

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 17 February 1994

The SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 16 February. Page 105.)

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** I would like to dedicate this speech to the memory of the late Michael Spooner, who was Secretary of the Liberal Party branch at Henley Beach and who was an extremely hard worker for the Party over many, many years. He had epilepsy and overcame many difficulties. He had full employment until a few months before his death. He was one who believed in a fair go and I know he would love to have seen the result on 11 December. It is a shame that his untimely death robbed him of that opportunity. Michael worked extremely hard for the Party in the Henley Beach area and the Federal electorate of Hindmarsh, in times when it was difficult to attract membership, in times when very few people were interested in the area. He often confided in me, not only because of his medical condition and difficulty in obtaining employment but also as one who was keen to see the Party grow and strengthen.

Mr Speaker, in supporting the adoption of the Address in Reply, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of the House. You and I entered the House at the same time, on 30 May 1970, almost 24 years ago. I think about 17 new members were elected to the House at that stage and you and I are the only two who have survived. So you can claim to be the longest serving member from the country and I will claim to be the longest serving from the metropolitan area. It is now getting to the stage where both of us are starting to chalk up some records as far as service to people in South Australia and the Parliament is concerned.

It is a pleasure to have had the opportunity, after many years, to stand for a seat that has traditionally been held by the Labor Party; a seat that everybody believed would still go to the Labor Party. Following the redistribution of electoral boundaries we initially believed that we would need a 5 per cent swing to win the seat of Peake. Now that all the figures and statistics are out, all those projections have been altered. Some people said that it was a Labor seat by about 3 per cent. However, when there is a redistribution of boundaries—I have had to suffer three in my political career—predicting the election result is virtually an educated guess because nobody really knows what is going to happen. There is difficulty in assessing where people vote, where they vote by habit and where the polling booths are in relation to the streets and the boundaries.

The electorate of Peake has made a decision and I have taken up the challenge, believing that it is an area that has been neglected, an area that is deserving of a tremendous amount of support, encouragement and hard work, and I hope that I will be worthy of that challenge. Parts of the electorate of Peake have a great history and it is crying out for support, development and encouragement. Tragically, in parts of Thebarton, Hindmarsh and Torrensville we have the highest unemployment in the State: almost one in four are unem-

ployed, and some people have not had employment for at least two or three years. Many people in the electorate are under-employed through no fault of their own, but that is another story that I will go into at a future time.

I have a tremendous amount of admiration and respect for Dame Roma Mitchell, and again she attended to her duty, as one would expect, in delivering the opening speech. It was sad to note in the past few months and since the Governor's previous opening speech the passing of John Burdett and Jessie Cooper. I first met Jessie Cooper back in about 1968-69 when I was a member of the Glenelg North branch of the Liberal Party. I was invited to go along to a meeting at which we had a guest speaker, Mrs Jessie Cooper, the first woman member of Parliament. I was absolutely staggered at the behaviour of the secretary of the branch let alone the president of the branch, who had no idea how to run a meeting, and after Mrs Cooper had addressed the meeting we had question time and then we adjourned to supper.

I went up to Mrs Cooper, introduced myself and apologised for the behaviour of the other members of the branch. I never believed that people could be so rude to a guest speaker, particularly a woman, and somebody who deserved greater respect. She said, 'Look, don't worry about it. That's all part of politics. When you make a speech you will always get some clown interjecting, and one is always prepared for those people, to come back and sit them down or you totally ignore them.' She went on and said, 'I'm not worried about the cut and thrust of politics and interjections, it helps me make better speeches.' That was the end of the conversation. I always admired Jessie Cooper and I took particular note of her career.

When I was asked to stand for the seat of Hanson when it was created in 1970, I took particular note of Jessie's performance in Parliament, and she was truly a representative of the people and did much to further the interest of various organisations and groups in Parliament. I always remembered the advice that Jessie gave, and I give the same advice to the new members, whom I welcome now: always be prepared for the clown who is going to make the interjection, and remember that some of the best speeches in this House have been made from interjections.

The late John Burdett was virtually the honorary solicitor for my electorate. He was wonderful. If I ever needed legal advice I would go to John. If we needed help or assistance in relation to welfare problems, John Burdett was always the one to whom you could go to discuss the situation. He was an outstanding Minister in the Tonkin Government in the period 1979-82. I do not think John was ever given credit for what he did within the Department of Community Welfare and for the way in which he took on the very difficult portfolio at that time, a time when there were tremendous welfare problems besetting South Australia, the like of which we had never seen before. We were able to control and contain those problems for a short period of time but, tragically, they are even worse today. John Burdett deserves a special place in the political history of this State as a very compassionate, dedicated member of Parliament and Minister, and we owe him much. He will never be given the credit, but to his wife Jean and his family I say, 'Thank you very much for the loan of John as a member of the Legislative Council.'

The 1993 election campaign will go down as probably one of the most vicious any of us have ever been involved in; the most vicious and deceitful campaign ever waged in the history of South Australia. Never before have I known a

Government, a political Party, to come out and attack the Opposition on what it might do. It was a campaign based and designed on pure fabrication. Wherever the Labor Party took its campaign, it tried to link the Brown Liberal Party to either Jeff Kennett or to Court in Western Australia. However, it made a mistake during the 1989 campaign when it likened us to Nick Greiner in New South Wales. So, by the time of the 1993 election, people were getting sick and tired of the Liberals in South Australia being linked to this, that and everybody else. The only person the Labor Party did not link us to was Joh Bjelke-Peterson, and I have been waiting for that to come. Time will tell. There is no doubt that the Labor Party will do that, too.

As I said, the best speeches made in this House are those from the clowns who interject. Bear that in mind. That campaign proved one point, and something most of us never realised: the vast majority of people in South Australia were sick and tired of the dishonesty and the deceitfulness of the Labor Party.

**Mr Clarke:** They didn't have to wait too long to find out the truth.

**Mr BECKER:** A fool is born every day. Unfortunately, some of them are elected to the Parliament and they sit in the Labor Party. The election campaign helped me create something that the member with the big mouth—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** The member for Ross Smith reminds me of a groper. I have to borrow a phrase that you used in this House, Mr Speaker—'all mouth and no brain.' The election campaign gave me the opportunity once again to set another record that the member for Ross Smith will never have the opportunity to emulate. I am the only member who has seen his seat redistributed three times and create four seats, which are now occupied by members of the Government. Back in 1977, when there was a redistribution of boundaries, 55 per cent of my seat went into the newly created seat of Morphett, now held by the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

The redistribution of boundaries in 1985 was an attempt to wipe out the opportunity for the Liberal Party to hold that seat. We won it by 299 votes after a very long and hard campaign. After the previous redistribution of boundaries, the 1993 election saw about a third of the old seat of Hanson move into Colton, which is now occupied by the former Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Steve Condous, and we are absolutely delighted to see him take a seat in Parliament. I could not wish for a better person to take over that area. Another third of the seat went into the new seat of Hanson, which was another opportunity to destroy the old seat of Hanson by splitting up the area and incorporating the airport.

I am also delighted that one of my very good friends, the member for Hanson, Stewart Leggett, won that seat. There is no doubt in my mind that he will hold that seat and hold it comfortably. Right from the word go in the election campaign issues were created in the new seat of Hanson, where the current member, Stewart Leggett, took up those issues and proved to the people that he will look after his constituency, the same as Mr Condous will do in the seat of Colton. The other third of the old seat of Hanson went into Peake, which has now given me the opportunity to prove something I have been saying for many years: politicians, after they have served a considerable amount of time in a particular seat, should try to take on a challenge in a seat that does not traditionally favour their Party.

That is something we proved. I had the opportunity to move into Peake and to make the Labor Party work for the

first time; it did not know how to do it. It was forced to spend money which it had never spent before in that area. We wound up a campaign, got amongst the people and motivated them, which left the Labor Party floundering, as one would expect. It proves the point that one should get out into the electorate, support the people, and stand up on behalf of the people. I well remember making a speech in this House, and I was goaded by the former member for Peake. The idiot Government of the day had brought in a cigarette tax and a beer tax, and it had taxed petrol—all things that affect the worker. Nobody has stood up in this House for the past seven or eight years and defended the rights of the worker or given any damn consideration for the worker, except me, and I was criticised by the Labor Party for doing it. The proof is in the pudding.

The workers did not forget me, because the vast majority of union members, the workers who have jobs, voted Liberal at the last election in the seat of Peake. I will not forget that; I am grateful to them and I will do all I can to help and support them. The announcement by the Minister for Industrial Affairs that unionism is now voluntary is worth \$5 a week to the pocket of the workers in my electorate. They are grateful for that. If they want to buy themselves a packet of cigarettes, they now can or, if they want to buy some extra petrol to go for a picnic, they can do it because they do not have to pay \$5 blackmail to some radical union that does not worry about their interests.

What annoys me in the 24 years that I have been in Parliament is that as soon as a worker gets into trouble and goes to his union for help or guidance he is told, 'Go and see Heini Becker; he'll have a go for you.' The unions refer the workers to me. I am not a member of the Labor Party; and I am not supported or sponsored by the unions. At least they know that they can go to someone who will look after their interests and do something for them. The people in my electorate are asking, 'Why should we join a union; why should we be involved in a union?', because when they go to a union for help the union sends them to see a Liberal member of Parliament. The best thing we have done so far is to bring in voluntary unionism.

I hope that the Australian Democrats also get the message. Let us look at the statistics of the last State election in South Australia. The Australian Democrats' average vote was 9 per cent. In the electorate of Peake, it was 3.6 per cent, the lowest in the metropolitan area. They lost their deposit again. It is not the first time that the Democrats have lost their deposit in the seat of Hanson or the seat of Peake. They seem to have problems with me, and of course they should. Janine Haines was a member of my 1973 campaign committee. I thought I taught her better. Obviously she knew what to do—as soon as she was eligible for her superannuation she took it and ran. The point with the Australian Democrats is that they should remember that in my seat, as in most metropolitan seats, the Liberal Party has a mandate to introduce voluntary voting. The best thing that can happen in this State is to give the people the opportunity for voluntary voting. I see no reason why we should force people along to the polling booths to vote.

At inner suburbs polling booths such as Torrensville about 15 people were standing outside ready to shove a how-to-vote card down your throat, and you were told by some arrogant person, 'Don't go that way; go this way.' They got those poor people in such a confused state that they did not know what to do. So, by the time they got inside the polling booth, they were upset. Of course, we saw the heavies there, the few

union organisers, who grabbed the blokes and wheeled them in by the arm to make sure they voted according to the wishes of their organisation. This must stop, because what we have in South Australia is a third world country election system. We are sending advisers all over the world. We are studying and advising third world countries on how to conduct a democratic election.

When you go to a polling booth in South Australia, you walk up to the desk and say, 'My name is so-and-so.' The clerk looks down and sees the name and says, 'Where do you live?' and hands you ballot papers for both Houses. There is no identification; you are not called upon to prove who you are. This is an old one that the Labor Party has used for many years. When you have been in here as long as I have and you know how your polling booths go and you try to work out your percentages and you see that something funny is going on, you know that they are moving people around, particularly where there are a lot of flats like I used to have in Henley South. The member for Colton will find out. He should watch the flats in Henley South, because they seem to have a transit system of moving young Labor people around the place. And, of course, there are the caravan parks, such as the West Beach Caravan Park. And who was Chairman of the West Beach Trust? He would have wised people up. There is that transient population. There are people who go around voting for and on behalf of other people. We have a very high illiteracy rate in this country and that is an indictment on our education system. There are people, including union organisers, who go along and vote on behalf of somebody else. It has been going on for years.

The former member for Light undertook a tremendous amount of research following the 1975 State election, which we lost by a few hundred votes. Again, we could not prove it; it is difficult. We believed we had a formula. We found out there was a deliberate movement of people from polling booth to polling booth; there was a deliberate move by certain people to stack electorates. We also discovered that there were up to 13 people at one address, but it was difficult to prove. No identification is required. Anybody can go along and virtually vote in any name. It is about time we changed the system. If we bring in voluntary voting, that is one thing we can do. We do not want the Irish system.

**Mr Atkinson:** Why not? What is wrong with that?

**Mr BECKER:** As I said, any clown will interject and help you make a speech. I recently had a little stay in a hospital in Perth. The nurse who looked after me was Irish. She was politically aware and said:

My father was a great political activist as well. Father usually got furious at election time because you went along and registered to vote—with voluntary voting in Ireland, you registered to vote—and he could not believe that sometimes 80 per cent of the population would vote, sometimes 120 per cent of the population would vote. He wanted to know how that was working out. There was a public meeting at which you could object to anybody being on the electoral roll. He saw the name Sean O'Leary. He went along to the public meeting and said, 'Mr Chairman, I object to Mr Sean O'Leary being on the electoral roll.' 'Why do you object?', he was asked. He replied, 'Because we buried him. God rest his soul, five months ago. I was there. I laid him out. I was a pall bearer. We buried him. I went to his wake. He is dead. He cannot vote.' So the chairman said, 'Have you got a death certificate?' He said, 'No, I have not got a death certificate. But I know he is dead; we buried him. Why is his name on the electoral roll?' He was told, 'Unless you can come up with a death certificate, his name stays on the electoral roll and he can vote.'

We do not want that system here. Let us bring in a form of identification. We will hear all the arguments in the world

that you do not need identification: it will be costly, it will be this and it will be that. But the Australian Democrats should remember that we have a mandate for voluntary voting. In my electorate they got only 3.6 per cent of the vote. I cannot see how the Democrats can stop voluntary voting.

Whilst we are on this subject, let us look at those who said they would keep everybody honest. Two members of the Legislative Council resigned to stand for seats in which they thought they could improve the vote—in Norwood and Davenport. In Norwood, the Democrats got 12.4 per cent of the vote. I, too, would leave and go back to the country to resume farming on Kangaroo Island or wherever it is. In Davenport, they got 26.5 per cent, which is also a pretty pathetic vote, considering all the publicity and all the money they poured into it. It was an attempt to try to boost the stocks of the Democrats in another place. What an exercise that was. Then we had to go through that terribly embarrassing situation on opening day of going back to the Legislative Council and reinstating one of those who had left the Legislative Council to contest a House of Assembly seat—to put him back in. What a joke of the whole political system when you can have members of Parliament moving from here to there just to suit their own purposes.

That is why I am very critical of the member for Elizabeth: it was downright dishonest and deceitful of him to put himself forward at the State election and then, six or seven weeks later, to resign to go to the Federal Parliament. About \$100 000 will be spent on a by-election.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** I know: 'What about John Olsen? What about this one? What about that one?' John Olsen has had to wear the criticism for what he did.

**Mr Atkinson:** Not one but two by-elections.

**Mr BECKER:** It doesn't matter. So what! The point is that the member for Alexandra retired because of ill health.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** As I said, there is always a clown in every school. He had a horrendous car accident. He was lucky to be alive; thank goodness for our great medical system. He had been in constant pain for a couple of years. He required a considerable amount of surgery. I am surprised he undertook some of that surgery, because his condition was touch and go. I have great admiration for Ted Chapman. He had every reason to pull out, because he was constantly in pain and great difficulty.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** He has just come out of hospital again. I was not aware of that, and I am sorry to hear it. I admire Ted. You cannot rubbish Ted Chapman for what he did. Roger Goldsworthy was the same; he has not always been a well person, either. He was quite within his rights to do what he did. For this to happen so short a time after an election is an insult to the voters in that area. I hope that nobody else who is left on the Opposition benches—and it is pretty hard to find where they are at times—has ideas of doing the same thing.

**Mrs Kotz:** The member for Giles might depart shortly.

**Mr BECKER:** As the member for Newland says, 'The member for Giles might depart shortly.' I do not know whether he will. But, certainly, that will give us an opportunity to have a go at another seat. I think we will do extremely well in the seat of Elizabeth. Giles will be no problem: we could create history up there and get that seat as well. When you analyse the last State election on 11 December, you see

that certain anomalies come up. It is time we looked at the system.

There were eight candidates for the seat of Peake. We had all the little funny Parties—we even an Independent Labor person who did not even put up a photo. That was obviously a stooge. We have subjected the people in a democracy to vote for candidates such as the Democrats, who got 3.6 per cent; the Labor Party, 30 per cent (25 per cent down); the Democratic Socialist League, 1.3 per cent; and the Greens, 2.9 per cent. There was an Independent bloke—an ego tripper—and an Independent Labor candidate who got 1.9 per cent, while an Independent for the Natural Law Party got 1.8 per cent.

It is about time we looked at the amount of deposit required. Most of these people lost their deposit. If these people want to have a crack at elections, why do we not jack up the deposit from \$200 to \$1 000. Let us get really serious, because some of these people did nothing: some of them were stooges, and some of them did very little as far as electioneering was concerned. But to be honest, less than 1 per cent was bad. It was embarrassing enough for the Democrats to get 3.6 per cent. So, there we are.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** Ten per cent. What is the difference? He didn't support you lot. He didn't support the Labor Party, but you did very well out of his preferences. I am surprised he did as well as he did in some areas. But there is a classic example of somebody who worked for over two years and who claimed he was on his third way around door knocking. I said, 'Keep going; make it four times.' It was like Terry Groom when he stood against me. I kept urging him to go door knocking, because every time he knocked on a door it was another vote for me. I do not mind, but I think we ought to be doing something about that.

Another problem is how to vote cards, and I have already explained that problem. It is time that how to vote cards were abolished. When people go to a polling booth, they are faced with absolute harassment with up to 15 people standing in the front of the polling place all trying to shove a how to vote card at them, and there is absolute confusion. It is time that nonsense was cut out because the names are on the ballot paper and the political affiliation can be made clear in the polling booth. There are enough papers and signs all over the place.

At one stage in my electorate we had an election campaign conducted on stobie poles, yet the local council banned posters on stobie poles. The Labor candidate and I did not do that, but the other candidate did, although it did not do him any good. Those are the issues that we should consider, and I would ask the Electoral Commissioner to consider them. The biggest problem relates to identification but, if we are talking about true, genuine democratic elections, then everyone should be made to identify themselves. Certainly, we should do away with how to vote cards, and people should be free to vote without encountering harassment at the entrance to polling booths.

It was a great election campaign; it was historic and I welcome all my new colleagues—the class of 93—and I can see the number of my colleagues growing and not diminishing.

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

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** It is with great pleasure that on this occasion I support the motion for the adoption of the

Address in Reply to Her Excellency the Governor's speech, which reflects the new direction in which the Liberal Government will lead our State by the introduction of sound policies for the benefit of all South Australians. I, too, take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your elevation to such a high and important office in this Parliament. I know that you will dispense the duties of your office with alacrity and, more importantly, with impartiality. I certainly wish you well in your deliberations in this Chamber.

I would also like to pay a tribute to members who retired from this Parliament last year. The Hon. Bruce Eastick was fondly tagged by the class of 89 as the 'tribal elder', mainly because of the honourable member's vast experience and because of his freely given assistance to those of us new to this Parliament in 1989. The honourable member's support was certainly appreciated by me and, I am sure, by many members of this place.

The contribution by the Hon Peter Arnold was solidly based as he was conscientious in his representations on behalf of his constituents, and he, too, still found time to support his colleagues, particularly in recent times those in marginal seats. I certainly hold the commitment and integrity of the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore in high regard. In modern times Jennifer Cashmore, the former member for Coles, was most certainly a role model for women aspiring to achieve, particularly for those women aspiring to become members of Parliament. I believe the honourable member would gain a great deal of pleasure, just as I do, in welcoming the increase in women's representation in this Parliament in 1994.

The former member for Davenport, Stan Evans, was the former Opposition Whip and was the politician in this Parliament who could truly claim to be a member for the people, and I appreciated his straight from the shoulder advice and his genuine loyalty to his colleagues and to this Parliament.

I also refer to Mr Peter Blacker, the former member for Flinders. Although he did not share the Party Room with Liberal members, his contributions to this Parliament were indeed admirable.

I recognise those former members with admiration for their contribution to this Parliament and their support to their colleagues, and I record my thanks for their friendship and guidance during my first term in this Parliament. I wish them every success in their retirement.

Each of those former members has now been replaced by new members and, having listened to many of the contributions that they have already made in this Parliament, I can see that the talents of those new members will obviously mean that they themselves will make their own special mark in this Parliament in times to come. For the four years up until the December 11 State election I was the only metropolitan Liberal member of Parliament north of the Torrens River. Therefore, in terms of Liberal representation, Newland was almost an isolated outpost.

**Mr Becker:** You were the Robinson Crusoe.

**Mrs KOTZ:** That is an improvement these days on what used to be called a 'girl Friday'. The residents of surrounding electorates, who on many occasions were unhappy with Labor representation from their parliamentary members, were never turned away from my office when they sought assistance, and this, I might add, placed considerable pressure on the Newland electorate office resources and on my hard-working personal assistant, who has my thanks and admira-

tion for her dedication and commitment, often under somewhat trying circumstances.

It is therefore a greater pleasure for all those reasons to welcome the members for Wright, Florey and Todd into this Parliament and into the adjacent boundaries of Newland. I also welcome and congratulate all members newly elected into this Parliament from all political Parties and look forward to their contributions to ensure better government for the people of South Australia, and I trust that members of the Opposition will provide bipartisan support for the policies of the Government, endorsed by the majority of the residents of our State.

The State election of 1993 is now history, and the result of that election is indeed historic. Some 60 years have passed since a Government in South Australia suffered such a massive defeat; I say that without malice and purely record a historical fact. Many people from my electorate share in the success of a change of Government and a change of direction for South Australia. Their support, assistance and voluntary help were invaluable not only during the election campaign period but also during the past four years in Opposition. I could not possibly mention all those supporters who now number in their hundreds, but I would like to record my thanks to those who are indeed representative of the many.

I particularly mention Howard Miller, the Chairman of my State electorate committee; Jack Ktisti my campaign manager; Yvonne Hoad, campaign office manager and Vice President of the Newland Central branch of the Liberal Party; Jean Burdett, President of the Tea Tree Gully branch of the Liberal Party; Scott Nicholls, assistant campaign manager; and Mary, Lilian, Suzy, Doreen, Fred, Brian, Dick and Graham. These people were the stalwarts of a very long campaign.

**Mr Becker:** You left out Brian.

**Mrs KOTZ:** I haven't quite come to Brian yet. The support and unswerving loyalty of all those people is indeed a humbling experience and one for which they have my utmost appreciation and sincere thanks. As the member for Peake has reminded me, the list of thanks would not be complete without mentioning the support of my family, which is most important to me, and that includes my husband and sons and our family friends and relatives. Finally, I thank the electors of Newland, whose overwhelming support achieved the greatest swing against the Labor Party in this State—a swing of 18 per cent—taking Newland, the most marginal Liberal held seat in South Australia, from .4 per cent Labor marginal to 17.5 per cent Liberal. In thanking my electorate community for its support, I give my assurance that I will continue to represent my constituency to the best of my ability and undertake once again to represent all members of my electorate, regardless of their political affiliations, as I believe a member of Parliament upholds the principles of democracy by representing all people within the community.

The results of the 11 December election gave an overwhelming mandate to the new Liberal Government to implement the policies presented to the people of this State in the lead up to the election. As a member of this new Government it was with a great deal of pride that I listened to Her Excellency the Governor of South Australia enunciate the new policy direction to be implemented by the Liberal Government. The fundamental focus of these policies is centred around job creation.

Unemployment is the single most disastrous element to strike at the wellbeing of our society, both in economic and in social terms. Unemployment, which has risen to unaccept-

able levels both statewide and nationwide, needs to be tackled with positive measures such as incentives to small business and industry rather than those that have tinkered around with indefinite trainee schemes, which cost the taxpayers and industry millions of dollars but which leave those trainees without jobs, still unemployed at the end of the day. The true picture of unemployment becomes hidden in many of these training programs, and therein lies the vicious circle that can devastate the optimism of young people and has most certainly devastated the hope and the optimism of the now long-term unemployed.

It is the intention of the State Liberal Government to tackle rather than to tinker with this major problem and, to this end, our Government has already taken steps to implement job creation programs and incentives. Within four weeks of the State election the Rebuilding South Australia package had been launched by the Premier, and within five weeks of the new Liberal Government in South Australia 57 000 employers in this State had received information relating to the four key programs and the four complementary schemes designed to encourage small and medium sized business to employ more workers.

Our commitment is to get South Australians back into the workplace, and within a month of coming to office we have acted on that commitment. The key components of the Rebuilding South Australia package have meant that the Government will pay the WorkCover levy for one year for each school leaver or long-term unemployed person a company adds to its work force. It means that we will provide grants to help export oriented companies employ experienced marketing personnel or marketing graduates. It also means that we have offered a payroll tax rebate of 10 per cent for employers currently involved in value added exporting, and 50 per cent for new employees taken on to generate new value added exports.

We will also provide \$2 million over the next year to help small business prepare professional business development plans. Economic development by business and industry has been stifled in this State by restrictive regulation and legislation by previous Labor Governments. A lack of incentive has denied business the opportunity to expand, to export and to employ. It is the intention of the State Liberal Government to provide incentive, and it is then the responsibility of business to grasp the opportunities that those incentives will provide. The sum of \$28 million has been allocated to the initial job creation package.

The response to the Rebuilding South Australia package up until 4 February 1994 has elicited inquiries from some 730 small business operators looking for relief from WorkCover levy subsidies for the employment of school leavers and the long-term unemployed.

**Mr Brindal:** Will you circulate this to the Opposition? They're obviously out rebuilding their Party.

**Mrs KOTZ:** I am quite happy to provide that information to any members of the Opposition. I think that, as the member for Peake earlier said, we have to determine the literacy of some of those members before we pass it on. As a result also of the inquiries, as I have previously noted, over 200 applications or inquiries in relation to the export marketing scheme have been dealt with. The Young Farmers Incentive Scheme, through the Department of Primary Industries, has received some 235 inquiries for support and subsidy in this area.

Up until 4 February, small business operators in South Australia seeking to access the Government's job creation

program to provide employment for South Australians during the course of this year have totalled over 1 500. While we have sat in this Parliament and been regaled on many occasions by the interjections of the Opposition (and it was also amazing to me to recall that this was whilst the member for Briggs, the Labor Party's Minister in charge of the Grand Prix in the previous Government, was busily feeding sections of the media with justifications for his inept and unbelievable mismanagement of the Grand Prix), I am pleased to say that a more responsible Minister of the Liberal Government was announcing further support for more youth employment schemes.

Some of the further schemes that this very responsible Minister of ours has been announcing included one that will look to provide a thousand young people with opportunities for employment through what is called the Adelaide working for youth program, and they are looking to provide those opportunities by the end of this financial year. This youth employment and enterprise project will be promoted by a network of 30 city-based youth agencies and it already has the support of State Government, local government, private enterprise, the media and the youth services industry in the planning and management of what will be seen to be a most innovative project. This project aims to target low skilled young people, including youth at risk, homeless youth and early school leavers. These young people, as I am sure we all recognise, are the ones who face the greatest difficulties in securing employment, but this project will be tailor-made to offer supportive employment in up to five youth industries.

There are many areas of policy that I would like to fully talk about in this Address in Reply speech, but of course the time element allowed for these short debates does not enable each of the members to pick up the issues that concern them individually as politicians and, unfortunately, does not allow us to elucidate all the areas of those policies that we want to talk about. Of course, we all look forward to future debates when we will be able to expand our thoughts on the different issues that concern us all.

During the opening of Parliament when Her Excellency was introducing the policies of our Government to this State, I was very pleased to see that, in the education area (and of course this has been of great interest to me over the years and I have great concerns about the literacy problems that have been vastly ignored within our State and our nation for a good many years), the policy that is now put down by the Liberal Government includes looking most definitely to improved teaching and learning in the early years of schooling. It will also include early intervention programs to focus on further improving literacy and numeracy skills and other competencies which are needed for effective participation in education in later life. Individual levels of literacy and numeracy will be identified through a standards assessment program, and most importantly to me—and I am extremely pleased to see that our Government is standing by this policy—is the introducing of additional staff, such as pathologists, special education trainers and guidance officers who will be provided to help children with learning difficulties.

An area of importance which is of concern not only to members of Parliament but to parents and staff within the schools is the improvement of school discipline. That will be another major focus of this Government through the introduction of a fair discipline code to signal a stronger approach and the need for greater cooperation between schools, students and families. There will also be provision for extra places in

alternative learning centres. That in itself is a major step forward on which I compliment Ministers for implementing.

I turn now to a further area of extreme concern for all members of the public. Prior to the election many things were said about our health systems within the State. Unfortunately, they have been allowed to run down over the past decade to the extent where patients in need of assistance, rather than being placed in beds within our hospitals, have been found sitting in chairs in corridors because beds have not been available. I am pleased that this Government will look towards introducing a new system of health funding, called casemix based funding, for public hospitals. This will provide opportunities to achieve significant improvements in cost efficiencies which will lead to reductions in waiting lists and allow people in need to access their hospital systems.

**Mr Brindal:** Does that mean that sick people will get operations in South Australia?

**Mrs KOTZ:** There is a great possibility that that will happen. It has been of extreme concern to all of us that people who are sick and in need of hospital treatment have been put on waiting lists for months on end without any attempt being made to bring them into a system of care and concern. This Liberal Government, as is proven by our policy direction, will look to the care and concern of our population. I support the Minister for Health's presentation of his policies on our behalf.

My community in Newland is well aware that I have spoken many times about justice and community safety. I am pleased that the Minister for Emergency Services, who will handle a great deal of this area, is on the bench at the moment. I am also pleased to say that this Government will be introducing legislation that will put an end to the early release of prisoners and implement a policy of truth in sentencing. Prisoners will have to serve the full minimum term fixed by the court before they can apply for parole. They will also have to demonstrate good behaviour, including abstinence from drugs and alcohol. In addition, they will have to participate in work and trade training. Education will be provided and, where appropriate, anti-violence programs and minimal risk to members of the public on their release will be taken into consideration.

It is also pleasing for me to say that this Government, as has been stated in the past, recognises that domestic violence is a serious issue within our community. Domestic violence legislation will be introduced to enhance the safety of those in troubled domestic relationships. An amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act will create a new offence of stalking which, in this day and age, is one of the most abominable crimes and has been more predominant in recent times than we have known before. I am very pleased to say that this Government has taken up that issue and will be presenting legislation to take into account this new and vilest of crimes.

In conclusion, I would like to turn to my local area, particularly to the City of Tea Tree Gully Council, which I would like to congratulate on winning a major prize in the South Australian division of the 1993 National Landcare Australia Awards. The award was won in conjunction with the children of the Ardtornish Primary School, who were recognised for their efforts in winning the Landcare Education Award, which was sponsored by Telecom earlier this year. The joint program is an innovative stormwater program for wetlands and has been operated out of Gifford Reserve. Of course, the program aims to improve stormwater quality as well as to promote environmental awareness.

The City of Tea Tree Gully and the Ardtornish Primary School will now represent South Australia at the national awards to be held in Canberra in March during National Landcare Month. I am sure all members will join me in extending best wishes to the council and primary school for their success at the awards and for initiating and participating in a most worthwhile enterprise, which I believe deserves wholehearted support from the community.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mr Brindal:** *Hansard* will record enthusiastic endorsement.

**Mrs KOTZ:** I am very pleased to hear that. Interjections are not recognised, but obviously members on this side of the House have—

**Mr Quirke:** What about this side?

**Mrs KOTZ:** They are included among those on this side of the House, who have endorsed those comments wholeheartedly. I will be most pleased to convey the congratulations of my colleagues to the City of Tea Tree Gully Council and the Ardtornish school.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not think that the member for Newland needs the ongoing support of her two colleagues alongside her.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mrs KOTZ:** Not at all; I must admit that there are times when I still struggle. In fact, that was usually the case in a previous time when the member who was then the member for Hanson and I shared an office in these august surroundings. I must admit that I learnt a great deal about many areas of parliamentary procedure—perhaps that is the most conservative way to describe some of the lessons.

However, it gives me great pleasure to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, particularly as the policies enunciated therein are those of a Liberal Government. Seeing the inclusion of those policies gives great pleasure to someone like me and others in the community who for many years have worked towards bringing the Liberal Party to government in this State. It is pleasing to support this Government and to know that our policies will receive support and now be implemented throughout the State.

It gives me great pleasure to perceive the optimism that was lacking in our community, particularly among our youth—those completing their school years and attempting to find employment. That optimism had been lost for a long time. However, even at this very early stage of our Government, it is noticeable that there is an optimism growing among the people of this State and a more positive attitude towards the future. I will be supporting that and I know that colleagues and members of this Parliament, including the new members who are here with new talents that they bring to this place, will be supporting Liberal policies as we move into the next term of this Government.

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling the member for Lee, I point out that this is a maiden speech and I ask that the normal courtesies of the House be extended to the honourable member.

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I commend Her Excellency the Governor on a speech that was directed towards a positive future. I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment to high office. I offer my condolences to the family, friends and colleagues of the late Hon. John Burdett and to the late

Jessie Cooper. Unfortunately, I did not have the pleasure of meeting Jessie Cooper. However, I did meet John Burdett who gave me moral support, advice and fundraising suggestions. John Burdett will be sadly missed by those who knew him.

This is my first speech in this House. The good citizens of the electorate of Lee have given me the responsibility of representing them in the Parliament of South Australia. I thank them for the honour which they have bestowed on me and I pledge myself to work on their behalf to the best of my ability. Being elected to Parliament is a milestone in any person's life. It is at such times that we reflect upon those people who have helped and supported us through the good times and the bad, those who have helped to shape our lives. My parents, Carmine and Giuseppa Rossi, taught me the value of hard work, honesty and integrity. I owe them a great deal. Sadly, my father passed away some years ago but my mother is still around and does not hesitate to offer her opinion and advice, whether or not it is being sought. Her advice, whilst not always attractive, is generally very wise and it is indeed a foolish person who rejects wisdom gained by experience.

To my wife Annette, who is a Beverley ward councillor in the City of Hindmarsh and Woodville, and to our children Josephine, Belinda, Robert and Marianne, I offer both an apology and my thanks—an apology because the rigours of politics has not made ours a normal home and my thanks because without them I would not be in this place. My wife's parents, Bill and Daphne Gordon, instilled in their daughter the same qualities that my parents taught me and they have been a great source of love and support.

Since joining the Liberal Party and becoming politically active I have met many good people. I refer to the late Bob Hann and his wife Coral, who worked hard for the Liberal cause for decades in what is traditionally one of the toughest areas for Liberals in the State. Bob was able to celebrate the election of the Brown Liberal Government on 11 December. He died a few weeks later. Bob and Coral Hann, together with their son and daughter-in-law, Kevin and Margaret Hann, and friend Rita Howard, kept the Liberal flag flying in some very tough times and I was very pleased that they were there to see the arrival of a new Liberal era in South Australian politics.

During my campaign in Lee I received the support and advice of many people. I wish to thank them all, those who letterboxed, knocked on doors and stood at polling booths, for the work they did in securing a victory in Lee. I have met some very fine people while moving about in the community. I would especially like to mention the work done by people like Len and Mary Croker of the Hindmarsh and Woodville Dog Owners Association, train enthusiast Peter Perin, members of the Woodville Lions Club, the elected members and staff of the City of Hindmarsh and Woodville, the Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner who has worked very hard for the people of the western suburbs, those dedicated citizens who make up the local branches of Neighbourhood Watch and my fellow worshippers at our Lady Queen of Peace Church in Albert Park.

The electorate of Lee takes in the suburbs of West Lakes, West Lakes Shore, Tennyson, Royal Park, Hendon, Albert Park, Woodville West and parts of Semaphore Park and Seaton. The electorate was named in honour of Mary Lee, the great suffragette who lived from 1821 to 1909. Arriving in South Australia in 1879, Mary Lee became the foundation secretary of the Ladies Division of the Social Purity Society

and she successfully lobbied for the age of consent to be raised to 16 in 1885. In 1888 she inaugurated the Women's Suffrage League and became its first secretary.

It is fitting in this centenary year of women being given the right to vote in South Australia that we should honour such a person as Mary Lee. The granting of women's suffrage in 1894 was the most democratic reform in our State's short history and we all owe our gratitude to the strong individuals who fought for and won the battle against entrenched conservatism. It is also fitting that in this year we take the next great step in reforming our democracy, that of ending the ludicrous practice of compulsory voting.

It would be remiss of me to stand in this place and fail to mention the work done for the people of Lee—or Albert Park as it was formerly named—by my predecessor, Kevin Hamilton. Kevin had held the seat since 1979 and had previously served as President of the Australian Railways Union. He was a past chairman and member of the Parliamentary Economic and Finance Committee until his defeat on 11 December 1993. I wish Kevin and his wife, Patricia, well in their retirement. I hope Kevin will forgive me if I make the suggestion, as have many of the electors whom I have met over the last two months, that he is a good bloke in the wrong party.

In December of 1836 Colonel William Light, Surveyor-General, wrote in his diary:

It was really beautiful to look back and see two British ships from the first fleet sailing up between mangroves in fine smooth water, in a creek. . . which at some future period might be the channel for import and export of a great commercial capital.

The area he described is near the site of present day West Lakes Shore in the electorate of Lee. While preparing this speech I came across the book by Susan Marsden *A History of Woodville*, which contains many interesting facts about the history of the electorate that I represent. Few people would know, for instance, that the higher ground at Seaton is the only evidence of the sand dunes that once formed the ancient shoreline of our State. In the early years of settlement Royal Park was a mixture of swamp, scrub and various slaughter-houses. They gave it the nickname of 'Piggery Park'. It was famous for its pungent smell, so much so that even when blocks of land were being offered for the very reasonable price of £10 each there were few takers.

Some of my constituents still remember the old tin shed which was built by the Wesleyan Church on Tapleys Hill Road in 1895 and which was fondly named 'Old tin glory'. Woodville West was originally known as 'Miners Village'. Much of Albert Park belonged to the Matthews family who were dairy farmers and who provided milk to the people of Port Adelaide. Around 1900, the Woodville Council requested that Mr Matthews donate some of his land for a road. He did so on the stipulation that it was to be named after his youngest child, and so May Street, Albert Park was built.

Fort Glanville was built in 1878 when relations between Britain and Russia were poor and war looked imminent. Thankfully the fort was never needed but it still stands today as a reminder of our first independent attempts to defend ourselves. It is well worth taking a visit to Fort Glanville to view an interesting part of our history. The men and women of the Fort Glanville Historical Society, a group of dedicated volunteers, protect and help to restore this important historical site. Every so often they dress in traditional colonial uniforms and fire the cannon, most recently at the Australia Day Citizenship Ceremony held at the fort in January. The first Adelaide airport was at Hendon, an area named after the

famous English airfield. Captain Harry Butler bought the site in 1920 and his exploits as an aviator are renowned.

The aerodrome, on a site not far from where my electorate office is now, remained Adelaide's main airport until 1927 when it moved to Parafield. The Jubilee Homes David Bower Cottages were opened in 1898, built for the deserving poor mariners or their widows of Port Adelaide. The six cottages, which are still standing, are used for various community purposes. The Bower Cottages and Bower Road were named in honour of David Bower, a self-made man, timber merchant, alderman and member of Parliament in 1865 and 1875. Mr Bower was a strong advocate of individualism. He wrote:

I have always made it a rule to look after my own interests and take care of myself first, and having done that I have felt it a pleasure to help my neighbours, or use my spare time for the benefit of the public.

One of the great landmarks in my electorate is Estcourt House at Tennyson. It was built by Frederick Estcourt Bucknall in 1882. Bucknall, who was also a member of Parliament, had plans for this area to become a thriving township. However, the money was not available. Bucknall went broke and Estcourt House was abandoned to his creditors and lay deserted until 1894, when it was bought by the James Brown Memorial Trust and used as a home for the aged, blind and crippled children. During the time that it lay empty it became known as 'Bucknall's Folly'.

When I look at the state of the once again abandoned Estcourt House today, with its broken windows and the vandalism done to the surrounding buildings, it serves as a symbol to me of the decline of our State over the past 10 years and the follies perpetrated during that time. During the Great Depression of the 1930s, the people in my electorate were very badly affected, as they have been during this more recent recession. Susan Marsden quotes a Mr Nankervis of Semaphore Park, who wrote to Woodville council saying:

Fifty per cent of our ratepayers are totally unemployed, 30 per cent are on part-time, and 20 per cent are in regular work but have had their wages greatly reduced.

High unemployment is still with us today and it is a problem that needs urgent attention. The causes of unemployment, as I will later argue, go further than the purely economic reasons often put forward.

West Lakes is possibly the most ambitious and successful of the urban development plans in South Australia. During the Second World War, Premier Tom Playford suggested the reclamation of the swamplands, which was to become West Lakes, for use as a seaplane base and aerodrome, but West Beach was adopted instead. The old port reach had been nothing more than mosquito ridden swampland for generations, but talk of reclamation and development kept up. By 1959 the Marine and Harbors Board had bought 96 per cent of the area and the town planner had drawn up plans for a housing project, but it was not until 1969, under the Liberal Government of Steele Hall, that the West Lakes Development Act passed through Parliament.

Today, West Lakes and West Lakes Shore are thriving communities set in beautiful surroundings. Replacement of lakeside revetment steps is long overdue, and it is the duty of the Liberal Government to see that the dream of 1969 is not diminished. This then is my electorate, and these are the people whom I have been elected to represent in this place. It is appropriate at this time that I say a little about myself and my beliefs. In the long history of the human race there has been a constant battle between two opposing philosophical



forces: individualism versus the collective. This has been particularly apparent in the twentieth century.

We have all, whether or not we know it, chosen one of these two paths to follow. I have chosen individualism. That is why I joined and supported the Liberal Party and now sit in this House as a Liberal member of Parliament. What is this individualism and what does it mean to be a Liberal? In answer, I will quote from the Liberal Party platform of May 1982, as follows:

Liberalism's central task is to safeguard and advance the freedom of the individual to subject all constraints on him to evermore stringent scrutiny.

A former member of this House, now the Hon. Justice Robin Millhouse, once wrote:

If you believe that your individual liberty is your most precious possession, then you believe in Liberalism. To Liberals the importance of mankind lies in the importance of every single human being, and not in the State or in a power structure.

While I am not always in agreement with the former member's politics, these words display a deep appreciation of the importance of individuals. To be an individualist is to support freedom, liberty, representative democracy and the rule of the law.

Opponents of individualism often say that such a philosophy leads to chaos and a society in which everyone does as he or she pleases, but we know and appreciate that with every one of our rights comes a responsibility. Respect for our rights and responsibilities means that in observing our rights we do not infringe the rights of others. John Stuart Mill wrote in his *On Liberty*:

Liberty of the individual must be thus far limited: he must not make himself a nuisance to other people.

The great American President, Abraham Lincoln, summed it up in this way in a speech of 1 October 1858:

I am for the people of the whole nation doing just as they please in all matters which concern the whole nation; for that of each part doing just as they choose in all matters which concern no other part; and for each individual doing just as he chooses in all matters which concern nobody else.

We came into this Parliament to do our best for the people who have elected us. The best way in which we can serve our electors is not by making decisions for them that they should make for themselves. Our role is not to dominate but to create the conditions necessary for individuals to reach their maximum potential. Thomas Paine was a passionate English/American radical of the eighteenth century who inspired many of the leaders of the American Revolution with his writing. With great insight he wrote:

Government in its best state is but a necessary evil. . . security being the true design and end of government.

Providing that security, nurturing excellence and protecting freedom is our role.

During the life of this Parliament we will debate the merits of voluntary voting. I have already stated my support for the ending of the current practice of forcing people to vote for reasons which I feel are obvious, but I shall leave that for another time. Nevertheless, those who would oppose this reform and other proposed reforms on the basis that the practice in existence is one of longstanding would do well to take note of some further wise words of Tom Paine, as follows:

A long habit of not thinking a thing wrong gives it a superficial appearance of being right.

I was born in Foggia, Italy in 1948 and came to Australia with my family when I was just four years old. I understand

that I share the honour, together with my colleague and good friend the member for Hartley, of being the first Italian born members of the House of Assembly in South Australia. Before being elected to this place I served on the Ethnic Committee of the Liberal Party (South Australian Division) and was proud to have been part of the team that organised the past three ethnic food and cultural festivals held at the Fantasia Convention Centre at Findon. It was the Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner who first suggested the festivals as a way of bringing people from different ethnic backgrounds together to share and learn about each other's culture. I support multiculturalism; that is, I support the idea that regardless of an individual's ethnic origin he or she should be able to live and work peacefully in a tolerant society that reflects his or her beliefs even when it does not share them. The definition of 'multiculturalism' that appeared in the 1979-80 annual report of the now defunct Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs is the best that I have seen:

Multiculturalism recognises the ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity of Australian society and actively pursues equality of opportunity for all Australians to participate in the life of the nation and the right to maintain ethnic and cultural heritages within the law and the political framework.

During more recent times, however, multiculturalism has come to mean much more than was originally intended. This change reflects what I believe to be the growing danger to all our citizens.

The supporters of collectivism are now trying to use multiculturalism to change our traditional political, legal and bureaucratic institutions. They run the very serious risk of destroying the tolerance that exists in Australia and reviving racial hatred in some parts of the country. The collectivists understand people only in terms of what group they belong to. When they look at me, they do not see Joe Rossi: they see a person of Italian origin and make assumptions based on that alone. But I am an individual first and an Italian born Australian second. The collectivists will try to use me, as an ethnic Italian, for their own purposes. As an individual, I will practise my own beliefs and traditions and respect the right of other individuals to do the same within a Liberal democratic framework.

The greatest problem facing our State and our nation today is high unemployment. When focussing on how to solve the problem, commentators normally talk only of economic adjustments and changes. What they fail to realise is that unemployment is caused as much by mistaken attitudes as by cyclical booms and troughs. Again we can see how collectivism has been the cause of much of the problem. Mistakes were made around the time of Federation from which we are continuing to suffer today. The ridiculous 'white Australia policy' was finally abandoned in the 1960s but not before it had done massive damage to our overseas reputation and our ability to trade with our near neighbours.

Australia was founded on a faith in Government authority, a belief in egalitarianism, centralised wage fixation, protection of industry and dependence on a great power for our defence. All of these are the foundations of our modern day problems. In the late nineteenth century, Australians had the highest standard of living of any nation in the world. In 1901, amid much celebration, we were proclaimed one nation. Then came the Tariff Act 1902, the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904 and the Harvester judgment of 1907. Within a few short years we had sown the seeds of our own malaise. Hugh Morgan, Managing Director of Western Mining, has described it in this way:

Our unemployment is a consequence of the supremacy of collectivism in our labour market arrangements for the past 90 years. Despite the fact that this country and our State of South Australia were founded by men and women who possessed a strong sense of individualism, collectivism snuck into the political mainstream, and the consequences have been disastrous.

Opponents of individualism fear the opportunities and responsibilities that go with being an individual. Their fear leads to anger and hatred. They need a group to feel powerful and strong, just like schoolyard bullies. The modern day trade union movement is a perfect example. Their entire energy seems to be devoted to the acquisition of more power. But have you ever noticed how unhappy socialists always seem to be? They always talk about the struggle and the sacrifice. They never seem to be at peace with themselves or their surroundings. There is nothing so miserable as a socialist. This is because their need to be a part of a powerful group is really a sign of a lack of confidence in themselves and of fear of being an individual. The failure of collectivists' ideologies is nowhere more apparent than in our education system. 'All who have mediated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced that the fate of empires depends on their education of youth.' So said Aristotle, and his words are as true today as they have ever been.

A recent UNICEF report entitled 'The Progress of Nations' found that Australia had the highest teenage suicide rate in the industrialised world. It is clear that we have been failing our young people. Over the past 20 years, the education community has been dominated by collectivist ideologies. People have been preoccupied with thoughts about class, equity and equality of outcomes. Technical education, once a legitimate option for many in our community, has suffered because it has been maintaining class distinctions. As a result, skills that would have been gained were not gained, and jobs that would have been had were lost. Teaching standards are no longer held in high regard by the community. In Asia and on the European continent where educational standards are generally very high, teachers command greater respect, and the profession attracts recruits of high ability. Australian teachers are highly unionised and the profession is not always attracting high calibre recruits. Those of high calibre suffer because of the situation.

A recent study by the University of Melbourne's Centre for Applied Educational Research found that schools do not have a profound influence on student achievements and that the effects of home background were not as pervasive as had been indicated in earlier studies. If we challenge the child to learn, he or she will respond in a positive manner. The debate over a national curriculum went off the rails. People lost sight of the objective and became preoccupied with simply gaining a common approach to education. There is no point in having a common national curriculum if the standards of reading, writing and arithmetic set in that curriculum are not high enough. We have moved away from the traditions of a liberal education, but I am pleased to see that in New South Wales a back-to-basics approach has been adopted in relation to the teaching of English. 'Quality' and 'excellence' should be the key words in any education system. We must rediscover the importance of a technical education and promote foreign language learning in South Australian schools to provide the next generation with the necessary skills so that they can go out and successfully compete in the international arena.

It is rather ironic that, in the area where the Government

has the most right to be active, that is, in providing security for its citizens, it has failed. Crime is a problem that we share with most other nations. It is on the increase. We cannot blame the rate of crime on the recession, for the real causes go much deeper than this. Just because someone is poor or unemployed does not mean that he or she will steal, rape or murder. The real cause of crime is the prevailing attitude within our community. There is a diminished respect for others and for other people's property. This is a classic example of collectivist thinking and its resulting effects. If we are all one large group, surely everything is ours and nothing is anyone's. To respect an individual is to respect his or her private property. If there is no individual, there is no private property. The young people who commit crime are angry and confused. Many show no signs of remorse, for they do not realise that what they are doing is wrong.

In many ways Governments of today have taken away the need for individuals to be responsible for their own lives. If people make a mistake, some agency or department will always be there to pick up the pieces. It is a sad state of affairs, and it will take a fundamental shift in the way we think before this problem is resolved.

I have no doubt that my speech will not be appreciated by all members of the House. However, I welcome and look forward to further debate on the issues I have raised. Supporters of individualism are often criticised for lacking compassion. Such propaganda from our opponents could not be further from the truth. It is because I care about what happens to my fellow citizens that I am in this place; it is because I care about the future of our young people that I have raised these issues.

What is so compassionate about an education system that fails to provide our children adequately with the necessary skills to get jobs? What is so compassionate about not looking after our disabled, elderly and infirm citizens? What is so compassionate about an industrial relations system that treats everyone as just another number? If a person is not a member of a powerful group, then that person is worthless and, if people do not want to join a union, they are bullied and discriminated against. What is so compassionate about an unemployment rate of 11 per cent? Ted Evans, Secretary to the Treasury, recently stated:

Unemployment is a matter of choice.

We can choose to reduce it if we really want to, but to do so we are going to have to cross swords with the powerful collectivists. I will not shrink from my responsibility to work for the best interests of the people who have elected me, and I have faith that good sense will prevail.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before calling the member for Frome, I remind members that this is the honourable member's maiden speech and as such he should be accorded the usual courtesy of being heard in silence. The member for Frome.

**Mr KERIN (Frome):** I, too, would like to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It was certainly an honour to meet Her Excellency on opening day and I happily support the many members who have taken the opportunity to congratulate Her Excellency not only on her speech but also on her lengthy and valuable contribution to South Australia in both her earlier career and as a representative of Queen Elizabeth.

I would like to express my gratitude to the electors of Frome for having seen fit to elect me as their member. I

assure every constituent of Frome that I will do my utmost to represent them well and work hard to have their communities gain the recognition they richly deserve for this region's enormous contribution to the economy of South Australia.

In common with all new members, I have many people who are responsible for my election. To my wife Cathy, I thank her for her help and understanding, and I am most grateful. A spouse is most important to members of the House, and I hope they all feel that they are making a valuable contribution to the State in their new roles. I would thank my four young daughters for their help and the provision of many lighter moments during the election campaign. They constantly complained about the media and leaflet references that 'Rob is married to Cathy, with four daughters.' They often reminded me that they do have names, and I place on the record my thanks to Lauren, Hayley, Caitlin and Hannah, my three year old adviser.

My parents—Maurice and Molly—have provided me with wonderful role models over the years, and having seen the sacrifices they made to give their eight children every opportunity has made me very aware of maximising my opportunities. I have witnessed my parents' enormous contributions to the communities around Crystal Brook and thank them for their example, backing and moral support. To all my family and my wife's family, I am most grateful for their support now and in the past.

Before deciding to run for Frome I needed to ensure that my decision would have minimal effect on the clients and staff of our business, Kerin Agencies. I am grateful that my younger brother, Peter, agreed to take on greater responsibility. He and all the staff have been a great help, and I thank them sincerely. The Frome electorate committee was an enormous help and I thank committee members for their input. I wish to single out Lindsay Graham, whose determination to get me to stand was carried through to a loyal, dedicated and committed effort throughout the campaign.

The number of Liberal members in the House is in no small way due to the Liberal secretariat, and particularly Graeme Morris and Joan Young. I hope they, along with all the helpers, enjoy the victory and we thank them all.

I am sure all new members are grateful to the staff of this House for the courteous and helpful manner in which they have coped with this massive intake of new members. The Frome electorate created by the redistribution of boundaries is made up of considerable areas from the previous electorates of Eyre, Custance and Stuart. Our Speaker would be well aware of the quality of the communities that he has lost to Frome. He was no doubt honoured to have represented the area including Peterborough, Jamestown, Gladstone, Laura, Wirrabara and other smaller towns. It is certainly an area rich in heritage and community spirit, and I congratulate Mr Speaker on the manner in which he represented this area, despite the huge size of his electorate. I wish him well in his new role as Speaker and add my congratulations to those of my colleagues.

Frome has also taken a considerable area of what was Custance. The highly productive areas including Burra, Spalding, Crystal Brook and Port Broughton have until the election been represented by the energetic Mr Venning. I am sure he regrets losing these communities and, as one of his previous constituents, would like to thank him for his vigorous representation of these areas. As his new member I assure him that he will find me as readily available as a constituent can find a member: when he is in his seat he needs merely to turn around and I will be there.

With the creation of Frome, the electorate of Stuart disappeared, and the city of Port Pirie and its surrounding areas form a major part of the Frome electorate. Correctly titled the 'City of Friendly People', Port Pirie was once known as a single industry city. The smelter at Port Pirie has brought enormous wealth to this State over many years, a point which many people and Governments have either forgotten or ignored. Whilst the Pasmenco BHAS smelter is an enormous contributor to the State and Port Pirie, the city has become less a company town, and perhaps my greatest challenge in this place is to ensure that Port Pirie receives some long overdue recognition and that the development and jobs so often promised in the past are actually delivered.

Apart from a small section of Port Pirie which was in Custance, the people of the city were previously represented by the former member for Stuart, Mrs Colleen Hutchison. My limited contact with Mrs Hutchison was quite pleasant, and I know many of her former constituents in the area would like me to thank her for her contributions whilst she was a member. I would like to join with them in wishing her all the best for the future. Obviously, given the manner in which this seat was assembled, the area has many past members of Parliament. I acknowledge the efforts of each of those and their contributions to the State. I would particularly like to mention the father of the current member for Custance. Mr Howard Venning, the former member for Rocky River, served in this House for 11 years and contributed greatly to my local area. I wish Mr Venning Sr well as he battles poor health.

Frome is indeed a diverse and productive electorate. Historically the area has possibly contributed more than any electorate to the economy of this State. As mentioned, the revenue from the smelter at Port Pirie has been vital to this State for over 100 years. Port Pirie was also one of the great Australian sea ports.

The Burra copper mines were a source of great relief to this State in previous troubled times and contributed greatly to the growth of the State's infrastructure. Peterborough was for many years a vibrant and vital railway town. We in Frome also class Burra as the merino capital of the world, and we all know of the enormous contribution that the wool industry has made to this country, so adequately summed up by the saying that Australia rode on the sheep's back. The area is also among the State's richest cereal, legume and beef areas, and these are supported by an ever increasing list of alternative rural industries.

Other enormous contributions to the State over the years include forestry at Wirrabara and Jamestown, fishing along the coast and the important role played by the Gladstone gaol until the time of its closure, the wisdom of which many would now question. These examples illustrate the enormous contribution which the area covered by the Frome electorate have historically made to the economy of South Australia. Sadly though, we also witness that history has served the area in many ways.

Beyond local control the region has suffered from the fall in world prices for all rural commodities and the products of the BHAS Pasmenco smelter. The sad and ill-considered demise of our railways has dealt a blow to nearly every town in the electorate but has been particularly savage on Peterborough, Port Pirie and Gladstone. The cost of maintenance and safety of our roads was undoubtedly given inadequate consideration in these decisions. The Frome electorate area has been very adversely affected by the 'State of Adelaide' attitude, which has seen enormous centralisation

occur over many years. This has not only closed many of our services but has also resulted in a continuous exit of many of our young people to Adelaide and elsewhere.

The much used expression that Governments cannot see past Gepps Cross, whilst perhaps obsolete as our northern suburbs grow, is still a very strong feeling of people in the mid-north of this State. Suggestions that it does not exist are normally followed pretty well straight away by cuts to services and further transfers to Adelaide. The Frome electorate has much to offer this State. A State with the limited available resources of South Australia cannot continue to ignore the underutilised infrastructure or the willing but unused human resources available throughout country areas. We need positive decentralisation and a renewed attitude to regional development.

At present regional development boards have been fighting extremely hard to attract business to the area. I applaud this Government's move towards greater incentives for regional development and its willingness to work with local communities to ensure that it happens. The largest development board in my electorate is the Port Pirie Regional Development Board, which takes in a large part of the electorate. It has been my pleasure recently to work with it in attracting Pivot Fertilisers to build a despatch plant at Port Pirie. This development is particularly significant in that its benefit is definitely regional. Currently under construction, it means jobs, a significant capital boost to those involved in construction, a few more ships per year into the port, work for local transport operators and a significant and important saving on fertiliser costs to the many farmers in the area.

It reinforces to all in the region that Port Pirie and the rural areas inland can benefit from each other's activities. It also has offered a much needed confidence boost to see development at the entrance to the city. The Port Pirie Regional Development Board has several other important projects on the drawing board, and it is not only to the region's advantage but also important to the State that the Government do everything within reason to ensure that jobs in industry, including exports, are created by facilitating the success of these projects. The highest priority of this Government is the creation of jobs, and my electorate is very ready to play its part.

The rural industries in Frome include: sheep for wool and meat; cattle, both beef and dairy; cereals; legumes; pigs; poultry; oil seeds; a growing ostrich industry; and various other crops and animals. The electorate has felt the full force of low commodity prices, and wool and cereal prices have had a severe effect on the viability of many. However, I am far more confident than many of a strong revival of rural industry. The ability of the farmers of Frome to grow crops and of our studs to produce the best animals is beyond question. Whilst some of the other areas are quite marginal, most of Frome is increasingly recognised as some of Australia's prime agricultural land.

I do not feel that miracles are needed to see the farmers of Frome turn things around. The recovery of commodity prices would see an instant lift in our rural prospects and a great boost to South Australia's economy. I have spent many years in rural industry, involved in research, marketing, agribusiness and in an advisory role, and do not agree with some of the popular assessments of South Australian agriculture that we constantly hear. The revelation that the average age of South Australian farmers is 58 is to me wrong. Perhaps this figure may be arrived at from the age of the landholder, but it is an inaccurate assessment of who is actually farming in

South Australia, and I feel that it is harmful to the industry to push this line. Unless there are many centenarians in a few pockets of South Australian agriculture with which I am not familiar, I would say that 58 overstates the average age by some 10 years or so.

Agriculture has many young participants and needs even more to help this State get out of the economic mess it is in. I applaud the announced initiatives of the Government. The exemptions on stamp duty and the young farmers' interest subsidy initiatives are both extremely positive and have created much confidence and enthusiasm within my electorate. I assure any members of the House who think these measures are generous that they are in fact two of the best investments made by government in South Australia in a long, long time.

South Australian agriculture has been through a crisis of confidence in the last 10 years. That lack of confidence has led to some poor decision-making and much uncertainty. I hope this Government, with some help from commodity prices, can lift this level of confidence—such a vital ingredient of rural recovery.

Much debate always centres around rural assistance measures and what we can do to get our farmers through until next year. Whilst these measures are always very important, I want to see a stronger focus than in recent years on the longer-term viability of our rural industries. To the farmers of Frome, a new malting barley and better disease tolerances in wheat and legumes would mean enormous differences in productivity and, in turn, viability. Unless we look to the future and increase our research and varietal breeding efforts then we will always have the situation of having to look at getting through to the next year. Farmers are essentially price takers and can only reduce costs minimally without affecting production. The key to their being more viable and making a greater contribution to South Australia relies on their being more productive.

The Minister for Primary Industries can expect to constantly hear my pleas for increased funding allocation to research, as I feel it is an absolute gilt-edged investment for this State and its primary producers. Cuts in research are lethal to our wealth creating industries. For their part, farmers must be constantly alert to new opportunities and must embrace new technology and ideas, not treat them with the suspicion which has sometimes led to a slow uptake of better farming techniques. Economic realities dictate that farming can no longer be just a way of life and tomorrow's successful farmers will have to be receptive to change.

The standard defence of some against change that 'we are the most efficient farmers in the world' is no longer relevant. Whether that statement is true or false is of absolutely no consequence and does not get a guernsey on the financial statements. My confidence in a strong rural recovery is enormous and the importance of that recovery to the economy of South Australia should not be ignored by any member of this House. The future contribution of agriculture, potentially enormous and important, is being jeopardised by the attitude to research and lack of foresight in this country. This has already been alluded to by the member for Light and has much in common with the member for Norwood's comments on medical research.

We have become locked into short-term political agendas. We fear the next Government will receive credit for the benefits of research and a more mature political attitude is vital. There are many issues of Government which impact heavily on the lives of the people and the communities of

Frome. I have spoken of regional development and rural recovery and, along with small business and service delivery, all are vital to us from the jobs perspective. Unemployment in Frome is undeniably too high. We have many able people willing to work who are not receiving the opportunity to do so. Consistent with the Brown Government focus on job creation, I will work at increasing the opportunities in the Frome electorate.

Small business in Frome has suffered along with the rest of the State from the perception of previous Governments that it was a bottomless source of revenue. Small business needs and deserves to be treated as the important economic contributor and employer that it is. Whilst in the short-term, due to economic considerations, we are stuck with taxes and charges which are disincentives to employment and economic activity, I hope this Government will be determined as quickly as possible to free this important sector of the economy from the impositions placed on it.

Public sector employment in the Frome electorate has been a major casualty of the last decade of centralisation. We have seen both our jobs and services go at the same time. Whilst I know that we all needed to accept rationalisation within Government departments, I feel that many decisions cross that fine line between rationalisation and centralisation. Some jobs went for legitimate reasons; others just went—mainly to Adelaide. Allied to this we saw Government department budgets being cut by removing the worker, mainly in the country, whilst the administration ranks grew—once again, in Adelaide.

I strongly feel that there are many good reasons why South Australian Governments will need to reverse this policy of centralisation. It is a policy which is in direct contradiction to what is happening in the eastern States, and I cannot see why the same principles do not apply in South Australia. There are numerous benefits to reversing this policy, not the least being the impact on regional cities and country towns. The policy change needs to be gradual, but I hope by the end of this Government's term we will have started to see decentralisation policies being implemented.

The last decade has seen the Government in this State try its hand at ventures it should never have touched. This saw the Government get away from its basic areas of responsibility, which in turn suffered. Health, education, law and order, community support and roads suffered, and the Frome electorate certainly bore its fair share of this neglect.

Law and order is an issue which has not received the attention it should have received. The problems in Frome are police numbers, police powers, the courts and limits on assistance to community policing. In recent years we have witnessed increased crime, yet reduced police numbers. In particular, we have had occasional epidemics of break-ins when the police are on holiday and no immediate relief is available. This impacts seriously on the victims, the community and police morale.

Whilst conceding that the area of police powers is extremely complex, I am aware of many cases where the police have been virtually powerless to keep the peace. Public disquiet over sentencing, for both major and petty crime, is at an all time high. Many people feel that the deterrent effect of sentencing has been forgotten. Joe Citizen wants the punishment more adequately to reflect the seriousness of the crime.

The public want people to be responsible for their own actions. If minors wish to act like adults, age should not be such an effective shield from appropriate punishment that it

ceases to be an effective disincentive. In recent years we have concentrated heavily on the rights of people. We need to relink rights with responsibility.

The court system should always be capable of administering justice to all. The major court in my electorate is next door to my electorate office in Port Pirie. To me it represents a disgraceful monument to the absolute neglect of basic services being provided to Port Pirie and country areas. As a citizen I am appalled that the administration of justice is handicapped by this totally inadequate and inappropriate building. The numbers called to appear on any day could fill the poky little waiting room many times. This results in people, whether accused, witnesses or victims, waiting together either in a narrow corridor or, more likely, on the lawn outside with hundreds of passers by observing their presence.

There is no wheelchair access to the building and there are high steps at each entrance. One recent wheelchair visitor had to climb out of his wheelchair onto the steps and pull the chair up behind him. There is no interviewing facility for lawyers and nowhere for court companions to go with their clients. On one very hot day recently a social worker had her clientele sitting along the top of my fence, resting a note pad on her knee to take details. As a matter of urgency, I am vacating my office and I have requested of the Attorney-General that it be used in the best way possible to reduce the problems. However, even this is a short-term solution.

The Port Pirie courthouse situation is a disgrace and an insult to justice in this State. I feel that it is a damning commentary on our priorities in this country when we spend millions of dollars on war crimes hearings and let our daily administration of justice deteriorate as it has in Port Pirie. It is a matter that I shall continue to raise in this place until I am satisfied it is rectified. It is an absolute credit to the Port Pirie police that they ever got a witness to appear in the circumstances.

Basic to our law and order problem is the image of the police. They have been forced to become revenue raisers. We need to give our Police Force far greater support to ensure that we are able to maintain the excellent quality of people. The actions of support by the Parliament and the judiciary are vital to police morale.

I am sure that I need not speak at any length about the importance of education in our community. This House contains ex-teachers who are much better qualified than I am to comment on standards, assessment, curriculum and class sizes. However, I will comment on the most regrettable state of our school buildings. The Frome electorate has many buildings that are substandard and many buildings that have been patched up over the years on an as-desperate basis. This is not only inappropriate but it is a terrible waste of taxpayers' money, when good money is constantly put after bad. We see old buildings get a new floor one year, a new roof two years later and reclad a couple of years later. We finish up with an old building at a greater cost than a new building.

Our education infrastructure is currently in such a mess that we need a 10, 15 or 20-year rebuilding plan with bipartisan support to stop this scandalous waste brought about by the previous four-year political agenda and to achieve satisfactory accommodation for our students and their teachers.

Country hospitals have been a major political sore point in recent years. Fear of closure has been ever present in some towns. Frome boasts an excellent and highly efficient hospital

network. The current morale of and cooperation between health professionals, hospital boards, their highly motivated staff and the communities they serve is tremendous. They have been put under unfortunate and unnecessary pressure by the health policy and the Medicare agreement. I welcome the changes of approach under the leadership of the new Minister for Health. There is a great confidence that he can deliver a better deal for country health, and I am sure that he will not let us down.

As in all regional electorates, the issue of roads is of major concern to many constituents. Certainly, the continued reduction of rail services and the corresponding increase in road cartage, particularly of grain, has had a devastating effect on our roads. This has placed an enormous burden not only on the State but also on our local councils. I welcome our Government's policy to seal all major arterial roads over a 10-year period.

I trust that all surviving members of the previous Parliament have kept and treasured the rocks from the Burra/Morgan Road presented to them by the member for Custance at the conclusion of his maiden speech. The constant poor State of this major east-west road continues to restrict tourism potential throughout northern South Australia. Those in the House last night would have witnessed the member for Custance, with whom I share the road, offer to ride it on a pushbike—I wish him the best of luck!

The Frome electorate feels cheated of Government-supplied community services. I would like particularly to mention the desperate shortage of specialised counselling services. This acute shortage has meant that our overworked social workers must on many occasions deal with problems that they do not feel qualified to handle. The need for greater access to a wide range of specialised counselling services is very urgent.

The community of South Australia owes much to its volunteers. In country areas we are far more reliant on them and I pay tribute to the enormous contribution made by volunteers in my electorate. They range from the CFS and St John Ambulance volunteers through many charitable and community groups such as Red Cross and Meals on Wheels to specialised groups such as court companions and Rural Watch. We also have volunteers contributing to our economic well-being, such as Soil Board and Weeds Board members, and many involved in tourism and progress associations.

The Frome electorate contains 12 council areas and those councils consist of many dedicated people who contribute enormously to their communities. I look forward to dealing with each of those councils. My electorate also includes one of the strongest and best organised sporting communities in the State. The contribution of sport to our communities is often underestimated, and the benefits of participation in sport in avoiding social problems is not well enough understood.

Members of this House may picture sport in Frome as being very amateur, but may I point out that, whilst we are all trying to come to grips with the Victorians stealing our Grand Prix, four of my constituents extracted more revenge than we were able to politically. The Peterborough Golf Club, represented by Bernie Stafford, Gavin Miller, Jim Davis and Brett Virgens, won the Australian Teams Championship at the Royal Melbourne Golf Club. I congratulate the team on this wonderful achievement and on making the transition from the pristine scrapes of the Peterborough course to the unpredictable greens of Royal Melbourne!

It has been rewarding to hear the preceding maiden speeches. Each member of this House is here at the pleasure of, and to represent, the 21 000 or so constituents of their electorate. We enter this House at a time when people's respect for politicians is at a very low ebb. As all other professions engage in codes of conduct, world best practice, quality assurance and other means of increasing performance, Australia's citizens sit at home watching the disgraceful goings on that substitute for Question Time in Canberra.

The challenges which face us at this time are enormous. If we are to go close to achieving the best possible for South Australia we must lift parliamentary performance in the same way as we urge our industries to improve. Our best footballers, the Robrans, the Eberts and McGuinnesses, have achieved so much more by playing the ball, not the man. Business people who get on with the job rather than becoming obsessed with their opposition are the winners. The lack of issues which receive bipartisan support in this place is indeed damaging to progress in this State. That great man and former Premier Sir Thomas Playford had a saying: 'You catch more flies with honey than with vinegar'. One wonders whether the great man would have repeated this saying on seeing the projects lost in South Australia since his time.

Political instability and indecision have cost us very dearly. I hope that the members of this Parliament can collectively recognise the extent and urgency of the needs of South Australians and put aside their own agendas. I urge each member to put their constituents and South Australia to the top of their priorities and always to place them ahead of politics and self. This State needs more Parliamentarians and fewer politicians.

Before entering this place I was about giving people jobs and increasing the productivity of my clients. I am proud of the people I have employed and with the progress of my clients. This Parliament must focus on jobs. I believe the Government has excellent policies and has made a promising start. We must all now work to create opportunities and make sure that we do not take our eye off the ball. Development, employment and economic prosperity are the means by which we can improve the standard of community services and reduce the debt that we hand on to our successors. I wish all members, wherever they sit in the House, all the best for this period of Parliament and feel sure that if each is true to his constituents we will achieve much for South Australia.

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I support the motion. I am a little disappointed that the Speaker is not in the Chair, but in his absence I would like to congratulate the new Speaker on his election to that high office. In my view it is a well deserved appointment. The honourable member is well known for his toughness but fairness. He certainly has a reputation for being a man of his word and I have every confidence that he will perform his duties in this place in a very just and fair way. Mr Deputy Speaker, I also would like to take the opportunity to congratulate you on your election to the high office of Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. Once again, in my view, it is a very well deserved appointment. Having served with you on the Public Accounts Committee and in this place for the past eight years, I have a lot of respect for the way in which you always conduct yourself. I am sure that you, too, will conduct your duties as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees in a fair, just and honest way as well.

I would like to congratulate Her Excellency the Governor on the manner in which she opened the first session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament and acknowledge the magnificent

contribution and job that she does in all aspects of her role as Governor of South Australia. She is a very gracious lady. She always looks the part, always looks smart, pays a lot of attention to detail and to protocol and, in my view, is an excellent choice to be Governor and she carries out her duties exceptionally well.

During the last parliamentary recess the deaths of two former members of the South Australian Parliament occurred, and I refer to the Hon. Jessie Cooper and the Hon. John Burdett, both formerly members of the other place. I did not personally know the Hon. Jessie Cooper, but I pay a tribute to her for her trailblazing role in and her outstanding contribution to the South Australian Parliament over many years, and certainly in this Year of Women's Suffrage it is appropriate that she be honoured in this place and in other places. Her contribution to and the fact that she was a member of this Parliament must have been a tremendous inspiration to other women in the community. From the time that she entered this place an increasing number of women have entered Parliament in both Houses, and that is to be applauded. The increase in women members is probably not occurring quickly enough but at least it is a step in the right direction. I extend my condolences to the Hon. Jessie Cooper's survivors.

I was extremely privileged to serve with the Hon. John Burdett on the executive of the South Australian Parliamentary Christian Fellowship in this place for seven years. John was President of that fellowship for eight years, and I have been Secretary-Treasurer for the past seven years, and I certainly enjoyed my time serving in that capacity with John. We worked very closely together. John was a very quiet, polite person; a person of great integrity and compassion. I had many discussions with John over the years on various issues, free from the constraints of Party politics, and I always valued those discussions and enjoyed his company. John passed away quite suddenly only three weeks before he was due to retire at the last election. It is a great pity that John and his wife Jean did not have the opportunity to enjoy his retirement after many years of service to the community. That is something that none of us has any control over; it is just the way it goes. He was a great person. He was a good friend to me and to many others in this place. His calmness and wise counsel will be very greatly missed in this Parliament, and I extend my condolences to Jean and her family.

At this stage I welcome all the new members in this Parliament. Some of them will go on to have long and distinguished parliamentary careers, while others, especially those members on the other side of the House, will not be here for very long. I make no apology for that statement because it is true. That is the inescapable nature of politics and we must all accept this reality. Members come and go in the way that the fortunes of Government and Opposition come and go. There is nothing we can do about that; we just have to accept the reality of it. However, this is called democracy and I would not swap our system here for any other system in the world. It has served this State very well. I believe that the South Australian parliamentary and government system is probably the best in Australia and one of the very best in the world.

I thank the constituents of my electorate of Price for electing me for a third term to represent them in this Parliament. My electorate is diverse, with very large areas of public housing, pockets of affluence, a lot of industry and, until the most recent redistribution, the port of Adelaide was in my electorate. Unfortunately for me that has been lost to my

colleague the member for Taylor but I dare say, from talking to the Electoral Commissioner, it will come back to me in the near future. The decision to split that part of Port Adelaide away from the electorate of Price was very strange. It involved only the small residential part of Port Adelaide, comprising about 300 houses and the commercial district. To take that away from suburbs such as Alberton, Queenstown and Rosewater was a stupid thing to do, and it has been admitted that that was probably not the most appropriate course of action. However, that will probably be redressed in the future.

The electorate has three council areas: Port Adelaide, Hindmarsh, and Woodville and Enfield. It also has 16 schools and many public facilities. Some of my opponents on the other side of politics, over many years, criticised the previous Government by saying that, because the seat of Price was such a safe Labor seat, it had been disadvantaged and forgotten. That is absolutely untrue. When I look through the list of public facilities, hospitals, and so on associated with my electorate I cannot believe how well Labor Governments have served the people of my electorate over many years.

I would also like to place on record my appreciation and thanks to the members of my family, to my personal assistant in my electorate office and my sub-branch members for their assistance and support during what, for us, has been a very hard and traumatic four years. It was very hard going to be a member of a Government that had a minority in both Houses of Parliament. You live on a knife's edge every day, and it was a very hard four years. We copped a lot of flak for things that went wrong. Very rarely did we have control of our own destiny because of the numbers in both Houses. However, we have to wear the election result, and we accept that.

On top of that, it was a very hard and long election campaign—certainly the hardest and longest I have had to fight in my time in this place. I am sure that both successful and defeated members will agree that it was a thoroughly exhausting exercise and one which is good to put behind us. Mr Deputy Speaker, I well remember after the 1989 election the then Leader of the Opposition, now the member for Kavel, and the former member for Kavel (the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy), who I was speaking to a few moments ago outside this Chamber, carrying on in this place about the fact that the Liberals had won 52 per cent of the Statewide vote but had only 22 seats and it was therefore still in Opposition. That seemed to be a fairly good argument at the time, but the election result of 11 December makes that pale into insignificance.

The Liberals never complained about the electoral system during the 32 years of Playford's reign when, really, on percentage, they won only two out of something like 14 elections, yet they stayed in office for 32 years. This gerrymander was finally laid to rest by the Hon. Don Dunstan when a one vote one value system was introduced. I believe the Electoral Commissioner is still trying to achieve electoral fairness in South Australia, but he has not yet succeeded, given the situation following the recent State election on 11 December, when the Government achieved a Statewide two Party preferred vote of 61 per cent.

That is fair enough; that is accepted as being what the people wanted, and I do not dispute it. However, the Government now holds 79 per cent of the seats in this House. That seems to be a very one-sided result—more one-sided than the 1989 outcome. It shows that a majority vote can be expanded out to that degree. I am not decrying the fact that the Liberals

won the election—they won it fairly and squarely. The people supported them and they are the Government, but I think the difference in the number of seats needs to be addressed in future deliberations by the Electoral Commission.

A very sad statistic following the recent State election result—and I am not in any way being critical of the new members; they all won their seats fairly and squarely—is that the Australian Labor Party Opposition lost 16 members from this House, through defeat and retirement, including Terry Groom who became an Independent. The frightening part about this is that the loss of those 16 people from this side of the House represents a loss of 183 years of parliamentary experience, including a Premier, a Deputy Premier and seven ministers.

The overall losses in both Houses from all Parties equates to 336 years of experience spread over 24 members; that is, 24 members of the 69 members that were here previously ceased to be members on 11 December. That is an enormous loss to our Parties, to the Parliament and to the people of South Australia. I wish those former members well for the future, whether they retired voluntarily or were defeated at the polls. Some may choose to continue their retirement, others may look for another job, and I dare say that a few of the younger ones will seek to return to this place. I wish them well in the future in whatever they decide to do.

The Government is a bit thin on experience on both the front bench and the back bench of this House. Only three Ministers have had previous ministerial experience, and 18 of the 26 backbenchers, excluding the Speaker, are new to this place. I do not think this Government can do the job, but for the sake of the people of South Australia I hope I am wrong, and I wish them well.

This is the year of women's suffrage, and I would like to make a few points about the situation in my electorate at Port Adelaide. New Zealand was the first country in the world to grant women the right to vote, and South Australia was second. The first woman officially to be given the vote in a South Australian election was the wife of the Reverend Kirby, who was the Minister of the Presbyterian Church in Port Adelaide. The Reverend Kirby was well known throughout the area, the State and even the nation as a trailblazer, one who worked tirelessly to try to clean up the Port Adelaide area. In those days Port Adelaide was a rollicking sea port, and obviously there were a lot of problems in the area.

Reverend Kirby worked hard and diligently and was responsible for the shutting down of a fair number of hotels and brothels in the Port Adelaide area. In fact, he was responsible for the introduction of 6 o'clock closing—I cannot remember the year—and that stayed intact until 1967 when the Dunstan Government brought in 10 o'clock closing. In recognition of the work that Reverend Kirby did in the Port Adelaide area, his wife was officially given the right to be the first woman to vote. I have been told by the Reverend Kirby's grandson who researched this matter—and I have not had time to check it—that because the South Australian election was held before the New Zealand election Mrs Kirby was the first woman in the world to vote. Once again, Port Adelaide comes to the fore. Another interesting piece of trivia is the fact that the Reverend Kirby is buried in the Cheltenham Cemetery, and prominent on his headstone is a clock showing 6 o'clock. That is an everlasting memory of that person and the policy of 6 o'clock closing that he had implemented.

I would like to spend a few moments paying tribute to one of our former colleagues in this place, Kevin Hamilton, the former member for Albert Park (now Lee). Kevin spent 14

years in this Parliament, and was unfortunate enough to be defeated at the last election. I am not in any way criticising the member for Lee who has just given his maiden speech; I welcome the honourable member to this place, and I look forward to working with him as the member for a neighbouring electorate. Nevertheless, the loss of Kevin Hamilton was great as far as the Parliament and the constituents of the electorate of Lee are concerned. They lost a very valuable member. I do not think that in recent times any member in this place has worked their electorate as hard as Kevin Hamilton has. It was jokingly said that he knew every constituent by first name: that would not be far wrong. He did an enormous amount of work in his electorate and was probably the most well known local member in South Australia.

As we all know, about six years ago the former member for Albert Park embarked on a walk to Port Pirie to raise much needed funds for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The first four walks, which were undertaken in the middle of January, right in the heat of summer—which he enjoyed doing—were from Arndale, Kilkenny to Port Pirie, one way; he raised many thousands of dollars. For the past two years, he has taken up a challenge from the mayor of Woodville that he also walk back, and he has done this. In the past two years, he has walked up to Port Pirie and back, a total of 500 kilometres. Every cent of this money was donated to the QEH. Some money in recent times has been donated also to the Port Pirie Hospital.

There is still some money to come in, but Kevin and his two co-walkers raised about \$37 000 this year. In the past the money has been used for heart surgery equipment, as well as mammography equipment for testing women. This year they plan to buy a transoesophageal echo probe for the QEH at a cost of \$45 000. The former member for Albert Park has told me he has written to the Minister for Health asking the Government to subsidise or match the \$37 000 on a dollar for dollar basis, 50¢ in the dollar or whatever is appropriate to buy this piece of equipment. This is a chance for the Minister for Health, who was very critical of the previous Labor Government in its funding, to put his money where his mouth is and come up with some money to buy this much needed equipment.

For the benefit of some of the newer members, I point out that Kevin Hamilton had open heart surgery quite a few years ago. He was one of the first people to have it in this State. His life was extended many times because of this operation and, even though he is not an old person now, he is very appreciative of that life saving operation. He decided later in life to put something back into the QEH and to help other people. At dinners that he puts on, both before and after these walks, he has people present who have had their life saved by heart surgery. One chap at the most recent dinner has had two heart transplants and is very grateful to be alive because of the contribution of people such as Kevin Hamilton.

As Kevin says in his own words, once he gets north of, say, Gawler, he is in tiger territory as far as political affiliations go, but nevertheless he has been very impressed with the absolute support and encouragement he receives from people who obviously do not vote for the ALP, but politics does not come into it. They applaud Kevin. They come out every year to see him and donate large sums of money to him. They arrange functions at the various hotels at which he stays. Hotel proprietors refuse to take any money for accommodation for Kevin and his team. They give fantastic support, and I am sure that Kevin would like me to place on



record his appreciation and that of the QEH for the commitment of those people and the sponsors and for the money that is raised as a result of this walk. As I say, every cent of the money raised by the former honourable member goes to the QEH and much equipment has been purchased over the years. After six walks, Kevin has raised in excess of \$198 000, and this has certainly gone towards saving a lot of people's lives and making life a lot more comfortable for many.

I would like to say a few words about the Port Adelaide redevelopment. While the port itself is not now in my electorate—for the time being it has been transferred to the District of Taylor—nevertheless my electoral office is still in the port, and I maintain a very close connection with that area. Having lived in the port area for 57 years, I know the place well. I love the place, and I would not live anywhere else. Much redevelopment took place back in the early to mid 1980s. However, the recession hit and various other factors came into account so that much of the redevelopment stopped. It was being handled by the Special Projects Unit of the Premier's Department, headed by Mr Hugh Davies, who has done an enormous job in Port Adelaide and other areas around the State.

Last year, Hugh Davies was relocated back to be based in Port Adelaide, and he wants to continue with the redevelopment. He wants to see the job through. He is getting towards retirement age, but there seems to be some sort of hiccup. He has been reappointed for the next few months, but there needs to be a commitment by the new Government to look at the situation, decide what it is going to do with the rest of the redevelopment at Port Adelaide and make the necessary allocation of money. I suggest to it—and I will be having talks with the Premier as soon as I can—the possibility of extending the tenure of Mr Hugh Davies in Port Adelaide to oversee and organise the ongoing redevelopment. He has done such a fantastic job of the parts of the port that have been redeveloped.

I feel that he certainly has the expertise. He is a magician, really, given the way he has stretched money. He has been given the power to buy, sell, exchange or whatever Government real estate with the private sector and create money. He has done that. He has run the entire operation without any sort of Government budget, and he has been a miracle man in no uncertain way. I appeal to the Government, particularly to the Premier, to consider extending Hugh Davies' tenure in Port Adelaide to let him see the project through to fruition. The redevelopment of the now vacant old CSR site—the building was demolished after so many years—and other areas, on the waterfront in particular, was put on hold for sometime because of the MFP. However, now that the Government has done a back-flip on that and has pledged its support to continue with the MFP, that should give enough impetus for the rest of the Port Adelaide redevelopment to take place. So I ask for Mr Hugh Davies to be kept on in Port Adelaide for the sake of the future redevelopment of that area.

As I said, the MFP has been refocussed under the new Government. I have yet to be convinced. I cannot quite see what the difference is between the old and new concepts. The Government is telling everyone that the project has been refocussed, and I suppose that, if that creates a bit more interest overseas and interstate, so be it. I hope the project goes ahead for the sake not only of the Port Adelaide area but, indeed, of South Australia and Australia. Some work has been done on the MFP site, and people are anxious to see more commence. I think once the bulldozers move in and start carving up the lakes and building up the surrounding

areas, we will see more interest in the MFP. I support the motion.

**Ms HURLEY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

### TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 894 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow the extension to the trading hours for shopping centres and supermarkets was presented by Mr Becker and Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

### MILK BOTTLES

A petition signed by 7 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow the use of plastic milk bottles was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

### CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

A petition signed by 394 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to re-introduce capital punishment for crimes of homicide was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

### CHILD ABUSE

A petition signed by 42 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to increase penalties for offenders convicted of child sexual abuse was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

### DRUGS

A petition signed by 36 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to increase penalties for drug offenders was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

### FAMILY DAY CARE PROVIDERS

A petition signed by 107 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to increase to four the number of children that can be cared for by a family day care provider was presented by Mrs Penfold.

Petition received.

### GRAND PRIX

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I am pleased to announce that Carlton and United Breweries is continuing its association with the Australian Grand Prix in Adelaide. Negotiations between the Grand Prix Office and Carlton and United Breweries concluded successfully this week. Under the new arrangement, Carlton and United Breweries will have major signage and beer rights at the Grand Prix track. Negotiations are continuing with other interested parties to secure new naming rights sponsorship for the Grand Prix. In the eight

years since 1986, CUB has spent more than \$25 million in Adelaide on its Grand Prix sponsorship. The company has made another significant commitment towards the 1994 Grand Prix. It will review its commitment annually. This decision gives us the financial security to get on with the job of ensuring that this year's event—our tenth—will be the best ever.

As is already known, the Formula One Constructors' Association has decided that from 1997 Melbourne will host the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. As South Australians, many of us will regret that decision. However, we must look forward. We will do all we can to ensure an orderly transition of the event to Melbourne. Meanwhile, I would like to extend a warm welcome to all Australians to join us in Adelaide for the 1994 Australian Grand Prix in November.

#### AYTON REPORT

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier):** I seek leave to make a further ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Yesterday, questions were asked in both Houses of Parliament in relation to an opinion by the Acting Solicitor-General for the Commonwealth of Australia to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the National Crime Authority. The assertion was made by the Leader of the Opposition in this House that the advice by the Acting Solicitor-General (who was also in-house counsel in the Federal Attorney-General's Department in Canberra) was that offences had been committed by the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Attorney-General in having received the report of Superintendent Ayton, referring to it in both Houses and tabling it in the Legislative Council. Such assertions are a blatant misrepresentation of the advice.

The Acting Solicitor-General's advice recognises that the reference in the State Parliament to the Ayton report and the tabling of that report in the Legislative Council were both subject to the privileges of the South Australian Parliament. No reference was made in the opinion to offences having been committed by the Premier, the Deputy Premier or the Attorney-General while they were members of the Opposition.

It is clear, even on the advice of the Acting Solicitor-General of the Commonwealth, but also on the advice which the South Australian Government has received, that no offence has been committed by the Premier, the Deputy Premier or the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General, as the first law officer in South Australia, has written to the Chairman of the Federal Joint Parliamentary Committee in response to a letter received from the Chairman, indicating that the action taken by the three Ministers whilst in Opposition was absolutely privileged and that they did not intend to appear before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. That remains the position. The Attorney-General made the additional point to the Chairman that the document has not been received from a past or present member of the Joint Parliamentary Committee.

#### CATHAY PACIFIC

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Last Thursday, the State Government welcomed the announcement by BTR Nylex of a \$90 million investment in the ACI Glass manufacturing plant in Adelaide. This expansion of the wine bottling production simply means yet another business maintaining its base in South Australia and reducing the importing of bottles. It also sways decisions by winemakers to send bulk wine offshore and bottle elsewhere. In short, it means growth and income and employment in South Australia.

This Thursday we are enthusiastically welcoming the announcement by one of the world's leading airlines, Cathay Pacific, to conduct all its pilot training at the Australian Aviation College at Parafield, north of Adelaide. This contract has come to the Hawker de Havilland's Australian Aviation College after intense competition between major Australian and overseas airline pilot training colleges. I can proudly say that Cathay Pacific management was impressed with the Australian Aviation College's quality training environment, its responsiveness and the high standard of commitment it provides for its students.

While the parent company, BTR Nylex, is reluctant to announce the number of pilots to train at the college or the value of the contract, I understand that Cathay Pacific has trained 77 cadets since its pilot training began in 1988. Pilots were previously trained at the British Aerospace Flying College at Prestwick in Scotland. While the company has enjoyed a good relationship with the British Aerospace College, I understand it is Adelaide's weather that enables the pilot training to be undertaken somewhat faster.

This contract is another example of the growing international recognition and respect given to an increasing range of businesses in South Australia that have been prepared to persevere with their marketing and attention to quality. The Aviation College currently employs 100 people. As a result of a vigorous marketing campaign by the Economic Development Authority the college is training students from 10 countries including Malaysia, Indonesia, Korea, China, Australia, Oman, Mauritius, Singapore, the Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea.

The college is now contracted by more of the world's major airlines for basic pilot training than any other aviation college. It is a world leader. A development such as this is an excellent example of the contribution Parafield is making towards the development of South Australia's international competitiveness. This announcement today makes an impact on South Australia's economy and its international reputation. It will have an impact on businesses and services associated with the college, and it means jobs for South Australians.

#### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—

Local Government Association—Report on the Operation of the Local Government Act, 1992-93.

#### ADOPTION LEGISLATION

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for Family and Community Services):** I seek leave to make a brief ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** This statement relates to the implementation of a review of the South Australian adoption

legislation. It is now five years since the Adoption Act was proclaimed in 1988. South Australia was one of the earliest States to acknowledge that community views regarding adoption had changed. A review of the legislation was undertaken in 1988 and, as part of this, a substantial number of people in the community were able to contribute to the discussion about future directions in adoption. The 1988 legislation emphasised the best interests of children. It contained provisions for open adoption as well as enshrining principles around the permanent placement of Aboriginal children. It also contained provisions for the release of information from adoption records as well as provisions for people to lodge a veto against such release.

In recent years most other States and Territories have reviewed adoption legislation and have incorporated principles and provisions similar to those in South Australia. Adoption continues to impact on the lives of a significant number of South Australians. The number of children relinquished for adoption is now small compared with the past, but many individuals and families have a connection with adoption across many generations. These connections have many meanings for different people and, as adoption is a process at the heart of family formation, there is significant emotion attached to individual and community views about legislation in this area.

Over the past five years a significant number of people and groups have made representation to me and to the former Government about various aspects of the adoption legislation. In addition, as Australia moves towards implementation of the Hague Convention on inter-country adoption, consideration needs to be given to legislative change in this State to ensure that the principles in this convention are included in the Adoption Act.

I wish to advise the House, therefore, that I have commissioned a review of the Adoption Act and have established a review committee to undertake this work. The committee will be comprised of people who are members of the South Australian Adoption Panel and will be chaired by Ms Linda Dore, a solicitor experienced in Family Court work.

## QUESTION TIME

### PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):** Could the Treasurer please advise the House how many public sector jobs the Liberal Government is currently committed to reducing, and what is the job reduction target on which the Government's debt reduction package is based? In its 'Meeting the Challenge' statement in April last year, the former Labor Government announced:

Over the next two years 3 000 full-time equivalent positions will be reduced from the public sector.

This commitment was restated in the August State budget, as follows:

The Government's objective remains to reduce the public sector work force by 3 000 by 30 June 1994.

During the election period, the then Liberal Opposition promised that it would not cut public sector jobs beyond the Labor Government's target. The current Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, in a response to 'Meeting the Challenge', said at the time:

A Liberal Government will not go beyond the 3 000 jobs proposed by the present Government.

In statements made subsequent to this the Treasurer has said that he intends to cut 3 900 public sector jobs. This figure is 900 higher than that of the former Labor Government and 900 higher than the figure promised by the then Leader of the Opposition in his reply to the Economic Statement.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I thank the Leader for his question. I must question the capacity of the Leader of the Opposition to remember a little bit of history. I make the point very strongly by going back to the period when Labor was in office in this State—11 dark years of it—and just remind him of what he did to this State. I remind him of his promise and that of his Government not to increase taxes, and of course they rose faster than any other State.

**The Hon. Lynn Arnold:** Vaguely irrelevant!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The Leader says this is 'vaguely irrelevant'. Sir, I am answering the question because I think it is absolutely vital that we put this in context. We are dealing with the problem that the previous Government created. Let us put this into context. The previous Premier, if he has not forgotten—he has forgotten a few things over recent months, and we know about the debt problem that he forgot about or was not told about, and Roxby that he forgot about or was not told about—will remember that the Labor Government, which promised not to slash teacher numbers, slashed teacher numbers by 1 200. Labor promised to reduce unemployment in this State, and I am sure all members can recall that promise. Of course, unemployment then increased by 40 000.

Labor promised in this House time and again that everything was all right with the State Bank and SGIC. Those members who are still here can remember those words: 'commercially confidential, but everything is all right.' It is almost like Joh Bjelke-Petersen revisited: 'Don't you worry about that; we've got it under control.' We found out, of course, the damage that was done in the process: \$3 150 million for the State Bank, \$350 million for SGIC, \$60 million for Scrimber, \$11 million for Marineland, and so the list goes on. In contrast, this Government has met and honoured every promise—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Ross Smith will have a chance to ask a question.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:**—laid down at election time, and I would like to make that quite clear. Also, I believe the former Premier—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Ross Smith for continuing to interject unnecessarily. I do not want to have to speak to him again during this Question Time.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I would like to complete this answer, because I think it is vital that we put this into context. I will do that by referring to the April Economic Statement, which we found, very close to the election, was not worth the paper it was printed on. The figures changed overnight by some \$577 million, and the Premier claimed that he did not know anything about it.

*The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I will talk about the 3 900, but I think it is important that we understand what this issue is about.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I draw your attention to your remarks on opening day. Putting something into context is all very well, but I would argue that five minutes is somewhat excessive.

I respectfully suggest that you ask the honourable member to answer the question before he sits down.

**The SPEAKER:** The manner in which Ministers answer questions is entirely up to them. I have noted the time the Minister has taken, and it is in excess of 4½ minutes. I suggest most strongly that he completes his answer as soon as possible.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I would if I could, Sir. The member for Giles, who was formerly Deputy Premier in this House, should remember some of his contributions in previous times. There are questions about how many jobs are involved and about the 3 900. We said at the very beginning that 3 900 was the applicable number. We explained at the time that the Government's target was appropriate, and we stand by that. Yesterday, I told this House that hidden in the figures was a problem or a challenge, and I said that that challenge would be met. We did not have the detail available to us before the election. I said the challenge would be met, and it will be. We have to review all that information—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier has now gone well beyond answering the question. I suggest that he completes the answer or leave will be withdrawn.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I will complete the answer by saying that we are in the process of looking back through all the figures, and the Audit Commission is yet to report. At that time we will be able to look at all the options we have available and at our revenue position in view of the improvement in the economy and see whether we can get more money out of the Commonwealth than we have to date, and then we will be in a better position to judge what decisions have to be taken in respect of this matter.

### STATE RECORDS

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** As Minister responsible for State Services, can the Treasurer report what progress has been made in the review of the State's stored records?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** We believed that, when computers were introduced, we were on the way to a paperless society. Unfortunately that is not the case; in fact, it is quite the opposite. We have yet to deal with 22 000 linear metres of records that have been housed in various repositories around Adelaide. For those people who want some idea of 22 000 linear metres, I point out that you could go to Glenelg and back with the information which has been accumulated and which has to be processed and archived according to its importance.

In the previous two years, some 15 000 linear metres was processed by State records. In 1994-95, we intend to process 11 000 linear metres of material, which would be enough material to reach from here to Glenelg and which is half the outstanding amount. In looking through the records, we find that leading the band is the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, which has 3 050 linear metres of material that must be scrutinised.

So, there is a real challenge for Government to ensure that important records are held and kept for posterity. There is also an important challenge for all Ministers and all departments in relation to how to reduce the paper warfare. That is particularly important, because the cost of storage and of reviewing all this detail and all these files is immense.

### ESSENTIAL SERVICES

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Treasurer advise the House whether the Government considers health, education, and law and order to be essential services? If so, will he give an undertaking that the Liberal Government will not cut those services and in doing so will not cut the number of police, teachers or nurses? In a press conference yesterday, the Treasurer announced the Government's intention to break its election promise not to make further cuts to the public sector and indicated that key essential services may be cut as 'the definition of essential services was very much a matter of definition', he said.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question, but obviously he is hard of hearing again.

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** As he always is.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** As he always is. He is very selective. We heard his selective quote in his question about the NCA. Yesterday I outlined the challenge: I did not say how that challenge was to be met, but obviously it is something that has to be addressed. In assuring the House of the matters of essential service to Government, we are mindful of the needs in those particular areas, and we have stated time after time that they are essential to the provision of good quality service in this State.

### WORLD TRADE FAIR

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** My question is directed to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. What was the outcome of the South Australian display at the recent World Trade Fair in Sydney, and will South Australia have an opportunity to host this fair in the future?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I can understand the embarrassment of members opposite, because it was the former Government that refused to participate in the first international World Trade Fair in Australia. It refused to be a participant. We were the only State in Australia that was not to be represented at the international World Trade Fair. However, given a change of Government on 11 December, the new Government soon put a change to that, and South Australia was represented at that fair.

I commend the officers in the EDA and other Government agencies and departments who, within a space of about six weeks, mounted South Australia's representation at that World Trade Fair. The World Trade Fair had some 450 exhibitors from 22 nations throughout the world, attracting about 17 000 visitors. Indeed, China alone had a delegation of 200 people at that trade fair. South Australia's stand, which consisted of 64 square metres because of the late notice, had representation from Mitsubishi Motors, Orlando Wyndham, the Australian Submarine Corporation, Australia's Best Foods, the EDA, the Mines and Energy Department, the Centre for Manufacturing and the Tourism Commission.

Incidentally, the World Trade Fair coincided with the visit of the Premier to Tokyo, discussions with Mitsubishi and its announcement on that day that it would continue its investment in South Australia in the foreseeable future, which created much interest in the left-hand drive Mitsubishi Verada station wagon that was exhibited on the stand, to the extent that inquiries came from China, Vietnam, Russia, Burma, North Africa and Indonesia.

In addition, the Orlando Wyndham stand attracted inquiries from 12 agents representing Hong Kong, Poland, Japan, the Middle East, India, Russia and China. The Submarine Corporation had inquiries from the Shipbuilding Research Institute in St Petersburg. In addition, Australia's Best Foods established a number of major contacts that it will follow up as a result of its participation in the stand. The Department of Mines and Energy, on its South Australian exploration initiative, attracted 13 international inquiries about participation in that program.

All this underscores the importance of South Australia being represented, something to which the former Government gave no consideration last year. It overspent substantially on the Business Asia Conference last year, I hasten to add.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It overspent by only about 100 per cent. I think the original budget was \$350 000. The last estimate I had was up to \$712 000, and the bills are still rolling in.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The original budget was \$350 000; the last accounts total that I saw was \$712 000, and the bills are still rolling in.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I assure the honourable member that we will have another Business Asia Conference this year, but it will be run appropriately, efficiently and productively in South Australia's interests, and it will not double the budget allocation that will be given by the Government. In other words, it will be done appropriately. We will not have one individual person involved in it drawing a contract fee of \$90 000 for participation in the fair.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It just so happens that the Business Asia Conference was in the middle of the election campaign. I am not quite sure whether that had much to do with it, but it was interesting to note that funds were spent without qualification in relation to that project.

Following the success of South Australia's participation in the World Trade Fair this year, we will be represented in Sydney next year. It is proposed that, after the first two years based in Sydney at the World Trade Centre, it will visit other States in Australia in 1996 and 1997. South Australia is currently considering putting in a submission, which must be lodged by 30 March this year, to participate and be the host State for Australia for the international World Trade Fair in either 1996 or 1997.

#### MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Will you make a ruling as to whether documents relating to the use of the country living away from home allowance by House of Assembly members will now be made available to both the Auditor-General and the Police Anti-Corruption Branch so that the public can be assured that no Cabinet Minister and no member of this House has improperly used this allowance, and will you table the Crown Solicitor's full advice to Parliament on this matter?

Yesterday, the President of the Legislative Council made a statement concerning police access to documents relating to the use of the accommodation allowance by the Hon. Ian Gilfillan following a police inquiry. The President advised the

Council that he was in receipt of a Crown Law opinion and other advice and that, as a result, had decided that copies of documents concerning Mr Gilfillan's use of the allowance should be handed over to the police to assist their investigations. In this House last Thursday the Premier said that he would have thought that any—

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. I do not want to ruin the honourable member's question, but I understand that members may not refer to debate in another place.

**The SPEAKER:** That is correct. However, the honourable member is making a passing reference. The honourable Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** In this House last week, the Premier said that he would have thought that any member of this House would be very concerned if there was any threat to that longstanding tradition of privilege of the Parliament, because he said that that was what I was suggesting by my question.

You, Sir, and all members would be aware of criticisms in the media and elsewhere that on this matter and on the NCA documents issue parliamentary privilege must not be used to obstruct the course of justice, to frustrate the police in their investigations or as a cover-up.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Ridley is out of order. I will take the Deputy Leader's question on notice. The Crown Solicitor's opinion was given to the President: it was not provided to me. However, I will endeavour to obtain a copy of the document and consider whether or not it should be tabled.

#### CASEMIX

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** My question is directed to the Minister for Health. What assurances can the Minister give that the Government's strategy to increase the efficiency of public hospitals will not result in a decrease in the quality of care offered to patients?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I thank the member for Hanson for his question, because it is a very vital question whilst we are introducing casemix funding for hospitals as an efficiency measure. In doing so, I note the support of both the former member for Elizabeth-elect and the former member for Bonython-elect for the casemix concept. The primary aim of the Government's hospital services improvement strategy is, first, to increase the efficiency of hospitals, and casemix funding is a way of doing this. But it is also a way of providing improved services to South Australians and, in particular, reducing waiting lists. I remind members of the House that as the former Government left office 9 100 people were on waiting lists, with more than three people waiting to get into every bed in every public hospital, and it is no wonder members opposite hang their heads in shame.

I assure the House that efficiency improvements under the casemix system will not be at the expense of quality health care. Thanks to very dedicated people working under difficult circumstances in South Australian hospitals, we are lucky in that we have a health care service overall as good as anywhere in the world and, of course, this Government will make a commitment to continue that quality of care. Efficiency is obviously a key mechanism in the way we are going to change the system, but I should add that as well as the efficiency changes the Brown Government made a commitment in the election campaign to add \$6 million annually to the budget specifically to reduce waiting lists.

These resources will be used to fund, as well as hospital operations and hospital care, matters relating to primary health care which will improve, of course, the quality of care across the broad spectrum. In other words, we are looking not only at hospital services but at a number of non-hospital initiatives such as home-based nursing, domiciliary care and other things such as that.

With respect to the quality of care in the hospital sector, at the moment very little is being done to provide the community with a guide as to how hospitals compare individually in relation to quality, and that is one of the best measures that casemix allows us to investigate. At the moment, quality is really looked at within rather than between individual hospitals. I assure the member for Hanson and the House that, as part of our policy was to have individual clinical audits—in other words, the clinical procedures will be looked at on a regular basis under the Liberal Party—the quality of care will definitively not suffer in general, particularly under casemix.

Lastly, I indicate that under casemix funding, in order to alleviate any anxiety about hasty discharge and hence a greater number of readmissions because of inappropriate discharge, one of the foundations of the casemix funding formula for hospitals will be an unplanned readmission survey. In other words, we will be investigating the number of people who are readmitted to hospital in an unplanned fashion. Of course, as the House would know, a number of people come back into hospital on a regular planned fashion, and they, of course, do not contribute to any anxiety. So, I assure the member for Hanson and other members of the House that under the casemix funding system efficiencies and patient care will increase, as will quality.

#### AYTON REPORT

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Will the Deputy Premier explain to the House the consistency between his answer yesterday on the confidentiality of Assistant Commissioner Ayton's submission to the Federal Parliamentary Committee on the NCA and his remarks to the House about its confidentiality on 4 March last year? Last year the Deputy Premier, then the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, prefacing a question in the House, stated:

... in view of confidential police reports relating to the Genting Group obtained from Western Australia. . .

It is now agreed that the Deputy Premier was referring to Commissioner Ayton's submission. Yesterday the Deputy Premier told the House:

Right now all I can say is that I have received the information. The information was from a substantive source, as everybody here would recognise, and it was not indicated to me at the time whether or not there was a confidentiality associated with that information which would reflect on its use, so my conscience is clear.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I am still not sure what the honourable member is driving at.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** Confidential police documents—a big grandstand.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I am sure that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would like to ask a few more questions, but Standing Orders prevent him from doing so. In this Parliament on numerous occasions we have dealt with confidential information. If members read my statement carefully they would find that the confidentiality provision and the extent

to which it could affect the data or information that I provided was not known. We deal with confidential information in this Parliament on a regular basis. I can remember, when we were in power previously, information from confidential sources being used in this Parliament. Now, members opposite are saying that they want a different set of rules although it was all right for them when they were doing it. Members opposite hid behind confidentiality for 11 years and we can see what happened to the State in the process.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I have no difficulty with this issue.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections. The member for Mitchell.

#### RACING MINISTERS CONFERENCE

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing inform the House of the outcome of the Racing Ministers conference held in Sydney on 10 February?

**The SPEAKER:** I suggest that the Minister answer the question. If he has a lengthy statement I suggest that he seek leave to make it after Question Time.

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** I thank the honourable member for his question, knowing his interest in the industry. The Racing Ministers conference in Sydney had the capacity to discuss four agenda items, three of which have serious ramifications for an industry which is now the third largest industry in this State and which contributes \$176 million to general revenue and \$28 million to State revenue. It is an important question. The first issue discussed was the good news that came out of the conference, namely, that we will see another six Sunday race meetings, a large majority of which I hope will go out to country and regional areas which could do with some injection of enthusiasm and support for country racing.

The other two issues of importance relate, first, to the success of telephone betting on-course in this State. All other States will switch over, as predicted, to telephone betting on-course from 1 July. That will have a serious impact but not a significant one. We will be watching the matter closely. It has the capacity to make an impact on bookmakers' turnover from which the codes and the Government receive revenue.

The second issue of a serious nature was the whole question of the payment of totalisator inducements. This is where professional punters who punt up to \$1 million or more a year are induced by cash discounts from the TAB or TAB agencies over the border and they turn their investments to those specific TABs. I am aware of a hotel in Adelaide that is giving a discount to professional punters to channel their money through them.

The looming disaster relates to the fact that countries such as Vanuatu may become involved in this activity, because VicTab has set up a TAB in Vanuatu which gives tax concessions also and has the capacity to lure millions of dollars from our betting turnover from such places as Vanuatu. If other States get into this act and lure millions of dollars out of the State, we will lose the turnover, and the Government and the codes will suffer. That problem is looming.

The fourth problem relates to the selling of Sky Channel from Adelaide and other States and being bought by Asian

interests setting up huge betting combinations based on Sky Channels in the Asian States. All in all, it is a matter that all members should view with some concern. The impact on revenue is serious, and the impact on the codes and as a sport will be serious if this is allowed to get out of hand. Ministers have gone back to their respective States to discuss it with their racing managers and after such discussion will meet again at another conference shortly. We will be monitoring the situation closely. I view it with great concern as it will have a huge impact on the three codes of the racing industry if not brought to hand. Legislation enacted in one State does not work: it is a matter for the whole Commonwealth to get together and consider before it gets out of hand.

#### AYTON REPORT

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Does the Deputy Premier believe that evidence taken *in camera* and submissions received in confidence by committees of the Parliament such as the Economic and Finance Committee and the Industries Development Committee should remain confidential unless released by those committees and, if so, why did he release details of the document that was a confidential submission by a policeman regarding organised crime to the Federal Parliamentary Committee on the NCA and say in this House yesterday, 'We used the information in the way it should have been used'?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I stand by the statement I made yesterday.

#### 'TALK ABOUT TRAVEL' TRADE SHOW

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** Will the Minister for Tourism advise what progress is being made in South Australia's bid for the 'Talk about Travel' trade show?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I thank the member for Reynell for her question. I am pleased to announce that the 'Talk about Travel' trade show, which travels right around Australia, will be coming to Adelaide in 1995. It is a very important issue because the AFTA group—the travel agents association—and the ATIA group—the travel industry association—have got together to recognise finally that Adelaide ought to be part of the show. The previous Minister made very little effort to have this important industry group come to South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I thank my colleagues for reminding me of the slackness of the previous Minister of Tourism. More than 180 principals of this group tour Australia every year. It is a very important group regarding inbound travel into Australia, in particular, South Australia, and we welcome the announcement by the South Australian Tourism Association today.

#### ELECTION PROMISES

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Will the Treasurer advise the House whether he will also resign, along with the Premier, if taxes are increased and the Liberal Government breaks its promises on taxes? During the election campaign the Premier gave a public commitment as Leader of the Opposition that he would resign if taxes were increased in the Liberals' first term in office. The promise was also made that the Government would not cut public sector numbers by more than the

target set by the Labor Government's debt deduction strategy, yet it appears that this promise will now be broken.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I do not really need to remind the House of all the broken promises, because I did that previously.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections. The Deputy Premier has the call, and I intend to ensure that he is heard in silence. The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Yes, they are getting a bit excited because they know what a rotten job they did for the past 11 years. The statement was made prior to the election. There will be no new taxes and no increase in the rate of taxation. That statement was made by the Premier, and it was endorsed by the whole Cabinet.

#### DETAFE SERVICES

**Mr TIERNAN (Torrens):** Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education inform the House of the expansion of TAFE facilities and, in particular, the go ahead for the extension of the Light Square campus of the Adelaide College of TAFE?

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** It is interesting to hear from the Deputy Leader about what the previous Government did. What it tried to do to that institute was to make the students fill Chesser House, which was totally inappropriate. It tried to 'do a shifty' and, instead of expanding the existing facility, as we are now, it tried to fill Chesser House to unload some of the State Bank debt. Work is under way on this large project. That college is currently the largest training and educational establishment in the State with over 21 000 students, and the expansion will allow for another 7 000 students.

It will have a library facility that will be available outside normal hours for the public and the students, and it will also eventually have a large child-care centre to serve the demands of that part of town, in conjunction, we hope, with the University of South Australia. So, it is a good news project for South Australia: \$20.5 million. It is a welcome boost to the building industry and to the suppliers of building materials. I was on site on Monday trying my hand at laying some bricks and I spoke to the bricklayers, and they were delighted that at long last in South Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** They don't need a ticket: they're getting jobs now. I met each of the bricklayers on site, and they were delighted that at long last there are jobs in South Australia. The outcome of this project is not only a boost to training and education but it means the creation of jobs in the building industry. I am delighted to be part of it and to make sure that the previous Government was not able to carry out its silly promise to fill Chesser House in Grenfell Street and split an excellent college, increase the running costs and boost the general cost of training without any net benefit. So, it is a welcome project for South Australia.

#### STATE FINANCES

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Will the Treasurer advise the House whether the Government agrees with Standard and Poor's assessment of its asset sales program, and has the Government now decided to 'bite the fiscal bullet like Victoria', as Standard and Poor's advised? On 15 December 1993 the

international rating agency Standard and Poor's stated that the new Government's debt reduction strategy was overly reliant on economic growth and asset sales, and the new Government would have to bite the fiscal bullet like Victoria if it wanted to reduce the State's debt levels to those stated in its election policy and, therefore, improve the State's credit rating.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I do not know who dreams up these questions and whether members opposite discuss them between themselves beforehand. Frankly, I believe that they are an embarrassment to their side of politics. What the member for Hart did not say was that they should proudly stand by the fact that we were AAA and they dragged us down to AA with a negative rating and, in the process—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** And the member for Hart, of course, was advising them at the time. I wonder whether it was his advice that took us from AAA to AA with a negative rating: I suspect it was. However, the fact is that we have come down from the point where we want to be, which is AAA. We must return to a AAA rating if we are to restore some financial credibility to this State. And that is our target. The fact that Standard and Poor's a few days after the change of Government said that it was not willing to change our rating was totally accepted. I believe firmly that it is not just good enough to talk about these things: we have to be successful at them. So, I expect that we will be rated according to our performance. I can tell the honourable member opposite that we will be rated a hell of a lot higher than his Government was!

#### RAJMANGALA INSTITUTE

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education inform the House of the significance of the current visit of the representatives of the Rajmangala Institute of Technology to South Australia?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** The Rajmangala Institute, a very large institute of technology in Thailand, has now developed very close links with South Australia, in particular with the TAFE sector. Last night I had the privilege to host a visit by the President of that institute and other members of the Thai National Economic and Social Development Board to cement that relationship. It is our first with Thailand, and I believe it will be part of a much bigger expansion in the future. It will be a partnership, with the sharing of lecturing staff, and with the TAFE sector here providing expertise in a whole range of courses.

The Rajmangala Institute has about 70 000 students. It is under the patronage of the King of Thailand. Apart from the obvious technical and training benefits that will flow to both countries, the Thais are very impressed with South Australian wines, and I was interested to hear their detailed knowledge of our red and white wines. One of them expressed an interest in Penfold's, and when one of my officers inquired further he said he had a particular liking for Grange Hermitage. The point is that, apart from the training links, there is a good opportunity to develop trading links with Thailand, particularly to boost the export of South Australian wines to that country.

#### COURTS ADMINISTRATION AUTHORITY

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles):** Will the Premier ensure, by legislative action if necessary, that the proposal of

the Courts Administration Authority to replace resident magistrates in Whyalla and other regional cities does not proceed? Those of us who live in regional South Australia will be aware of the current determination of the Courts Administration Authority to withdraw resident magistrates from certain regional areas. My understanding is that it will be more expensive and certainly will be a lesser service to people who live in those provincial cities.

The Attorney-General has stated that he cannot intervene. If the Attorney-General feels he cannot intervene in this decision—and I feel that is nonsense—will the Premier ensure by legislation, if necessary, that the decision is reversed?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** First, I remind the honourable member that it was his Government that introduced the independence of court administration. It was his Government that established, by way of legislation, the very thing he is now asking to be reversed by legislation. The previous Government brought the legislation into this Parliament, and we raised some serious questions about that matter, particularly in the Upper House. We raised the reservations. It was the former Labor Government—

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** If I was the member for Giles, I too would dissociate myself from the frontbench in exactly the same way, not just on this issue but on all other issues, because the frontbench embarrassed itself. I can assure the honourable member that the Attorney-General is concerned about this. In fact, the member for Gordon has already raised this matter in respect of Mount Gambier. He has proposed that he will visit that centre and talk about the possibility of somehow establishing some sort of magistrate service in the regional parts of South Australia.

The member has raised the issue: we are attending to it. I cannot give an answer at this stage because, as he will realise, it has been laid down by his Government's legislation. We are certainly trying to see what can be done to help provide a magistrate service in regional parts of South Australia.

#### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services. Are any changes proposed for CFS communications and, if so, how will they affect the ability of the CFS to operate?

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I thank the member for his question. I am aware of his strong interest and support for the CFS, particularly in his area. The CFS is constantly reviewing its operation to ensure that it can properly respond to all situations, and in doing that it is constantly reviewing its operation to ensure that it is operating in a cost-effective manner and in the best interests of the service it provides.

The CFS communications centre was established in 1979 on a 24-hour basis, and it has operated in that manner ever since. Prior to that time CFS brigades used to organise a turnout at local level. Since that time we have seen the CFS devolve its operational responsibilities down to regions and groups of brigades, and the CFS has become mindful that the use of the communications centre by particularly rural and outlying metropolitan areas has been gradually diminishing.

As a result of these changing circumstances, an employees working party has been established by the CFS to identify options for improving the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of that service delivery. The working party is to complete its



analysis by 7 April this year. In undertaking those duties the CFS will always be structured to provide a full and adequate service to outlying regions. Concerned parties will have every opportunity to put their point to the working party, and they will be able to actively participate in the consultative process.

I am aware that this matter was raised in the press a couple of days ago and that there are also some other concerns by CFS officers over whether or not they will be amalgamated with the MFS. I am pleased to announce that, in conjunction with the policy that was announced by the Liberal Government before the last election, work is well under way on completing the drafting of legislation to ensure once and for all the separation of the CFS and the MFS. That legislation will be introduced into this Parliament in the very near future to ensure the operational independence of those two vital organisations to fire protection and prevention in South Australia.

### GRAND PRIX

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Is the Premier satisfied that no member of his ministry or his staff was informed of the success of Victoria's bid for the Grand Prix before the State election?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** There were so many interjections I did not hear the exact nature of the question. Could I hear the question again?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That is a clear reason why the Chair will deal very firmly with interjectors if they continue while questions are being asked. Could the honourable member for Spence repeat his question.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Certainly.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The honourable member has been in the House for four years. He understands that he must direct his question through the Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot uphold the point of order, but the Chair has tried to be lenient particularly with new members asking questions. I ask the member for Spence to direct his question to the Chair precisely and clearly.

**Mr ATKINSON:** As I said before, Mr Speaker: is the Premier satisfied that no member of his ministry or his staff was informed of the success of Victoria's bid for the Grand Prix before the State election?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Yes, I am satisfied that none of them knew about the fact that a contract was signed on 16 September and therefore that the Grand Prix was lost to Victoria. I wonder what the answer would be if the same question was put to the members, Ministers and staff of the former Labor Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### COMPUTER MANAGED LEARNING CENTRE

**Mr WADE (Elder):** Can the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education explain how the Computer Managed Learning Centre is assisting in the provision of off-campus training?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** In simple terms, the computer managed learning program which is offered by Regency Institute allows students to access programs either at home through their computer or at work via their company's computer. It has been a very successful project that will

expand over time. Currently, companies such as Mobil are on-line and their employees can access programs during working hours or, as I indicated earlier, at home. It offers a range of courses; it saves travel time; and it is very efficient and effective.

We are expanding the program and already have arrangements with Australian Newsprint Mills in Tasmania, and are negotiating further contracts with companies in Western Australia. So the TAFE sector in South Australia is at the forefront of modern technology, bringing money into South Australia as well as expanding opportunities for people interstate, in country areas as well as the metropolitan area, to have the most up-to-date, convenient training at minimal cost.

### UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** My question is also directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Is the Minister concerned that the University of South Australia has announced that it will wind down courses at the Salisbury campus and, if so, will he undertake to request the Vice Chancellor to reverse this decision? The University of South Australia—

*The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier is completely out of order. The member for Napier has the call.

**Ms HURLEY:** The University of South Australia is rationalising its facilities. As part of that process it is moving a number of technology oriented courses to its Levels campus. Other courses will be moved to its city and Magill campuses over the next decade. This will leave students in the northern suburbs with unacceptably long distances to travel for courses such as community services and teaching.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** This is an issue in which I have been involved. As the honourable member would know, we do not control the activities of any of the universities, but I have been in close contact with the Vice Chancellor. I am assured that they are not closing the Salisbury North—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I am informed that they are not closing the Salisbury North campus, but over time they will transfer some courses to the Levels.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I have made the point quite clearly to the university that the Government would be concerned if there were a denial or a reduction in educational offerings to people in the north. That is a very important point, and it relates very much to issues of equity and access, and that point has been made. I think we should be careful not to criticise establishments like the university when they try to be more efficient and when they try to rationalise when they have two campuses within a few kilometres of each other. I am assured by the university that there is no intention to close the Salisbury North campus—

**An honourable member:** Salisbury East.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** Well, Salisbury East. It depends where you are standing. It is north from here.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** You have spent too long on the golf course. The Salisbury East campus—to make the Leader happy—will continue, but its role will change. As I indicated at the start, we do not control the universities. If we want the

universities to be efficient and effective, we have to let them run the show in the best way they can.

**An honourable member:** The Deputy Leader is on the council.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I trust that that answers the honourable member's concerns. We are monitoring it very closely, but we do not have any direct say in the decision-making process.

### YOUTH ISSUES

**Mr KERIN (Frome):** Will the Minister for Youth Affairs inform the House how the Government is addressing youth issues?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I notice that I have only six minutes, so I will be brief. This Government has sent a very clear signal to the community. First of all—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections. Members encourage the Minister to give lengthy responses by continuing to interject.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** First, we have established the Ministry of Youth Affairs, which the previous Government did not. We have sent a signal to the community that we believe young people are important not only because of their future and the future of the State but as young people. Our first priority is to create employment and to assist the private sector to take on young people, and we have been working very hard to achieve that. The jobs package, which was released early in January, is already starting to bear fruit in terms of the WorkCover levy reduction, where medium and small companies take on school leavers and the long-term unemployed. We have a whole range of other initiatives that I would be happy to detail in a ministerial statement at some time.

However, I will mention some briefly now. We are well advanced in instituting a youth parliament in conjunction with the YMCA and we are working towards Proclamation Day awards for young people to acknowledge the work they do. We have had a good response to the young farmer incentive scheme to encourage young people to remain in rural areas and on farms. We have been in contact with all Government agencies and departments to ensure that they have a youth-friendly charter, that they recognise young people, that they cater for them and that they provide programs that are relevant to them.

We have an Urban Corridors of Green scheme under way that will involve young people in renovating and rehabilitating the environment in the urban setting. We are gearing up for a youth expo to enable young people to showcase what they are doing in terms of their achievements, both in groups and as individuals. In June, we will be providing an employment broker scheme, which will enable people to convert part-time jobs into full-time jobs, and that will have particular benefit for young people. We will also have youth media awards for the media that report accurately matters affecting young people; we are appointing honorary youth ambassadors and we are establishing a shopfront facility closer to the Rundle Street/Hindley Street area.

They are just some of the initiatives that we have under way, and we intend to move vigorously to ensure that we meet the commitment that we gave prior to the election: to give young people a future; to give them hope; and, most importantly, to give them jobs. The latest figure on youth unemployment, which is in excess of 40 per cent, is unaccept-

able. For 15 to 19 year olds, the unemployment rate is in excess of 42 per cent, and that is an absolute disgrace. We have inherited that and we cannot correct it overnight. However, we are doing all we can to address that situation. The tragedy we face in South Australia is that, if we do not give our young people jobs and a future, we will lose them interstate and overseas, and that is something we cannot afford to have happen.

This Government has as a priority the creation of jobs, particularly for young people, giving young people the respect and recognition that they deserve as well as the opportunity to participate in decision-making on a meaningful basis. As well as a youth parliament—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will wind up his response.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I will be meeting with young people on a regular and informal basis so that Aboriginal youth, those from ethnic backgrounds and those from poorer backgrounds, can participate as well as those from more favoured backgrounds. This Government has a total package to which I am totally committed.

### POLICE DEPARTMENT

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Did the Minister for Emergency Services seek from the Police Department a copy of a memo authored by Superintendent Pawelski has he read this memo; what are his views on the content; and does he agree with Pawelski that senior management of the Police Department have lost their way?

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I sincerely thank the honourable member for his question. Yes, I have seen a copy of the memorandum written by Chief Superintendent Pawelski and I saw it before it went to press. It is interesting to reflect on the content of the memo and the time at which it was written, for the date on the memo sent from the officer to his supervising assistant commissioner was 4 November 1993.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** As the honourable member would be well aware, that was well before the time of the last State election. The memo reflected the frustration experienced by that senior officer over the lack of support that was given to the Police Force by the Arnold Labor Government. The officer concerned is a senior and professional officer and he quite rightly—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** Well, if the honourable member cares to sit back and listen, he will hear the rest of the answer. The officer quite rightly expressed concern about the direction that policing was taking in South Australia under the Labor Government. He sought more operational policing—more opportunity for police to be at the grassroots level, on foot patrol, to combat the problems.

The Liberal Government came into office on a platform of providing 200 extra operational police—more police on the beat. The work is already under way to accommodate extra officers in training at Fort Largs Police Academy. We also indicated that we would move members of the STA Transit Squad into the Police Force as fully-trained police officers. The first of those officers are now riding trains after we fast-tracked the system by taking 19 officers who had previously been police officers through a one-month training course at Fort Largs Police Academy to start that program post haste.

As I reported to the House last week, that is working effectively.

We also announced the establishment of shopfront community police stations. In the very near future I will be announcing to this House where those stations will be opening. So, yes, we are acting, and I am pleased to see that the Chief Superintendent's memo reflects concerns previously expressed by the Liberal Party.

The only item in the memo which did concern me and which was not expressed by the Liberal Party previously was the Chief Superintendent's assertion that some police were turning a blind eye. Certainly, that has not been my experience or that of other officers to whom I have spoken, but understandably police have been frustrated at the lack of support they have had in undertaking their duties. We now have a much happier Police Force in South Australia.

### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer):** I move:

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Government Bills to be introduced before the Address in Reply is adopted.

Motion carried.

### SESSIONAL ORDERS

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer):** I move:

That for the remainder of the session, Standing Orders be so far suspended as to provide that:

- a. at the conclusion of the period for questions without notice the Speaker may propose the question 'That the House note grievances'. Up to six members may speak for a maximum of five minutes each before the Speaker puts the question;
- b. the motion for adjournment of the House on Tuesdays and Wednesdays may be debated for up to 20 minutes, provided it is moved before 10 p.m.;
- c. the motion for adjournment of the House on Thursdays:
  - (i) may be moved later than 5 p.m.;
  - (ii) may not be debated.

In moving this motion, I indicate that its contents are identical to the Sessional Orders in the last Parliament while the Standing Orders Committee is considering the matter for inclusion in the Standing Orders. I understand that members would like the practice of having the grievance debate after Question Time to continue, Sir.

Motion carried.

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

**The SPEAKER:** The question before the Chair is that the House note grievances. The honourable member for Giles.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles):** In Question Time I asked the Premier whether he would exert some authority on the Attorney-General to, in turn, exert some authority in the matter of the Courts Administration Authority decision to reduce the services of country magistrates in regional South Australia.

The decision of the Courts Administration Authority absolutely astounds me. This Government's response to its action astounds me even more, because I would have thought that a Government such as this that does have some country

representation in this place would ensure that the Courts Administration Authority saw to it that regional South Australia was properly serviced. The fact that that is no longer going to happen is an absolute disgrace to this Government and particularly to the Attorney-General.

Quite clearly, no substantial reason has been given by the authority for this change. We have heard only from the Acting Chief Magistrate, Jim Cramond, that the decision has been made and that the rest of us will have to wear it. Apparently, Mr Cramond believes that he has the absolute right to decide whether resident magistrates are placed in those regional areas and that the Act gives him that right. I can tell Mr Cramond that, if the previous Government was still in office, Mr Cramond, notwithstanding his interpretation of the legislation, he would not have been able to make that decision to the detriment of services to people who live outside the metropolitan area. I was absolutely astonished that this decision was taken and was imposed on the people of rural South Australia with no consultation whatsoever.

When challenged about this, Mr Cramond said, 'I have had some brief conversations with some of the legal profession.' That is not good enough. With the greatest respect to some of the legal profession, they are not terribly representative of the rural people of South Australia. The argument is that there is not enough work for magistrates—that the work has declined. I would like to see some evidence of that. If that is indeed the case, where is the evidence for it? I would like to see some comparisons made of what is happening in the magistrates courts in the metropolitan area, because it is not good enough for Mr Cramond, or for anybody else, to make a decision and to base it, when challenged, on these assertions and to present no evidence whatsoever to the people of non-metropolitan South Australia to back up the decision.

I believe that the Attorney-General is a wimp; he was once described as a little crumb by a former Premier of this State, and I think that was correct. All that is required is for the Attorney-General to tell the Courts Administration Authority and the Chief Justice, if necessary, that this is unacceptable to the Government: I know the decision would very smartly be changed, because the Courts Administration Authority is responsible to this Parliament for the expenditure it makes. It can obviously be questioned during the Estimates Committees and so on. To suggest that it has no responsibility to anybody for the way it spends its money is ridiculous.

However, if the Attorney-General says that he cannot do anything about it because of the legislation, I demand of the Government that it change the legislation, and it will have my support in doing so. If it refuses to do that, I intend to introduce a private member's Bill, which I know will have the support of the member for Mount Gambier, at least, as well as other members—I hope all members who live in non-metropolitan Adelaide—to see that this decision is changed. That would be a long-winded, unnecessary way of going about it. I do not believe that we ought to have to go through all the rigmarole of changing the legislation. All that is required is for the Premier to say to the Attorney-General, 'Get Mr Cramond and get Chief Justice King in your office and tell them this decision is unacceptable. The people of non-metropolitan South Australia are as much entitled to services as the people in the metropolitan area. See that that decision is changed.' And they will change it smartly.

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** For some years I have, on occasion, raised the drawn-out battle that my constituent, Mr Bruce Yates of Lockleys, has had with the Department for

Family and Community Services concerning false and unsubstantiated allegations made by some officers of that department against him. In an endeavour to retain contact with his children, Mr Yates took action through the Family Court, and Judge Burton in June 1987 said, in effect, that there had been no abuse of the children by the father in 1985 and that his little girl had never made any such allegations. It may seem strange that today I should have to refer to a case that occurred nine years ago, but I do so in view of an article that appeared on the front page of the *Advertiser* of Wednesday 16 February. Under the heading 'Abuse case father claims \$2 million', the article states:

An Adelaide Hills man wants \$2 million compensation for the seven year nightmare he says he has endured since he was allegedly falsely accused of sexually abusing his daughter. . . Mr Hillman claims to have suffered 'great shock, anguish and emotional distress'—distress at the separation from his children. He says the allegations have left him in an 'anxiety depressive state'. . . The claim alleges wide-ranging failures by the system under which the allegations of sexual abuse were investigated, in particular that the techniques used by both doctors to determine sexual abuse were unsafe and unreliable.

That article also refers to the department. This is not unusual: I understand that about 65 similar cases have been made known over the past two years. However, in a letter dated 3 June 1987 to the then Director of the Department for Family and Community Services, Ms Vardon, the Ombudsman said of Judge Burton's findings:

It appears to me from His Honour's findings that there may be a number of matters relating to administration which may require further consideration, in particular the administrative process and any system of checks on the part of the department when receiving what has now transpired to be a complaint from an unreliable source. . .

Mr Biganovski's comments in his private letter to Ms Vardon fly in the face of his public response to Mr Yates' complaint, quoted by the then Minister, John Cornwall, in defence of the department's actions. In his letter to Mr Yates, the Ombudsman stated:

There is, however, little point in focusing much attention on the notification procedure and the preliminary inquiry on the part of any social worker which was at all times geared to promoting the paramount interests of the child and was in that sense highly remedial in effect as well as having an investigative purpose. . . The result of my investigation is that in my opinion there has been no maladministration on the part of any officer of the department within the meaning of section 25(1) of the Act.

These two statements seem impossible to reconcile, especially in the light of the comments of the Full Court of the Family Court, which heard Minister Cornwall's appeal against the cost decision in this action. The court included the Chief Justice of the Family Court, Justice Nicholson. Their Honours said:

What in fact occurred in this case was that an officer of the department chose to record as a complaint of sexual abuse, a request for advice made of her by Ms Woodman based on information conveyed to Ms Woodman by the wife. No complaint or suggestion of sexual assault had been made by the wife.

Their Honours noted that it appeared that none of the relevant provisions of section 91 of the Welfare Act 'were complied with by the officers of the department in this case'. They continued:

The fact is that the Minister was party to proceedings which involved a grave allegation against the husband which was found not merely to have been unsubstantiated on the civil standard of proof but to be completely without foundation.

Their Honours concluded:

We consider that there are aspects of this case which give rise to considerable disquiet. The method of investigation of the allegations

was unsatisfactory and incompetent and led to a substantial injustice being done to the husband and wife and to the children themselves.

I could go on about the attitude to this matter on the part of the Ombudsman and also the former Director of the department, Sue Vardon. I call on the Minister for Family and Community Services to establish immediately an independent inquiry into about 63 similar cases, to be undertaken by a retired magistrate or judge in order to ascertain what damage has been done to the integrity of those who have been falsely maligned by this department.

**Mr TIERNAN (Torrens):** I wish to bring to the attention of the House the excellent and dedicated work performed by the volunteers and staff of the North East Community Assistance Project (NECAP). NECAP has been providing emergency relief to residents of 130 suburbs for the past 14 years. This organisation, which was started voluntarily by a local resident, took four years to gain any form of funding, Federal, State or local. Diane Davies, the current coordinator, commenced work as a volunteer eight years ago, and five years ago was appointed as a part-time coordinator, thanks to the Department for Family and Community Services. Although this position is funded for only 30 hours, Diane works an average of 80 hours per week.

I would like to note that the need for such community groups is a sad reflection on our society leaders, and it is difficult to ignore that the need for their services to help families has dramatically increased during the past four or five years. The North East Community Assistance Project is located in the old buildings of the original Gilles Plains Primary School on North East Road, Gilles Plains. I would like to note some of its services. This organisation is one of the most respected welfare organisations in the State and is an excellent example of the way in which a mixture of volunteers and paid staff can work in the best interests of the community. It is something that is worth looking at in the future, particularly when we consider other organisations such as St John Ambulance.

The conditions and work load of this group have not deterred them from providing a high standard of service. However, I am concerned at the little financial support this group receives, especially situated, as it is, in an area with one of the highest unemployment levels in this State. It is time we took a good look at such groups as NECAP which provide such a valuable service to the public. For example, the organisation interviewed 720 clients in 1993; it spent \$44 000 on providing emergency relief from a grant of \$40 000 by the Federal Government, with volunteers making up the difference. The volunteers contributed 16 000 person hours in 1993.

It is interesting to note that one of the services it has just introduced is the provision of breakfast at one of the local primary schools. This breakfast service has tripled in size in the past two years. I would also like to note that the NECAP organisation provided 399 Christmas hampers during the last Christmas Appeal—almost double the previous year. The toy library facility provided toys to 180 children in the region, 85 per cent of whom are from sole parent families. NECAP also sponsors the Gilles Plains Primary School breakfast program, as I said, and it trains volunteers. That is very good for an organisation of this nature.

Before their volunteers are allowed to work in the community, they are provided with minimum training and then with ongoing training. The organisation has already

trained 75 volunteers for the 1994 program, bringing the volunteer staff up to 110—an excellent operation.

In conclusion, the community and the Government should commend the North East Community Assistance Project's staff and volunteers for the excellent service they provide to our community. They are dedicated and hard-working above and beyond the call of duty. I would like to mention some of the volunteers who deserve our support, such as life members, Elizabeth Hepworth, Mr R.J. Harris and, in particular, Mr Joe Silverton, a 75 year old retired gentleman who works tirelessly a 12 or 14 hour day five days a week. I commend this group to the Government and to the community, believing that we should, both morally and financially, support such an excellent project.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):**

The issues I want to raise today concern the statement made yesterday by the Treasurer in his response to questions asked in the House and also media questions he was asked at his press conference. I might say that I believe that the class of '93, as they term themselves, would do very well to consider carefully the way in which the Treasurer has been answering questions and to note the way in which he is softening up everyone for a further barrage of broken promises that will come from the Liberal Government. I see in the performance of the Treasurer in both this Chamber and at his press conference yesterday the very essence of a person about to come out with a budget or an April economic statement that will justify, he thinks, a series of radical changes to policies promised by the Liberal Party before the last election.

In fact, I think what we have been privy to is something of a performance that he is giving to Cabinet, where he is saying to his Cabinet colleagues, 'All those things you heard us say before the last election about maintaining services in education, health, law and order, and all those other things which we said were so very important and which got the support of the electors in the last election, you will have to forget, because I, the Treasurer, am going to tell you that that will not be possible, that we will not be able to afford them.' It is quite clear that a number of things that he has already done have indicated the preparation he is making at the moment to make these changes come about.

Let us look, for example, at the question raised today of the 3 000 jobs. The 3 000 jobs have, the Treasurer hopes, quietly turned into 3 900. Who knows what else they may turn into after that? He was asked a question about that today, given the firm words of the former Leader of the Opposition, the now Premier of this State, before the last election. In 1985 another Leader of the Opposition, the member for Kavel, the now Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, used to make statements about the fact that when he was making promises that were rock solid commitments. Do members recall those rock solid commitments of his, those big slabs of mock-up concrete that were really made of styrofoam? These were his rock solid commitments.

The Premier attempted to do exactly the same thing before the last election. He said, 'We will not cut further than what is contained in the April statement of the Government.' The April statement was quite clear. Admittedly, at the middle of the year there was some doubt as to whether we would be able to sustain that target of 3 000 jobs or whether we would have to go further than that, given what had happened at the

last special Premiers Conference. However, after close examination of all the financial information available, we stated at budget time that there would be no change to that figure of 3 000, that that figure would be maintained.

What did the Opposition of the day do? It said that it would adhere to that same figure of 3 000; it would not go beyond it. No amount of circumlocution or sophistry on the part of the Treasurer, the Deputy Premier of this State, can allow him to explain adequately how he has gone from 3 000 to 3 900. Frankly, he has just broken a promise.

What he is doing in his statements today and the statement in the House yesterday is warning South Australians that he is about to break a whole pile more. It was intriguing to listen to his answer today on the question of taxes and charges. When asked whether he would resign, like his leader the Premier said what he would do if he increased taxes or charges. The Deputy involved all his Cabinet. I must say there were a few pale faces down the line when suddenly they heard themselves swept up in this grand offer to resign if taxes—and I point out what he went on to say—'or the rates of taxes are increased. I ask the class of '93 to pay special attention to that—not only taxes but the rates of taxes being increased. That is what the Treasurer told this House today. That is what the Treasurer today involved everyone down the line in.

Given that he made statements yesterday that he claims things are not as he was told before the election—and that simply is not true: he was told all the financial information before the last election—and given that he is now so sweeping in his assertion there will be neither increases in taxes nor in the rates of taxes, if he is going to achieve his debt reduction target that went farther than ours, I might say, he will have to cut services, and the 3 900 will be replaced by a figure much larger indeed.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley is interjecting out of his seat and is completely out of order. He knows better.

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** I wish to speak this afternoon about the myriad of council/local government schemes involving waste management and recycling. Currently, throughout Adelaide, with a population of one million people, we have 70-litre garage bins collected, along with plastic bags, manual handling, 240-litre mobile garbage bins, plastic crates for recyclables and split bins. We have a myriad of collection schemes as well; for example, same-day collection of recycling and waste, separate recycling collections, contractors out there who are collecting, manual lifting, and lifters on the backs of trucks; and now we have the newest innovation in technology, the robotic arm. We have direct transfer to the disposal locations for the disposal of waste, and now the waste is handled through waste transfer stations prior to transfer down to the disposal locations, all with the basic aim of trying to reduce by 50 per cent the amount of waste going to landfill by the year 2 000.

At present a number of councils are looking at setting up waste transfer stations and material recovery facilities. The biggest problem with that is that, because of the urban sprawl, there is a lack of available space for councils to locate these facilities. Currently, it is causing a great amount of concern to the residents in some electorates (and one of them is in my area at Marion), as well as a concern in the electorate of Lee. In relation to the aim to reduce waste by 50 per cent by the year 2 000, it is believed that we should be addressing the

areas of bio-waste and also waste direct to landfill. Based on studies overseas, 90 per cent of these items are collected by the council: 50 per cent of the collection is bio-waste, 40 per cent is waste attributable directly to landfill, and 10 per cent is comprised of valuables or items which can be recycled.

In the green waste, or bio-waste area, if the number of bins used for collections of items or more than one item is picked up by the local government, then this percentage of waste collection is increased above 50 per cent. Councils should be encouraged to look at sharing resources before collection and disposal of this bio-waste. The problem here is that the storage of this waste can be unsightly and also causes health risks for the local residents. In the case of waste which can go only directly to landfill, in some instances, and in the case of bio-waste, as well, councils are encouraging residents to look at home composting to reduce the amount of waste collected. The problem with this is that residents are using incorrect containers which are creating health risks in the local community. As well as that, councils are using waste transfer stations for collection of this waste prior to transport to disposal sites, and this is causing problems. Local government and also the State Government should be encouraging the use of the new technology of incineration or reduction of waste to pulp prior to disposal to landfill.

Many recycling schemes are basically only a regurgitation of existing schemes or direct disposal to landfill, and every time someone goes to criticise a recycling operation they are too frightened to do so because they will be regarded as being similar to a child molester! Many of the schemes introduced by local government are expensive and are basically glorified rubbish collection operations. One only has to travel to a number of council depots within the metropolitan area of Adelaide to see bale upon bale of plastic stored by councils waiting to find something to do with it. I refer members to the *Age* newspaper of Saturday 8 January 1994, in which it is stated:

The economy skewed towards use of primary materials in plastic and paper production. The high transport and labour cost of collecting material—

referring to recyclables—

is relative to primary products.

And thirdly:

Consumer preference in city and in supermarket aisles continues to be for primary products.

**Mr ASHENDEN (Wright):** Before I go on to the main point that I wanted to make this afternoon, I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that, when he wants to hand out gratuitous advice to the class of '93, of which I am not a member, his own members might like to give him some advice about his performance since he has been Leader of the Opposition. I just cannot believe how poor is the standard of questions that have come to the Government from the Opposition. One would think that both he and particularly the honourable member who is sitting on the front bench right now were framing dorothy dixers for our Government, because the questions are just so appalling. I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he should really look at his own game before he starts handing out gratuitous advice.

Next, I would like to commend the member for Torrens regarding the comments he made about NECAP, because it certainly is a program which provides tremendous and most needed assistance to residents of the north-eastern suburbs.

The main reason I wanted to speak this afternoon involves a very expensive problem that the previous Government has left for the residents of Wright, that is, the absolute lack of provision of any emergency services within the Golden Grove Development, which covers Golden Grove, Wynn Vale and Greenwith. Generally speaking, the indenture that governs that area is an extremely good one, and most of the essential services that are necessary for an area are provided long before they are needed. For example, I think most other areas of the State would be very envious of the education facilities that are available for the families and the children that move into the electorate of Wright—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Nothing to do with the Labor Government, my friend. It was done by an indenture that was brought in by the Tonkin Government. So back in your box! So, the indenture does provide an excellent background for the development of that area. However, there was one area which was not addressed in the indenture Act and which has been totally ignored by the previous Labor Government for the past 11 years, that is, the provision of emergency services to that area. There is not a police station in that area. The nearest 24-hour police station is at Holden Hill or Para Hills. There used to be a 24-hour station at Tea Tree Gully until the Labor Government decided that it was not needed. Therefore, we have a situation where we do not have the police in proximity to this very rapidly growing area. Also, I might point out that the area is growing towards the north east, away from Holden Hill and away from Para Hills.

As well, we do not have any ambulance services out there. The nearest ambulance service is at Modbury. Again, as the area develops, those people are getting further and further away from the ambulance service. Why do we have such a poor ambulance service? Let us look at what the Labor Government did in getting rid of volunteers and at the costs of the ambulance service that we have to wear because of its ideological problems of having people who want to help the community not being allowed to help the community.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Ross Smith has already been warned today. He knows the consequences.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I point out to the member for Ross Smith that I am looking forward to my Address in Reply contribution when I can talk about some of the garbage about which he spoke in his maiden speech. I am sorry that I have only half an hour for that speech, and I will need all of that to tear him to pieces. The next matter to which I refer relates to the fact that we have no emergency services as far as fire protection is concerned. Again, the previous Government did absolutely nothing to assist and, at the moment, much of the area of the Golden Grove Development is the responsibility of the CFS. It is a marvellous organisation which does a fantastic job, but it is trained to protect the rural community rather than a developed urban community, as is the case there. We do not have the MFS to assist.

I make the point that we have inherited a huge and expensive problem, thanks to the Labor Government, and we will now have to address it in the best way possible. I assure the residents of Wright that that is exactly what the Government and I will be doing.

**CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (PRISONERS'  
GOODS) AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Emergency Services)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982. Read a first time.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

The object of this Bill is to rectify a recently discovered loophole in the Correctional Services Act. Until recently, the department restricted the entry of goods into prisons by interpreting section 33(3)(h) of the Correctional Services Act to require approval of the manager of the prison before a prisoner could receive any parcel of goods from outside of the prison confines.

On 21 December 1993, the Crown-Solicitor advised the department that an application to serve Judicial Review proceedings on the manager of the Yatala Labour Prison would be made. This was as a consequence of an earlier decision by the manager to invoke this section of the Act to refuse a prisoner access to a parcel which had been received without his prior approval.

The Crown-Solicitor has advised that the department was inappropriately interpreting this section of the Act and should concede the Judicial Review proceedings and agree to costs. In addition to conceding the Judicial Review, the Crown-Solicitor recommended that the department should seek to urgently amend the Correctional Services Act to reflect the need to restrict the entry of goods into prisons.

This advice has major implications for the prison system in that prisoners will now be able to have parcels containing any item they wish sent to them and prison managers will have to give them the contents of the parcel unless the item does not qualify as part of the range of items permitted in that division's items in cells, or the item contravenes the regulations. For example, a parcel of food would have to be given to a prisoner. As drugs can be added to food, this can cause difficulty. It is not practical to test foodstuffs and it would seem sensible to prohibit its delivery to prisoners, unless permitted by the manager.

It is widely recognised that control of the entry of goods into prisons is essential if the Department for Correctional Services is to effectively manage the behaviour and activities of prisoners in a safe and secure manner and procedures have been adopted to ensure that prisoners cannot receive goods which might prejudice the 'good order' of prisons.

An important part of these procedures has been the interpretation given to section 33(3)(h) of the Correctional Services Act that the approval of the manager is required before prisoners can receive any parcel from outside of the prison. This has ensured that only those parcels approved by the manager need be thoroughly searched by correctional officers for weapons and other contraband, while those without approval are returned to the sender where a return address is known. In those instances where a return address is not known, the item is recorded, stored and given to prisoners on their release.

Now the advice is that the department cannot restrict the entry of goods into prisons unless the goods contravene regulation 6 of the Correctional Services Act regulations, or are items not permitted in the cells. This advice could have significant resource and security implications for the department.

Without legislation to stop the uncontrolled forwarding of parcels to prisoners, checks of all parcels will have to be more thorough, and only those items specifically covered under regulation 6 of the Correctional Services Act Regulations, or not included on the list of items permitted in cells, will be able to be excluded from the prison. Prohibited items include liquor, paint, oil, acid, glue, herbicides, fungicides, insecticides, pressurised spray canisters, cigarette lighters, explosives or explosive devices, incendiary devices, any type of gun, any type of material designed or capable of being used to instruct or teach a person to make a weapon or cause a riot and any instrument which can be adapted to inflict bodily injury.

The additional staff resources which would be necessary to search every parcel thoroughly for contraband and return or store items as a consequence of expected increases in parcel numbers would be considerable and would affect the operation, and, in particular, the security, of prisons.

The intention of this Bill is to ensure that the receipt of goods by a prisoner will need the permission of the manager of the prison. As a consequence, managers will have more control over the number and nature of parcels received in prisons.

In those instances where the manager does not give permission, the goods may be returned to the sender, or stored or destroyed, all at the prisoner's expense, or may, at the discretion of the manager, be handed over to the prisoner's family. Should the items be stored and on release the prisoner fail to collect the items, the Bill also provides for sale of these goods. Proceeds of sale will be refunded to the prisoner if his or her address is known. It is considered essential that these amendments be made and I therefore commend this Bill to the House.

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 33—Prisoners' mail

Clause 2 amends the section of the Act that deals with prisoners' incoming and outgoing mail. All references to parcels are deleted from the section so that it will continue to relate only to letters.

Clause 3: Insertion of s. 33A

Clause 3 inserts a new provision in the Act that deals with goods being sent to or by a prisoner. A prisoner is not entitled to receive goods unless he or she has the permission of the manager of the prison to do so. A manager may cause all goods and parcels, whether sent to a prisoner or sent by a prisoner, to be examined. If goods are items prohibited by the regulations or the manager does not give permission for their receipt, the manager has an absolute discretion to deal with or dispose of the goods as he or she thinks fit. The Minister may fix charges for storing goods on behalf of a prisoner. Costs of selling, storing, etc., goods may be deducted from the prisoner's account (but not from his or her resettlement account). Prohibited items must be destroyed if they are not to be kept as evidence of an offence. Goods left behind in a prison may be sold. The proceeds from the sale of any goods under this section will be credited to the prisoner's account or refunded to a discharged prisoner if his or her whereabouts are known. If not so refunded, the Unclaimed Moneys Act applies.

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

**ADDRESS IN REPLY**

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from Page 125.)

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Napier. I remind the House that this is a maiden speech and ask that the normal courtesies apply to the honourable member.

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** The former member for Napier is a strong individualistic person who had a sharp wit and an ability to rile members opposite. I am sure that it will take some time for members who knew him to get used to seeing me answer the call as member for Napier. I suspect that members opposite might feel some relief that it is me rather than Terry Hemmings. Perhaps I might change that in a fairly short time. It was a long and difficult campaign for me and many other candidates. It was complicated in my case by a long list of candidates for the seat, including an Independent member of Parliament who had been a Minister in a coalition Cabinet. In the long lead up to the election proper much was made in the media of the suggestion that I would be forced to forego the seat in favour of that Independent. Quite a few senior people told me that I had no hope of winning. I continued to campaign because I believed in myself, I believed in the people who were supporting me and I did not believe in big people standing over little people. It meant that my family and friends had to withstand a great deal of pressure. I am proud that they and the overwhelming majority of the ordinary members of the Labor Party supported me.

I secured enough votes in this difficult campaign to ensure my election. Some of the support was for me personally, but

most of it indicated faith that the Labor Party would continue to represent their interests. I feel a strong obligation to justify such support as an individual and as part of the Labor team. In reflecting on the circumstances of my election, I know that many candidates fought very good campaigns but nevertheless lost. The extent of the swing against the Labor Party meant that only those contesting very safe Labor seats had a chance. A number of very good members lost their seats and talented candidates did not have a chance to prove their worth.

Napier is now a very marginal electorate. For any member, that concentrates the mind wonderfully. I have only one term to prove that those who voted for me had sound judgment. My principal consolation is that the Liberal class of '93 has many even more concentrated minds. How will they justify such a majority? What policy and what changes can they effect to reproduce such a result? So far they have been short on policy but long on setting up reviews and committees and sacking senior public servants. The arrogant assumption is that they know what is good for us—we do not have to worry our little heads about detail or complicated policies; we can just leave it to them to make decisions in their own time. Nowhere is this more clear than in the proposal to whittle away the responsibility of citizens to vote for their Government. Whatever the official excuse, and for all the talk about choice, the true rationale is that some individual's votes are worth more than others, that the well-educated, well-read, sophisticated minds of their middle-class voters are better able to make the right decision. The others who are not up to those standards are not to be encouraged. Let me tell the Government that the sound commonsense of the electorate sees through such posturing.

We on this side have to accept the decision of the electorate in the last election means that the previous Labor Government failed the test. The current Government must accept that it must pass its own test and not attempt to change the rules to try to gain advantage. The classic conservative attitude to those who do not have much money is that it is somehow something they bring on themselves. Lack of money equates with lack of intelligence, ability, social skills or the desire to work hard.

Then comes the equally classic sequitur that we should not encourage such inadequacy by being generous with our public money. This attitude ignores the heavy impact of Government and commercial policy decisions on the lives of working class people. In the northern suburbs the effect of economic restructuring has meant the permanent loss of many jobs in the manufacturing and public sector. Leaner budgets at the State and Federal levels have magnified the problem, particularly for those Government and private agencies which have to cope with the fallout of the problem. Agencies with staff stretched to the limit and extremely tight funding are at the coalface of the problem and frequently rely on volunteer assistance. Indeed, there are many volunteers in my electorate who work almost full-time on community activities.

I do not want to dwell unduly on coping with the problems, although that is obviously important in the short term. It is easy to fall into the trap of being more interested in what to do with the disadvantaged than in why people became disadvantaged in the first place. This is a wide issue and I want to concentrate on two aspects: first, education; and, secondly, the family unit. Education became a very public issue in Napier over the past two years. Many of the schools in the area were built during the 1960s and needed extensive repair and refurbishment.

This issue was a window, the public face of other serious problems within the schools. Staff were coping in an environment where a significant number of students came from homes with serious health and social problems. Staff spent too much time dealing with these problems rather than teaching students. This situation was addressed effectively by the previous Labor Government with back-to-school and other one-off grants. This was combined with a sympathetic attitude to staffing under the Peachey Road trial project. This allowed a flexible approach to the deployment of teaching staff and school services officers.

This approach revitalised the school community along Peachey Road. There is now a more positive and optimistic environment which encourages learning. The approach needs to be continued, not only with the Peachey Road schools but with all disadvantaged schools in the State. The basic fact is that more resources are needed to put disadvantaged schools on the same level as schools in other areas. The penalty for not ensuring that students in all areas have an equal chance is a deeply divided society. The restructuring that we are undergoing is irreversible. Jobs will be available primarily to those who are literate, flexible and able to deal with new technologies. Retraining will be a common aspect of working lives. Many children who are in school now will go into jobs that we have never heard of. If you do not equip children in disadvantaged areas with the ability to cope with these changes, you will entrench that disadvantage.

Disadvantage will also be entrenched if families are not adequately supported. When the conservatives opposite talk of families, one can see the wistful look in their eyes as they hark back to the golden age of the 1950s, when the norm was supposed to be a happy nuclear family with a sole breadwinner. The reality is that that golden age is largely a myth peddled by conservatives and given credence by nostalgia. The reality for many people was very different. Families exist in many different forms, and many in the north are struggling under compound disadvantage. Often there are problems with health, social dislocation, poverty and chronic unemployment in one family. These problems must not be perpetuated into the next generation.

We parents hope that our children will go out into the world confident, strong and competent. Many parents share this hope but they are not able, because of their own background, to give their children the best start. The most dramatic example of such a handicap is where domestic violence and sexual abuse have characterised family life. These issues have received much attention in the media recently, but reports have largely focused on the criminal aspects. There has not been enough attention to the very long-term effects on victims. People—usually women—who have suffered domestic violence and sexual abuse can be impaired in their ability to form stable relationships or to function effectively in a family unit. The perpetrators are often left to continue their behaviour in other relationships, and this is an insidious poison that spreads throughout society.

There has been much talk from the Government about the family unit, and it has even addressed the topic of domestic violence. What it has not done is talk about actual support. Where has there been consultation with relevant agencies, the promise of further funding for counsellors, the programs set up to tackle the problems? I have talked so far about disadvantage in the northern suburbs because, as a Labor Party member, the need to redress social disadvantage is important to me. However, that would deal with only a small aspect of Napier, and I do not want to perpetuate the media image of



the Elizabeth/Munno Para area as poor and run down. Most of my constituents would not classify themselves as disadvantaged.

As in any other area, whether it be Springfield or Smithfield, people raise their families, participate in sporting and social events and work if they can. The struggle that is part of the lives of many people in Napier simply sharpens their strength of humour, gives weight to their innate dignity and increases their tolerance. Much of the electorate consists of newly developing suburbs in a semi-rural environment. It is a fast growing, predominantly young community. We are surrounded by market gardens, close to the pleasures of Gawler and the Barossa Valley, the foothills of the Adelaide Hills and the delights of crab fishing at St Kilda.

The new suburbs are not without their challenges: the litany is familiar in the north and in the south. Planning for expansion is essential: there need to be in place adequate community facilities such as schools, community centres, shops, medical care and transport services. On a Statewide level there needs to be detailed consideration of interlocking issues such as environmental pressures and the provision of Government services. The previous Government undertook this planning role very effectively in the 2020 Vision document. The essential feature of this and other good planning documents is extensive community consultation.

I want to conclude with a few observations as a complete newcomer to this Parliament. I must confess that I lean to science and progress rather than to history and tradition. Parliament seems to me to derive many of its practices from a far off time when it was run by men with a well developed sense of their own dignity, honour and legislative duties and a less developed sense of their family and electorate obligations. The hours that Parliament sits are inimical to family and community life. There are in the House areas restricted to members only, and it seems very strange to me to see members whose wives or husbands have come to dine with them being segregated in another dining room, away from the other members.

With respect, I believe that there is also significant scope for streamlining the functions of the House. One small example might be the use of electronic voting for matters before the House rather than requiring divisions. Changing the sitting times of the House to reduce the number of evening hours and simplifying the procedures would make the Parliament more accessible. It would also encourage a wider cross section of people, including more women, to seek to enter Parliament.

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I also support the adoption of the Address in Reply and look forward with great interest over the ensuing sitting days to the various pieces of legislation that were mentioned in Her Excellency's speech. There is no doubt that there will be a long and involved legislative program, and it is my guess that it will go well into May. Indeed, some of the items may go well into what is traditionally known as the budget sittings of the House later in the year.

It would be remiss of me not to make some remarks about the events of 11 December last year, and the way 11 December created what I believe will be a fundamental watershed in South Australian political life. There is no doubt that the results were, from the Labor Party's point of view, a disaster, and it would be wrong for anyone to suggest that is not the case. It would also be wrong to suggest that in all sorts of ways the events of 11 December could really have

been avoided in the circumstances. It was the worst electoral climate that I had seen since the 1966 Federal election and the 1979 campaign, although I think in many respects there were considerable differences between 1993 and 1979.

One of those differences, in my view, is that 1979 did not need to happen, but it was the result of an early election, predominantly, called at a time when the population of South Australia perceived no reason for that election. I believe that the writing was on the wall, in a broad sense, some three years earlier than 1993. In fact, it was on the wall, I suspect, from the 1989 election when the Labor Party was elected to this House with the narrowest of majorities under an arrangement with two Labor Independents. I take that view because I am a great believer in the political pendulum. I think that, if we look at the past 30 years, we can see that the Labor Party has dominated political life here in South Australia.

With two exceptions, namely the 1968-1970 Steele Hall Liberal Government and the 1979-1982 Tonkin Government, the Labor Party has had almost 29 years in power in this State. Of course, they were different Labor Governments, and I do not have the time today to go through how that evolved and how the changes occurred. It is sufficient to say that, if we look at the voting trends in that time, and had the election been held on current boundaries, where the instruction to the Electoral Commissioner is that the Party that receives 50 per cent plus one of the vote shall be the Government, the Steele Hall Government would not have come into being, either, and the Liberal Party would have seen only three of those 29 years in Government.

Having said that, the events since 1989 when I was elected to this place revolve around three main factors. The first, and I will return to it later, is the State Bank, SGIC and a number of other problems that bedevilled the Government. The other issue is the recession which came on in large form throughout the last half of 1990 and which went on pretty well unabated until the middle of last year; and in fact the positive signs of a definite recovery were mixed until the last quarter of 1993. In terms of an electoral climate, no Government wishes to go to an election when the economic indicators point to a heavy recession.

The other issue which I think is a very strong characteristic and gave us that result on 11 December is predominantly the fact that a large number of the people in South Australia had no living memory of what a Liberal Government could be like. Indeed, for a voter to have voted for a Liberal Government that person would now be well into their thirties. For a person to have remembered what the Playford Government was like, when we had exactly the same number of kids in schools as we have today but with only 40 per cent of the teachers, that person would have to be in their fifties. It is the nature of politics, not only in Australia and South Australia but in the Western World, that from time to time change is perceived as a necessity. That was a very big and fundamental factor on 11 December. I believe it was also a factor in the poor or poorer performance than what many Labor Party members believed should have been the case in 1989.

Let us now have a very quick look at the last Government. One of the first remarks I want to make is this: there is no doubt in my mind that one of the persons who got an absolutely poisoned chalice was the current Leader of the Opposition and the former Premier. There is no doubt that he inherited a situation that was extremely difficult in all sorts of ways. Indeed, he was fighting against the trend, the inexorable shift out there in the community that indicated they wanted a change. He inherited a Government at the time

in terms of our own research—and I am sure research available to some of those members opposite, and indeed the material was published in the various media outlets—which indicated that our vote had slumped to all time record lows.

On 11 December the Labor Party received 39 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote, but that was a big improvement on the time when the Leader of the Opposition took on the job of leading the Labor Party. Indeed, had a poll been held at the end of 1992, it is my view that the Labor Party would not have had 10 seats on this side—and I predicted on election day that we would have 10 seats. But what I did not say then (although I said it privately to others) was that we would be lucky if we had 10, because I believed the circumstances were such that had that election been held at any other time, and particularly in the run-up to the Federal election and shortly after, we would have suffered an even worse fate. Those things are very difficult to assess now. We have a lot of hindsight, but we do not know how an election campaign would have developed at a different time.

Quite clearly, at the end of last year, the election on 11 December was what could only be described as a slaughter, and I think everybody out there knows that, and anybody who looks in this House and has any awareness of the fact that these are the Labor benches can quite clearly see how we were defeated. However, I have not yet heard the Liberal Party go on about electoral fairness. We heard a lot about it after the 1989 poll. We had the then Leader get up and make a very impassioned speech, and a number of other luminaries over there commented about the fact that they had 52 per cent—I believe 52.2 per cent was the claim, and it was probably accurate—of the two-Party preferred vote and they had only 23 seats in the House. They believed that they had been robbed of an opportunity to form a Government in 1989.

We do not hear members opposite commenting on the fact that, with 39 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote, Labor members constitute only 20 per cent of the seats. It will be an interesting exercise when it comes down to the electoral redistribution, because members on this side will be arguing before the commission for a system that will ensure the representation of members along the lines of the two-Party preferred vote. It seems to me that the system we now have in South Australia where so many seats fall between 45 per cent and 55 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote has a number of problems. With a bumper crop, such as the Liberal Party has had this time, the Parliament has a number of problems, and it is only the quality of the 10 members on this side that will ensure an effective Opposition.

The other problem, of course, is the long-term one for the residents of South Australia, and that is that an effective Parliament requires a Government, and for that matter an Opposition as well—but particularly the Government—to make a series of hard decisions. Following the redistribution, we will look with interest at what happens to the various members over there—the 37 members—and how their electorates are constructed. We will also watch how the backbench reacts to those in front of them in this Chamber when they start making a number of decisions, many of which will have to be made in the interests of South Australia.

A number of people have suggested to me that the logic of my argument is that we really ought to embrace some sort of proportional representation system, somewhat like Tasmania. I believe one of the factors that has led to a lack of development in Tasmania is the political instability and the problems created by that system. It is my view that what is

needed now are some fundamental changes to the Electoral Act, such that we do see a much fairer system of representation along the lines of the two-Party preferred vote. I am committed to the position that was adopted by the Bannon Government when a Bill was introduced into this House for an electoral distribution and the consequent referendum that went through to end the mal-apportionment of boundaries that existed at that time.

In September 1992 the Leader of the Labor Party inherited a situation that was extremely difficult, and I think a number of the mistakes which were made in the late 1980s—some of which I will detail in a moment and others in subsequent speeches to this House—need to be listed. They were mistakes that for the past three years both the Bannon Government and then the Arnold Labor Government attempted to correct. Of course, some of them were of such magnitude that the correction proved extremely difficult, and will prove more difficult for those members opposite than they realise. I will deal first with the State Bank and then with SGIC and some of the involvement that I had with those organisations.

Very early in my parliamentary career I received a phone call from a single mother who was being put out on the street by a bank in South Australia. The circumstances, very briefly, were these: she alleged that her husband, who was an accountant, had arranged his affairs in such a way that when he left his wife—and he had some prior knowledge of this; he had it well organised—she would wind up with absolutely nothing in any property settlement.

The bank would do his dirty work for him and she would be put out onto the street. He owed the bank a small mortgage on the house; from memory, it was about \$30 000 or \$33 000. However, he owed Beneficial Finance about \$500 000 and, to my knowledge, the then Beneficial Finance did very little to try to collect it. The husband left this woman absolutely destitute with the children: he made absolutely no provision for them whatsoever. He let the bank continue to see the mortgage grow and grow in terms of unpaid interest.

What happened, of course, was that the woman found out about this when she received the statutory letter in her letterbox advising her that she would be evicted. She got the letter and showed it to me. I rang the local branch of the bank—I hasten to add that it was not the branch at Ingle Farm with which I have a very good relationship—and the manager told me quite openly that her ex-husband had been into the bank and had discussed with the bank how the situation could be solved. It was suggested that the best thing to do was for the bank to evict the woman concerned. That was advice the bank took up—hastily, I add. The notice was put into the letterbox, and that was it.

It took me two weeks to contact senior management of the bank. It would have taken longer had it not been for the Estimates Committees of this Parliament, because these events happened some two weeks prior to the Estimates Committees. I found it impossible to get through to anyone in the management regime that Mr Marcus Clark had put together. Eventually, State Bank officials were up in the gallery; one of them—a Mr Paddison—was there with a number of people around him. I went up to him and said, 'I understand that you are Paddison. I would like to talk to you on the backbench.' He replied that he was a busy man and that he had a number of things to prepare for. I said, 'So am I, Mr Paddison, and I have been waiting for some two weeks to get through to you on a matter where a mother is being put out onto the street with her children.' He told me that his staff

had been instructed—and this was a very interesting comment—not to take phone calls from any Tom, Dick or Harry. That is how they reacted not only to the Government of the day but also to any member of Parliament. I will come back to that in a moment.

I advised him that I was not Tom, Dick or Harry and that at a suitable time, if he persisted in this attitude of putting a single mum out onto the street and conniving with her ex-husband in this way, I would denounce him and the bank from the backbench in this Parliament—a threat, I might add, he took seriously only when I put it in writing and faxed it to him personally. The mother was not put out onto the street: the events were sorted out. She is now happy, albeit in a different home, and she has some stability back in her life.

I have been involved in only two instances where people were being put out onto the street—both of them by the State Bank of South Australia. I say here and now that we have gained not a thing from the public ownership of that bank here in South Australia. I say quite clearly—and I want it on the record—that, when I have had to deal with other banks in similar circumstances, whether it be the Commonwealth Bank or one of the private enterprise banks, I have not had those sorts of problems. Therefore, the ownership of the State Bank of South Australia, the fact that it has been a Government instrumentality, has done nothing for the electors in my patch—not a thing. When I was elected as the Chair of the Economic and Finance Committee in October 1992, I had—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** Yes, you can go into that if you like, too. When I was elected to that position—and, as the member for Spence points out, that had his great support—one of the first things we had on our plate was a resolution of this House to look into the salaries payable to State Bank executives. Of course, the old Marcus Clark regime is now long gone, and I thought so had all the various attitudes of confidentiality and all the rest of it but, no, I was wrong on this one: these blokes even sent out their Christmas cards with 'In confidence' written on them.

They contacted me and said that they had had enough inquiries; they wanted to get on with their life. They wanted to talk to me about the inquiry that this House had instructed the committee that I chaired to pursue. Indeed, it was an interesting conversation, because I suggested to them that it might be possible for me and staff members to discuss with them any concerns that they had—the arrangements or whatever. We made a tentative arrangement for the following week. Owing to parliamentary duties of one kind or another, I could not make that appointment. I rang them and suggested that the best thing they could do would be to complete the questionnaire that the committee had prepared and that at some stage in the future the issues could be debated.

Their answer was very interesting. They said they would reply on their terms when they wanted, and they wanted to discuss with me or the committee the terms of the inquiry. I told them that they would reply by the due date set down by the committee and that they would comply with the Parliamentary Committees Act. I also said that, now that I had asserted that, they could come down here and have a cup of tea if they wanted to and I would arrange for the staff to attend so that we could discuss any issues. Well, they brought a small army with them and we had to book the second floor conference room. At that meeting they told me how difficult it would be to discuss any kind of executive salaries.

Let me tell members what happened then. They produced a figure on a piece of paper and gave it to me. They said that

that was all the information they would provide. It was a raw figure for all the executive salaries. I asked them how many it correlated to. They told me that it was none of our business. I read them a copy of the Act and a copy of the resolution. They told me that they thought my interpretation was very interesting and that they would take it to the next State Bank Board meeting. I congratulated them and pointed out that that was the one bunch of people less popular than Labor politicians at that time in South Australia.

I was puzzled at what the whole exercise was about, but I found out soon enough. They had told the Deputy Premier who had then told the House that they had 38 executives and that they had had 47 the year before. That was a porky pie. They then told me that it all depended on how you wanted to define these things. I then asked how many people they employed: did they employ any cleaners or anyone earning over \$100 000 in South Australia or anywhere else, for that matter? They replied that they did not but that they did employ a number of technicians. I asked what they did: did they work on computers and did they pay them over \$100 000? I was told that they were paid well over \$100 000 and that some of them were in Treasury, some were here, some were in New York, and some were in London and somewhere else. I asked exactly what it was that these technicians did. I found out that they were the same old paper shufflers as the bunch up here. The officers then confirmed to me, in an exercise like pulling teeth, that there were 92—not 37 but 92.

I believe that the relationship that the Government and members on this side of politics had with the State Bank was very similar to that which I have announced here this afternoon. Indeed, relationships with SGIC were not a whole lot better. I think the report that came down from the Economic and Finance Committee made that pretty clear as well. I understand that the State Bank had a very good party on the day after the election. I have been shown—but I do not have it in my possession yet—a guest list. On that list was a very large number of Liberal members of Parliament. It was supposedly for an anniversary of the State Bank. Well, the Premier was not invited and the Deputy Premier was not invited, but a number of members of the Liberal Party were, and they had a very good celebration on that Sunday.

At the end of the day, as the then Treasurer said, what happened in the State Bank was that it was one bunch of Liberals handing over a lot of money to another bunch of Liberals. I have made my views on SGIC quite public. We were not able to debate too much of the report that came down concerning SGIC, and there are curious wage fixing policies in that organisation, but again I find little or no benefit for any of my electors in the public ownership of SGIC, except in the compulsory third party arena. I will leave that matter for another debate.

I would like to discuss a number of issues this afternoon, one, of course, being the technopolis or whatever it is going to be called now. We all knew it affectionately as the multifunction polis. I am absolutely puzzled by the way things have developed here, not over the last month or two but, indeed, over the past three or so years since the project was won by South Australia. I always thought that it was going to be an extremely difficult project to sell because very few people understood what was really going on. I was one of those people who really did not understand what was going on and I had a number of briefings, and I am not much wiser today.

One of the briefings I attended was conducted by the multifunction polis people and was held on the floor below Dazzleland in the Myer Remm centre. You, yourself, Sir, were part of that particular exercise, and we had some two hours there looking at lovely coloured drawings, and so on. We were told how wonderful were the houses that would be built down at Gillman; the bricks would be made of cement and excrement, and the people would be encouraged to drink their waste water.

I sat there when the committee went away to have a look at the figures—to look at the books, if I remember correctly what you said at the time. We had arguably one of the best morning teas and, in fact, the only one in Economic and Finance that we did not pay for. The briefing was held on 11 November because I remember we stopped at 11 a.m., as is always my wont, and we looked out and saw the old diggers at the Cross of Sacrifice. I also remember on that day going into the washrooms with one of the members of the committee—not a member on my side of politics, but I will name him if he wishes—who said that we would have awful problems with this Gillman project. I asked him what he meant, although I could see them straight away—it was a case like that of the Emperor's new clothes, but I was curious as to what he saw were the problems. He said, 'How will we keep our Housing Trust tenants happy when they see how wonderful all these developments are going to be down at Gillman?' I said that I thought people were really going to be in a hurry to live in excremental brick houses and drink their own waste waters, to which he said, 'I've been had.' I said, 'You've been had.'

We listened to the rest of the briefing, went down in the elevator, got in a bus and were taken around the Gillman site; we came back, and in the end the then leader of the project said he would see us in six months time, to which I replied, 'No, we will be back in two weeks to have a look at the books.' When we looked at the books it was overwhelmingly clear in the report that we made to this House that, indeed, nothing had happened down at Gillman. I am yet to be made aware of anything happening down there. I represented the Minister for Housing and Urban Development at a function in the Adelaide Town Hall, I think some time in October last year, where I saw a presentation on the multifunction polis and how there would be a light rail from Adelaide, where no-one lived, going down to Gillman, where no-one worked or lived, and then coming back again the same way, which theoretically would cost only \$.5 billion. I was absolutely staggered by this particular project.

So, I look forward with a great deal of interest to see how this Government is going to deal with it. I have some reservations about the multifunction polis, as members may have discovered this afternoon. I think I generally deserve the reputation that I received from a Federal Minister who suggested that my imagination does not go much further than where to put the rubbish bins, the roads and a few things like that; I know not to put them down in Gillman unless the Federal Government and the State Government are prepared to put about \$400 million or \$500 million into that project each year, and not the sort of funds that right now would not build any more than about 15 kilometres of a half-way respectable road in anyone's electorate.

**Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth):** In this Address in Reply debate this afternoon I would like to make a brief contribution on a without prejudice basis, Mr Speaker. There is some possibility that events tomorrow morning may result in a

situation where I will not be in a position to return to this place. It is not for me to pre-empt that decision, and certainly I have no intention of doing that, but on the other hand if, in fact, it goes that way then I will not be in a position to return to this place on Tuesday because, of course, by then I would have lodged a nomination for the Federal electorate of Bonython and therefore would no longer be eligible, having resigned from this place. So, there is a possibility, Mr Speaker, that you may see me back on Tuesday; I am not yet certain but we will see what tomorrow morning brings.

In the event that that is the case, I would not want to leave the service of this House without having placed on the record my appreciation of the work not only of my colleagues, and I include people on both sides of the House in that remark, but also of the staff of this place with whom I have had the opportunity and the honour to work over the past 10 years. Indeed, I have been quite fortunate in this place to have served in the parliamentary context as Deputy Speaker and as a member of some of the parliamentary committees, and also, of course, as a member of the executive Government as the Minister of Health in the former Government.

In both those contexts I have worked with a very large number of people, not only in this House and on the staff of this House and this Parliament but also on the staff of the Public Service of South Australia and, in particular, in the Health Commission, the Department for Family and Community Services and in the Office of the Commissioner for the Aged. In all of those positions I have enjoyed very substantial cooperation and support from some very professional people. I would include in that, of course, the table officers here, the members of *Hansard*, catering staff, the attendants and staff members right throughout the employ of this place who always serve members here without regard to their political affiliation and in a very professional capacity.

One has to take a long-term view in this place, Mr Speaker, as I am sure you would know, and indeed a number of the projects that I have worked on over the years have illustrated that very well. It took me about four years to get the postal system changed so that we had postal cards with the local post office; and, instead of bringing mail from the country down into the House only to see it shipped back again, we were able to take advantage of some more modern technology than that. I also had some involvement in the introduction of technology into the *Hansard* system, for example, and over a long period we have worked with the staff, with State Print and with members to ensure that not only could costs be saved but also the staff could enjoy the production of their documents through modern technology, and members could enjoy a much better production much earlier.

Indeed, I have also been associated with the introduction of a more modern committee system into this place, the value of which members such as my colleague the member for Playford have given some indication, and I think all members are coming to an appreciation that the Parliament must indeed play a strong and effective role in holding the executive Government of the day accountable and that the only way we can do that in this context, in the 1990s, is through a strong and effective committee system. I am pleased that the new Government is continuing with that; indeed, it is expanding it.

I would also like to comment briefly on a couple of the other measures with which I have been involved and which also illustrate the benefit of committee work in this place. One of the most significant achievements, and the one of

which I am probably most proud, is the juvenile justice reforms enacted in this place. They were a very substantial product of a bipartisan approach to the committee system, and while, of course, it was the former Government which was in control of the House at that time and which had a substantial say in the drafting of those measures, members on both sides of the House worked quite hard in the committee system to ensure that they were broadly representative of the community's wishes.

**Mr Atkinson:** You're too generous.

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** Indeed, this is an occasion on which one can afford to be generous, as the member for Spence points out. I am sure that in future contributions to the House he will illustrate the correct political perspective on this matter. Another matter that was of some significance was the self-defence select committee, which took evidence from the community.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** Indeed, we did get it past certain people in the Upper House, certain lawyers, who shall be nameless. However, the reality was that that was a substantial improvement to the law, arising, again, out of a select committee of this place, and I was pleased to be able to play a role in that. I also served on the electoral reform select committee of this House, and played a very interesting role in that debate. Not all my colleagues agreed with the role that I played at that time, but at the end of the day we saw some improvements to electoral reform. We have further improvements to make, and I note that my colleague the member for Playford has already drawn attention this afternoon to some of the improvements we need to make in that area. While he and I might disagree on the basis of some of them, I think the ratios need attention, and he has drawn attention to that matter.

While I had the opportunity over the 18 months that I was Minister in the area of health to introduce a number of Bills in this place, two which stand out in my mind and in the minds of my colleagues are the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Bill—

**The Hon. S.J. Baker:** It's still there.

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** It is still not through. The House of Assembly endorsed that measure by a substantial margin. Indeed, it enjoyed strong support but, as the Deputy Premier

points out, it bogged down in another place. In spite of extending the time for consideration, our colleagues in another place were not able to reach agreement on that measure. I am heartened to hear that the new Minister for Health is equally supportive of the measure and intends to reintroduce it in this place. I hope that he does so soon, because with just under four years left the Legislative Council may have just enough time to consider it and put it into law.

The other matter in which I took a strong interest in a health sense during my time here was, of course, the issue of smoking. Together with a number of other members of this place, I was able to ensure on a bipartisan basis that we progressively limited the areas of this building in which smoking was permitted, thus setting a good example to the community and employers. Another measure, which I think was particularly important, enabled the Parliament to increase the age for the purchase of cigarettes from 16 to 18 and to substantially increase the penalties for those who sold cigarettes to under-age smokers, therefore hopefully obviating the substantial health problems which can flow from smoking in later years.

That is a brief summary of some of the issues with which I have been involved over the years. If it is the case that I am not to return here but am to move on to other areas of public service, I would like to ensure that the record reflects the appreciation I feel for officers of this place. Nearly 10 years of service in this House has allowed me to work with a number of people, particularly with my colleagues on this side of the House but also at times, particularly in the health area, with other members of the House, to ensure that the environment of this State is to some extent improved. We are all just one member of a substantial team, and any individual contribution is only a small thing in the totality of events. No one member alone can influence events to that extent, but we can all push them in a certain direction. If it is to be the case that I do not return, I hope that history will reflect that I nudged events in certain directions in certain areas to the benefit of the people of this State.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 22 February at 2 p.m.