in preschools.
- To establish a maximum class size of 25 for junior primary and 27 for the remaining levels of primary schooling.
- To create a school payments fund to fund the cost of materials in schools and to maintain the fund in real terms.
- To promote excellence by increasing advisory services.
- To ensure teachers can effectively implement curriculum advisory services (in fact, they have been decimated).
- To guarantee no funding cuts to schools.
- To provide extra staff for special schools.
- To provide progressive improvement of school buildings and grounds.
- A curriculum guarantee for every student to significantly improve the quality of education.
- The establishment of a natural history centre in the Flinders Ranges National Park for environmental education.
- To retain non-instructional time for secondary teachers at 20 per cent.

Here we have a litany of promises, not one of which was kept. Is it any wonder that South Australian parents are deserting this failed Government and its education policies in droves?

The area for which I have particular responsibility for the Opposition in this House is health, and I should like to spend the remaining brief time in this debate addressing a number of issues which arose in regard to a media release which the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services put out today and which is clearly the gloss. Of course, the dross will come when the budget papers are released. The Minister indicates that this year's budget will include an unspent \$34 million from last financial year's health budget.

Every one of the 9 500 patients on the waiting list has a legitimate right to ask the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services, 'Why was that money not spent on my operation?' The reason it was not spent is clearly that it was being squirreled away so it could be used as a pre-election sweetener. Certainly, it is appalling that a Government would play with people's health and cause increased suffering for its own political ends. The Minister indicated with much hullabaloo that this budget includes spending of \$67.7 million on capital works.

In at least one report which has been leaked to me and which I highlighted last year it was stated that merely to upgrade the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to modern day standards would require \$200 million. A legitimate question to the Minister would be: does he believe that this wonderful \$67.7 million to be spent on capital works will guarantee that the sluices do not leak in hospitals and that maggots do not get through the walls? On Thursday I questioned the Minister about services for the Child Protection Unit at the Women's and Children's Hospital.

I asked the Minister whether he would increase funding because clearly the unit was unable to deal with the load. In fact, the House was told then that the facilities were completely adequate, that there had been an increase in the previous year, which I acknowledged to the Minister, but he said that in the present circumstances there would seem to be no need for any increase because everything is adequate. What do we find a mere five days later: \$750 000 is to be directed to this very service. I am delighted it is being directed there because clearly it is necessary, but obviously the Minister was not on top of his portfolio.

This Government and its standing in the polls are adequate examples of why the people of South Australia are rejecting a self-centred, faction-driven group of people who would rather deal with their own internal squalid problems with groups of thugs from South Terrace than with the low key people on North Terrace—

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

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Like other members, I support the motion and commend Her Excellency the Governor for the decorum with which she presented her address to Parliament last Tuesday. Her Excellency's speech first drew attention to the deaths of former members of Parliament, and I, too, would like to add my condolences to the families of the late Sir Condor Laucke, the late Mr Dick Geddes, the late Mr Teusner and the late Mr Hugh Hudson. I do so, Sir, because I knew all of those members, although I did not know Mr Teusner very well.

Sir Condor Laucke had spoken to me on numerous occasions. It was said on the occasion of the State funeral that he was certainly a gentleman in every sense of the word, and I do not think that any one of us would dare to suggest otherwise, because I have never known a gentleman who was so kind and thoughtful. Certainly he was prepared to discuss matters of importance and of a family nature with any person at any time, and I think to that end it has been an honour to have known Sir Condor, and I certainly extend my deepest sympathies to Lady Laucke and other members of his family.

Many of us knew the late Mr Geddes, who was a member of the Legislative Council from 1965 to 1979. He and I had many issues of common interest, as he was originally from the land, and as such we were able to have many discussions. Mr Teusner left Parliament one term of office before I entered this House, and although I recall many a discussion about his contribution to Parliament, which indeed was lengthy, I did not have the pleasure of meeting him then.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson was a Minister for the first six years of my membership of this House, and he was a man of strong political integrity who was able to lead with a firm

conviction. As other members of this side of the House have said, he put his stamp upon a new education portfolio at that time, and it certainly earned the respect of many people. Mr Hudson told me to call him Hugh on the very first day of my entry into this House—there was no such thing as 'Mr' in the corridors; everyone was on a first name basis—and that was the manner in which he conducted his business around this House, and certainly it was a pleasure to have him in my electorate when he was holding that portfolio. I extend my sincere condolences to the families of all those members.

Her Excellency referred to numerous issues throughout her speech, which was designed to be a springboard into the next State election, or certainly to be a springboard into the last session of Parliament that this present Parliament will have, and I found it rather disappointing that there was very little in it that could be a source of inspiration and confidence for the future. The very first thing that I picked up was that there was no reference to the submarines. One would have thought that that was a business that was able to attract many hundreds, if not thousands, of jobs to South Australia, and as such should have been worth a mention. However, that was not the case, while other lesser issues were referred to.

When I refer to other lesser issues I do not mean that in any derogatory sense because every aspect does have some significance to each of the individuals. Reference was made to the requirement to effectively prop up the State Bank and I do not think any of us realise or understand the gravity of that situation. Certainly, I believe the Government will realise and understand the gravity of the situation because there is no doubt it will cost it office next time around. I feel for all the people who are suffering as a result of the tightening up of banking policies. Much of this has been brought about by maladministration, certainly poor administration, by many executive officers of the bank.

I find it rather hypocritical that the banks can now put the heavy on farmers and small businesses in a manner which completely lacks feeling and understanding for their position. I would like to quote from an editorial in the Kangaroo Island newspaper. The editorial was entitled 'Stop the madness'. I will not quote it in its entirety, but I will refer to it because it goes on to talk about the Gary Lovering case where the farmer is now obliged to pay \$1.87 million. That, no doubt, has taken the Lovering family from the island and caused enormous problems. The editorial of Mr Neville Cordes states:

That Gary Lovering did what he did is not surprising—for it is the mark of the man. Those who have lived, worked and played with this man know him as a fighter, a leader, a man of integrity and an outstanding citizen. The judgment [in the court case] painted a black picture. Not of crimes committed, but of errors and omissions, neglect of fiduciary duty and the minute of the law. Thus the major creditor, the State Bank of South Australia, proved its case, at enormous cost. But there would seem to be hardly any benefit at all for it in the exercise. So who wins? Not the Loverings—they've been wiped out. Not the Kangaroo Island community—it has had another kick in the stomach and lost a hard-working family who have contributed enormously over the decades. Not the bank—certainly not the bank. Its hypocrisy in pointing the accusing finger of bad management at its clients is breathtaking. Who wins? No-one. So let's stop this madness. There has to be a better way. Maybe there is still room for some commonsense to prevail, enabling something to be salvaged from this particular mess. Believe it or not we are a friend of the State Bank, we want to see it restored to its once proud position as the battler's bank, the little people's bank. But it has a long way to go. Anderson, McNamara, Holman, Arnold, Lovering—the list goes on and on. We appeal to the State Bank—all banks—to stop the madness now. There has to be a better way. Just find it.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I believe that you, Sir, as Chairman of the Rural Finance Select Committee, would share those sentiments. I commend to you and other members of that committee some of the statements that have been made to this House from time to time. We need to find a better way to handle crisis situations as they occur. Mr Deputy Speaker, you and other members would know that I have raised in this House on a number of occasions my concerns for what may happen when certain people are pushed to the limits of stress that they may not be able to handle. My biggest fear is that somebody is going to get seriously hurt in all of this exercise.

Her Excellency referred to a number of other issues in relation to primary industries and reference was made to the mouse plague. Members would know that I have already given notice of a motion, hopefully to come on next Wednesday, so that issue may be able to be debated before this House and some resolution brought before it. However, our weather conditions—and reference was made to them in Her Excellency's speech—are not proving favourable to some areas of the State. We have had a very late season, as members would know, and regrettably large areas of the State have been affected by the mouse plague. In the last two or three days severe wind storms, coupled with damage, have occurred in areas with little or no crops on them.

People in those areas are facing what might well turn out to be a very bleak farming year. I hope that that is not the case: where there is some hope, we would like to think that some return will result. For the interim period it certainly looks as though things are not too good for the areas of the northern part of the Eyre Peninsula and some parts of the Murray.

I would like to raise a couple of other issues of a more social nature. Members will know that I have referred in this House to vandalism in schools, such as the large-scale breaking of windows and the trashing and setting alight of schools. This has created a great deal of animosity and anxiety within the community, so much so that there has even been the suggestion of vigilante groups. I make the plea that we do not head down that track. Certainly, we must work within the province of the law; we must do everything we can to assist the police to track down the offenders who damage public property; and we must help get our young people back into a learning environment in which they are relaxed, free from stress and able to get on with the job.

Earlier this year, an unfortunate incident occurred at the Port Lincoln High School; there was a massive brawl, in which large numbers of students were involved. There was many a blood nose and I am told that, on a couple of occasions, there were some broken noses. To the credit of the Headmaster, the school staff, the school council, and the Minister and her staff, immediate action was taken. That resulted in emergency meetings being called that very same night and a subsequent series of meetings. I am very pleased to be able to report to this House that a great deal of good was done by those meetings, and my full commendation goes to the Principal of the high school, Mr Rod Cox, for his involvement in putting straight that matter.

As members have probably gathered, in that brawl there were implications of racial bias by various groups. To his credit, the Principal sat down one section of the community in one room and gave every student a piece of paper and a pencil, and he put the other group in another room, telling every one of them to make a statement. That cross-check provided the opportunity to sort out who were the trouble-makers. Fortunately, it was a very small number of people.

They were sorted out, and certain prosecutions have been laid. Certainly, a children's aid panel has been called in and many of those students have been chastised—and in some cases charged—for their wrongdoings.

I hope that no school ever has to go through that exercise again. I only hope that the lessons learned through that have had a salutary effect on all concerned and that the learning environment that has now been restored can continue in the future. I thank all sections of the community for the responsible manner in which they responded to that—the school council, the staff and the students, who have been able to demonstrate that they can get on with their learning activities in a responsible way. I hope that the lesson has been learned and that the wider community can take an interest in it.

Unfortunately, a similar thing might have occurred at the Kirton Point Primary School where, during the school holidays, three rooms were trashed. In that instance, the offenders carried paint onto the school grounds and took it into classrooms. It was an act of wilful damage; there is no question about that. Only a fortnight ago, those three rooms were burned to the ground. That has caused an enormous amount of stress to the students and the staff and, needless to say, it has been not only in the headlines of our papers but in the State media, and a lot of counselling has been required for the students and staff involved.

I am also pleased to report that the respective departments—and there were many departments involved—responded quickly, and at this time there is certainly nothing but praise for all those departments for the way in which they responded to a very difficult position. In saying that, I point out that we have not solved the problem. There are people out in our communities who want to destroy public property—for whatever reason, we do not know. I hope that those persons who have done that will recognise the error of their ways. I hope that any people who know or have any indication of who the offenders might be will contact the police so that we can do everything within our power to see that it does not happen again.

On many occasions in this House I have referred to the Gulflink Ferry. I do so again to give my full support to that project. I believe it is an area where the Government could almost immediately pick up 500 jobs. It would provide a transport corridor between the eastern seaboard and Western Australia, save a considerable amount of mileage and take a large amount of the heavy haulage industry off our roads, and that is obviously costing this State a lot of money. We could get that heavy haulage off our main roads, particularly the road from Port Wakefield to Kimba or through to Cowell; it would then go via Cowell, Cleve, Lock to Kyancutta and back to the Eyre Highway.

I strongly support this project not only because I believe that the project stands up in terms of the financial figures for the heavy haulage industry but because the spin-off effects for the Eyre Peninsula would be enormous. There would be an immense benefit to the tourism industry of South Australia and to every other industry on Eyre Peninsula because it would bring Adelaide, obviously a large market place, so much closer. It would make the Eyre Peninsula a weekend destination; and it would enable people to buy a holiday town house, or whatever they would like, within driving distance after work—admittedly, it might be a bit later, if one leaves from work at 5 o'clock on a Friday evening, but one could still be at Port Lincoln by 10 or 10.30 that same evening. That is the sort of infrastructure that is possible with the Gulflink Ferry.

I have been actively involved in trying to promote and assist the proponents of that project. I have come across enormous levels of Government bureaucracy. To my pleasure, I have found that the Premier and Ministers have been quite supportive of the project, but I have also found, to my absolute horror and dismay, that some of the departmental officers have been to the contrary. I would question whether the Ministers who are giving some moral support to that project know exactly what their officers are doing. I hope, at a later time, that I will be able to relay to the House some of those instances, which I am sure the Premier and some of his ministerial colleagues would be quite horrified to find out.

So, I do ask that at the appropriate time this House give due consideration to and support for the Gulflink Ferry project. It can create immediate jobs, not only in the construction of the infrastructure at either end and in the building of the vessels but also in the ongoing service, operation and supply of the ferry units. It would enable fuel distribution to Eyre Peninsula to be carried out ex-Cowell; and it would enable an enormous amount of support services to come via Wallaroo. No doubt the member for Goyder would have an intimate knowledge of the services and support in his electorate. Certainly, the township of Wallaroo and the intervening towns on that carriageway would benefit from it. I know that the Mayor of Wallaroo and the council in that area have given the project their full support. I guess we are all at a point of frustration: where are we going; what is the hold-up; and where do we go from here?

There is no doubt that if the ferry was up and running the building industry would be able to pick up enormously, and I am referring to Eyre Peninsula, no doubt at Wallaroo and along the carriageway as well. There is no doubt that many of those seaside resorts could well become the retirement centres for many people in Adelaide. It is getting to the stage now that land available for the retirement housing industry is no longer affordable within a reasonable distance of Adelaide. We are finding that Victor Harbor and areas in that vicinity are far too expensive for the average person to acquire a block and set up a retirement home or unit.

It is no longer possible for that to be within the affordable range of the average person, whereas, if the ferry were operable, certainly all those other townships on Eyre Peninsula and no doubt on Yorke Peninsula (but certainly Cowell, Arno Bay, Port Neill, Tumby Bay and Port Lincoln, and the list goes on) would be within easy reach of Adelaide. Add to that the benefits of produce from the peninsula being made available on a daily basis, and the closer links with sporting bodies. No doubt Eyre Peninsula and Yorke Peninsula could then have inter-association sporting championships. The list goes on and on. I just hope that we will see in the very near future some breakthrough to this seeming impasse and what I suggest is an unexplainable attitude of some departmental officers.

Having said that, I would like to refer to a few other more positive industries that are getting up and running at the present moment, and I refer to the tuna farming exercise that is presently under way in Port Lincoln. There are 24 or 25 ponds operating, each pond having 10 tonnes of fish, with a value-adding process of from \$6 to \$40 a kilogram. That is certainly a success story at the moment.

However, there are learning problems. Where do we find sufficient pilchards to be able to feed these fish? Already fish are being imported from Tasmania, Western Australia and Japan to feed the tuna in the ponds at Port Lincoln, so that they can be value added and returned to Japan. That industry

is now providing 200 permanent jobs, plus casual jobs that would go with it, all because of the entrepreneurial activities of a few tuna fishermen and the recognition of an opportunity that existed.

In the very first instance, recognition must be given to the fact that the State Government did play some part in the first two trial ponds. It was a tripartite arrangement between the South Australian Government, the Japanese Tuna Farmers Federation and the Tuna Boatowners Association, all of whom contributed financially to that. In a very short space of time, it soon became known that this project would be a goer, and now enormous amounts of money have been spent in setting it up.

There has been a lot of trial and error effort in the catching of the fish so that there is less stress on the fish. Tuna are now able to be caught in a purse seine net, held there while another vessel brings down a small towable pond. Two divers get into the water, open up the nets and steer the fish into the pond, lace them up again and, at 1 knot per hour, tow the pond back to Boston Bay at Port Lincoln, where a similar process occurs and the ponds are pulled alongside the fish farm, the nets are unlaced and the fish swim in. There is minimum stress, but it is a technique that has been designed and evolved by the tuna fishermen.

I trust that the Japanese people continue their desire and like for sashimi fish which are bringing enormous prices at times, from about \$800 per fish up to about \$13 000 (which is the record for a very large fish of about 137 kilograms). These fish are very valuable and worth looking after. On a lighter note, it was rather interesting when a 12 metre whale got into one of these ponds and caused a bit of a hassle for a while.

Mr S.G. Evans: It had a whale of a time!

Mr BLACKER: It certainly had a whale of a time. It did not eat any tuna and they were able to get it out without any stress to the whale; and they hardly lost a tuna fish out of that same pond, so it was great. This has had another spin-off. The tommy ruffs that swam into the pond when they were very small have now grown to the extent that they cannot get out. They are now about five or six times the normal size of a tommy ruff and they have become a valuable commodity. However, the bureaucracy has stepped into the act again with the question: whose fish are they? The tuna fishermen do not have a licence to take tommy ruffs. Those tommy ruffs have swum into the ponds out of the wild and been fed by the tuna fishermen. Whose fish are they? I do not know. There is a technical problem there that has to be resolved. There is a resource that has developed by mistake or a quirk of nature, but it can be addressed and quite a significant industry can be developed as an offshoot from the feeding of the tuna.

Another aquaculture industry that is getting under way is abalone. I commend those three different organisations which are into abalone farming. They have successfully bred and hatched out the abalone and they are into the growing out stages. They are looking for a cocktail abalone—something below the normal size of abalone that can be taken from the wild—to meet that cocktail market. That has the potential to be a multi-million dollar industry. I commend those who have taken enormous risks and spent a lot of time and money on setting up the hatcheries and the growing out ponds and tanks in order to get this market going. May they do well. However, let us get Government bureaucracy off their backs and give them a go. I am sure that if we did that other industries would also get going.

Similar comments could be said about the oyster growers. At present they are catering for only 12 per cent of the State's consumption of oysters, but it is envisaged that within two years there will be ample availability of locally grown oysters to meet an export market. The oyster industry is going through that same phase now. It has developed a marketing arm of its organisation called OYSA, and I believe that it is heading along the right track.

I have read Her Excellency's speech, but I find little or no reference to the Year of the Family. As all members know, next year is to be designated by the Commonwealth Government as the Year of the Family. I find no reference whatsoever in Her Excellency's speech that this Government is heading down the track of having a complementary Year of the Family at State level. Members know that I have raised this matter in the House on many occasions. On each occasion I have been knocked out because the Government of the day said that it should be done at Commonwealth or Federal level. Here is the opportunity. The Commonwealth has designated next year as the Year of the Family. What is South Australia doing about it? According to Her Excellency's speech, nothing. I think that this House should be taking up that matter and making sure that we get a cooperative approach by all Government departments, thereby ensuring that they focus on the Year of the Family.

Mr S.G. Evans: The Liberals will do that after Christmas.

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member says that the Liberals will do that after Christmas. I do not know when the election will or will not be held. Whatever happens, it does not matter. The planning needs to be done immediately if we are to become meaningfully involved in such a program. I am sure every member of the House would have to agree that that is what we should be doing, but at present there seems to be little or no evidence of that.

I noted in Her Excellency's speech a reference to Mabo. Yesterday, I attended a meeting in Sydney of National Party State Leaders. We were trying to achieve some commonality of approach. I believe from the discussions that took place there and what I have heard from the Premier of South Australia and other people here that all States are heading down a common track.

If the Federal Government does not soon do something about the tenures and leases, each State should enact complementary legislation. I propose that every State should meet to get their acts together, so that they can then meet with the Commonwealth to make sure that rational commonsense prevails over the outcome. There has been so much misinformation, so much misunderstanding and so much misrepresentation by the press, and more particularly by some of the organisations which may or may not have vested interests. We need to make sure that we are on a level plain in this matter and know what we are talking about and are able to proceed appropriately with it. I support the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Victoria.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I want to start by reaffirming my allegiance to the

Queen, as Queen of Australia. We are very fortunate to still maintain our ties with Britain. Being an anti-republican, which I will say a little more about in a moment, I hope that for many, many years to come we maintain those ties.

I also acknowledge the very good work done by Her Excellency the Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell. It is fair to say that she is popular in all corners of South Australia. She has taken the time to travel throughout the State and the job she is doing has been admired by everybody. I was fortunate enough to be in my electorate yesterday when Her Excellency travelled all the way down to open new district council chambers in Naracoorte. Travelling all the way down for the event and then back to Adelaide, she again showed her dedication and how she feels about South Australia, even when the State is in the depression that it is.

In relation to the republican issue, I say to all those people who want to tear down something that works very well simply to put in place something that does not have any future benefit for this nation and this State, please think again. I am proud of our British background. We are part-time people as we sit in this place, which was built in 1889, participating in democracy as it was practised in the British Empire. We are most fortunate that we have a Parliament modelled on the British Parliament and modelled on democracy as it was and still is known in that country and, of course, in the dominion.

As we sit in here and look around at the portraits of famous people who have sat in this place and understand that we are here for a very short time, albeit long enough for the actions of some of us to have some influence on the direction South Australia is taking, we acknowledge that, being here to do something for our State and for democracy, we owe this opportunity to our British forefathers who came to Australia and founded this country. To all of those people who want to substitute something that I do not believe will give us any benefit, all I can say is: think again. And to those people who sit in this place until the next election, as well as those who will continue to be here after the election, I say: please think about the future of our State and nation; have some vision for the future and do not destroy something that has existed in this State for over 140 years and in Australia for some 200 years.

As you would understand, Mr Deputy Speaker, this republican nonsense being debated in Australia at present is a political stunt to take our minds off the real issues that this country is facing: one million unemployed nationally, and 100 000 unemployed in South Australia; an economic recession that is akin to the 1930s, and no-one is doing anything about it. The Federal Government and this State Government have their snouts in the trough and are carrying on the notions of Government in this State and nation simply to enjoy the benefits and the perks of power.

No decisions are being made—keep your mind off what is going wrong in the country and make sure, because of compulsory voting, that we keep the public in the dark and do as little as we can! If ever there was a case of a blueprint being put before the people of Australia which would have turned this nation around, it was that blueprint proposed by the Liberal Party before the last Federal election. I am not bemoaning the case that that election was lost, but it was the last chance for Australian people—voters—to have honest Government.

It was the last chance for Australian voters to have a plan put before them to alter the course of the nation but, because of compulsory voting and the scare campaign, or the nega-

tives, promoted by the Government of the day—I do not criticise them for that: it was good politics—this nation will now turn around much more slowly than it would have turned around if we could change direction more quickly. People on both sides of the House—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: If the Minister wants to interject (I would love him to do so again) and goes back to his seat while I have 25 minutes left to speak, I can spend my time on the fabricator, who is at the root of half of the problems in this State, and I will come to those problems in a moment. However, a change of direction was needed but that did not take place. Of course, there is a different philosophy within the Liberal Party in South Australia, because we have a policy of non-compulsory voting and so those people who choose to vote because they care for their State will in future be voting for the direction South Australia must take. It will not be those people who are forced by law, forced by the policies of members opposite, to put a number in a square who will choose the destiny of South Australia.

Half the problems we are now experiencing in this State have been caused by hoodwinking the public of South Australia, by this Government constantly over the past 10 years misleading this House and the public of South Australia as to what was actually happening. The biggest financial disaster in Australia's history was perpetrated by members on the Government side. We have heard in the past couple of days how this House was misled by some of its most senior Ministers—I cannot put it any other way—and we have witnessed the cover-up that went on. The answers given to this House were that those matters came out in the royal commission. Those matters did not come out in the royal commission, and that whole issue of the State Bank saga—and probably only two or three people in this House know exactly what went on—did not come out in the royal commission because the Royal Commissioner was not examining the propriety or impropriety of members of this Government: he was probing into something completely different. But if he had wanted to probe into the impropriety of this Government a much different picture would have emerged.

So, over the past 10 years this House has been misled by this Government—\$3 billion down the drain. No-one is accountable and the present Premier is not game to go—and will not go—to the people. He says that he might go next March. The press is screaming for it, and the public of South Australia are saying, 'Why don't you be accountable?'. There is not a murmur. Government members have their snouts in the trough and worry more about what is happening in Hartley and Napier. Who have their hands in the slush fund? There are more worries about that than there are about governing South Australia.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: We've got \$9.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Well, the present member for Napier interjects. I hope that after the next election the very honourable and hard working member for Hartley, as he is now—the Minister of Primary Industries—wins that seat. He has shown independence and guts in taking on the factions and the Government. He has worked very hard to look after the people of South Australia and I hope the people of South Australia get behind the Hon. Terry Groom and keep him in this place.

It is people with that honesty and integrity that we need in this place. We need people with the vision that he has for the future of South Australia. Mr Deputy Speaker, I am sure

that if you were allowed to speak in this debate you would agree, because it is most important. The work that he has done in primary industries shows—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Perhaps he has taken advice from other people—but it shows that he cares and that he will not stoop to accept that slush fund in his electorate to try to get him re-elected. I am sure that people on this side of the House will not only be giving him moral support; some of us will be out there doorknocking to bring home to the people of Napier what a good gentleman he is and how he should represent that electorate after the next election. That is all I wanted to say; I just wanted to cover that matter very briefly.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: I think that the public of South Australia should have these matters aired. That is what democracy is all about. With parliamentary privilege one can speak the truth without fear or favour in this place. I think it is time that more people spoke out about what a great job he is doing. People in my electorate—the electorate of Victoria—have asked me what they can do to help, and I say to them, 'Don't worry, when our policies come out I know you will want to follow them. But if you want to help, get into your secondhand ute, or whatever you have, or cadge a ride, go down to Napier and help doorknock and tell the people there exactly what is going on with the State Bank. The Minister got out of that Party because he was ashamed of it and he is standing as an Independent member in South Australia.'

I was staggered today when the present member for Napier got up and said some very nasty things about the Minister. I thought then, 'Well, what does that say about mateship?' How could you have one of your mates stand up here and slander you like that? I do not know how they can go out and have a cup of coffee together with all of that going on.

An honourable member: They don't.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Well, they don't even share the slush fund, I am told. It is that sort of mateship that has got South Australia into the position it is in at present. I will move on from the good job that the Minister of Primary Industries has been doing under severe pressure. How would it be sitting in Cabinet meetings when you know that your Cabinet colleagues are undermining you? The farmers in South Australia went to a lot of effort to lobby the Minister of Primary Industries on what should be happening during the mouse plague. It is a desperate situation out there, and many members on this side will attest to that because they have toured around and had a look at it, and to the Minister's credit he has been around and had a look at the situation.

We made representation to him and he said, 'Look, of course we have to do something about it, of course we have to help them.' But when he got to Cabinet the rug was pulled out. He had made the announcement: 'We think we will pay for the strychnine to help these people to stop the plague.' Talk about the Pied Piper leading the masses. But when he got to Cabinet, no, it did not want to help him. I say to all people in rural South Australia: 'Don't blame the Minister of Primary Industries, he is trying to do his best. Just have a look at what is happening in Cabinet as the factional fight goes on and they continues to pull the rug from under him. If you have your problems in South Australia rurally—and we know you have—use your last dollar to try to get the Minister of Primary Industries re-elected in Napier.'

Mr Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr D.S. BAKER: Thank you to the honourable member, another rural member who can understand the value of what the Minister is doing.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, well they're leaving the ship. I want to pass on my condolences to Sir Condor Laucke's family. He was a great South Australian. The work that he did for South Australia has been acknowledged on both sides of this House. While he was Lieutenant Governor those of us who are involved in politics had many chances to meet with Sir Condor over the past few years. It was said, in fact by the Premier, that Sir Condor was a serene man; he was an unassuming man.

I think that all South Australians can look up to Sir Condor and acknowledge what he did for this State, and take heart that there are people who want to work for South Australia and that those people have South Australia in mind and not their own needs and ends. My condolences go to Sir Condor's family. His memory will live long in South Australia.

I want to turn now to the Electricity Trust and the E&WS Department, and I guess it stems from one Minister. There is one Minister in this place whom I have been criticising for many years, and I have for many years been criticising the departments he runs, because of the incompetent way in which he runs those departments and because of the dollars that have been lost to the taxpayers in South Australia. Once again—

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I hate talking about people when they are not in the House, but he just happens to be in the House.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: The Minister interjects about profit figures. If he wants a discussion about profit and loss he has picked on the wrong person. If he can show me one department that he has run since he came into this Parliament—certified by the Auditor-General—one department that he has touched that has made a profit, let him stand up here and do it and we will have the debate. And he can go first, second or last, I do not mind, because this Minister has been a disgrace in South Australia with his incompetence in running these departments. On everything he has touched he has lost taxpayers money. We will start off—

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: We will get on to ETSA right now. Robin Marrett did a magnificent job with ETSA. Its reform process is about 70 per cent along the road that any business person would say it should be along. He did a marvellous job, and what happened? Robin Marrett said 'Look, I am going to leave, and I want this reform process to carry on.' So, the board of ETSA looked over the whole of Australia for the best person to do the job and picked a gentleman from SEQEB in Queensland, but he did not suit the Minister. I suppose he could add up, and that was why they did not want him. But he was not allowed to come down.

I have written to that gentleman and said, 'Keep your bags packed; South Australia needs you.' When you cannot pick people for a job because they are competent, it shows how low you are going on the managerial scale. That gentleman would have carried on the reform process that Robin Marrett started, and I think everyone would acknowledge that it was a battle, because he did not get any help at all from the Minister. The board fought with the Minister and the Chief

Executive Officer fought with the Minister because nothing was happening. So ETSA, as one of this State's great potential money earners to help South Australia out of its problems, at present is being bled dry—

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: And you'll sell it off, won't you.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The Minister said that we would sell it off. What we will not do is suck \$100 million out of electricity consumers in South Australia and put it into General Revenue and run it down as he has been doing.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: Because you won't be in Government.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I will not even bother with that, Mr Deputy Speaker. However, that is what happened there. Look at the E&WS Department. Here we are, attempting to put together (although it will not succeed) two of the State's biggest entities, with assets of \$2.6 billion each; ETSA with liabilities of about \$450 million and the E&WS Department \$1 billion in debt. Here we are, trying to put together these two entities, one 75 per cent down the way of reform that is necessary to give us cheaper power in South Australia to attract, in turn, some industry to South Australia; in relation to the other, the Minister would learn a lot if he read pages 59, 60 and 61 of the Auditor-General's Report. They have not even revalued their assets (especially the dams and the underground mines) to allow for depreciation in their balance sheet.

That is how far out of kilter they are; they cannot even prepare a balance sheet that allows for depreciation so they can work out their liabilities each year and keep up that infrastructure in South Australia. They do not want to stand the heat. That is why they are trying to put it together, because the reforms have not even started there. The Auditor-General has been scathing in his last two reports about what is going in the E&WS, so they cobble it together for a bit of an election scam, like the previous elections in 1989 and 1985 and say, 'We will put them together because there are a lot of benefits in it.'

The document put out by the Minister, detailing the strategic potential saving as a result of the E&WS and ETSA merger, is an absolute shambles. If I went through it line by line, I would find that it is a typical document written by bureaucrats or people who know absolutely nothing about financial management. The Minister is putting this forward. I understood that the Minister would not even allow the Chief Executive Officer the correct replacement; he would not allow the gentleman to come down from Queensland. There is a pretty good yarn going around that there have been a few motions of no confidence in respect of his administration lately.

Any person worth their salt could go through this document and make those savings on each department if they were any good at all. This reads as an absolute scam. I know we will debate it in the next few days, but I just hope the Minister has a few answers. I know he will not have them, but I hope he has a bevy of advisers around him who understand a bit about finance and who can add up, because we will expose to the public of South Australia exactly what the Government is trying to get away with here. The taxpayers of South Australia will be asked once again to pay for a cover-up—that is all this is. What about the gentleman who will run it? What credentials has he to run a business with assets of more than \$5 billion?

That is pretty big business; it is nearly double what the Minister and his colleagues lost in the State Bank. That is

how fast they have been going back. They went back \$3.1 billion in the past five years in what they lost in the State Bank, and here we have them trying to put together an entity worth another \$5 billion that is of absolutely no financial benefit to the taxpayer at all. If they claim there is a financial benefit, there is nothing in this document to show that that financial benefit could not be found by the prudent management of each organisation.

It will be a very interesting debate, because no doubt this Minister will be running it, but this is the very same Minister who told us that Scrimber was a wonderful thing. It had more opening dates than there are trees in the forests in the South-East. Finally it was opened just before the 1989 election and we were told what a wonderful entity it was. Now there is nothing left; it is a shell. They are trying to flog off the technology at about one-tenth the price they bought it for. That is a typical example of the Government's financial incompetence and, if you check back through *Hansard* for the past five or six years, you will see that the criticisms about Scrimber that came from this side of the House week after week—how it could not work, how it was badly managed and how we should get out of it—are on the public record.

Mr Deputy Speaker, you may very well say (and you would be quite right), 'Why did you not move a motion of no confidence in the Minister when it crashed?' There was a very good reason: it was much better to leave him there, because, after Scrimber (and we flagged it on this side of the House), he got stuck into the Forests Department. Forests in South Australia are one of our best assets. Potentially they can return \$40 million cash a year.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The Minister of Primary Industries interjects. He is doing his very best. He has had to pick up the pieces and try to put them together again for the benefit of South Australia.

An honourable member: And he's out there doing it.

Mr D.S. BAKER: He is out there trying. The forests in South Australia over the past financial year lost \$75 million in cash for South Australia. Dispute it if you will. I would love members opposite, who would need to go to a good financial person in order to understand it, to debate it. There has been the normal cover-up. We should be able to get \$40 million a year out of just the wood alone. This operation started with some disasters in New Zealand: in fact, we lost \$17 million or \$18 million when we bought a business in New Zealand on unaudited accounts. That is an example of the Government's level of intelligence over the past 10 years. They reckon that the old kiwis are a bit dumb! They sold us a business on unaudited accounts and, when the Government finally asked a financial consultant to explain it, it was too late, they had signed the deal.

It is a joke, Mr Deputy Speaker. I can see that you are not laughing, but you, who I know must be a very wealthy person, sit there not having had the opportunity to be a Minister as you richly deserved. Sir, you must be saying, 'If only I had been there I would not have allowed this to happen.'

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: He would understand what is going on in forests. I assure members you, Mr Deputy Speaker, would not have lost \$75 million last year of taxpayers' money, because you understand what this is all about. I do not think that you have even sold your brewing company shares, but you understand what it is all about.

That is the problem in this State. The Government could not care less how much the taxpayer has to put in. Coming up to the next election we will have the same old promises again. Before the last election we had free bus travel for kids. If ever the parents of South Australia should damn this Government, apart from what they are paying out now to prop up the State Bank, it is because they lost control of their children as a result of the free bus travel that was given out at that time. People were travelling all over Adelaide from Elizabeth to right down south, obliterating the railway stations with graffiti, all because it sounded pretty good just before the election. Of course, straight after the election it was taken away.

Mr Venning: What about the Entertainment Centre?

Mr D.S. BAKER: As the honourable member has said, the Entertainment Centre, EntCent as it is well known, which supposedly was to cost \$45 million and which cost \$60 million, is a white elephant.

Mr Venning: It went for three elections.

Mr D.S. BAKER: It went for three elections, and we will have them all trotted out again. One thing that will be obvious at this election is that the promises are starting to wear a bit thin. Day after day in this House we are documenting all those promises, all the developments that we were going to have, all the dreams that have turned into nightmares. We are starting to get a bit of a track record; it is starting to come home. We have the Scrimber operation which cost \$60 million, the second biggest disaster that this State has ever known; the State Bank, \$3.15 billion; and SGIC, a wonderful example of financial incompetence. People are starting to understand that what we will get from now on for the next couple of months is the old fabrications, the same old press releases dribbling out the same promises. I have told the people in the Leader's office to make sure that the dates are changed on the top of those releases, because they might have forgotten as there is only four years difference. People are starting to wake up because it is hurting their pocket. No longer can they afford this incompetence.

I think it is fair to say that the speech given by the Leader of the Opposition today documented in detail the litany of disasters that have occurred in South Australia during the past 10 years. When the Government drops the gong and says that it is ready to go to the people—I do not know why it is waiting—when we get down to what it is all about and the Liberal Party policies are put on the table and the debate really starts, that is when members will see that the Liberal Party has a plan and a vision for South Australia. Financial management and competence on this side of the House will make sure that that policy is carried out. The important thing that we must realise is that, if you put the expertise and track record of this Government into any other situation in the private sector, those people would have been drummed out of the companies that they ran.

Because of the accidental bias of the electoral system, which has now been somewhat rectified, because we did not have a true democracy in South Australia, these people have been held in Government for the length of time that they have been in Government. A true democracy is when 50 per cent of the people plus one decide a Government, and not when we have to get 53 per cent to get into Government. People in South Australia will remember eternally that members opposite were a *de facto* Government and were in Government with a minority of the vote in South Australia.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: He did not lose \$3.15 billion. Playford would never have had you in his ministry, let alone in his Government. It is a bit different. At least he was a good picker of men.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I bet he was. So, Mr Deputy Speaker, on we go.

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

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and, in doing so, I would acknowledge once again the excellent job being done by Dame Roma Mitchell in her capacity as Governor in this State. She is not only interested in what is happening in the State, but she displays great compassion and continuing care for the people of South Australia and it is a pleasure to see her continuing in that active role.

I would like to extend condolences to the families of the Hon. Sir Condor Laucke, the Hon. Richard Geddes, the Hon. Bert Teusner and the Hon. Hugh Hudson. They each made a good contribution to South Australia and their passing is a loss for this State.

The address given by the Governor on behalf of the Government was a disappointing document. It was extremely thin and had little substance in it. In fact, one could say it was more transparent than a bride's nightie. It had nothing in terms of offering hope or substance for the people of South Australia at a time when this State is confronted with what is really a tragedy in terms of a decline in investment and record levels of unemployment, particularly among young people. That is a most disgraceful and unsatisfactory situation, yet the address that was given on behalf of the Government offered no solutions whatsoever. Just more of the same, more paralysis on the part of this Government, or what would be more accurately termed a situation close to *rigor mortis*.

In looking at the address in detail, if we look at the manufacturing sector, various words are used but, as I indicated earlier, they are of little substance. One of the fundamental points that has to be addressed in terms of manufacturing in this State involves a change in attitude towards those who work in the technical and trades areas. That is one of the reasons why we are in the predicament we are in today, because there has been a general downgrading of the role of such people in the community, unlike in other countries, for example, in Germany and Japan.

It was put to me the other day by a tradesperson that in many television advertisements blue collar workers and tradespeople are often portrayed as silly and stupid. That sort of discrimination against blue collar, trades and technical people is foolish and short sighted and is something that must be changed. The sooner it is changed the better. One of the consequences of that negative attitude towards the people involved in manufacturing and the trades generally has been a decline in our manufacturing sector. Manufacturing is important in South Australia, not only obviously for jobs but also in the wider context of Australia's security. It is a situation we should not underestimate. Hopefully, it will never be used in that context, but it is important to remember that Australia is relatively isolated and needs to maintain its sophisticated manufacturing and electronics base in case of threat from external forces.

We can look with pride at our achievements. If we look at the submarine project, we can see that in South Australia

we have the technical expertise; we have the ability to manufacture, and it is a sector that must be boosted and brought right back to the forefront of economic activity in this State.

In the address, mention is made of enterprise zones and one cannot help but notice that there is an element of discrimination as to where those zones are to be located. I have nothing against having enterprise zones: it is a good idea. However, it should be on the basis of equal consideration rather than on the basis of what is in that document—a discriminatory approach to certain areas and not others.

Reference throughout the document is made to 'social justice'. It is a term that this Government has used *ad nauseam* because it does not really believe it, and it certainly does not practise it. It is the most misused slogan of recent times, and it is meaningless if you have high levels of unemployment, if there are no job opportunities, if young people cannot get training, and if they cannot get jobs. It is time that this Government was honest, deleted references to the term 'social justice', and spoke in terms of what it is really on about rather than trotting out that propaganda term which it is not committed to.

The Environment Protection Bill is referred to—an important piece of legislation that will be debated shortly. It is important that, in a time when economic circumstances have taken a downturn and we have high levels of unemployment, we remember that the environment is still an important aspect of our total way of life, and I do not accept the view that simply because times are tough the environmental issue should slip off the agenda. I remind members that both 'environment' and 'economics' have the same origin in terms of the Greek word *oikov*, and we should look to bring them together rather than try to artificially separate economics from the environment. There is a lot more that can be done in the community in respect of the environment. There is often a lot of lip service paid to it as a term, but not so much in respect of an actual commitment. There is much more that can be done in respect of recycling, composting, less wasteful packaging, and using resources more efficiently—in other words doing more with less, and that is, after all, real economics when you look at it closely.

This Government, in its address, has spoken of public sector reform. This side of the House acknowledges what has been, and still is, a fine Public Service in this State. Certainly, it needs to be constantly made more efficient and effective, but in so doing it is important not to denigrate public servants or to put the blame on them for the mistakes of this Government. It is very easy to attack public servants and put the blame on them, when the blame should be worn by this Government. I personally take exception to terms that can be used as a form of abuse, like bureaucrat—and I think that even the term 'public servant' is inappropriate in this day and age. They are actually public officers: they are not servants to anyone. Public officers readily accept that the system in which they work should be one based on efficiency and effectiveness, and in my discussions with them they are the first to acknowledge that they want to be part of a Public Service which is both efficient and effective and we should acknowledge the fine record of the South Australian Public Service extending over many years.

Reference is made in the Governor's address to Mabo, and I acknowledge that it is a very difficult and complex issue. I remind members that in debating and discussing the issue of title to land, we should not inflict or encourage harm upon our Aboriginal community. It is easy for that to occur during

debate over land title. Similarly we should not underestimate the achievements that have occurred amongst Aboriginal people over time, particularly in relation to education and especially tertiary education. This aspect is brought home to me very strongly, because I recall that, as a child, both Lois O'Donoghue and Faith Coulthard, who were the first Aboriginal nurses to be accepted for training at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, used to come to our home because they were friends of an older sister of mine.

They would have meals and so on at our place and regularly attended there in the year that Aboriginal people were first accepted as trainees at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. When I attended secondary school, I was close friends with Aboriginal students. It is important, when we are talking about Mabo or any aspect relating to Aboriginal people, that we try to put a face on the issues we are talking about and realise that we are talking about Aboriginal people and not some distinct, separate entity that is removed from us.

I would highlight the fact that in discussing issues such as Mabo we should not lose sight of the fact that land nowadays does not have the same significance as it might have had back in the 1800s. Therefore, in terms of Aboriginal advancement, it is important that the community focus on issues such as education and health as well as on the question of land title. I think to some extent there has been an obsession with land title without our realising or acknowledging that, in today's world, land *per se* is not the sole source of status or advancement and that education and health are very important aspects. Likewise, we should acknowledge the important aspects of Aboriginal culture that can be of benefit to us. Getting back to the point about the environment, I point out that the Aboriginal people believed that the land owned them, and that is the opposite of our traditional cultural belief. That view gives a totally different perspective of the environment and the way in which we relate to it. In summary with respect to Mabo, let us make sure that we avoid the extremes and isolate the extremists, whether from the Aboriginal community or the non-Aboriginal community.

The Governor's address focuses also on the primary industries sector, which has had a rough time in the last few years—probably the roughest stretch for quite a period. The sector has experienced difficulties in regard to weather, plagues and prices. However, I believe the long-term future for agriculture-horticulture is promising indeed. Whether we like it or not, the world's population will increase substantially in the short and long term, and there will be increasing markets for food and clothing. It is largely a question of marketing some of these things much more effectively.

The suit that I am wearing tonight—this might sound like a fashion parade—is made from cool wool, which makes a beautiful, comfortable suit. I am told that in the United States there is resistance to wearing wool, because the image of wool is of hot and prickly material. This suit, which is made in Australia from pure wool, is as light and comfortable as cotton. We should be marketing our natural products overseas in a more meaningful and productive way.

Similarly in relation to horticulture, our fruit and vegetables are produced in an environment that is largely pollution free. We should be making more of that when we market overseas. In terms of food processing, we could be doing a lot more to process our agricultural products rather than exporting them, thereby making sure that we create jobs in South Australia and Australia.

The Governor's address referred to education and training, which is a critical area if this State is to advance. I note that

mention is made of the Vocational Education, Employment and Training Authority. I am disappointed to be informed that it is unlikely that legislation establishing the authority will come before this Parliament before the end of the year. I hope that does not turn out to be the case, because it is critical for the good functioning of the new Institutes of Vocational Education (which replace TAFE colleges) and the training revolution that is under way that the authority be established promptly so that it can accredit the new courses to be set up.

The Institutes of Vocational Education must be a genuine alternative to universities, and it comes back to the point I made earlier, namely, that we need to get away from the idea that everyone must go to university and that everyone must wear a white collar in their employment. I believe that the institutes offer the possibility of providing a real alternative to university—not a copy, not an imitation, but something that focuses on skills and skills training in a way which is excellent, which has high status, which provides leadership in the community in respect of training and which coordinates job training throughout their particular and various regions. The institutes are a very exciting development, but they must be given some autonomy and adequate recognition, otherwise they will not achieve the necessary status and level of excellence that is required if they are to fulfil that important training role in the years to come.

We are in the midst of a training revolution. We have already seen the introduction of programs for the construction industry and the industry training boards and councils, and that will continue and expand dramatically in the next few years in a way which will ensure greater on-the-job training. The idea that one must go to an institute or TAFE cathedral, as I call it, to get qualifications will diminish, and we will see more on-the-job training, as is happening already at Holden's, the oil refinery and elsewhere. Training will be more flexible and more responsive, being owned and driven by industry in a tripartite arrangement involving industry—the employers—trade unions and education representatives from the community. If those groups can work together, we will all benefit. The days of the childish, petty infighting and inter-fighting among those groups should be put behind us; instead, we should focus on the benefits of training so that industry and companies can prosper and profit.

The Helpmann Academy is referred to in the Governor's address, and that is a very worthwhile venture. It is important in terms of getting South Australia back to the forefront of the visual and performing arts. It is important that we have high quality training, drawn from the expertise within the universities and the institute sector. One of my concerns is that the Helpmann Academy should cater for the needs of country students as well as those from the city and that it not be seen simply as something for city people.

Recreation and sport is a very important area within our community in terms of not only employment—and I refer particularly to the racing industry—but also quality of life. For example, one has only to look at the way in which people have focused on the Crows to see the importance of sport within the community, but obviously it goes much further than that in respect of sports played by men and women, girls and boys. We should not underestimate the importance of sport as part of a healthy community. It is interesting to note that one of the reasons why, I suspect, the Crows have received great support is that people in a time of economic depression are looking for positive activities to which to attach themselves.

To that end, it is important that at a school level sport should be encouraged and that we do not develop an anti-competitive approach which sees a flim-flam, phoney type of competitive sport at school. Certainly, there must be rules and guidelines to make sure that young children are not abused or hurt, but the notion that competitive sport is somehow bad has to be disregarded. We should encourage young people to participate in sport because the more they play sport the less likely it is that we will see problems arising from young people getting into strife.

I now refer to law and order, one of the aspects that is highlighted in Her Excellency's speech being the contentious matter of sexual abuse. We all know that sadly it exists, and where it exists at all it is to be condemned and dealt with. However, I think it is important that we do not exaggerate the incidence of it. One of the difficulties is the fact that there is very little scientific evidence to tell us exactly how widespread it is, but it is important that it is not used as a topic to denigrate families, or to denigrate fathers within families, in particular. I believe that some people have that on their agenda and they use what is a legitimate concern to go beyond that concern because they have got a particular social engineering agenda in mind. This is an important issue, not to be ignored or overlooked, but certainly not to be exaggerated or used for some ulterior social engineering purpose.

In terms of law and order, one of the critical things that needs to be done is for our society to focus on basic values, in particular respect for people, respect for individuals and respect for their property. It is amazing that in a society that is capable of building something like a submarine our school system, in particular, seems unable to develop a set of basic values and to impart them to young people. There seems something incongruous that in a society that is so technically sophisticated we cannot raise young people in a way in which they can display and accept basic values. That has become very difficult because of the decline in religion, and, whether you like that or not, the fact is that one of the sad consequences has been an upsurge in all sorts of behaviour which is antisocial and destructive of people and property.

Safety in the work place rightly gets a mention in the Governor's address, and it is an issue about which I feel very strongly. Sometimes I have heard members opposite suggest that members on this side of the House do not take that issue seriously. I strongly disagree with their assessment. I believe it is a fundamental right of people to be able to work in safety, whether it is in a factory, on a farm or wherever; it is not something that should be ignored or downgraded.

In terms of health and community care, which is an enormous topic, there are a couple of aspects on which I would like briefly to touch, the first being mental health as it affects young people. Sadly at the moment there is a gross deficiency in respect of specialised accommodation for teenagers who are suffering from mental illness. I heard the Minister refer to some aspects of this today and I believe it is a matter that should be addressed urgently. It is completely unsatisfactory for teenagers to be dealt with at Glenside, and the facilities at the other hospitals are grossly inadequate. It is a very serious problem because I believe many of our young people require psychiatric help, and some of the more severe cases need accommodation that is appropriate to the illness from which they are suffering.

One of my hobby horses for a long time has been the question of men's health. That is not to take anything away from the question of women's health, but it is an issue that has been overlooked to a large extent in our society by

Government and by community groups. It is important that we address questions relating to women's health, but it is also important that we address some of the issues relating to men's health and look at some of the reasons, for example, why on average men live much shorter lives than women and that we address, for example, some of the issues that confront men. I refer, for example, to particular types of cancer: testicular cancer and cancer of the prostate are issues that need to be addressed and there should be greater awareness of these issues in the community as well as more screening programs.

I acknowledge that men have often been their own worst enemy because they have been reluctant to seek advice and help, but that is no excuse for Governments to shy away from the issue. Certainly there should be education or promotional campaigns which make males aware of those issues. If we look at a very sad aspect, particularly of male health, we find that in 1991, for the first time in more than 50 years, male deaths from suicide exceeded those caused by motor vehicle traffic accidents. That is an appalling situation. In arguing the case for greater attention to be paid to men's health, I must state that the beneficiaries are not only the men if these issues are addressed, but also the women, because many of the—

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr SUCH: And the children as well, as the honourable member interjects. There are many elderly women in the community who are lonely because their spouse has predeceased them. They live a lonely existence and it is something that we should try to address in terms of improving the longevity of the male population. If we look at those suicide figures quickly, we see that in 1991 there were 1847 suicides of males in Australia. As I indicated earlier, that is an appalling figure. It is something that must be addressed, not in a sensational way but in terms of encouragement and education.

Similarly, in respect of providing facilities for males who are disturbed, aggressive or hostile where they can get quick or prompt counselling, I have suggested before the idea of a men's hotline which could be integrated into existing telephone services where men could make contact if they felt that they could not control their behaviour and where they felt aggressive or violent, particularly towards their family or spouse.

In respect of care for the ageing, it was put to me the other day (and I have not checked the accuracy of these figures) that in recent times the number of South Australians in their 90s was somewhere in excess of 5 000, and those in their 80s in excess of 40 000, the figures in those categories having doubled in the past 10 or 15 years. Even if those figures are not 100 per cent accurate, they indicate quite clearly that our population is an ageing one and that these people deserve attention and respect to make sure that we use their talents.

I was pleased to see that something is to be done with regard to improving the Retirement Villages Act, which is a matter of concern to many elderly, not only within my electorate but I assume within others. Time will not permit me to cover every aspect mentioned in the address by Her Excellency the Governor. I have hinted previously at employment. It is an appalling situation. It should be the major focus of this Government to create jobs. That has not happened, and it is to be condemned for that.

Finally, I will refer to a couple of issues with which I am concerned. The first relates to the matter of violence in our society. It is one that has concerned me for a long time. I am not surprised that we continually read about horrific crimes

of violence in our society, often committed against women. I believe there is too much violence portrayed through the media. I do not consider myself to be a wowsler, but I believe that there is unnecessary violence in films, videos and magazines. As a community we should not be surprised if some people are violent in real life given the steady diet of violence and dehumanising activity presented to young people, in particular, as well as older people. The sooner we do something as a community to reduce the amount of violence, the better.

Another matter that is of grave concern to me is the way in which the Family Court system operates. I acknowledge that it is funded by the Federal Government, but I have attended there to provide moral support to constituents on several occasions. I believe that the Family Court is basically an industry created by Government to deal with family and marriage breakdowns.

I see it as something like a mechanical and clinical system, and what I have seen there distresses me greatly. I am not blaming the judges, the court clerks, and so on, because they did not create that monster. However, as a community, I believe that we need to move quickly to improve and find ways of dealing with the tragedy of family and marriage breakdown in a more sensitive and humane way. I encourage those members who have not seen the system in action to familiarise themselves with it, because I believe that radical reform is urgently required.

I conclude by issuing a warning to those who are ready to condemn judges in our judicial system. The judicial system is not perfect, but we should be wary of trial by media and selective quoting from court transcripts in a quest for some kind of political correctness. If we do not want judges, we should replace them with computers. I acknowledge that the system is not perfect. It is a fragile system which has evolved over a long time and it should be protected.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I support the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply. I should like to join previous speakers and all honourable members in expressing my condolences to the families of the late Sir Condor Laucke, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, Bert Teusner and Dick Geddes. Much has been said about the late Sir Condor Laucke. The life of Sir Condor can be an example to all, particularly politicians. He was indeed a great man with a fine record. The tributes paid to him at his State funeral last week were absolutely magnificent. It was a pleasure and a great honour to be there. He was an example to us all that one can rise to greatness without playing the political games that so many of us seem to want to play today.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson was a great friend of my father. In fact, they had many a spar across this Chamber. My father said that Hugh Hudson was the smartest and probably the best member of the Labor Party. Bert Teusner, from the Barossa Valley, was also a colleague of my father, as was Dick Geddes. I first met Dick when he and my father challenged each other for the Legislative Council seat of Northern in the early 1960s. Dick Geddes was successful then and my father subsequently won the candidature for Rocky River, in the House of Assembly. Dick lived at Wirrabara, and the farm is still there. Whenever I drive past I think of Dick Geddes. He was a great friend to many rural people. I owe him a debt of gratitude for starting me off when I became active in politics as a Young Liberal nearly 30 years ago. It is very sad that these people have died.

I have pleasure in contributing to the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech, but I had no pleasure in listening to the content of it. I congratulate Dame Roma on the excellent job that she is doing. She is proving to be a very popular Governor. Last year at the Clare Show it was raining very heavily and there was mud everywhere, but Dame Roma was there in her element talking to all the rural people. She was very well accepted in the mud and slush with the rest of us. She is a very pleasant person. I give the Government credit for choosing Dame Roma. It is great to see her doing such a fantastic job. I hope that her health holds up and that many years hence she will be able to reflect on her successful time as Governor of South Australia. Her Excellency's contribution is one of the few things that we can be positive about in these times.

I also wish to mention the contributions of four of my colleagues as this will be their last debate on the Address in Reply. The member for Light (Bruce Eastick) again was a friend and colleague of my father and he is now a friend and colleague of mine. He has been a valuable asset to me as a raw recruit to this place and has on many occasions taken me aside and said, 'Look, young fellow, we don't do it that way here. I suggest you take this line.' It is sad that he is leaving, but as Mayor of Gawler no doubt we will have plenty to do with the Hon. Bruce Eastick and his wife Dawn. The work that they have done for this Parliament and the people of Light, can never be overestimated.

I will never forget the work and the mind of the member for Davenport, Stan Evans, who is in the Chamber, because without a doubt I give him credit for being the smartest, the trickiest and most cunning politician I have ever met. If I had to win a certain seat and, if I sought advice, I would certainly seek it from Stan Evans, because if ever there was a survivor in this Parliament it is Stan. My father also speaks very kindly of Stan and the work he has done.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.H. Hemmings): Order! I do not want to stop the flow of the member for Custance, and the generosity he is bestowing on those people who are leaving the Parliament, but I remind him that he should refer to members by the district they represent, not by their names.

Mr VENNING: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I did initially, but I did rather personalise the speech. I agree with your ruling. Also, the member for Chaffey, Peter Arnold—I have done it again, Sir, but I mentioned the electorate first—was a colleague of my father in this place and a great asset to this place and gave great assistance to me. He gave very good advice and he will be missed. Likewise, Jenny Cashmore from this side has an excellent record in this place.

I also want to comment on the speeches made during this debate by some of the Government members: first, the member for Albert Park. I keep referring to the sorts of speeches that members make in this place, but that speech was the most negative contribution I have heard from any member, Sir, even worse than your own, as well as that by the member for Henley Beach. I did not want to hear this sort of speech today. I wanted to hear a much more conciliatory line taken by members opposite, particularly the member for Albert Park, who I note has just entered the Chamber. Those sorts of speeches do not do anybody any good, because those days are well and truly gone—gone, dead and buried! This bashing the boss syndrome is not on. Sir, you will not hear speeches from this side bashing the worker, either: those days are also gone. The speech by the member for Napier was a

little better, but I would hope that in future we will see the end of this sort of speech.

I pay tribute, as did my colleague the member for Victoria, to the member for Hartley and soon to be the new member for Napier, Terry Groom. I say this in all sincerity, without wishing to be accused of being political. I often wonder why the likes of the member for Hartley and also the member for Henley Beach did not get ministries many years ago, because are among the few members over there who have an idea of how to run a business—at least they can count. I wonder why it has taken so long—why the member for Henley Beach has never got a ministry and the member for Hartley got one only recently. But, as the Minister of Primary Industries, I give Terry Groom full credit for putting runs on the board when very few other Ministers have done so. They are not even governing; they are doing nothing. But I will give Terry Groom credit. With all this scrapping going on in the seat of Napier—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Culance obviously did not hear me when I previously ruled that he will refer to members in the Chamber either by the office that they hold or by the district they represent. The honourable member cannot have it both ways and tack on the name afterwards. He must mention the title members hold or the district they represent. Does the member for Culance understand?

Mr VENNING: Yes, thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I will refer to the member for Hartley, now the Minister of Primary Industries. The work he has done while he has been Minister has been credible in many areas, particularly in the centralising area and in my own electorate in moving the field crop centre out of Adelaide to Clare. We know the history of that. I was heavily involved in the initial talks. The Minister was given a challenge, and he accepted it. I give him every credit for that.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I shall ignore trivial interjections. It is great to see the Minister in the country areas; he is seen in many country regions, and I give the Minister every credit for that as well. He could be here in the city protecting his back, but he is doing the honourable thing, and doing as a Minister should in working hard in his primary industries portfolio area. I publicly acknowledge that. With regard to the mice plague, I know that he had courage in enabling us to use strychnine. I also know that he wanted to make that available to the farmers, with the Government to pick up the cost; but we know that he was rolled in Cabinet, and I do not hold him responsible for that. Also, I have said to many of my friends in the country areas all over South Australia, 'If you have a friend or relation living in the seat of Napier, give them the message and give it to them hard and fast: this man is honourable and he is doing the job properly.' If the present member for Hartley, to be the new member for Napier, wants my assistance I will give it to him because he is going to leave his mark on that portfolio area.

This Government is, what I call, a lame duck Government. In fact, it is a dead duck Government. I think it is time to reflect on the performance of this Government and it is a good time right now because this is the last Address in Reply under the present Government. It makes pathetic attempts to deceive us into thinking that things are not as bad as they seem, such as saying that we have unemployment below the national average. I just cannot believe that. So what? If members opposite were to be threatened with a chainsaw, would they know or care whether the blade had more or less

than the average number of teeth? Unemployment at double figure levels hacks at the vitals of our social structure, whether it is just above or just below an average that one cares to name.

One can try to say that youth unemployment is down, but that is only because many of our young ones, like it or not, are staying on at school, and my own are included in that, or they are attending TAFE colleges doing courses they do not want to attend, in order to train them for jobs that in fact are not there. The jobs are not there so they are still at school. The problem still remains.

Then, there is brave talk of development zones, but why stop at just two of them? Why do they have a development zone at Whyalla and at the Gillman MFP site. What is wrong with Port Augusta and Port Pirie? I do not give the Government any credit for having any wisdom at all. Both those electorates are on the marginal line. Why are Port Augusta and Port Pirie not included in the development zone? Those three cities have always been together in the triangle. Why have they been excluded? I put the challenge to the Government to include them. It is a quite biased approach they have taken. I cannot understand why Whyalla should be in it, on its own.

The talk of eliminating the budget deficit by 1995-96 is nothing more than that: it is just talk. It is totally laughable that they could even talk like that, because we all know that this debt is going to be with us long after all of us have left this Parliament. It is nonsense to talk of business support programs when, at every turn, business, especially small business, is assailed by new charges, new taxes, new legislative controls and requirements that seem designed solely to stifle initiative and prevent entrepreneurship.

We have heard more about Mabo again in the Address in Reply. I cannot understand why South Australia is now the only State that has not decided to distance itself from the stance of the Federal Government, and particularly the Prime Minister, Mr Keating. Why are we again out of step with the rest of Australia? It just appals me.

Of course, we do see a moral initiative in environmentalism with the Environmental Protection Bill which, to quote, 'sets South Australia at the forefront of environmental legislation'. That is great. Top at this but bottom at everything else. Can we sustain South Australia with this sort of priority? We then have the claims of innovative public service sector reform. What breathtaking gall that is. They have completely failed to learn from the chapter of bungles, bumbles and blunders and have come up with targeted separation packages.

That sounds fine in theory, but in practice it proved to be playing the same old tune: no consultation with the people most affected and hitting the easy targets without regard for the consequences. We know what is happening there—the wrong people are leaving, taking the money and running. They are leaving huge vacuums in many departments. The effect on the capacity of the Department of Primary Industries to serve its clients is drastic. Some of the department's best expertise has been shunted out the door with a cheque and a pat on back. That has left a huge hole at the top of that department. Again it is the rural communities—the constituency that seems perennially to be invisible to this Labor Government—that bear the brunt.

The much vaunted E&WS and ETSA union, commonly known as WETSAs, is another rush of blood to the head—a harebrained notion whose full import on every sector of our community has not been fully thought out. That is just like

the SARDI exercise in the Department of Primary Industries. When the previous Minister of Primary Industries—the Hon. Lynn Arnold—left that department he had this harebrained idea about SARDI. He set it up with no consultation and the system now has to make it work. It would be the same with WETSA. In Primary Industries there is not much to get our teeth into; perhaps the best we can do with this is to say that it is damned with faint praise.

There are claims of ‘aggressive international marketing’, and they mention the countries of Turkey, Iran, Israel, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Kuwait, Algeria and China. I agree particularly with the reference to China, but why the emphasis on this rather unstable part of the world? Where is our push into East Asia? I refer to countries like Malaysia, Singapore and Vietnam—stable countries and moving towards greater stability.

The Government speaks proudly of bringing in a Bill involving impounding livestock. I wonder why that was included in the speech. Is this a reflection of most of our embattled farmers being unable to find the cash to build or maintain fences? Safety in the workplace has been mentioned again. The moves in relation to safety on farms is causing a lot of hardship to people in rural areas. It is a very emotive issue. The farm is the home in most cases and people do not want to cocoon their children. That is what the intended Bill looks like doing. I will be doing all I can to ensure that sanity prevails when that Bill comes to this House.

The Independent Speaker is on the record as having said that when the time came he would put the Government out. I refer to the member for Semaphore. We will obviously now go to the last day that this Government can exist. It will be a slow, lingering death, and it does give me much pain. The great tragedy is that the parliamentary process does not appear to have worked. The problems that this Government is causing will be haunting this State long after we have all gone from this Parliament.

It is all very well to blame other people—and we have heard the Government do that—and outside influences, but the 1980s was the decade of Labor. History will show what damage that decade has caused to so many aspects of our economy, to so many sectors of our population and to the very fabric of South Australia. The 1980s saw all the economic graphs dip and all the economic indicators fall, while the problem graphs soared ever upwards.

What happened to Labor’s stated dreams at the 1982, 1985 and 1989 elections? One can think back and consider the things that were said and now look at the actuality. I remind the Parliament of the slogans that were used. In 1982 the Labor Party proclaimed: ‘We want South Australia to win.’ In 1985 it said: ‘South Australia is up and running. With the people behind us our recovery is a reality. It is all coming together.’

In 1985 it was really coming unstuck. In 1989, realising that the State Bank was already having problems internally and that the previous Premier had already ‘done a shonk’ in making the bank hold down its interest rates, its slogan was, ‘Now is the time to move forward. We have the expertise and the conviction, and we have the opportunity to make South Australia the most exciting State in our nation in the 1990s.’ What hollow rhetoric! I often wonder, as the newest member of this House, how the system is supposed to work. By any standards, by anyone’s imagination or accountability, this Government has failed. We have all failed, when we look at the results.

It is an absolute disgrace. I do not think any other Government in Australia or in Australian history has the record of this Government, and we hear speeches from members opposite blaming everyone else. The damage has been done. We will not see the end of it. People who have been in charge of this State just have not had a clue. Gone are the benefits of the great work of those who have gone before, particularly that of Playford. Now we are subservient and a mendicant State. When the Federal Labor Government starts talking about *per capita* grants to States, we must wonder where that will leave us—living off the crumbs.

All this from a grossly incompetent Government that was dishonest, particularly during the last election, with those State Bank interest rate cuts that cost the State an extra \$2 million. Now the hidden agenda of the republic push is revealed as the very abolition of the States. As a bankrupt State where do we stand when we must fight against this sort of move? It seems that the price that might be exacted for this Government’s ineptitude and scandalous mismanagement could be the ultimate price, the dismantling of this very Parliament. However, I am quite confident that, if it ever came to a referendum, the people of South Australia at least would far sooner vote to abolish the Federal Government long before agreeing to put down its own State representation.

They will not ever, and I would never, hand total power to Canberra. There is a growing swell of sentiment for change in our complete parliamentary system, and I am afraid that some of it is not good. My own electorate is telling me more and more that there are options that must at least be considered for change, whether it be a cut in the size of our House or a reduction to one House here in South Australia. We are hearing it more and more, and why? Because we have failed, and the people out there have no confidence in us.

They are saying to us, ‘You are not worth the money you are costing us.’ How could any of us disagree with that? But twist and squirm as it will, the Labor Government cannot worm its way out of its responsibility for the abjectly miserable state in which South Australia now finds itself. It is not just the State Bank fiasco for which it must answer, although that alone would have been enough to cripple our State economy for years to come. But even without the enormous disaster and catalogue of bungling and mismanagement by this Government, there has been more than enough to plunge us deeply into an economic morass.

Combine them and we are, indeed, in a slough of despair. Evidence of this is the list of enterprises that have abandoned this State in the recent past. I have been personally involved with many of them. Amongst the most recent, Email’s freezer and refrigeration plant moved to New South Wales along with up to 400 South Australian jobs. There was hardly a whimper from the Government when that happened. Imagine the fanfare when a company like that comes to South Australia, but it leaves and nothing more is said. These companies just go.

Kelvinator, Simpson, Elders, John Martins and *Advertiser* Newspapers, once names synonymous with South Australia, have all moved their headquarters interstate. John Deere had very big headquarters here but has now gone to Brisbane where it is spending \$600 million. Why Brisbane? It is now the business capital of Australia, because Joh Bjelke-Petersen put that State in fine economic condition—and Mr Goss cannot claim that. We all see that that is a charade. The once proud Adsteam empire is being carved up and its carcass distributed around the country. South Australia has lost 70

per cent of its listed companies since 1980, just 13 years ago. Seventy per cent of its listed companies—what a disaster.

They are either leaving or preparing to move headquarters to Melbourne, Sydney or now Brisbane. To really rub salt into the wound, we now have the spectacle of that once proud flagship of our State, SA Brewing, sold out to the internationals, particularly to such a small country like New Zealand. Has New Zealand got it together? Members have visited New Zealand and guess what? They have a GST. Who will have to have a GST or a similar tax before very long? It will be Australia. New Zealand will own all our country hotels and half the Adelaide ones. Southwark, as South Australian as the Crows, is now being sold to the Kiwis. It is the epitome of what is happening to this State.

We are seeing a haemorrhage of South Australia's business base and business skills. Members opposite know this. They make these feeble excuses. Will they stay in office another six months and let the thing die the slowest, most miserable death? We are bleeding to death, and the Labor Government does not have a clue how to stem the flow. Businesses are leaving the State in ever increasing numbers, and the Government does nothing. How will we get them back? We will surely have to get them back, to get this State going again.

For a decade past, the Labor Government, blinded to reality by its doctrinaire ideology, has presided over the utter destruction of South Australia's economy. The facts are so daunting that most people cannot really comprehend just how deeply in trouble we are; they do not understand, they just do not believe it. Anyone who knows the full extent of the damage would not be able to vote for Labor. The \$3 billion State Bank debt is the most obvious legacy of Labor's mismanagement and incompetence, but there are many more examples; it is a veritable litany. We have heard about Scrimber, and the Minister is here with us tonight. This long running farce comes with a \$60 million price tag. I wonder how many roads I could build from Morgan to Burra with \$60 million. That is the issue up there, and it really bites hard.

We say goodbye to \$60 million, just like that, over an enterprise that was ill-founded to start with and very poorly administered. SGIC had to be propped up with a \$300 million capital injection, and we know all about 333 Collins Street. I saw it. It is a fine building, but I understand now that it has been devalued to under half its original value. We lost \$1 million on Tandanya and \$8 million in respect of Marineland, the troubles in the Entertainment Centre threatened to make it a white elephant, and the list goes on and on. When you compare the list with the successes that the last Liberal Government had, and it was not in power very long, it makes you wonder what has been going on. It is very sad that this has been allowed to happen.

What is the result of all this? South Australia is now in hock to the tune of more than \$9 700 for every man, woman and child in this State; a level of debt that has grown by a staggering (and nobody disputes these figures) \$1.279 million every day for the past 10 years. That is no exaggeration. When will the Government turn this around? If this Government hangs on until March, how many millions of dollars more will that be?

Mr Atkinson: What if we got another four year term?

Mr VENNING: Heaven forbid! I can hardly believe the Keating Government got back; if this Government were to be returned I just would not comprehend. It cannot happen; and it will not happen. The system would have completely broken down.

This Government is being kept in place by the Independents, one of whom has said that he would put the Government out when the time came. How bad does it have to be before enough is enough? The institution of Parliament in this State has absolutely failed.

As a new member coming into this place I thought that the South Australian Parliament would be the place in which to bring up issues that would be debated with commonsense, and that things would happen. However, when one sees the make-up of this place, the style in which debates are carried out, the decisions made and the people who make them, it is no wonder that we are where we are. Is this Government going to drag its decaying corpse through until March? If the Premier does not go to the people shortly it is up to the Independents to force their hand, otherwise this session will become an exercise in futility. We might as well close this place down and make it an extension of the museum next door.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the adoption of the Address in Reply. I recognise the great work done by Her Excellency the Governor in representing our State and working for our people and the role that she plays in a monarchy system. I am one of those who believe that that system is worth preserving. I understand some of those people who have a strong socialist view, who may have an Irish background and who have always had a chip on their shoulder or a feeling of spite against the monarchy system.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I said some of them. I think that goes back over a long history, but I say also that I do not know whether any other country has a better system than ours. Perhaps the suggestion by a former city clerk or city manager that we attempt to begin our own monarchy has some benefit: note the role of the Governor-General. I would support that without reflecting on the current monarchy in the UK. They are not English monarchs in the true sense of the word because there is blood from many different races within their family. That is no reflection upon them.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: Well, it is not. We as a country have the same thing among our people. We do not condemn people because they come from a different background, race or creed; at least I hope we do not. We have a preference. Each and every one of us is racist to a degree. We say that we are not but if we were put to the test we would be. I see some benefit in looking at having a monarchy within Australia and retaining the monarchy system, because if we go to a republican system, it would not matter how we tried to tackle it Party politics would come into it.

As much as I am a member of a Party, I do not believe that it would be good to have the head of the State in that field. I do not care what happens, whether people say that 75 per cent of the Parliament would support an appointment. We all know what would happen. Deals would be done. One Party would say, 'We'll back this one for five years if you let us have a turn with someone for the next five years.' There would be no continuity with that system. In particular, Party politics would show its ugly head, and it would have an ugly head if it were operating right throughout the system. I think we would all admit that, because as a Party we try to win at all costs. Some people even tell fibs before an election in

order to win, and there have been some recent examples of that.

I wish to recognise four people who have served our State, one of them nationally, Sir Condor Laucke. Those who served this State include the Hon. Dick Geddes, the Hon. Bert Teusner and the Hon. Hugh Hudson. They made their contribution and in so doing made a sacrifice, as did their families, in particular their spouses, who backed them.

As much as there are people out in the community who cynically attack us and say that we are a mob of parasites and lazy loafers who bleed the system, there is a significant number of people who recognise the contribution we make and the sincerity with which that contribution is made. In the case of these four former members, their families can rest assured that they made their contributions as members of Parliament and by serving the community in all cases other than as members of Parliament.

They made contributions to the community by serving other organisations on a voluntary basis. They did not have to do that to stay in Parliament. They could have all survived for their terms in Parliament without going out and making that extra contribution, but they did it because they believed in having a voluntary system operating in the community, even though at the same time they may have been paid for the services they gave elsewhere.

While I was earlier listening to the member for Custance I started to reflect that this will be my last Address in Reply in all probability. I started to think about the colleagues with whom I have served but who have gone by the way. I will not go through the whole list of 34 and I will not name them for *Hansard*, but I have served with 34 people who are no longer with us. They have passed on and I think that there are even more than that, but I can name 34. When one gets over 60 years and is confronted with four-year terms so that one is likely to be 64 by the time the election is called, one has to contemplate whether one should serve again, and the four-year term convinced me to say at this stage that this is probably my last period in Parliament.

When I think of those 34 former members I realise that many of them did not get much retirement. If this game is so easy on people and is not hard, I wonder why so many former members have left us so early. Indeed, most of their spouses are still with us.

I want to talk about one or two matters in my electorate. Some weeks ago I wrote to the Minister of Environment and Land Management about the piece of land known as the Forest Reserve at Hawthorndene, or referred to by as some people as the Blackwood Experimental Orchard. It consists of about 20 hectares and I know a plan was put to Mitcham council to subdivide part of the land and for the rest to be left as open space. I am assured that the majority of the council supported that proposition, but there was a problem in trying to negotiate a price at which the council believed it could subdivide the designated land and recoup its money so that it was not costing the council anything for the open space, except in the long term when it would have to maintain the land.

About two years ago when discussions were first begun the value of the land was about \$1.6 million or \$1.8 million. It has been suggested that the Government should give that land to Mitcham council and, in my view, that is a great idea, but I do not think that any Government in power is likely to agree to such a suggestion because, if it gave such a gift to one council, it would have to do it for other councils. Nevertheless, I would like to receive a reply to my letter from

the Minister because it is frustrating when people ask me what the Minister thinks about a situation and I do not have the answer.

However, the discussions with the Mitcham council took place *in camera* and are thus not available to the public. It would help if we knew which way the Mitcham council voted on the issue or how far the discussions went. If the Minister can help me in that way, that would be of benefit to my many constituents who have an interest in this piece of land.

I want to refer briefly to Craighburn without going into any great detail, and I refer particularly to a couple of rats I smell, those rats being actions of Government, originally of councils. In 1972 the Meadows and Mitcham councils, as they were then—since then the Happy Valley council has been formed and Meadows council has been split up, part of it going to Mount Barker—brought in zoning for that land called Craighburn, north and south of the Sturt Creek, declaring it rural A. That meant that, whenever the services were available, the owners of the land, Minda Incorporated, could subdivide it.

Anyone who reads *Hansard* will see that at that time I fought tooth and nail in this Parliament to have those regulations defeated. Parliament would not accept my argument that we would have a problem in the future because the land would be up for subdivision and the community would not accept it. We now find that, some years later, Minda Incorporated wants to exercise the right to subdivide north of the Sturt Creek, having subdivided as much of the southern side as it was able to achieve through the regulations. The subdivision on the southern side has to be seen as a reasonable development because the allotments are of a reasonable size and most of the trees remain although, for the aesthetic beauty of the area, it would have been better not subdivided. That might have been the case with all of Adelaide before white man came here. Once we came here, we decided that we needed something better than bark huts to live in because we were not as tough as the original settlers and we wanted more modern cons.

Minda moved to develop the northern side into 1 800 allotments. The Minister of the day, Hon. Don Hopgood, took action under section 51 of the Planning Act to declare it a special project, and therefore Minda could not go on with it. Minda then took out a writ in the Supreme Court, being prepared to challenge the Government on that issue. The Government knew that it would be rolled, so it backed off by saying that it would appoint a committee in June of that year, that committee to bring down a report within 22 weeks. Approximately 2½ years later, there is still no report.

We have a supplementary development plan, which was created by the Government, not by the council—and that is the first rat, because the Government attached some land that was left from the southern side to the huge amount, some 300-odd hectares, on the northern side. It could then argue that not one council but two councils were undertaking the supplementary development plan and that, under the Act, two councils could not do it. That is the first rat. It was taken out of the hands of the Mitcham council to stop it having a say in the supplementary development plan, even though the Government knew that there was a right of appeal through that process. The Government eliminated that possibility.

That plan was achieved through the second rat, as I see it. It has a bit of a smell about it; it is obvious what the Government did. It said to Minda, 'If you will give us the 181 hectares of open space at a very low figure, we will agree to a supplementary development plan on the 60-odd hectares

that are up for subdivision. We will let you have dense housing on that to push up the value.' That is the very thing the community and any sensible person would object to for that environment, because of fire, water and infrastructure issues—all sorts of things. By that method, the Government ended up with a nice piece of open space for \$3 million, which was paid for on 15 July this year—at least, that was the date that was published in the paper and there was no comment by the Government to say that was not the case.

Now we have a difficulty on our hands. We are talking about allotments of 300 square metres or even less—about half the size of a netball court—for duplexes. That is an area where there is bushfire risk and all sorts of things, and adjoining is the 135 hectares of the Blackwood Hill Reserve which belongs to the Mitcham council and which is being replanted with native shrubs and trees. That is a great idea. I will probably not be around in 20 years when the trees have reached maturity: on 135 acres on the side of a hill, just over from the Sturt Gorge, when the temperature is 39 degrees and a nice wind is blowing, God help some of those people, because they will need it. That is how much we think today, and that is not a fault of the Government. I believe that there needs to be a firebreak all around that property. Trees should not be planted at the edge of the property because of the inherent dangers for the future. I hope there is never another fire, but that is like saying that we will never have the flu or some other common disease in our family again.

I want to raise another issue; I will have the opportunity to go further with Craighburn in the near future. I think we can find an answer that the Government might see as appropriate, where everybody gives and takes a little so that many people are spared heartbreak and others can save face. I refer now to a family who came to live in South Australia from New South Wales. The husband has a very responsible job in the community. They had a trailer and they used it not realising that in South Australia it had to be registered. In some other parts of Australia, the registration and insurance applies to the vehicle that is towing the trailer. They took a small amount of material from home to a place where they wanted to use it. They were apprehended and a penalty of \$250 was imposed on the young man. He was starting out in life in a job, and he was fined \$250 for towing an unregistered trailer.

Those who abide by the law become angry and disappointed when others who smash windows in the local community, causing damage of up to \$10 000 in one night, get off with virtually no penalty. It is a high penalty for such an incident. I can understand why those people, who I believe are some of the most responsible in the community—and they are not close friends of mine and have no business association or community connections with me—feel so hurt that they ring to ask, 'Mr Evans, why is there such a penalty for this when others are destroying properties around us, breaking and entering and all sorts of things?' These offenders usually happen to be young and all they get is a slap on the wrist, being told not to do it again.'

As much as it is humanly possible, we should have equality in the law. For example, in the summer months of late January or early February, six young people parked their cars on school property at Coromandel Valley and went to the local dam, over which there was a fight many years ago. I appreciate how the gentleman who owned the land was helped by a decision of the Hon. Don Dunstan and the Hon. Geoff Virgo, but the land is now in the hands of local government and the school. After parking their cars on school property, they went to the dam. Someone telephoned the

police. It was night time. They were on school property. They were breaking the law. They did not think about it when they went to the dam, because they were not really on school property all the time—just when they parked their cars. There were six of them. They had never had any convictions in their life. They are what I believe to be an example of good young people of today having a bit of fun.

So, after talking to the police, they decided that they would not go to court. They would take the advice of those around them and save the State money and save using up court time. Five of them wrote and pleaded guilty. The sixth one went to court and pleaded guilty. He got fined virtually the same as the other five, but a conviction was not recorded against him, whereas it was against the other five. They now have a black mark against their name over an incident that was not major—there was no damage, nothing like that—and the other one has not. If there is equality in the law, none of them should have had a conviction recorded.

I am sure that, as first offenders, if they had gone to court, they might all have got off without conviction, but they were told by others, including the police, 'You will be treated the same.' I have written to the Attorney asking whether there is any way to have those five convictions removed, because there would be justice in that. I hope I can win, because there is enough trouble in the community with real larrikins, and it is a bit rough when a group of young people such as this do no more than many of us did in our younger days and have to face this sort of consequence while the others get off.

One of the other problems we have in the Hills is poor television reception, not only in the areas in Belair near Grevillea Way and in Coromandel Valley near Turners Avenue, etc., and part of Hawthorndene but also now near the Big Crow, the shopping centre that has been built at Pasadena. I hope that the authorities can put in a translator, as they did at Victor Harbor, to improve the television service to these areas. I make the plea that that needs to be considered.

The other issue that concerns me is the plight of small business in our community—not just in my own community. Tonight, a colleague and I walked up the Mall and down Hindley Street, and members should do so and look at how many properties are empty. If members go right throughout the suburbs, they will see that it is like a city that has been destroyed by some disease, and small businesses are mainly at the end of it. They have suffered, and in many cases they have lost all they have ever had.

Near the Supreme Court in the Sir Samuel Way building a person had a business. The courts started using volunteers to serve tea and coffee on the different floors of the building, and that destroyed that person's business. That is one of the fates of the volunteer system having an effect on a small business. I do not blame the volunteers. It is just one of those things where the small businessman suffers and, in the final analysis, he looks like losing his home.

The last area about which I wish to speak is vandalism and crime in the Hills. When I first came into Parliament, over 25 years ago, we had very little crime in the Blackwood area. It was a safe area. One did not even have to lock one's doors. What has happened? Why has it happened? Is it because we as a Parliament are not concerned and did not worry? Is it because the Government of the day did not worry? Is it because television has had an effect? Is it because we passed laws that said, 'Children of any age have virtually all the rights and the parents have none?' There must be a reason.

Young people will go out—and it is mainly young people—and smash shop windows for the heck of it: they smash up the local toilets or the information sign, or they break into one property 18 times in 12 months to the point where that person cannot be insured. They are charged and then let off to do a bit of community work and say, 'I will not do the community work,' but walk into the local kiosk, where a gentleman is attempting to show that he can make a living when jobs are so hard to get in order to provide a service to STA travellers, whether they be train or bus. Those young people say to the owner, 'You are the "B" that dobbed me in and I will get you; I will kill you.' The next day he finds tipped in front of the door of his kiosk where he starts work at 7 o'clock (and it is not very warm at 7 o'clock in the Hills in early July; you have to be out of bed pretty early to get there at seven) a big heap of rubbish with excreta on top, and they have urinated under the door. He says, 'This is not for me.' He goes home, saying that he has had enough. I think any one of us would take that approach.

We are told that we cannot get more police services. We need dedicated patrols. Perhaps we have to go back to push bikes. We have had two young girls assaulted; we have had a hold-up at the bank; we have had a family tied up at pistol point while somebody has ransacked their house; and we have had another family with an intruder moving in and taking a large amount of money at 1 o'clock in the afternoon. There must be an answer to the question: why has it happened? It is difficult to stop it. Also, we have forced people to spend a fortune on security, whether it be dogs, which cost money to keep and sometimes high fences to keep them in.

Mr Venning: Steel doors.

Mr S.G. EVANS: There are all sorts of security: electronic and physical, such as barriers on windows and deadlocks on doors. Millions of dollars worth of money is spent because somehow we have gone wrong in our system.

Was it the social engineering of the 1970s of saying, 'It does not matter; if you object to the law, you can break it.'? Was it because we said the police could not move people on? Was that the beginning of it? I know that some members opposite talk to each other, as we do, and we know the reason why. We became soft. We all know it, and all of us may have got a clip over the ear. I have told the story before that I got a broken wrist from hitting my daughter. I would be jailed for it today, but it was about 24 years ago. She cried afterwards—not because I hit her, but because her father broke his wrist. I am grateful for that.

I say to the Parliament, as I may be leaving it: I hope we are prepared to take up the challenge that parents need support. You have given a lot of support to the children, but parents need support because we have made the position impossible for them if children decide to rebel. That is where the support has to be. I agree with the member for Flinders about some support for the family. I do not care how you describe the family, but the family needs support, for the sake of the children and for the sake of their children also. I support the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 11 August at 2 p.m.