

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 24 February 1994

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

## SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The **SPEAKER**: The Standing Orders Committee is considering proposals for the conduct of private members' business for the rest of the session. For today I think it appropriate to deal with the few items on the Notice Paper in accordance with the principles of the Sessional Orders of the last Parliament, unless any member has any objection.

## LOTTERY AND GAMING (TWO-UP ON ANZAC DAY) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr **ATKINSON (Spence)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act 1936. Read a first time.

Mr **ATKINSON**: I move:

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

Two-up is a game of chance. It is played with two coins, preferably pennies, and a small flat piece of wood called a kip. Each coin should have a heads side and a tails side. My two-up set has two 1922 pennies—incidentally, the year of my mother's nativity; I hope she will forgive me for mentioning that—with the words 'Commonwealth of Australia, One Penny' on the tails side and a profile of Mr George Windsor on the heads side.

Mr **Quirke**: George junior or George senior?

Mr **ATKINSON**: Senior. The object of the game is to toss the two coins into the air and to have both land on the heads side. I have blackened the tails side of both my pennies to help my fellow punters identify the outcome although, Mr Speaker, it is permissible to polish the heads side to achieve the same effect. A two-up game is run by a boxer or croupier. The players assemble around what is known as the ring or the pit. In each round of the game one person is the spinner, that is, the person who tosses the coins. Bettors take it in turns to be the spinner. The spinner aims to throw two heads. The bettors hope that he throws two tails or five odds in a row. Bettors wager their money by placing it on the ground in front of them in the ring. All bets having been placed, the boxer calls 'Come in, spinner.'

The spinner steps into the ring and places two coins on the kip, one heads up and one tails up. One head and one tail is a no throw, and the spinner continues until he gets a result. Five no throws or odds and the spinner loses. If the spinner throws two heads he wins: if he throws two tails he pays out to those who have wagered at even money. There are, of course, side bets with some bettors choosing to bet heads and other bettors wager on tails without the involvement of the spinner. After a result the kip passes clockwise to the next player around the ring. During the game one person is posted as a lookout to warn of the approach of strangers or the police, and this person is called the cockatoo.

The virtue of Anzac Day two-up is that true odds are offered. True odds are on offer because there should be no deduction on Anzac Day. When you and I, Mr Speaker, bet on the races with the tote, the Totalisator Agency Board takes 14 per cent of the pool before paying out to the winners.

The bookies set their odds so that the percentage chances of each runner add up to 114 per cent or more. The bookies have to pay staff, turnover tax and put bread on the table for the missus and the kids. I dread to think how big the deductions are on poker machines at the Casino or for the lotto, the pools, club keno and instant money. Two-up players on Anzac Day bet against each other with no banker, no pool, no deductions and no overheads. I should add that in some of the long-standing schools which prevailed on days other than Anzac Day it was common for the boxer to take a deduction—that deduction on winnings or bets might be anything from two shillings to four shillings in the pound.

Other jargon terms that I should bring to the attention of the House include: 'ringie' for a boxer or ring-keeper; 'alley-clerk', a man who arranges bets for inexperienced players; 'alley loafer', an impecunious man who is not allowed to take a seat at the ring; 'sleeper-catcher', one who picks up bets that have been left on the floor too long; 'head', a professional gambler; and 'mug', an inexperienced player. Also, a double headed penny is a 'nob' and a double-tailed one is a 'grey'.

Australians have been playing two-up since 1794 and most likely earlier. It is said the game is derived from pitch and toss played at Newgate Prison in London. One of the first two-up schools was at Circular Quay in Sydney; Central Railway Station has been home to more than one school. Two-up was commonly played by Australian troops in both World Wars. During the Great War it is said that a Turkish airman refrained from dropping a bomb on diggers in an exposed two-up school because he thought it sacrilege to attack what was obviously a religious gathering.

The Kalgoorlie school, one of the two best-known schools, closed once a fortnight on payday to give each miner's wife a fair crack at her husband's wages before play resumed. Tommo's school in Sydney suffered many raids by the police and became a floating school. At one time schools run by the Tommo organisation had up to 30 permanent employees who drew at least £600 a week in wages. During one raid by the police on the day of King George's death, 150 people were arrested, including Tommo. The next day the beak asked Tommo if he had no respect for the late King. Tommo informed the court that before play had commenced the previous day he had ordered two minutes silence in memory of the departed Sovereign.

Mr Speaker, the Bill would permit two-up to be played on Anzac Day. It exempts from the definition of 'common gaming house' in the Lottery and Gaming Act 1936 any hotel or Returned Servicemen's League club that hosts a two-up game on Anzac Day. The Bill legalises only those schools at which no deduction is made and no admission charged. The Bill preserves the principle of true odds. It is my opinion that Anzac Day, not Australia Day, is our real national day. Anzac Day commemorates blood sacrifice, the making of a nation on the battlefield. Anzac Day goes deeper in our emotions than Australia Day.

When separatist feminists were trying to disrupt the Anzac march and religious commemoration in the early 1980s on the spurious ground of protesting against rape in war, I rediscovered the Anzac march. I had gone to the march as a child to watch my father march with the Royal Navy, or with my Uncle Peter in the Royal Marines, but, alas, dad had dropped out when mum joined the Campaign for Peace in Vietnam. I think I have been to the last six or seven marches straight, enjoyed the bands, sung 'Eternal Father Strong to Save' at the Cross of Sacrifice and then sauntered over to the football at

Adelaide Oval with the bells of St Peter's Cathedral in the background. Now mum comes too. This year I hope to take my children and explain the contingents in the march to them, especially the more exotic units such as the Maquis, the Arctic Convoys, the Chetniks, the Polish Home Army and the Army of the Republic of Vietnam (always the best dressed contingent). The historian Ken Inglis in the book *Gambling in Australia* writes:

The returned soldiers' tradition of two-up survives, especially in Sydney, in games played on Anzac Day, its players saying, I suppose, that they own 25 April, that it is their day, and that they can affirm their ownership by symbolic law-breaking.

My only doubt about this Bill is that by legalising two-up on Anzac Day we may spoil the spirit of unlawfulness that gives the game its zest—I hope not.

It is my intention that the Bill encourage the game and introduce it to a new generation that has never served its country in battle. I commend the Bill to the House and wish it a speedy passage so that it might be law by 25 April this year. Assuming the Government takes the adjournment on the Bill, I invite members and staff to join me later in the day for a school at a place to be determined.

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

### MEDICARE

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I move:

That this House deplores the terms of the Medicare agreement with the Commonwealth Government signed by the previous Minister of Health, in particular, the requirement that the public/private ratio in public hospitals be maintained at the 1991 level and, noting with satisfaction the moves now made by the present Minister to alleviate such problems as long waiting lists, this House urges the Minister to negotiate with the Federal Government to ensure terms more in line with the reality of what the people of South Australia, and especially those in country areas, require of their hospital system.

This motion is largely self-explanatory. I am sure that most members would have been absolutely aghast when the previous Minister signed this agreement.

When this agreement first came to light, it was yet another example of the then Government's apparent anxiety to sell this State's very birthright, with its effect of severely limiting the freedom of many hospitals, especially country hospitals, to operate according to the best interests of their patients and their community. The previous Government negotiated secretly and apparently with no consultation. This agreement could have had the effect of denying many country people the right to treatment in their local hospital.

Other State Governments, as we all know, got a much better deal from the Federal Minister by hanging off and waiting until the last minute. As we have seen since 11 December, so often the previous Government did not hang in there in the best interests of South Australia and, as a result, we got the worst end of the stick. After the event, the South Australian Health Commission advised many country hospitals that the bed day ratio was not negotiable. They were also told that they could incur a penalty of \$405 per bed per day if their ratio got out of kilter, if they exceeded their private occupied bed days or if they failed to achieve their public occupied bed days while the ratio was exceeded.

No hospital, let alone a country hospital, can afford to pay that sort of penalty. Complying with these ratios could have cost larger regional hospitals in excess of \$750 000. It was common to see calculations of about \$1 million for some of our larger regional country hospitals. Even a small 20-bed hospital could have been faced with a cost of \$100 000 or

more. It was some months after the agreement was signed that people suddenly realised what had happened. They realised what the previous Minister of Health had done and the parlous problem they now faced. The hospitals did not know who would come around or when they would come around to collect the penalty. To my knowledge, nobody has been around to collect it, and I hope they never do.

On current admission patterns, all hospitals in my electorate would be above the ratio, unless some action is taken. The big question is: was it intended that privately insured people would be refused admission to a hospital if the ratio was exceeded? I have not had an answer to that question from anybody at any time. If a privately insured patient applied for admission to a country hospital, I just cannot believe that they would be told, 'We are sorry but we are already over our ratio; we already have too many private patients in this hospital, so we cannot admit you'.

I just cannot believe that any Minister of the Crown, particularly the former Minister of Health, who is no longer with us because he has resigned, could sign this agreement without thinking the whole thing through. I cannot imagine what benefits to the community those who signed this agreement expected. In country areas, there certainly would be none. People in the country are already conscious of their limited health care options, and most are privately insured because of it. Because of that, I welcome the casemix program announced by the new Minister, and I am confident it will go a long way towards alleviating the health care inequities that all people in South Australia, especially country people, have had to suffer, because our system was in a mess.

The Liberal Government has inherited an absolute health mess. I do not think the health system in South Australia has been in a worse state across the whole gamut in modern times. It was revealed this morning that South Australia has the highest fall-off of private health care insurance of any State of Australia, and that has made the problem even worse. The public health system in this State is completely overloaded, whilst we have untapped potential in the private system. I have always believed that we must give people an incentive to be privately insured, and that must be via a tax benefit. We have to have both systems, because we are not geared up to run a completely public health system.

Finally, I urge the House to support this motion. I am confident it will pass, with support from both sides, because I know that members of the Opposition could not believe this situation when it was revealed. Right through the election campaign, there was not a single more important issue in my electorate, and the Government of the day could not counter it. It was certainly an embarrassment to all Labor MPs, particularly in rural areas, and more particularly in Frome. My colleague the member for Frome raised this question several times. Neither he nor I received a satisfactory answer from the candidate, the Minister or the Government. It is now time to solve this problem, and I urge the House to support the motion.

**Mr De LAINE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### CRAIGBURN FARM

**Mr EVANS (Davenport):** I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should acquire all of Craighburn Farm except for any portion which Minda Inc. wish to retain for their ongoing operations.

I am aware, as are other members of the House, that there is a lot on record about Craighburn Farm. There are further points that I wish to add to the argument. Some people would argue that the development of Craighburn Farm should go ahead because, according to the various authorities, it is outside the water catchment area, the Hills face zone and the bushfire prone area. However, members should also note that that description also fits the Parklands and the land surrounding the Waite Institute and Urrbrae College. I accept that some of those lands have been donated in trust for specific uses, but the point I make is that the breathing or open space aspect of those lands to those communities is no different from the open space nature of the Craighburn land to the Blackwood district community. We could imagine the outcry if someone proposed to develop the open space land in the city.

Concerns have previously been raised about pollution, and I need not expand on those concerns in this debate other than to say it is unusual that the Patawalonga catchment authority should be set up at the same time as 1 300 homes are developed on the Sturt Creek—before the catchment authority really has a chance to examine what damage the proposed development might do.

Members may not be aware that at this stage no environmental impact study has been done on the proposed development. The community believes that, if the development proceeds, there will be a significant loss of amenity in the area. Its belief is that sites as small as 300 square metres are being proposed and that this is simply not suitable for the environment of the Hills: 300 square metres is about the area needed for a tennis court, and the community does not believe that the allotments are in keeping with the larger allotments that were created when the area was settled over 100 years ago.

A number of concerns have been raised by the community regarding the proposed development, one being stormwater disposal. As I understand it, stormwater disposal will be done through a detention basin and wetlands system. This does not form part of the official application. Given the history of Craighburn Farm and the number of promises that have been made and broken, the community believes that the council and the Government need to tread carefully in the treatment of stormwater disposal. The development is a staged development. If each stage of the development is developed by a different developer, which part of the stormwater disposal does each developer carry out? If one stage is built and another is not, what happens to the stormwater disposal system?

One other concern that was raised regarding the stormwater disposal system is the capacity for dams to hold the water. Mitcham Hills is one of the highest rainfall areas in the district and the amount of water that will flow into the dam will be significant. If it floods, it will flood into the Sturt Creek and into the Patawalonga.

Another concern is that the then Minister (Hon. Greg Crafte) announced some 1 600 development sites on two stages. Proposed stage 1 involves 597 sites. At this juncture, stage 2 has yet to be designed. If stage 1 has 597 sites, that leaves the potential for 1 000 sites in stage 2. The community is fearful that, if the Government does not take up its option to purchase the land in 1999, stage 2, which is a smaller block of land, may end up having 1 000 development sites on it and not 600. That would certainly be unsuitable development in the Hills. Members need to be aware—and I will go to some length to explain—that at this stage the Government has an

option under the indenture agreement to buy stage 2 in 1999. If the Government does not take up that option to buy the land as open space in 1999, I understand that it automatically reverts to housing. The community is naturally fearful of this. If the Government does not buy stage 1 land now for approximately \$15 million, stage 1 will be developed into a significant estate. When stage 2 comes up in 1999, there is a chance that the Government will say, because that land is next to a significant estate, that stage 2 land is worth considerably more than is estimated now and, therefore, it cannot afford to buy stage 2; stage 2 will then also go to housing. Given the history of Craighburn and the number of times that Governments of the day have made promises and then broken them, you can naturally understand the community's fear that that may happen.

The council has rejected the development on 11 grounds: stormwater, bushfire, landscaping, native vegetation protection, enhancement to existing environment, road access and many others. I may deal with those at another time. Some things are clear—what the community will not get from this development. It is on record that, according to the department, public transport will not be extended; and it is on record that, according to the department, roads will not be improved. I have no commitments yet regarding extra policing for the district. We have a station, but we have no police. That is not the fault of the police themselves but rather a funding problem, which the Government needs to address. I appreciate the fact that the Minister is looking into that on behalf of the district.

It is of real concern to me that, according to the Education Department, there is no need for new schools. In its report to the Planning Commission on Craighburn Farm, the Education Department stated that the Blackwood, Craighburn and Coromandel Valley primary schools and the Blackwood High School had the capacity to take up the population in the development. I rang those schools yesterday, and it may interest the House to know that the Blackwood Primary School currently has 435 students and no vacancies at all; the Coromandel Valley Primary School thought I was ringing to offer it more space, because it has 500 students and has zoned the intake area to limit the number of students. I understand that that school will approach the Minister for Education in an attempt to make the zone smaller, because the school is growing at such a rate that it simply does not have the room. That school wants to stop the growth.

The Craighburn Primary School has about 60 spaces, but members need to understand that the Craighburn Primary School is situated on a route of traffic movement away from the city. The natural traffic movement from the development of Craighburn Farm would be towards the city, but Craighburn Primary School is the other side of the farm, so it is unlikely that people would travel to Craighburn Primary School but, even if they did, it has only 60 spaces.

Blackwood High School has only 15 vacancies in year 10, 15 in year 11, and three in year 12, and then only if children are interested in French or home economics. So I can only assume that Craighburn Farm will be a development targeted at DINKS (Double Income No Kids) families or families who have 15 year olds who want to be French chefs. The department believes that children from the Craighburn Farm development will not attend Belair Primary School, but that is unbelievable because Belair Primary School is the only school on the main road between Craighburn Farm and Adelaide. It is only natural that people will get into their cars, drive to Adelaide and drop their kids off at Belair Primary

School. The Belair Primary School is very full at the moment and is in the process of collocating.

So the community gets no schools, no police, no public transport and no roads, but it does get the associated infrastructure problems. The development basically contributes nothing to the community, other than more houses and more people. As a local business person (I run a business in Blackwood), I understand that some of the businesses would support the idea of more people, but that has to be weighed up against the long-term effects on the community and the district.

Minda has always said that it would sell the land if the price was right. It is on public record that Minda wrote to the council and put a value of around \$15 million on stage 1, and senior officials in the department have received notification in writing of that value. So, the department is well aware that the value of stage 1 is \$15 million. Minda also wrote to the then member for Davenport in 1992 advising that the value of Craighburn Farm was anywhere between \$21 million and \$25 million, thus we know from that that the value of stage 2 is approximately \$10 million. I am not suggesting in this motion that we have to pay \$15 million or \$25 million today. We can negotiate with Minda to pay, say, \$1.5 million or \$2 million a year over a period of time. We can negotiate the purchase conditions, but I do believe this Government should purchase the farm.

There are many uses to which the farm could be put. This motion does not propose that the farm should remain as totally open space. I recognise that, for that sort of investment on behalf of the State, there may need to be some compromise by the community. Maybe there is a use for the grounds in regard to sports facilities. The Blackwood Football Club, the Blackwood Bowling Club, the Blackwood Recreation Centre and the local baseball, netball and tennis clubs all require more sporting facilities. Interested parties have been looking at Craighburn Farm in regard to establishing a wildlife sanctuary not dissimilar to Warrawong, and there have been suggestions about establishing a conservation park there not dissimilar to Cleland. When you consider that it is only 25 minutes from Adelaide, you can see the tourism benefits of such a development so close to the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The community understands that the Government and Minda currently have an indenture, the exact nature of which I am uncertain because I have yet to see the document. However, there is no doubt that this is yet another mess that has been left to us by the Labor Government—one that is not dissimilar to the Hindmarsh bridge or some of the employment contracts.

We need to be aware that the present Government made press releases in 1992 committing itself to buying Craighburn Farm and that it did so knowing full well that the State had financial problems. It may not have known the extent of those problems, but in 1992 the whole State was aware that the State Bank, SGIC and other institutions were causing this State severe financial problems. So, this Government made commitments on its own behalf in that full knowledge.

The purchase of this land is no different in my view from the purchase of Belair National Park in 1880 to 1890, when it was proposed to sell the park to fund the State out of debt. The *Advertiser* in an editorial ran a 10-year campaign to ensure that the Belair National Park was not sold but held in trust by the Government for future use. The use to which it is intended to put Craighburn Farm now is no different from the purchase of the Belair National Park. We do have

financial problems but, if we purchase the farm now, in 100 years time the community will thank us for it.

The community and I wish to place on record our appreciation of the great work that Minda does. In every discussion on Craighburn, the community and all politicians have always congratulated Minda on its outstanding efforts in the care and development of its clients. We have always said that Minda should receive full and fair financial compensation for the land, and we have always believed that Minda should be not disadvantaged but fully compensated.

I trust that members will take up the point made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday when he talked about accountability in Government. There is no doubt about the commitment made by this Government as regards Craighburn Farm—it is on public record—or that the public is calling for greater accountability not only from individual politicians but also from Governments *per se*. Governments in Australia and other parts of the world cannot keep on going down the track of making promises one day only to break them the next. The community will not wear it. So, I call on the Government—maybe naively—to honour the commitment it made on behalf of the community regarding Craighburn Farm.

The future of Craighburn Farm now rests with this House and this Government. As the local member, I will continue to fight for what has been promised over a 22 year period by Governments and Premiers of all persuasions. Like every single local member before me, I will continue to represent the wishes of my community on this matter, and that is to keep as much of Craighburn Farm as possible as open space. I ask members to support the motion.

**Mr De LAINE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 23 February. Page 249.)

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):** In rising to speak to this Bill, I want to make a number of points about the principle of Supply Bill legislation, the content of the Bill before us and related matters of Commonwealth-State relations, which of course are very relevant at the moment because of the Council of Australian Government meeting that will take place tomorrow.

At the outset, I must say that I understand that this Bill will take Supply through to 30 June 1995. I anticipate that that means that we will not have the need for a further Supply Bill in August of this year. For many years, the practice has been to have two Supply Bills per year. That practice eventually became difficult to change because it seemed as though members would be denied the opportunity to debate budgetary matters if one of those debates was removed. However, it is common sense to reduce the situation to one Supply Bill a year and, if this Bill aims to do that, I certainly believe that it is a good move. The Parliament can deal with many other matters; there are many opportunities for grievance debates and members have lots of time to put before the House their views on assorted matters.

As to the Bill itself, a number of matters seem quite reasonable. The actual financial allocation cannot be argued with too much at this time, because we do not know what the Government's intentions are on the breakdown of the detail of the spending of that amount. This is just an enabling Bill to allow moneys to be there to be spent for Government

purposes. As I said yesterday in my Address in Reply speech, we have many questions about how the Government intends to fund the number of commitments it has already made to this point, because it has been spending money lavishly since the last election.

From our knowledge of the accounts, which we made well and truly public, last year's budget was well framed and did not provide lots of opportunity for heavy spending initiatives. Indeed, that was one of the reasons why the general policies that were put by my Party before the last election could not be termed high spending policies. It was not a case of bringing out a cheque book to try to buy the support of the electorate. We believed that that would have been an irresponsible thing to do; we felt that it could not be sustained alongside the debt and deficit reduction strategies that my Treasurer and I had announced.

Yet here we see that a high spending approach has followed in both pre-election promises and in some post-election activities by the Government. The detail of that will be called to account in due course when the budget that is in place comes in, when the Treasurer brings down his statement in May, I understand, and also later in the calendar year.

Some details outlined in the Treasurer's second reading speech propose ways of dealing with some of the matters of financial importance to the State. For example, there is the issue of the Asset Management Task Force, which certainly sounds interesting in regard to the tasks that are set for it. I remind members that it has the job of identifying surplus lands and related assets and developing a strategy for their disposal, of identifying and advising on the issues to be covered in the corporatisation and sale of Government bodies, and of identifying and recommending action to rectify deficiencies in the recording of all major assets of Government.

I will come to that major issue of existing assets in Government in a moment. A number of issues that need to be addressed were being addressed over the years, but it is an issue that warrants the attention of both sides of the House. As to the identifying of surplus land and related assets, before the last election we realised that not a vast array of land assets would be available for sale, partly because there had already been some significant sales of land related assets over recent years, and because it depends on what one's definition is of an asset that is actually available for sale.

Certainly, there are many land related assets in Government ownership, but they have schools, hospitals and Housing Trust houses on them. Before the last election we expressed concern about their being taken out (and I presume it is a reasonable thing to take them all out), because we certainly do not support the sale of schools that are ongoing as schools, the sale of hospitals that are ongoing as hospitals or the sale of Housing Trust houses that have Housing Trust tenants in them—unless it is part of the program whereby the tenant enters into a purchase agreement with the Trust, and of course that has been going on quite successfully for some years. There is not much surplus land left available for sale if one takes out those land assets I have mentioned, and that is why we raised before the election the very real query about whether or not the spectre of Housing Trust sales was going to go beyond the voluntary system that presently applies with tenants being able to buy the houses that they live in.

I hope that the Treasurer will, of his own volition, make as much information available to the Parliament as possible on the work of the Asset Management Task Force. I hope that he will see it as in the interests of good government and the

good operations of Parliament that, as the task force identifies the objectives laid out in the second reading speech, it is appropriate for members of Parliament to be told as much of that as possible. I hope he does that of his own volition; if he does not, we will be asking questions through all the fora available to us, including Question Time and the Estimates Committee process, which will occur later in the year.

There is much rhetoric about asset management and the sale of other assets but the actual track record of the Liberal Party to date has not been particularly promising. I say that in the sense that it has not been particularly good at supporting processes that would give the best possible return to South Australians. I identified yesterday, as I have on other occasions, that the process the Liberal Party wanted to put in place for the sale of the Government shareholding in SAGASCO would have resulted in a major loss compared to alternative ways of selling. Fortunately, the Liberal Party was not in Government at the time and therefore it was not able to put that into effect, so the taxpayers of this State gained \$100 million extra benefit on that sale.

Presently, we are going through the process of sale of the State Bank and we will debate that at great length when that legislation comes before the House. I make the point again that the processes the Liberal Party announced it supported, by all reports of financial analysts, would have been costly in the sense that they would not have produced the benefit for South Australians that would otherwise have been gained by the processes we had put in place. So, although the rhetoric sounds very good, because of the statements made by the now Government both while it has been in Government and also prior to that when it was in Opposition, I think many questions must still be asked and much more detail must be required of the Government before we can feel happy that it knows what it is doing in this regard. I make a passing reference to the Pipelines Authority of South Australia and the very confused answers that the Treasurer has given on this matter where he has said a number of different things. He clearly does not know the actual situation that applies.

I support further development in the area of the maintenance of assets and the asset registers. It is important that we have proper accountability of the assets of the State and that we have a proper assessment of how those assets are going in terms of their functioning capacity and in terms of their general level of maintenance. I note that a set of policy objectives has been laid out to ensure that the capital works programs and asset management practices of the Government are closely attuned to Government priorities; that there will be the objective to minimise the costs of providing, maintaining and operating capital assets to support service delivery of agreed standards; and that there will be a basis for a new asset management culture in the public sector. All those goals sound quite laudable. There is the possibility of some hidden agenda in a couple of places there, but I will deal with that in a moment.

As a Government, the Labor Party was certainly making significant inroads into all of those areas. For example, we had looked at new ways of providing schools. The old way of providing school buildings in the 1960s and 1970s clearly had not worked as it left us with surplus assets in a number of areas after enrolment decline had set in in certain suburbs; assets that were not able to get the best possible return; assets that were ageing altogether and providing a major maintenance problem for the budget. In the 1980s we were changing a lot of that and I believe that, when we look forward to the rest of this decade and into the next decade, in particular,

when the assets built in the 1980s reach the same age as those of the 1960s and 1970s have in recent years, we will see a much lower impact on the budget from the maintenance requirements of those buildings, and that is because a lot of work was carried out on design principles.

A lot of work was also done on ensuring that, where we were able to predict with reasonable certainty what enrolment patterns might be and where we were able to anticipate with reasonable accuracy that there would be a falling off to a lower level of enrolment after a period of time, certain schools were built that took account of that by having some of their infrastructure built in forms that will be more easily saleable in years to come. I refer to Aberfoyle Park Primary School, where some of those buildings can be sold later for retirement accommodation. I refer to Parafield Gardens North West Primary School, where some of the expanded capacity is built in the form of units that can be sold as duplex houses later on.

I think they are the kinds of initiatives on which a lot of work can be done, but I put on the record what has happened to date. The use of Ribloc materials, invented here in South Australia, are now being licensed all over the world. We are seeing the benefits of that, for example, in the replacement of sewerage mains. I hope we see more of that kind of thing and that the Government will allow more of that to happen in the future.

We come then to an area that is of major concern to me. I note that the Government states that a critical and closely related aspect of restoring the State's financial well-being is to ensure that the provision and operation of infrastructure and the delivery of services to the community at acceptable standards is achieved for the lowest possible cost. The Treasurer went on to talk about schools, prisons, hospitals and water treatment works being involved in that. It is this talk about the lowest possible cost—for the provision of a service in schools, for example—that is of major concern to me. He mentions that it is imperative that private sector involvement be invited, encouraged and nurtured in the development and operation of new infrastructure items such as schools. Does that mean that they are to be invited to build the schools and then to operate the schools? What is being talked about?

The Minister at the front bench laughs at that, but if he were to read the Treasurer's second reading explanation he would see that this speech is quite clearly related not just to capital costs but also to recurrent costs—the operating costs of such facilities. I know the Government has a policy on this matter with respect to prisons; that has been on the public record. We did not know that it had such a policy with respect to schools, yet schools appear in a number of paragraphs in the Treasurer's second reading speech. It is true that we see cheaper operation costs in many private schools. They have larger class sizes and poorer staffing generally than applies in Government schools, so it is true that one can say they can do it more cheaply.

I would be very concerned if we were to see that system then applied in the Government sector, or to say that because it can be done more cheaply we believe we will still get a good quality education system from our Government schools. That will not happen. This will be a ruse for cutting costs in education; it will be a ruse for trying to get around the financial problems the Government has got itself into; but it will be a ruse that will not work with the electorate, as was well known from the efforts in education from 1979 to 1982.

I notice also in the speech that benchmarking is to take place, and again I am concerned as to how this can occur in an area such as education. What are we to choose as the benchmark against which the current performance of schools will be measured? The facts are that, if we were to take the private school benchmark in South Australia, we would find that Government schools in South Australia do spend more. Yet we see what happens in Government schools; a range of other services is provided which are often not provided in private schools at all.

If we then look at interstate schools, we see again that we spend more than the national average. The Grants Commission has found that we do spend about 10 per cent more on services in a range of areas, including education, than other States. Does this mean that we will then take the Grants Commission benchmark as the level to which we want to reduce the cost of education in this State? I do not raise an idle speculation there because the now Premier, before the last election, said as much on the Keith Conlon program on one occasion when he indicated that we spend more on services in this State than the national average. He saw that as inefficiency, as a lack of productivity, and it showed on his part a fundamental lack of understanding of this matter.

Yes, we do spend more on things such as education, but there are two components involved in that, one being the nature of South Australia's geography and demography. We are a large State with a small population. We have a relatively large number of small country schools in isolated communities—certainly much larger than in Victoria, a small State with a relatively large population—and that will cost more. Looking at the *per capita* costs of education in respect of schools throughout the State, one will always find that the country schools have more spent on their students than city schools have, and that is the way it should be, because the costs will be higher.

So that demographic-geographic reason is one of the explanations for the fact that we spend above the national average. But there is another reason and that, quite frankly, simply has been Government policy. There are things that we want out of our education system that other States do not seem to want, and we are prepared to pay for that. I raise one example that is now being picked up by many other States (but I do not think as well as is happening in South Australia)—a policy I myself introduced in 1985, namely, the Languages Other Than English (LOTE) program.

I am proud of the fact that I was the first Minister in Australia to introduce that program as something that would be conducted through all our primary schools within a defined period. It was a 10-year period, and 1995 was to be the finishing year. I know that we are well on schedule for that one—well, I hope that we are still well on schedule; I hope that that program is not being abandoned by the present Government. Up until the election, we were well on schedule to meet the 1995 goal. That cost money. We had to put in extra teachers and extra resources for that to happen. Guess what happens when you do the national accounts? It shows up. That kind of policy area shows up in giving us a higher cost of education.

The only way, therefore, to get us back to the national average, if that is to be the benchmark that the Government intends to use in areas such as education, will be to ignore the geography and demography of the State, which will be painful in terms of the services received by students in country areas, for example, and to disband or undo the policy initiatives that were put in place. I can tell you, Mr Deputy

Speaker, that the parents of this State do not want that to happen. I believe they appreciate that we do have a higher quality education system in this State than that which exists in other parts of the country. While the second reading speech contains some areas of interest, and we look forward to seeing how they develop, many areas of concern are hidden in seemingly innocent phrases.

*The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Well, again, the Minister at the front bench smiles at that, but the Treasurer will have to answer some questions as to how these things will add up. I come back again to the issue of that benchmark in question. In the program performance budgeting area, I am interested to note some of the Treasurer's comments, and I would like to hear more from him on the changes he proposes in this area.

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

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** I support the Bill. I begin my remarks by pointing out how pleased we on this side are to see the way in which the Public Service, the purpose for which this Bill is raised, has recognised and accepted the challenge of the change of Government which occurred 10 weeks ago. It has been incredible to see the Public Service accepting that a new Government is in office and that there is a need for a new culture in its thinking and approach to the delivery of the services provided to South Australians through the respective Government departments. I want to place on public record, as a Government back-bencher, my appreciation and that of other members of that commitment, in the true spirit of the Public Service, by all those thousands of people who work in the public sector to do the bidding of the new Government.

The policy has changed because the people of South Australia have spoken through the ballot box. Those changes have already meant that many things that we were unable to get done before, because the previous Administration had a different mind set, are now being done, much to the joy of South Australians who are the recipients of the services provided by the Public Service, as well as the public servants themselves almost without exception. The only people who have had any difficulty with the change of Government are those who are, dare I say, members of the Labor Party.

As the former Premier said, in a Freudian slip in debate only last week, those public servants who are Labor supporters are the only ones who have been moved out. If a person engaged in the Public Service cannot accept the policy directions determined by the Government, which is ultimately accountable to the people through the ballot box, as part of their mission and the framework through which they deliver those services, they should go and should not need to be told that they are square pegs in round holes. So, as many of those people as necessary have left, although I guess there will still be a few more who decide that they cannot serve this Government and accept the policy direction for which it has a mandate.

We need to look only at the greater confidence in business investment in this State, particularly in the small business sector, as a consequence of the initiatives announced jointly by the Premier and Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development; at the change that has taken place in the administration of the Treasury since the

arrival of this Government; or at the changes that have taken place within the industrial relations and tourism portfolios.

WorkCover now understands its new mission and the way in which it will function. So also does the Department of Labour. We are on the point of introducing changes in relation to whether or not people should be coerced into joining a union, especially in the public sector. The Government does not see itself as a collection agency for other instrumentalities without having them pay a fee for the service, and that includes unions. There is no argument from the union movement on that point. Of course, the member for Ross Smith would well understand that. Indeed, I understand there is no argument from anywhere else but that unrepresentative bunch of opportunists in the other place called the Democrats, who sought political advantage, but who were roundly rejected, at the last election.

Their two front runners are political colts. It is a bit difficult to refer to the former honourable member of the other place (Ian Gilfillan) as a colt in chronological terms. I think 'chronologically enhanced' is the phrase that is politically correct these days. But he is certainly not someone who has run a political race of any great consequence in getting a seat in the Upper House. The people who cannot make up their mind which way to vote Democrat and then go somewhere else, thinking that they have done their bit, without really contributing to any real, clear understanding of the direction society ought to take. They justify doing that in the same way as the people they put in the other place justify doing it.

The best way to describe any Democrat is: 'There they sit astride the fence, with both ears firmly on the ground.' That is the kind of approach they take to policy. They need to be chastened by the knowledge that not only has the electorate spoken, the Public Service changed its outlook, but the trade union movement itself now accepts the need for these amendments. One has only to look at the work that has been already done in further education to get a shift in emphasis. One can look at corrections, and the way the prison system is responding to the policies that we have introduced.

One can look at the new approach that is to take effect in policing in the wider community, as a quite proper additional arm of the work that is already being undertaken through the bipartisan support for Neighbourhood Watch, where we will now have police back on the beat, as it were. We see the acceptance of that by the police. Indeed, they welcome the opportunity to participate in that way. We can look at the changes that are being made in the National Parks and Wildlife Service as well as in the culture of the Family and Community Services Department; at procedures in the Department of Agriculture; at the need to be focused in the benefits that we produce from the extension services and the research facilities; the bipartisan approach there has been in the establishment of SARDI and now, more particularly, the new direction that that will take with the emphasis properly defined.

More particularly also, for the rural community, we can look at the commitment this Government has given as of 1 January this year to exempt transfers of land between members of the same family (from father to son, as it were, or to daughter, or mother to son or daughter) without the need to pay stamp duty on that or on the other transactions that are really drawing blood from a stone at the present time, namely, the payment of stamp duty on the discharge and re-establishment of a mortgage, where loans have been shifted from one bank that is not prepared to be competitive

with its interest rate to another bank or finance house that is. That is the kind of approach that has been taken by this Government and the public servants whom we seek to supply through this measure.

I find that commendable and say to the House that we have it right, first time. I commend all the Ministers, both here and in the other House, for what they have achieved in gaining that wider understanding. I also commend their advisers and their departments for the way in which they have taken up that challenge. I want also to draw attention to some very real problems that must be addressed through the provision of supply; problems of rural areas, particularly my own electorate. In the first instance, I draw attention to the consequences of economic policies that have adversely impacted on those communities; policy settings that have been made by both the Commonwealth Government and the previous Labor Government.

Therefore, the parlous state in which we find our rural communities is in no way a consequence of anything they have done or failed to do. It is a direct consequence of economic policy settings made by Government. In bringing this problem to the attention of the House, I want to quote from the annual report of Susan Milner, the Murraylands rural councillor, as follows:

The feeling of depression in the Mallee is palpable.

That means that you can feel it, you can hear it, and it is distressing in the extreme at public functions or when you go to a home. The report continues:

Many people are experiencing severe stress burdens. General health is deteriorating. Many allied councillors in the Mallee are unsure how long the people in the region can bear the burden. Many farmers are facing nil income (or negative incomes) and with no support from their financial institutions, they may well starve. With the new guidelines disallowing access to Job Search allowance, because of asset restrictions, and ineligibility of others in accessing Farm Household Support, the outlook for many farming families is exceedingly grim. There is more and more discussion amongst farmers of walking off leaving the debt and the farm with the bank.

Debt is no longer the issue, income or cash to buy provisions is. Banks remain firm with persons seeking sale of their properties, the difficulty being that the land market is inconsistent. Some farmers have had their property listed for over five years with little or no interest, while others have offered their property for sale and sold almost immediately. This has not necessarily been because of the quality of land. All types of land (good and bad) have sold. Some of the sales that the councillor is aware of have occurred between neighbours, with some non-Mallee farmers buying land.

I want to add to that by pointing out from my own contact with the people in those communities that there is a collapsing social framework in the area that I represent, and indeed in all the rain-fed agricultural areas of South Australia which generate an enormous amount of export income for our State's economy, and that income is being derived for this State's benefit by people and their efforts on their farms, taking the risks to do so, who are getting little or no reward. Their families are not just marginally below the so-called Henderson poverty line, they are miles below it, and in some area schools I know that every family in the school (not a family of a public servant such as a teacher) who comes from the non-government sector is entitled to household support, though many of them do not claim it out of pride. In the future, they will have to or starve.

There is an extremely urgent need for us to recognise the rapidly escalating societal problems of rural communities arising from the very depressed economic conditions which they have been suffering over recent years. With most families—75 per cent to 90 per cent—who depend on farming for income having negative incomes from their

enterprises during the last four years or so, they have now reached an equity crisis point if they have not reached it before. They do not have any significant asset base against which to further extend their borrowings to live, let alone continue their farming or other service industry business enterprises in those communities. They are worried; they are stressed; and this situation has been ongoing for all members of the family—from the youngest children through to adolescents to the adult parents and the older members, who in other circumstances would be entitled to retire but who cannot because they are caught in the trap of having the land in their own name and, whilst no income is being derived from it, the asset value precludes them from being able to get a pension. The effect, as I have said, is palpable—their symptoms differ according to their age cohort, but the consequences nonetheless are very serious, and the suicide rate goes largely under reported.

Communities are very stretched; the self esteem of the individual members is very low; and the family decisions, community organisation decisions and the commercial decisions are bad because distress makes a very poor companion for rational judgment. Social indicators are that there is an increase in psychiatric problems. That is illustrated by the increasing marriage breakdown, the family disintegration, and the escalating suicide rates, which, as I have said, go largely under reported. Of course, the psychiatric problems are easily identified when one looks at the changing mix of pharmaceutical goods being sold through rural pharmacies compared to the profile about 10 years ago and compared to that in urban settings. A small group of community leaders urgently needs to tell this Parliament exactly what is going on and how serious the situation is as we go into the opening rains of autumn.

It also worries me that the mouse plague of last year was improperly addressed by the previous Government. The then Minister won a lot of favourable public comment for what he did, but it was too little and too late, and in consequence there was a scatter-shot approach. If you could afford to buy the bait, you could kill off the mice on your property; if you could not afford it, you did not. Neighbours found that, even though they controlled the mice at the time of year when that was most critical to their crop seeding and germination, because their neighbours had not been able to they are now reinfested. The whole area where there was not blanket application of poison now has a rapidly escalating mouse population.

What this Government needs to do, and what the previous Government failed to do, is to provide the bait free, regardless, to everyone to get rid of the ruddy mice before they again put this coming year's export—this coming year's crops for those families—at risk. If we do not do that, we are simply perpetuating the problem.

It is like putting a bandaid on a wound on your right finger when you have gangrene in your left leg. Sooner or later, whilst you may heal the wound on the right finger—or at least cover it and prevent it from further bleeding—you will die, because the gangrene will poison your blood. That is exactly what this mouse plague is doing to the entire Mallee region at this time. It is building up in numbers more thickly in those areas where bait could not be afforded last year, and the mice will again spread right across the area. I presume that it is the same elsewhere in the State. This problem needs to be addressed urgently. I have already had representations made to me not only by local government, agricultural bureaus and the like but also by children in school who do not



want to go through the experience they had last year of sharing their bed with dirty, grotty little mice, not in their tens, dozens or scores but in their hundreds. In some instances people had to rip up their carpets and pitch tents on the floor of their living room to find secure places for their food and so that their children could sleep without being molested by mice.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Ross Smith.

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** In speaking on the Supply Bill, I indicate that I have learnt and heard a great deal from members opposite about what the new Government will do with respect to its debt reduction program. We also heard a lot about that during the recent State election. I have also heard a great deal from members opposite, particularly the new members of Parliament in their maiden speeches, who have referred to the various needs within their electorate where they feel Government should intervene and supply the necessary funds to provide additional services to their electorate. What is not in dispute is that we must have economic growth in this State to pay for not only our existing services but also for an extension of those benefits.

One of the most significant tools in gearing up for economic growth as far as Government policy is concerned will centre around industrial relations, vocational training and education. Unless we get that mix right, it does not matter what else is done in terms of trying to gear up the State for economic growth. Let us examine very briefly the State Government's position on industrial relations. In terms of its policy position, it referred to amending the Industrial Relations Act to provide for greater access to enterprise bargaining—indeed, unlimited access to enterprise bargaining by non-union workplaces—to effectively bring in a form of individual contracts at State level. There is only one reason why a Government would pursue such a policy, and that is to introduce a low wage position for the State's work force.

Overwhelmingly, the State's work force, those covered by State awards, have what is known as 'common rule' awards. Many members opposite may not understand what a 'common rule' award is, and very few would appreciate what a 'minimum rates' award is. A 'minimum rates' award is exactly that: it allows an employer to offer better wages and conditions if they so wish, but they cannot offer pay or give conditions of employment less than that prescribed in a common rule minimum rates award. Those minimum rates awards are not fantastic sums of money.

In my own local newspaper, there was recent publicity about a company that boils chicken feet for export to China. The employees in that company, which looks like going into liquidation, recently obtained a State award rate of about \$10.60 per hour. Prior to their being covered by an award, which was only recently obtained, they were award free. They were in the classic position of being able to negotiate with their employer for a fair rate of pay, and they were not members of a union at the time. They had this perfect negotiating position that the Government believes should exist for these people. Their rate of pay—

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I know that the member for Ross Smith is new to the House, and we have been listening for four minutes, but we are debating the Supply Bill. Following the Supply Bill there is time for all members to make grievances. I do not believe that the member is addressing the Supply Bill. As he is a new member, I ask that you give a ruling on this matter.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member does have a point in that the second reading debate on the Supply Bill is not as wide ranging as the grievance debate that follows. It would be in order if the honourable member addressed the Supply Bill, and I am sure he will do that.

**Mr CLARKE:** If the member for Unley had not interrupted me, in about 30 seconds he would have seen the point behind what I am saying. Those persons enjoyed a flat rate of \$10 an hour, irrespective of the hours they worked, and received no overtime. One of those gentlemen, who is a constituent of mine, worked 36 hours straight for \$10 an hour. As the member for Unley asked in his point of order, what has that got to do with the Supply Bill?

I now turn to that, because I needed to set the backdrop to what the Government wants to introduce here in South Australia—unfettered rights for employers, basically, to do what St Crix Holding did with respect to its workers. I also refer to the impact that would have on the capacity of this State to generate wealth and supply the funds needed to support the various services of this State. I do not know whether the member for Unley reads the *Australian*—it is a Murdoch newspaper, so I am sure it is his natural bedtime reading—but I refer members to a Features article dated Thursday 17 February 1994. The article refers to an interview with a Mr Ray Marshall, who is Professor in Economic and Public Affairs at the University of Texas and who has been sent to Australia by the President of the United States to look at things such as labour relations in Australia and to make recommendations with respect to labour relations in the United States. It is very interesting to note that Mr Marshall summarised his comments about the US system of labour relations and its impact on low productivity, low wages and low value-adding, all of which has been pursued by United States employers under successive Administrations in that country.

The thrust of his article is: why would Australia want to go down the US road? What is there, he asks, about the US system that Australian employers would want except a weak union movement? The basic submission in his article is that Australia has little to learn from the US—rather the reverse—in relation to health care, industrial relations, labour training and so on. He says that in the US processes for industrial relations, labour training and work organisation are the worst in the developed world. His basic submission is that American industry has gone backwards because of its reliance on a low wage, low output policy pursued by American employers.

Indeed, the Secretary of Labour in the United States, Mr Robert Reich, in his book *The Work of Nations*, states that in a world where capital and transnational companies and jobs cross borders with ease, the economic future of any nation depends primarily on the value-adding skills of its work force. That is very true. I do not think any member of this House would have any disagreement with the observations of Mr Reich. Indeed, there is no hope in Australia for economic growth if we believe that we can pursue a low wage outcome, whether it be in any one State or in the nation as a whole, because we can never compete with, in particular, Asian nations to our north, where Government regulations and laws supporting employers make it extremely difficult for free trade unions to operate. Labour rates in some petrochemical plants in Indonesia, for example, are as low as \$7 a week whereas a counterpart worker in Australia receives about \$500 a week. There is no way that we could ever reduce our

wage levels to the low rates that apply in a developing nation such as Indonesia, so we have to discard that notion.

Indeed, the only way we will attract people and industries to this State, is through a high value-added component, and you do not get that unless you have a sound education system and a good State vocational educational training system which works closely with Government, unions and employers to ensure that there is timely delivery of services to its client base. You cannot enthuse a work force to learn new skills, to adapt and to up-skill itself unless there is a financial reward at the end of it. You cannot achieve those gains by simply saying, 'You must have low wage outcomes.' The article is extensive, but it is important that I refer to a number of the points made by Mr Marshall. The article states:

Marshall, a professor in economic and public affairs at the University of Texas, chairs the commission's international working group, which is focusing on European and Australian lessons in labour affairs. 'There are a lot of interesting lessons in Australia', he says. 'We are not going to any country we don't think we can learn anything from on worker-management relationships. We are not going to the United Kingdom, for example.'

The Thatcherite ideologues, and those supported by members opposite—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Ross Smith will resume his seat. The member for Unley has a point of order.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. I am finding this speech quite fascinating, but we have waited for half the speech and I still cannot recognise the relevance to the Supply Bill, and I ask that you rule accordingly.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Unley does have a point. The member for Ross Smith did say that he would return to the matter of Supply, but he seems to be teasing out his argument like a thread of fine silk: it is barely perceptible and his argument is barely audible, as far as Supply is concerned. I would request the honourable member to return to the Supply Bill as soon as he can.

**Mr CLARKE:** The difficulty that members opposite have is this: there is no point debating a Supply Bill if this State cannot generate the wealth, the funds, the basic necessities—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** And, therefore, I am about creating wealth; I am about creating opportunities so that the Supply necessary for the efficient functioning of Government and the provision of services, which all members have referred to, can actually be achieved.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** We have a very large debt problem. The State Government is grappling with those problems and this is part and parcel of my submission, if I can put it that way. It is all very well debating the Supply Bill *per se* but, if one does not look at the underlying economic trends and, in particular, the formation of skills in this country to enable skilled workers to get into jobs that are long lasting and to pay taxes, there is absolutely no point in our being in this place, because there will be no funds to pay even our wages let alone for any of the other services.

**Mr Brindal:** That is another debate; that is a different debate.

**Mr CLARKE:** I just want to turn members' attention to the importance of industrial relations and vocational education and training in the provision of the essential services that we all want for our constituencies.

*Mr Caudell interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** Of course, and profits for businesses. There is no argument from me whatsoever. However, in their

stated policies members opposite have wanted to pursue a low wage outcome, which will affect Supply, because we will not have the funds necessary to do all that we want. Mr Marshall further states in the article:

One of the reasons we get so much conflict—

and he is referring to America—

is because American companies, unlike Australian companies, have large accessible non-union alternatives. They can pay lower wages than the unions negotiate. And that is one of the reasons why we got increased hostility to unions in the USA during the 1970s—because the union to non-union wage gap widened significantly, creating an incentive to take on the unions.

One of the reasons we have only 5 per cent of American companies following the high productivity option is because they don't have to. You couldn't follow the low wage option in Singapore or in Germany. Their systems won't let you. You would have trouble doing it in Australia.

He refers also, but I will not quote him, to the uniqueness, as he sees it, of our Australian industrial relations system, which ties wage increases to improvements in productivity.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am still experiencing some difficulty. The honourable member has been speaking now for about 15 minutes on what I consider to be more doctrinaire policy and hypothesis than the simple dollars and cents which are at the very heart of the Supply Bill. I ask the honourable member to do his utmost to come back to the subject of the debate.

**Mr CLARKE:** Certainly, Mr Deputy Speaker; I will conclude my remarks shortly.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I didn't know that you had been elevated to the Speakership.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Unley may not be around to listen to the conclusion if he does not stop interjecting.

**Mr CLARKE:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your protection. In conclusion—

*The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I say to the Minister for Correctional Services that I have hardly begun. What is essential when you are debating anything concerning Government money is whether or not you have it. I would have thought that was the most fundamental point of all. In terms of the supply and allocation of money, it does not really matter much, because if it is ever decreasing or cannot keep up with the services that our constituents rightly demand we have failed them.

My point is simply this: the policy that is being pursued and enunciated to date by the State Government is inimical to the securing of economic growth in this State. It will lead to confrontation if it is successful and it will produce a low wage strategy which will not introduce into this State the type of industries that we need to export and create jobs and provide the services we all expect.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Emergency Services):** I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the consideration of the Bill.

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** I would like to take this opportunity to examine something that has mystified me for the past 11 years, and that is why Governments exist and take people's money. We take people's money in a legitimate form—that is, taxes. During the time in which I ran as a candidate in Kaurna, I questioned many people through a survey, which went to every household, as to how they felt about the taxes and charges in this State. I must admit that

when I put out that survey I expected it to come back with the very real answer that, first, people were totally opposed to the level of taxes and charges imposed on them by the State but, secondly, that they paid them, anyway. However, to my surprise I found that the majority of people who returned that survey indicated to me that they were quite happy to pay the taxes and charges. However, to a one they all made the same statement: that although they did not mind paying the taxes and charges they did mind paying them to a Government that was totally wasting their money.

When we consider that we are now paying more than \$2 million a day simply on an interest bill that we need not be paying but for the non-accountability of the former Government that existed in this State for 11 years, I can understand people complaining about that, and I agree with their complaints. What happened over the past 11 years? Why did the people allow that Government—and I emphasise ‘the people’, because we have had several elections during the 11 years when the people re-elected the former Government—to remain in office? All I can say is that the idea of accountability simply went wrong over those 11 years and that people did not really question that Government adequately.

However, I hope that people will now question the new Government. When we bring Bills before Parliament there will be ample opportunity for people in the community to question those Bills, and I hope that that will be done with aggression. I would like the community to be aggressive about the way they question the Government because, without that sort of aggression from the community, no Government will be accountable for the money it spends.

The Liberal Government has said it will be completely accountable in terms of its Ministers and its government, and I believe that. To keep that on record we need to be accountable to the people, who will determine that we are accountable. So, it is really a challenge for the people of South Australia to make sure that that accountability continues.

As to the time I will spend here during the new Government's term, members will hear me constantly referring to the Kaurna community, because I sincerely take very seriously the challenge of being here to represent those people. I do not see my role here as performing or interjecting: I am here purely to put the case for Kaurna and I will do so *ad nauseam*.

In terms of the money that needs to be resourced for Kaurna, I could touch on many issues, but today I will restrict myself to just a few issues. I mentioned the Noarlunga Hospital in my maiden speech. The hospital has the potential to be a gem in our community, but I think it needs to be planned and planned well. Over the past 11 years there has been little forward planning for all electorates in the southern areas and particularly in Kaurna.

I say that because in Noarlunga we have a hospital that should have been planned to be a major regional hospital for the whole of the Southern Fleurieu Peninsula. However, what we see is an inadequately serviced and resourced hospital with theatres and wards fully equipped but not funded to be open. The hospital listing allows for four children to have nose/throat operations a month but, if one child falls off that list for a reason that cannot be helped, the hospital is not able to place another child for treatment. That is totally inadequate.

When we consider the size of Seaford Rise and the potential increase in that population and add to that Moana South and Aldinga Beach, whose populations will grow, to have Noarlunga Hospital funded in such a meagre way is just

not acceptable to the community and must be addressed. However, I am not suggesting that Noarlunga Hospital should take on a role like Flinders Medical Centre. I am not suggesting for a minute that it should override such major activities that happen at a hospital like Flinders Medical Centre. Far from it, but Noarlunga Hospital must be financed and resourced in such a way that it will actually service the community's needs, and those needs in that area will be obvious, because they need general surgery, children's services and plenty of services for the elderly. I would like to see Noarlunga Hospital take that thrust under our Government.

The issue of schooling is another major concern for the electorate of Kaurna. I said in my maiden speech that, although Kaurna is a very large electorate, it does not have a high school within it. That is true; it has two high schools very close to its boundaries, one is Christies Beach High School and the other is Willunga High School. Both those high schools are full, and the catchment for the Willunga High School, in particular, services a large proportion of the Kaurna electorate. It is very easy to see that, with the size of the population, there is an incredible need for a high school within the Kaurna electorate.

I applaud the fact that the previous Government saw fit to plan ahead for the Seaford Rise High School, which was a great example of a new area being planned for in terms of its resources. However, the planning should not be done in such a way that it is financed to be a very slow build-up. There are already enough children in that area to warrant the high school being built as a full-fledged facility immediately.

I will also be fighting very hard for allocation of another primary school within the Aldinga Beach catchment area, and the reason for that is that the original school was built for about 350 children and it currently has over 700 children enrolled in it, and this cannot be allowed to continue. Schools must be built ready for the children. Seaford Rise Primary School, which has opened this year, is another example of forward planning for which the previous Government must be applauded, and I hope that our Government will take those sorts of examples and build on them.

I turn to the issue of the need for extra police manpower, and I speak about that in terms of the Christies Beach police station which, as I said in my maiden speech, is in great need of extra resources for manpower. I applaud the Minister who, in the lead-up to the election, has announced that an extra 200 police officers will be provided over the first term of our Government, and I would hope, and I am sure that it will be the case, that a considerable number of those extra police will come to the southern regions.

Having served in local government, I have tended to spend a bit of time talking to Government departments in the past, and I have found it interesting that they never seem to want to accept the need of the growth of the area. I put on record that 2020 Vision spent a lot of taxpayers' money to produce a document which, as we were told all the way through our consultation process, was relevant for the next 20-odd years. However, the population growth that was projected in the 2020 Vision document for the southern area will occur in that area within the next five years, and I do not want that to go unnoticed. That population growth will occur in the southern area in five years; not 20 years.

I reiterate that I do not want to see the south left like the old sections of Old Noarlunga, which has been established as a large community for a long time and which has been left without the services. So, let us plan, and let us plan well.

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

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** I wish to inform members of the benefits that will come to my region from the Brown Liberal Government's plan to seal all arterial roads in South Australia over the next 10 years. The electorate of Flinders has two unsealed arterial roads and they both serve very important regional areas of Eyre Peninsula. The roads in question are the Elliston-Lock road, which is 52 kilometres long, and the Cleve-Kimba road, which is 55 kilometres long. Both these regions share sporting events, cultural contacts and commerce. The Romans recognised that, to improve the commerce and economy for a nation, you first had to provide it with an efficient means of doing business. The Romans were much better road-makers and had a stronger commitment to improving contact between regions than previous State Governments.

In the past 10 years of Labor Administration it milked the motorists, collecting \$669 million in petrol tax but allocating only 30 per cent of this to the roads. The rest was used to prop up the general revenue. Without good roads in the community we can never get the kind of economic activity that my electorate requires to keep our public infrastructure in place. Better access to adjoining communities via a sealed road will stimulate more economic activity.

The present Cleve to Kimba rubble road is at best a hazard to travel over and is at worst impassable. It is little better now than it was when at the age of 18 I was in a car that rolled over on it. The Cleve-Kimba road provides a connection between the Eyre and Lincoln Highways. Once sealed it will provide direct access for central Eyre Peninsula to the eastern seaboard of the peninsula. The eastern Eyre Peninsula is an important grain producing region. It produces in excess of 12 per cent of the State's wheat. Surely, this form of production deserves an adequate road system. School bus safety is another consideration and I would ask the House to note this when considering this important road.

The other unsealed arterial road within the electorate of Flinders is the Lock to Elliston road. This is another road that I know well, as our family farm was situated on it and as a child I travelled over it to school. The road connects two towns joined together with a common district council, and they have many other common interests. This road was given a priority for sealing as far back as 1960. This had the full support of Eyre Peninsula's local government bodies. The overall benefit of a sealed road network to this region has not been realised, owing to the failure to seal this section of road.

The need of these communities is great. There is no form of public transport to these areas, and it can be reasonably expected that this situation will change, should the road between Lock and Elliston be sealed. This road provides the only link for Elliston residents to specialists and medical and hospital facilities located at the Whyalla base hospital. Once again, schoolchildren are required to travel this deplorable road daily. We put their lives at risk every day because of the hazardous condition of the road. The township of Elliston was proclaimed in 1878, 116 years ago. Ten years later local government was established. I believe it is a disgrace that Elliston, the headquarters of its local government district, does not have a direct sealed road to the capital city here in Adelaide.

Every community deserves to be able to maintain contact with the capital city via sealed roads. As I said, the Romans recognised the need for roads to stimulate economic growth.

Let me just outline some of the more recent history on the state of this road in question. In 1964 the roadway was flooded in July and August, and motorists detoured through paddocks. In 1971 the road was totally impassable for two weeks in May. After the floodwater subsided, detours through paddocks were again used. Again in 1974 the road was flooded, and the same happened again in 1975. Then in 1979 the road was totally closed to all traffic for six weeks during October and November. The Romans would not have tolerated this situation; why should my constituents in Flinders have to put up with it? The road transport system on Eyre Peninsula is considered to be at least 20 years behind other areas in this great State. Eyre Peninsula has been denied by successive Governments for far too long.

I wish to alert members to another road within the electorate of Flinders which should be considered for sealing. This is the Birchmore Road, South Coast Road, West End Highway and the Playford Highway from Parndana to the West End Highway, more commonly known as the ring route on Kangaroo Island. Comprising about 142 kilometres, only 56 kilometres of this road is sealed. This road serves the prime tourist attractions on Kangaroo Island. Seal Bay, Kelly Hill caves and the Flinders Chase National Park are all accessed by this road.

These attractions are the major reason why tourists visit Kangaroo Island. We have an investment in providing better road facilities to service these tourist spots. Numbers visiting Kangaroo Island are expected to climb sharply, and the presence of these people will impact on the State's economy, including here in Adelaide, where their journey to Kangaroo Island usually starts and finishes. Completing the sealing of the ring route on Kangaroo Island is an investment in the future for every South Australian.

Finally, back to the Romans: they are remembered as road builders. My hope is the Brown Liberal Government will be remembered for finally finishing the job of sealing the State's arterial and important tourist roads, especially those neglected for so long within the electorate of Flinders.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Gordon.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon):** First, I would like to express my personal thanks to members of my State electorate committee of Gordon, Mount Gambier branch, for the stalwart service they have given to me, over the past 19 or 20 years in some cases. I refer to the President of the SEC, Mr Marians Karklins and his wife Kay Karklins, in particular, who have served my cause well and truly for the main part of that period. Others who have served similarly as well are Mrs Barbara Riquier, who was involved mainly in a secretarial and treasury position; Mr Jack Williams, formerly of the Australian Army, who has served me well as a campaign officer; Mrs Sue Charlton, more recently the President of my Mount Gambier branch of the Gordon Electorate Committee; and last but not least the anonymous people, the great number of supporters and people in the electorate of Mount Gambier, now Gordon, who have given me their support, loyally and consistently, during the past 19 years or more.

I would like to offer some reassurance to members of the class of '93 who are subject to some ambitious teasing from newer members of the Opposition. I simply point out to the newer members on this side of the House, on the Government benches, who are or were considered to be in relatively marginal seats, that my electorate of Mount Gambier was a solid Labor seat in 1975, with the Labor Party winning consistently over 60 per cent of the vote. In 1975, I entered

this House with only a very small winning percentage after the two-Party preferred preferences had been distributed between the six candidates who stood in 1975.

**Mr Brindal:** Now you've got the safest seat in the State.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** That is not the case, I am sorry to say this year. Last year, I joined the members for Victoria and Mallee, as their electorates were then, with around 73 per cent of the vote. But, to my utter amazement, at the last election I found that I practically stood still and still have about 73 per cent of the vote, while a number of other Liberals, including the member for Flinders, who is now representing the Liberal Party in her electorate for the first time in many years, have overtaken me, and they stand well ahead on the ladder. Rather than being ashamed of that, I take great pride in the fact that on this side of the House I am surrounded by members who achieved well at the last election.

Based on my own experience, I say to them that they should take considerable solace from their experience. You should serve your electors, well, hard and diligently. Indeed, you should serve all your electors in that vein; you do not know which way any person who comes before you has voted. It does not really matter, because you are elected to serve the electorate, listen to everyone and attend to their complaints diligently. Try your hardest and do your best. You will certainly not win every case that you put before the Minister or a Government department but, if you do your best, there is a good chance that you will be forgiven for failure: if you do not try, you will be pilloried. So, members, take heart and do your best, as I know you all will, and serve your electors as they would like you to serve them.

There has been a slight air of pessimism emanating from the Opposition benches with regard to the accession to power of the Dean Brown Government in South Australia. I have been checking out the newspapers and announcements, and I find that generally about the electorate there is a tremendous air of optimism which seems to have been reserved for the moment after the announcement of the Brown Liberal Government win in December.

Admittedly, we do not take credit for everything that has happened. We cannot take the credit, because some of it—though not a great deal—stemmed from the activities of the previous Government. However, even its best hopes and ambitions were being stymied and stultified by the reluctance of companies—generally major companies—to make any positive announcements for fear that the Labor Party might win the last election, not because of it.

Following the Brown Liberal Government win, we have had a spate of things announced. Parochially, I could mention the Mount Gambier City Council's tennis court, which has benefited from \$30 000 for new lights and which will bring new life to that sport both winter and summer.

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am not sure whether it came off a whiteboard, but I did hear one clean whiteboard saying to a Minister recently, 'Minister, at least one of us is clean.'

The announcement by the Mitsubishi company, when the Premier went to Tokyo to hold discussions with senior executives, that the company had committed \$500 million towards the Adelaide plant was particularly gratifying. It was a wonderful gesture on the part of that company, which is most welcome in South Australia. There is also the possibility that the company will later expend further considerable sums on engine manufacture for world-wide distribution. It augurs well for the motor industry.

The Holden company is manufacturing more than 400 vehicles a day, which is a splendid achievement. When we look at the consolidation in South Australia of tubular steel steering assemblies, car mufflers and a whole range of associated products which are going into the motor vehicles exported from South Australia, it augurs very well for the next decade of car manufacturing in this State. It is a really delightful thought because, with that reassurance, of course, comes substantial employment into the thousands.

BRL Hardy, following its amalgamation last year, has announced a 400-hectare expansion in the South-East on *terra rossa* country to complement the vines already being grown around Coonawarra and Padthaway. That is good for the State, because it means not only manufacture but the export of produce across the world, and the quality of wine produced in the South-East is magnificent.

The Mount Gambier City Council also benefited with a \$50 000 grant from the Education Department for use on the splendid Margaret Street pool facility, which is well utilised by students throughout the South-East for swimming lessons, sport and recreation. A number of grants were announced by the Federal and State Governments which I will not list in detail, but they are part of the general financial run which takes place each year.

The new gaol at Mount Gambier is due to be opened in May, or soon thereafter. The planning for the new Mount Gambier hospital, we were assured yesterday by the Minister in conference with the Chairman of the hospital board, Mark Lampshire, and others, is going ahead and is on schedule.

I congratulate Mr Ray Heinrich, a dairy farmer in the South-East, on his accession to the Presidency of the South Australian Dairy Farmers Association. It is an honour both for him and for the South-East. I know that he will acquit himself very well on behalf of the industry, as he has in a board capacity in the past.

Woods and Forests made \$11 million in the first half of the current financial year, after 11 years of loss following the 1983 bushfire. That is a turnaround that augurs well for the future of the timber industry in South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has run out. The member for Lee.

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** I would like to point out to the member for Spence that in the remarks he made in his Address in Reply contribution on 22 February I found his assertions both insulting and incorrect. If I may, I would like to quote from the dictionary the definition of the word 'lie', as follows:

intentional false statement; thing that deceives; speak falsely; be deceptive'.

On page 187 of *Hansard* Mr Michael Atkinson alleged that I was not the person that the Leader of the Liberal Party wanted. I must say that Premier Dean Brown was the first Leader to come to the western suburbs and to officially open a campaign office. Luckily, I was the first person who opened a campaign office in the whole State, and Dean Brown did not spend half an hour, as Mr Bannon spent with Kevin Hamilton, but spent over one and a half hours in the campaign office giving me help, advice and any support that he could. The second part of the misstatement of the member for Spence is that I stood for the Findon ward of the Woodville council. I have never stood for the Findon ward of the Woodville council.

Another thing he said is that I stood against my wife in the ward of Albert Park. I believe that a person who stands against someone stands against a sitting member, but neither

my wife nor I had been councillors for that ward. I would like some type of ruling—and unfortunately the member for Spence is not here—towards an apology or retraction of these statements, which are totally incorrect and very offensive, in my view.

He made the assertion that Labor won all booths situated in Spence. I asked the Library staff to provide me some details of the last results and I find that Woodville (S2) had Danny McGuire with 216 votes to Michael Atkinson's 173. In Woodville south Danny McGuire, the Liberal candidate, had 845 and Michael Atkinson 779. Unless my mathematics are wrong, I think Danny McGuire had more votes than Michael Atkinson.

Another thing I found offensive in his statement was that Mr Glen Jarvis wrote my speech. Mr Glen Jarvis helped me in writing my speech, because I am not a very diplomatic person. He cut some of the words that I would have normally used and put in a few others, but the texture, the points raised in the speech, were totally mine. Every member of this House has an assistant, and Glen Jarvis happens to be my assistant—living in the wrong electorate. Unfortunately, it was Michael Atkinson's electorate. I found that very offensive, as did my assistant.

Yet another point that I found insulting but cannot make too much of is that the member for Spence said that he had the Hon. John Burdett as his mentor. As far as I know and for as long as I knew the Hon. John Burdett, he never talked badly about another person. He played the ball and not the person. The member for Spence is a gutter player, and I think that an apology should be recorded.

So, Mr Speaker, I hope that I have put the record straight, or you may ask the member for Spence to clarify some of his points. The other point I felt offended by was that I was a member of the Labor Party. At some time in the future I would like the member for Spence to explain in what month or what year I was a member of the Labor Party. I expected the member for Spence to give me a few weeks to settle in before he attacked me, but I suspect he refers to the period February 1986 to August 1986. How could I be a member of the Labor Party if in December 1985 I stood as an Independent against a sitting Labor member? In that situation, according to the Labor constitution, no-one can be a member of the Labor Party for at least two years. Again the member for Spence, mathematically, does not know how to add up. So much for him accusing me of not pronouncing the words properly in my maiden speech. I think I was a virgin but that now he has raped me. I will conclude my grievance at another time and allow the member for Spence an opportunity to refute my points of view.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** Mr Speaker, coincidentally, I want to speak today on the same subject that the member for Flinders so capably spoke on earlier in this debate, namely, country roads. I noted her words with great interest. I am very concerned at the appalling state of South Australia's roads, particularly its country roads, especially those in the Mid North of this State. When you see the road maintenance crews patching patches on our main roads, there is a serious problem. If we ever want proof of a sector that has been neglected by a series of Labor Governments, we can look at roads. There have been many other areas of neglect in our country regions, particularly education and health, but they are not so obvious. The condition of our roads certainly is. When people leave Adelaide and get past Gepps Cross all of a sudden it is apparent to even the most unbiased observer,

'By Jove, what has happened to our country roads?' They were once the nation's best.

My interest in the Morgan-Burra road is well known. I referred to it in the first speech I made in this Parliament and, as honourable members know, I still have a bag full of stones from that road and I am quite happy to present those stones to any member who wants a memento, and I did that yesterday, Sir, to the member for Frome who now shares with me the responsibility for that road. The point is that this is not simply a collection of local problems; it is something that impinges on the whole State transport system and on the rural industry at large, and thus on the whole State's economy.

Throughout the disastrous term of the previous Labor Government this problem became steadily worse as it cribbed more and more road taxes into the general revenue. The result is that we now have infrastructure that has been seriously run down, and it is obvious to us all that it will take a massive effort to bring it up to a standard such that the rural sector is fully able to realise the benefits of the renaissance that I fully expect in South Australia with our new policies and our new Government. In 1991-92 the Labor Government returned less than one-third of the money it collected from fuel franchise to maintaining and improving the roads that carry the lifeblood of our State's economy. In one of my earlier speeches in this place in May 1992 I highlighted the short-coming between the money collected at the fuel bowser from all our people in South Australia and what is spent.

When the Tonkin Government left office in 1982-83 it had collected \$25.7 million, and it spent it all on the roads—100 per cent was allocated to the road fund. In the first year of the Bannon Government the amount collected increased to \$38 million, and 66 per cent was allocated to the road fund. That degenerated and, according to the last recorded figure—1991-92—the Government collected \$85 million and spent only 29 per cent on the roads. That is—if members will pardon the pun—highway robbery. I estimate that the figure collected when the Labor Government left office on 11 December was almost \$100 million, and less than 23 per cent would have been spent on our roads. That is unequal and, to say the least, dishonest.

I am encouraged that the new Government has given a pledge that during its first 10 years in office, which is 2½ terms, it will upgrade all the major roads to a reasonable standard. I look forward to that, and I will support the new Transport Minister (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) in all her endeavours to achieve that goal, because we have a very serious problem.

South Australia has about 10 000 kilometres of sealed roads. They were designed to have a 25-year life, and we are now stretching that to 35 years. When one looks at them, one can see that they are certainly being stretched—we are patching the stretch marks well and truly. It is a simple mathematical exercise to work out that the Labor Government should have been replacing up to 400 kilometres of roads a year just to maintain the existing road structure. However, it managed to replace only 50 kilometres. Members can see what happened: it was a blatant run down of a valuable State asset—our roads.

Thank goodness we now have a change of Government and a pledge to stem this dangerous trend and to reverse it. I will be ever vigilant to ensure that it does just that. Had the situation continued, our transport network would have been hopelessly in hock, as it almost is, anyway. In many instances, the only option in country areas is to own a four-wheel drive vehicle, particularly in the area you come from, Sir.

Many people drive on the highways in a four-wheel drive vehicle, because it is the only way to keep tyres up and to preserve a vehicle's suspension. However, it makes the situation worse, because it cuts up the roads that remain.

The cost of letting these roads deteriorate, especially the east-west arterials in the Mid North cannot continue to be borne by the rural community, particularly local government. These costs come in the form of increased transport charges, restraints on productivity and, not least, the cost of the accidents that are undoubtedly caused, or at least contributed to, by such dangerous road conditions. The roads have deteriorated so far in many areas that I have seen bitumen roads ripped up and turned to rubble.

These country roads have been made to do what they were never designed to do. They were designed in the 1950s to carry maximum truck loads of 12 to 15 tonnes. Now we see double units carrying in excess of 50 tonnes. Where is the commonsense in all this? We have a modern, high-tech transport system running on 1950s-style roads. The burden of keeping what are really arterial roads up to scratch has been largely left to councils—the local community—and they have not been given the funds for this work.

We are seeing this deceitful act, where the Federal Government is giving grants directly to councils to do the work. Once again we are seeing the State's authority bypassed. I was glad to hear the comment yesterday by the Premier that this will be brought up in Canberra on Friday. In my first 3½ years in this place I have often complained about the state of the roads in the Mid North. Now that my electorate includes the Barossa I am saddened that I must include its roads in my complaint. In this beautiful area of South Australia—our tourist jewel—there are many roads that can only be described as very poor. It is an absolute discouragement to a very important tourist trade. The rip-off of our country rail system has made this problem even worse.

Last year, when I was journeying between Hallett and Burra, I saw two road gangs repairing the road and, when I stopped, I saw right alongside me a gang of men pulling up the railway line. To see the grain going down the road in trucks is an absolute disgrace. I have mentioned previously the Spalding-Burra-Morgan road and Anama Lane, which is a very critical joining road; and the Clare to Adelaide road is rapidly becoming a high priority on my list because it is a main road. In many areas it can only be described as dangerous, because it is getting so narrow and full of potholes. The Tanunda-Gawler road is another very narrow road with trees growing right on the verge. In fact, some of the white posts are outside the tree verge. How dangerous is that?

The Redhill-Koolunga-Brinkworth-Blyth road is no longer in my electorate but it is a major priority. I will continue to push for its sealing. The Blyth-Snowtown road is now sealed, and it is much appreciated by people in the region. In the Barossa, the Concordia, Trial Hill, Browning, Wirra Wirra, Glen Devon and Springton roads all need upgrading. I will watch with interest what happens over the next 10 years. I hope that all those roads are upgraded in that time. I highlight the facts raised by the member for Flinders. This is an area where the country regions of our State have been ignored. I look forward to playing a vital part in the upgrading of our roads.

**Mr TIERNAN (Torrens):** On behalf of the electorate of Torrens, I bring to the attention of this House a major concern within the community that unfortunately is getting worse every day, or as my father used to say in his good Irish

brogue 'worsen and worsen and worsen'. Unfortunately this problem is getting out of control. When a group of people get together, no matter whether they are talking, drinking, laughing or playing sport, we expect them to behave in a reasonable manner. Unfortunately, that is not what is happening in our electorates at the moment. Far too often, groups of people are gathering in our smaller reserves, and we have quite a few of them. They congregate in the corners and around the fountains and use the water for devious means. Their behaviour frightens the local residents and scares the hell out of the elderly. When they approached me about the problem, they were too scared to give their names, but they asked that something be done about it.

The behaviour of the people in these groups is quite outstanding at times. The inventiveness of the sign language they use would be a credit to them if they were in the performing arts. If things continue in this way, we will have many more problems and we will lose control of the situation. These groups gather in the corner of a reserve, usually late at night, and get louder and louder and more and more offensive. Even though there may be a public toilet within 50 metres, they are so lazy or so tired they cannot move, so they do it exactly where they stand. They are very good shots with a slingshot and stones, and break many bottles. Unfortunately the younger kids come out the next morning and have problems with broken glass and the used needles.

Some might think that that is not a major concern. They are misbehaving, disturbing the peace, and behaving in an unacceptable manner—no worries, call the police. If you dare! If a resident switches on a light in their home, they know that he or she will be using the telephone, so they throw rocks on the roof, and they are usually from your roads, because they come from out of the district. They graffiti the cars. The greatest trick is to let down the tyres. Can you imagine coming out in the morning, late for work, and all four tyres on your car are flat? It is exciting! Unfortunately, that is what is happening in almost all small reserves in my electorate. The police turn up, and that is where the sorry tale starts. Why in heaven's name should we put up with a situation whereby police officers are abused for doing their duty, and they can do nothing about it?

That is what is happening in practice. My colleagues who are practitioners of the law will tell me that there is this law and that law—and I have copies of them—but you need to be a lawyer to be able to read them. It is so difficult to apply that in practice and it is not happening. The sign language directed towards the Police Force is internationally known, yet it is not an offence. It is impossible for the police to operate in this manner. Of course, as soon as the police show up, you have never seen such goody two-shoes; butter would not melt in their mouth. What can the police officer do? Nothing, because they do not even look as though they are committing an offence. Next thing they will be coming out with their prayer books and having a prayer session. That is, of course, until the police officer disappears around the corner and then, lo and behold, they are off again.

It is a major community problem and it is happening in all our districts. How do I know? I have attended 19 public meetings, that is, two in each suburb of the electorate of Torrens, and at each meeting the unacceptable behaviour of small, medium and large groups of people was brought up as a concern. Residents told me that the people concerned were not from their district but had come from another part of town.

I know we would say that it happened only in Hindley Street. If it is just in Hindley Street, you either go to Hindley Street and put up with it, or you do not go to Hindley Street. However, this is now happening where you live. You have no choice. It is happening in your front garden, at your front door, down the street. You do not have a choice: you cannot walk away. The public expects members of this House to give them adequate protection. They do not understand and they do not really care about what the law says or does not say: they care about what is actually happening to them. If the law is such that it does not allow the right actions to take place, we must review it—we must do something about it. If we do not, we will end up going further and further down the road to hell. Our country cousins know what that is like: it is full of rocks and similar objects.

**An honourable member:** It is hot, too!

**Mr TIERNAN:** It is very hot, particularly in the bushland of the Speaker's electorate. What are we going to do about it? We should speak to some of the older generation. The member for Florey would know of the earlier regulations under which you could push people along very quickly. I am not advocating a return to that extreme right behaviour. I am not advocating a return to a restriction that can easily be abused. I do not believe that that is necessary. But the current airy-fairy situation which allows people to misbehave at will, without any protection to the community, is not acceptable. Things have to change. The pendulum has gone too far to the left. It is time we addressed this major problem and brought back a reasonable compromise.

How are we to do that? We will not do it with a big stick. Our society and our education is such that it will not work. When I have approached some of these groups, they have said, 'You cannot tell us to move on. We do not have to give our names and addresses. We do not have to do this. We have this right and we have that right.' There must be something wrong within our education system because either the students are not listening or we are not telling them that there are responsibilities that go with these rights. Somehow that responsibility has been totally ignored. It is not a simple problem: it is a complex one, but it has to be attacked and solved on many fronts, not just with the application of laws but through the education of our society.

The other evening I went and sat in a house, and the people I was with told me, almost to the exact minute, when the problem would start. I went outside to speak to the group. Having been in the forces for about 12 years, I thought I had heard most of the beautiful, colourful language you normally hear in those sorts of areas. Well, I had my ears pinned back.

**Mr Venning:** Outside Parliament House.

**Mr TIERNAN:** I am not sure if it is outside, but it could be inside. To cut a long story short, as leaders of this community we really have to look at this situation and get those people involved who can resolve it, but we must take action now, and we must do it relatively soon before it is too late. There are some parts of society where, many people say, it is already too late. Do we have to wait until we have the American situation where somebody is beaten to death in the street simply because they said, 'Hey, you have disturbed the baby. You are making too much noise. You are cursing and swearing, and I do not like that sort of language in front of my children.' Do we have to wait until somebody is so badly abused that they die before we take this problem seriously?

It is not good enough. It has been going on willy-nilly for a long time. I took the trouble to read some of the Acts that the police work under, and I would say that it is almost

impossible: they are in a catch 22 situation all the time, and that is not good enough. It has to be fixed. It is obvious to me and to other members of this House who have approached me on this subject that the community has a major problem with this unacceptable behaviour. Our Police Force has a major problem trying to do something about it, and obviously something is wrong with our education system because it is not instilling a sense of responsibility that would alleviate that behaviour. I repeat: I do not want us to return to the extreme right situation we had in the past—that is not an acceptable answer. But the pendulum has gone too far to the left and must be curtailed; it is causing considerable frustration to all in our community, particularly our police, and both Parties should undertake to review the problem.

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

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

*[Sitting suspended from 12.57 to 2 p.m.]*

### STATE BANK (CORPORATISATION) BILL

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

### ELIZABETH BY-ELECTION

**The SPEAKER:** I advise the House that, after consultation with Party leaders and the Electoral Commissioner, I have decided to issue a writ for the by-election in the seat of Elizabeth as follows: the writ will be issued on Friday 11 March, the closing of the rolls to be at noon on Monday 21 March, with nominations closing on Friday 25 March. The poll will be held on Saturday 9 April and the writs will be returned by Friday 22 April.

### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

State Bank Corporatisation Technical Information Paper

### DETAFE

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I wish to relate to the House new directions that I have set for the Department of Employment, Training and Further Education. The new directions were discussed and crystallised at a key business strategy workshop held on Friday 18 and Saturday 19 February 1994 at the Noarlunga Campus of the Onkaparinga Institute of Vocational Education. The workshop was attended by all central office executives, Institute of Vocational Education Directors and Mr Peter Wall, Chairman of the Interim VEET Board.

The new directions I will report will ensure that South Australia is influential in the national training reform agenda, that the training system is sensitive to industry needs, and that services are competitive and contribute to the State's economic competitiveness. In turn, the Government's initiatives will enhance training or retraining so that South



Australia has its rightful place and competes successfully in the world market.

The new directions also give a clear signal that the Government's initiatives for young people, employment generation and opportunities for Aboriginal employment are backed by organisational and resource support. The Government has already announced the Rebuilding South Australia, Creating Jobs program, a comprehensive range of employment incentives designed to provide opportunities for youth and other unemployed persons.

With the establishment of the Vocational Education, Employment and Training Board later this year, this State will enter a full partnership with industry in the planning and delivery of education and training services. It is important that we deliver training that is relevant. The VEET Board will also facilitate closer linkages between public and private providers of training.

The new directions will support the State's increasing export drive in educational services, an area in which I recently announced important progress relating to initiatives in Thailand. South Australia has been successful in generating education exports, and this success will be built upon and increased.

Importantly, the new directions for the department will ensure that the TAFE system gets the recognition it deserves. The South Australian TAFE system is considered to be among the best in Australia, although that is one of South Australia's best kept secrets, and I intend to rectify that. TAFE training will be seen as a viable alternative to university education. Already, South Australian TAFE is up with world leaders in hospitality services and flexible training delivery.

The Regency Institute houses the internationally renowned International College of Hospitality Management, which is endorsed by the Swiss Hotels Association. In training delivery, TAFE uses teleconferencing to enable students located in remote areas to gain access to TAFE courses.

As soon as I became Minister I commissioned the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Employment, Training and Further Education (Mr Andrew Strickland) to undertake a review of the department's corporate directions, central office structure and required management improvement initiatives to ensure that the department can deliver the Government's policies and priorities. The Chief Executive Officer's proposals were presented to the business strategy workshop. The department's new corporate directions will emphasise a number of key areas:

- increasing the number of training opportunities and enhancing learning outcomes for individuals;
- better meeting the training needs of industry and commerce with particular attention being given to the needs of small and medium enterprises;
- making sure that nationally agreed policies on the reform of vocational education and training meet this State's needs and are implemented effectively;
- working together with other education sectors to facilitate the meeting of individuals' training needs and getting the best from the education sector's resources;
- improving the quality of programs and services, including the provision of support services to students which meet their individual needs;
- making sure that programs and services take into account the need for special efforts for youth, the unemployed, Aborigines, women, disadvantaged men and the particular needs of regions;

- ensuring that there is a continuing drive to enhancing performance through improved management practices, processes and systems in all areas of the department;
- recognising and supporting the contributions of the department's employees for they are the department's most valuable resource.

The department's corporate directions will be implemented by a streamlined institute and central office organisation. Last year, the number of institutes of vocational education was reduced from 19 colleges to 10 institutes. Now, the number of central office divisions will be reduced from seven to three. Those divisions will be:

- a Strategic Support Services Division to be responsible for the coordination of a range of key strategic planning, policy and management matters on behalf of the Minister, the Chief Executive Officer and the VEET Board. The division will also coordinate implementation of a comprehensive management improvement program.
- the division will be consulting with industry and industry bodies in the interests of establishing the most effective processes to enhance industry-provider relations.
- a Corporate Support Services Division to be responsible for providing a range of central services to the department as a whole and warranting location in the central office on the basis of their strategic importance and economic competitiveness. Services which are not competitive will be outsourced or devolved to institutes.
- an education and training support services division to continue to provide quality services in curriculum design and development, quality assurance and learning resources.

The primary aim of the central office activities will be to support institutes' provision of quality services to students. It is expected that staff numbers in the central office will be reduced as a result of the decline in the number of director and middle management positions and a progressive devolution of service capacity to institutes. Further efficiencies will be realised through the creation of self-managing work teams with a charter for continuous productivity improvement, a practice successfully introduced by the best private companies.

In addition, in accordance with the Government's priorities, there will be a number of special units, such as the Office of Youth SA, an Employment Policy and Programs Unit and an Aboriginal Employment Development Unit. A new initiative is the appointment of Mr Peter Fleming as Director of an International Education Services Unit with a charter to promote and sell the State's education and training services.

The Office of Youth SA will seek to work closely with other State agencies, Commonwealth bodies and community bodies to ensure that young people are recognised, that they are able to participate effectively in society and that they get a fair go in respect of resource allocation. The Employment Policy and Programs Unit will work closely with institutes and local economic development boards.

The new central office structure will be implemented through a transition team with a charter to ensure that the central office continues to function effectively. The team will include a staff representative and an institute director as well as three divisional directors. The team will have a brief to reduce bureaucracy by reducing levels of management and by streamlining processes.

In conclusion, I am confident that the new directions I have reported today will boost the department's capacity to

achieve best practice in TAFE service delivery; to improve employment prospects for South Australians, particularly young people; and to ensure that South Australia's competitive position in the national and world economy is enhanced.

## QUESTION TIME

**The SPEAKER:** In the absence of the Premier, the Deputy Premier will take questions directed to him and the Minister for Tourism will take questions directed to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development.

### STATE DEBT

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):** Can the Treasurer advise the House whether he believes the Liberal Government's debt reduction strategy is still achievable in light of the advice he has now received from Treasury and in light of the assessment by Standard and Poor's, which states that the Liberal Government's asset sales program will 'only achieve modest asset sales beyond those previously expected under Labor, and perhaps nothing more than an additional \$500 million beyond 1994-95'?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I do not know whether he is deaf or dumb, or perhaps both, but quite candidly we have traversed this path on at least three or four occasions already in Question Time. I have quite clearly said that the answer is 'yes'; we can reduce the State debt below that proposed by the previous Labor Government. I do not know what more there is to be said. I can say 'Yes' and 'No' all day but, quite frankly, the question has been asked, I have answered the question and, if the Leader of the Opposition still happens to be here or in another seat in 1997-98, he can assess whether we have done the job.

**An honourable member:** Put it on a white board for him.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Elder.

### STATE BANK

**Mr WADE (Elder):** What is the Treasurer's response to the half-yearly results announced today by the State Bank of South Australia, and how do these results impact on the future sale of the bank?

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Sir, there was an interjection for which I should congratulate the member for Giles. I presume that the member for Giles takes full responsibility for \$3 150 million worth of losses by the State Bank.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** It is interesting that, when you are in Government, you feel that all the good news should flow from the Ministry and that you should set aside the bad news. I would like to make the point, without taking a political stance on this, that the bank—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The profit was made during the previous Government. There has been an improved performance from the State Bank, which we would expect, and we hope that it continues—in fact, we will ensure that it continues. At midday today the bank released its half-yearly result to 31 December 1993. It reported a \$65.3 million pre-tax profit, and this compares with a \$42.9 million pre-tax profit for the same six months of the previous year.

Importantly, that result has been achieved for a number of reasons, some of which are sustainable in the long term and bode well for the formation of the new bank. Also, operating expenses fell by 16 per cent to \$146 million, reflecting the continual down-sizing of non-core bank business—in fact, all that interstate and off-shore business had nothing to do with a solid regional bank. Importantly, we are now reducing the efficiency ratio such that the ratio of net operating expenses to net operating income was 62.9 per cent for the six months until 31 December, compared with 63.9 per cent, which is 1 per cent higher than the previous year. So, it was a solid year. It is a performance that we trust will be built on, because it is absolutely vital that this bank has a very strong start to its new operations. It is vital that we get the profit ratios up and the cost ratios down to ensure that the Bank of South Australia is one of the healthiest, most efficient and most effective operating regional banks in Australia.

### STATE ASSETS

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Treasurer identify the land and properties to be sold to raise \$260 million as part of the Government's asset sales program to reduce State debt, and is a detailed schedule available for investors? The Liberal debt strategy released on 3 December 1993 indicated that \$260 million of land and property would be sold. This undertaking followed a statement by the now Treasurer of 6 October 1993 that widespread asset sales including unwanted land and workshops would be part of the Liberal plan to reduce State debt by \$700 million to \$800 million by December this year.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I thank the Leader for his question. It has two aspects to it, and the first is: do we have a schedule? We have a growing schedule, and that may or may not be made public. The point at issue is whether we should reveal to the market at large all we are doing or do we shape it strategically? As a Party that believes in good business practice, I would have thought that we would maximise our benefits in the marketplace. I would also like to think that, when we are selling something, we are doing it for very good reason, namely, to maximise its price; and, when we are selling land and property, we are doing so consistent with our urban development objective. I would also think that, when we are selling property and land, we are doing so with the economic development of the State in mind. So we will apply a number of important principles to the sale of property. There is no difficulty with the sum which has been mentioned and which we laid out in the strategy—

*The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Well, I said the question was in two parts; and I am answering the first part. If the Leader can contain himself, I will then answer the second part. There is sufficient asset base to more than cover the amount that was specified at the time, and at an appropriate time we will provide further information, but it is certainly not appropriate at this stage.

The second item mentioned was the reference to 31 December. I can understand that, when we are dealing with this amount of money, members may not grasp the full impact—in fact, in briefings, journalists may not understand exactly what is being said. What was said at the time relates to a question asked by the member for Hartley which I tried to track down yesterday. I finally tracked it down, and I remember it well because, at the time I was interviewed on that item, I merely mentioned that even under the Govern-

ment's strategy \$600 million or \$800 million worth of assets would be sold, not debt written off. Quite clearly, that was the impact of the message. If I had said that we were going to write off \$800 million worth of debt by 31 December 1994, obviously I would have been derelict in my duty and responsibility. So, absolutely—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I can understand that there is some level of confusion about State debt, because I can remember the Leader of the Opposition making dramatic calls to the South Australian population to support his economic strategy, and I can remember the Meeting the Challenge statement, which he outlined to the people of South Australia. He had hundreds of people at his disposal to develop that strategy, unlike the Opposition, which had virtually no resources. In April he played down a plan for South Australia. We found out later that the whole plan was irrelevant. It had nothing to do with the actual plans of the Government.

The Leader got it wrong, although he had hundreds of people at his disposal from whom to get expert advice. We happened to get it right with a hell of a lot fewer resources than the Leader had available to him at the time. If the Leader wants to ask a very important question, I will be delighted to answer it, but he will have to improve in his performance.

#### BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** Will the Treasurer explain why it is essential for the State Bank logo to change as part of the corporatisation of the bank? Many constituents have contacted my office in the belief that there is a cost of \$10 million attached to the changing of the logo, and they are seeking an explanation.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The most fascinating aspect of the announcement about the new bank name and logo has been the reaction from the Opposition. Members of the Opposition were well aware, before they left government, of those sorts of proposals. The Treasurer was informed exactly what options faced the Government. In fact, much of the work that was picked up by me when I became Treasurer had been prepared by the steering committee under the former Government, properly briefed at the time. Now the Leader of the Opposition, who was then Premier, says, 'Look, this is a great waste of money.' He should have said, as should his Treasurer, 'That option is not on: we don't want to have anything to do with it. We want to leave the old State Bank the way it was. We are quite happy with its being associated with \$3 150 million worth of losses.'

If Oppositions are to perform their role, they must be a little more constructive than we have seen from this group on the other side of the House. What we have are reactions to our picking up from where the previous Government left off. On this issue, the Government was presented with a plan to rejuvenate the State Bank, to prepare it for sale. It was responsible for preparing it for sale and it had signed an agreement with the Federal Government to do exactly that. It had signed an agreement with the Federal Government to bring it under the taxation regime and under the Reserve Bank. So, it is no secret that members opposite were told about the options at their disposal. I find it pathetic that the Leader of the Opposition suddenly says that \$10 million is a waste of money when he did not close off that option or suggest that the steering committee head in another direction.

But let us get back to the logo. There was an article on the front page of today's *Advertiser* with some suggestion that there was a conflict between the CPS and the State Bank in relation to that logo. I should explain—and again the former Premier would probably be aware of the circumstances, as would the former Treasurer—that in designing a new name for the bank and a new logo a number of procedures are followed. A person by the name of Ian Kidd, a very capable and nationally accredited designer, was engaged for the process.

That person was given a free hand. The only caveats were that it should relate to South Australia and it should have a strong, positive image. Mr Kidd designed a number of possible logos for the bank which were market tested: we actually went out and asked people, 'How do you feel about particular logos?' and we received a very strong response—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Yes, in fact we market tested well before the election and we got some very good results from that. We actually asked groups of people how they felt about this as an image, and the response was excellent, mainly because the people could relate to the fact that it was representative of our State emblem.

It should be pointed out that the CPS has its own logo. It is using Sturt's desert pea for advertising purposes. We searched the register to ensure there was no breach of existing copyright or other trademark that might have affected its use, and again we found that the results were clear: we could use the stylised version of a desert pea without any possibility of redress.

So, having done that, after the designer came up with this chosen design which enjoyed such strong support, and realising that CPS used an advertising device, we contacted CPS about that matter, once very informally and on another occasion (and I have a briefing note on that: on 17 February) on a more formal basis. No questions were raised. Indeed, in one set of informal discussions it was suggested that the wider use of this would help CPS.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I think the Minister has given an extensive explanation.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Thank you, Sir. From the point of view of the State, the logo is strong. It has strong support. It was done very advisedly and professionally and it will serve the Bank of South Australia particularly well.

#### YEAR OF THE FAMILY

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** As we are now approaching the end of the second month of 1994, can the Minister for Family and Community Services advise the House what the South Australian Government is doing in relation to the International Year of the Family?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I understand the concern that has been expressed by the member for Reynell and I am somewhat disappointed in that it seems that little was done by the previous Administration in preparation for this important year. On behalf of the Government, I will be launching the International Year of the Family in South Australia next Saturday at the Fringe family day in the Lion Arts Centre, and I would welcome any members to join me on that occasion. I will be announcing a number of initiatives.

The aim of the year, of course, is to increase awareness of family issues in communities across the world. It will highlight the importance of families to the basic fabric of our society. The year also provides opportunities to question how

we as Governments, employers, neighbours, communities and individuals can do things better to support the family in its important role in social and economic life.

The Year of the Family is for the whole of our community and many activities are planned right across the State. The Government is providing a strong leadership and support role to the International Year of the Family. A State advisory committee has been established, chaired by Ms Anne Skipper, and has members from a broad range of community groups and organisations with a strong commitment to families. A series of forums will be held during the year to look at the subjects of families in the future, families and work, and enhancing family harmony.

We are also very pleased that the national conference for the International Year of the Family is to be held in Adelaide in November. The Commissioner for the Ageing will be sponsoring a conference 'Generations Together' in May, when we will look at the part that older people—as grandparents, volunteers, carers, and so on—can play in the life of younger people.

With the assistance and focus provided by the Government, I am sure that the year's activities in all communities across the State will be an excellent celebration of family life and a good opportunity for debate and discussion by the people of South Australia about the family in the future.

#### STATE DEBT

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Acting Premier and Treasurer advise what is the Government's estimate of debt as a proportion of gross State product at the end of your first term in office? Given the Acting Premier's previous response about the failure of journalists to grasp the situation and about how he had to avoid being derelict in his responsibilities, I seek to explain—

**Mr BRINDAL:** Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley has a point of order. I anticipate that the honourable member will say that the Deputy Leader is commenting.

**Mr BRINDAL:** No, Sir. I was going to ask whether or not this is a hypothetical question. I believe such questions are out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** I cannot uphold the point of order. The Deputy Leader is entitled to ask the Treasurer about future financial projections and therefore I will allow him to continue.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Thank you, Sir. My explanation is that the Premier, as Leader of the Opposition—

**Mr LEWIS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is the Deputy Leader's question directed to you or to the Deputy Premier, given that the Deputy Leader used the second person pronoun 'your' in the course of his explanation?

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. I suggest to both the member for Ridley and the member for Unley that Question Time is not the time to take unnecessary or frivolous points of order. The Chair will not treat them kindly if they persist. The honourable Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Thank you, Sir. The Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, stated in this House on 28 April 1993:

We will not regain the highest credit rating unless we can reduce public debt below 18 per cent of gross State product. This will be the aim of the next Liberal Government.

Yet, on 8 November, the Acting Premier, who was then shadow Treasurer, stated:

... his key goal was to gain a AAA credit rating for South Australia and a ratio of 16 per cent debt to GSP would get us there. However, the Liberal Government's recovery program, released a month later on 3 December 1993, provides yet a third figure, and states:

Achievement of this strategy will reduce Government debt below 19 per cent—

**The SPEAKER:** I suggest to the Deputy Leader that he conclude his explanation.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:**—not 16 or 18 per cent of GSP—by the end of a Liberal Government's first term.

To date, the Acting Premier has provided three different figures, and I am informed that Treasury has advised him that none of these targets is achievable without further expenditure cuts or tax increases. Given that overseas and national financial markets hang very closely on the Treasurer's statements, I think that perhaps he should clarify this matter for the confused journalists.

**The SPEAKER:** I point out to the Deputy Leader that that was a very long explanation.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I can be forgiven for wondering when he was going to finish his second reading explanation. I think some of the members opposite do not realise that they are out of Government and in Opposition.

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

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I would like to go back just a smidgin in time to answer that question because, as the Deputy Leader would well understand, we had a set of figures provided by Treasury—by the Premier—on, I think, 22 April 1993, which clearly set out what the Government was going to achieve. We well know that just a few days prior to the election it all fell apart.

What the former Premier, with the best of Treasury advice, told us was absolutely misleading. We prepared our debt management strategy on the information that had been provided; and rightly so. We did not have 400 people to write the script. We had limited resources. We followed and tracked the finances on the basis of a set of figures with which we had been provided, a set of figures in which presumably Treasury had a major part from the point of view of putting them together in preparation for that statement.

We presumed that the parameters and the underlying assumptions made in that statement resulted in the figures that were provided, indicating that by 1996 the State debt under the Labor Government would be reduced to \$7 billion. That was what was said. We said that we could do \$1 billion better by taking on these particular projects, and we adhere to that.

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

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I have never met anyone quite as rude as the Deputy Leader. He has this grave incapacity to understand that he is out of Government. It is about time that he woke up and stopped abusing Parliament the way he does. The answer to the Deputy Leader's question, under the new assumptions that we have had to make because of the massive blunder perpetrated on us, is that instead of getting below the 17 per cent mark we are now aiming for the 19 per cent mark.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Deputy Leader.

#### STATE ASSETS

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Can the Treasurer provide the names of those Government bodies to be referred to the Asset Management Task Force for advice on corporatisation and sale to the private sector? The Treasurer has outlined the

establishment and role of the Asset Management Task Force, which includes a strategy for providing advice to the Treasurer on the sale of Government bodies. It is clear from his statement to the Parliament that private sector involvement must be invited, encouraged and nurtured in the operation of items such as schools, prisons, hospitals, water treatment works, and so on.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** There are two questions involved here, the first one relating to personnel. We are in the process of setting up the steering committee on PASA as I presume members would understand. We have a commitment, at some stage in the future, to sell PASA. We are setting up the steering committee for that, and it will comprise a variety of people, most of whom will be drawn from within Government and headed by the CEO of PASA. That committee will have access to Crown Law advice, Treasury advice and Asset Management Task Force advice, and it will have skills—

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

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:**—and real skills from the Mines and Energy Department, as indicated by my colleague. That particular matter is currently under consideration. In regard to the second question, I remind the honourable member of exactly what occurred under the previous Government. We know that under the previous Government other financing arrangements were made rather than borrowing from the market to fund various operations. If my memory serves me correctly there is a financing arrangement for the Mount Gambier hospital and the Hallett Cove school, the traditional means of funding Government having changed—and it changed under the previous Government.

I presume that the Opposition would welcome improving the relationship between the private and public sectors. There are a number of areas where the private sector can participate more strongly in the belief that we can form a greater partnership than we did in the past.

Importantly, we are not about preventing private sector people from saying to us, 'We can deliver a very efficient service much better than you can from within.' That was clear at the time of the election, and it is clear now. We will not prevent private sector personnel from participating by using some of the rules and regulations that prevailed under the previous Government, such as, 'If you don't have a fully unionised work force, you will not get a job.' That is the sort of rubbish that we had previously, and it prevented a number of key providers of services in this State from participating in Government. We are seeking a constructive relationship between the private and public sectors from which both will benefit.

### MONASH PLAYGROUND

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** What progress has the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing made in relation to the re-opening of the Monash Playground and, in particular, regarding the securing of the required indemnity for the playground's constructor and its present operator, the District Council of Berri? The Monash Playground has been the most significant single tourist attraction in the Riverland over the past 20 years and, in terms of its visitation from interstate, probably one of the most significant in South Australia. The playground has been closed for 15 months because of liability insurance problems and, despite repeated offers to resolve the situation by the previous Government, this did not eventuate. It is a truly unique attraction with a national reputation, and it is a great example of local community volunteers doing

their bit to add value to the State's tourist effort. The Chaffey electors are understandably impatient for a resolution of the matter.

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** I would like to compliment the honourable member for his vigorous representation prior to the election and ever since. The playground at Monash, I believe, has the potential to be one of the best tourist ventures and tourist attractions in the Riverland. Over recent years it has been the subject of considerable controversy, mainly regarding issues related to the safety of the playground equipment. It first came to the attention of my department when the Playgrounds Unit prepared a report for the Local Government Association. As most members would be aware, the equipment was designed and supplied by a local Riverland engineer, Mr Grant Telfer, and the playground is built on land owned by the Berri council. The equipment is extraordinary in that it has been designed for use as much by adults as by young people.

Some time ago, Mr Telfer's solicitors raised a concern in respect of indemnity. They put to the Berri council and to the Government that something had to be done to cover the indemnity; otherwise, the park would remain closed. Since coming into Government, we have addressed this subject with some urgency and sought to bring it to resolution. This has been difficult because of varying views from the various solicitors who represent Mr Telfer and the Berri council. By way of a progress report for the honourable member, I can advise that an indemnity agreement has been prepared and discussed with the playground's designers and builders and their solicitors, the local council and its solicitors and the Local Government Association. This agreement has been reviewed on many occasions, and we have now reached a point where the three bodies to which I have just referred now agree with it.

The indemnity was discussed last Tuesday at a meeting of the Berri council, at which it was passed. It has now come to Adelaide and is currently with my department, and I will be taking it to Cabinet on Monday week to seek its ratification. It is our desire as a matter of Government policy to have the playground opened as quickly as we can, and we are endeavouring to do that.

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Spence. I ask the honourable member to adopt the same practice as other members when asking a question, and that is to ensure that he indicates precisely to which Minister the question is directed.

### ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Thank you for recognising me, Mr Speaker. I ask the Treasurer—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Spence.

**Mr ATKINSON:**—what progress has been made by the Government to sell the \$55 million Hindmarsh Entertainment Centre as part of the Government's debt reduction strategy? On 29 October, the Liberal Opposition stated that it would upgrade the Entertainment Centre and transfer its management from the Grand Prix Board to the Basketball Association of South Australia. Yet, in the Liberal Opposition's recovery program released early in December, it stated that the sale of the \$55 million Entertainment Centre was a key feature of its debt reduction strategy.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The House should understand that whatever we sell must be in its most enhanced state. Whether it be PASA, SGIC or the Entertainment Centre, we will not obtain a proper price, and we will give the taxpayers less than justice if we sell those assets as they are performing at the moment. The Entertainment Centre is a white elephant in the way in which it has been operating recently. It has been under performing to an enormous degree; absolutely under performing under this Government. There have been disputes that have been—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I was pointing to the other side when I said 'this Government'. I will have *Hansard* corrected right now. I meant to say 'under the former Government'. We all know that the former Government could not run the proverbial chook raffle, and it certainly could not run the Entertainment Centre. People were fleeing in droves from putting on high class entertainment in Adelaide because of the actions of the former Government, which allowed these disputes to roll on without resolution. Major promoters around Australia refused to come to Adelaide, and the Entertainment Centre remained vacant for many months of the year—in fact, it made a significant loss as a result.

In answer to the member for Spence's question, I am sure that he would agree that the Entertainment Centre should be a showpiece for South Australia, something that people want to buy, and that it will not be bought at the right price unless it is performing. In the area of entertainment, that is one of the key things that must be achieved. We must double or treble the patronage of that centre so that when we are ready to sell it it will be bought at the right price.

#### TRADING HOURS

**Mr BASS (Florey):** Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs advise the House of what action the Government is taking to recognise the position of small retailers when dealing with the issue of shopping hours?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** On 4 January, it was announced that we would set up a new committee of inquiry to look into shopping hours. One of the principal guidelines of that committee was to ensure that in investigating the issue of shopping hours it would look at the effect on small retailers in South Australia. Some 60 000 small businesses in this State trade in the retail area, and a very large employment component in South Australia is in that area. Any inquiry set up by this Government will make sure that the present and future role of small business is well and truly taken care of. We have placed on that committee two people with particular involvement in small business. Their job will be to make sure that all issues relating to the small business sector are looked into.

#### AUDIT COMMISSION

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** Will the Acting Premier give an undertaking to release all consultants' reports on which the findings and final reports of the Commission of Audit will be based?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I have not considered in what form the reports will be delivered. I assume that as the reports by the consultant are made available to Government they will be made available to the wider community. I would have thought that anything less would not be proper. So, as the

consultant's reports and the main report from the Audit Commission are delivered to us, they will be taken on board by Government very swiftly; and I would expect that the reports delivered to us will be the reports that are delivered to the Parliament and the people of South Australia.

#### REPATRIATION HOSPITAL

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** Can the Minister for Health inform the House of the Government's attitude to staff involvement in negotiations on the future of the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I thank the member for Mitchell for his question about a particularly important issue in the whole of health care planning in South Australia in the future. As the member for Mitchell would recognise, this whole question arises because of the desire of the Federal Government to be no longer involved in the direct provision of care in running veterans' affairs hospitals as of 1995.

During the past couple of years, since that date has become imminent, the House has passed a number of motions and has debated the issue on several occasions. In particular, the most recent motion passed with bipartisan support, and that stated amongst other things that, as a condition of transfer, the staff of the Repatriation General Hospital, Daw Park, are satisfied that their interests are adequately safeguarded. This has obviously been a matter of great concern to all levels of staff and the veterans' community in relation to the whole of the transfer since it was first announced.

Therefore, I was surprised to find that, on coming to Government and seeking a report on this matter because of the vigorous representations that have been made to me by so many people, the negotiation process between the then South Australian Government and the Federal Government had completely stalled. It was an absolute stalemate. It was no wonder that staff morale at the repatriation hospital was being damaged by this complete lack of progress and by their having been locked out of the negotiation process.

I felt that it was too important to have such a decision hanging over the head of staff members, patients, veterans and, indeed, the whole of health care in South Australia, and I was not going to allow that situation to continue, so I wrote to Senator Faulkner, the Federal Minister for Veterans' Affairs, and I suggested that we have an immediate meeting, Minister to Minister, to see where we were going with the negotiations. I am pleased to say that he was only too happy to agree. In fact, I think that he might have been surprised that the previous Government had not taken up such an option.

Prior to that meeting, which was held in Melbourne a couple of weeks ago, I had a number of meetings with stakeholders in the repatriation hospital—including the ANF; the Public Sector Union; the Repatriation Advisory Board, which included a staff representative, and so on—so that I could take their views with me to the meeting with the Federal Minister. At those meetings with the stakeholders I undertook to make certain that I would make representations on their behalf to the relevant Federal Minister. My meeting with the Federal Minister was very constructive, and negotiations in relation to the transfer of the repatriation hospital and the relevant financial matters have recommenced, about which both Senator Faulkner and I are pleased.

At that meeting I insisted that it was in our interests and in the interests of staff for them to be party to the negotia-

tions. He agreed that it was quite appropriate for the staff to be kept fully informed with respect to where the Department of Veterans' Affairs was coming from. In fact, because they are employees of the Federal system, the Federal Government had to become involved before they could be included. The staff are to be party to the negotiating positions of both the Department of Veterans' Affairs and the Health Commission, and those negotiations started at officer level immediately.

I regard the results of that meeting with the Federal Minister for Veterans' Affairs as being very positive. I believe that, given the fact that previously the negotiations had reached a 'Pepsi and Coke' standoff, with nobody blinking, it is a major achievement that we are going to take health care and veterans' affairs into the future, and we can now expeditiously resolve the concerns of staff and patients.

In addressing the potential transfer of the repatriation hospital to the provision of South Australian health care, I would stress that the veterans need not be under any misapprehension; their concerns are of prime importance to the Health Commission and to the Government, and the quality and standard of their health care will not suffer at all.

#### AYTON REPORT

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Did the Acting Premier provide the Premier or Attorney-General with any information about the source from which he received his copy of the confidential Ayton submission to the NCA and, if so, what was the information?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I am pleased that the honourable member got the preview to the question right this time. The answer is, 'No'.

#### WARDANG ISLAND

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** Following the visit by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs to Wardang Island recently, can he inform the House of the role the Government can play in the development of Wardang Island?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I am very pleased to address the matter of Wardang Island. In doing so, I recognise the longstanding concern of the member for Goyder about issues relative to Wardang Island and his agitation that the best possible result be achieved in relation to any negotiations. As people would realise, Wardang Island is just off Port Victoria on Yorke Peninsula; it is about a two-hour drive on a very accessible road from Adelaide, and it is, in fact, a paradise, because there is snorkelling, swimming and excellent fishing. I have to say that while on the boat over to the island I saw lots of butterfish. I did not catch any, but I saw a lot.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Indeed, the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources indicates that there is an excellent geology trail in that area, and that is another tourism initiative which has just started there. There is also the potential for Aboriginal cultural centres and so on in that area, so it has great potential in the tourism industry. Following my visit to Wardang Island with the local member, where we met with Aboriginal community leaders, I was quite struck by how committed the local community is to developing the island. They have funded, from their own reserves, a community project officer, and those reserves have come from operating a most successful farm on Yorke Peninsula. In fact, I am pleased to inform the House that the

Point Pearce community is the biggest single barley producer on Yorke Peninsula, and that is another success story for well-managed Aboriginal enterprises.

The Government is very keen to assist and encourage the Aboriginal people; we have a project officer in the State Department of Aboriginal Affairs with specific responsibility for Wardang Island. DEET has offered to fund training places for the projects which are related to fishing and to tourism development, and an Aboriginal liaison officer from the Office of Tourism Industry Development is working with the community. We are very optimistic that, with proper tourism development, which will be labour intensive and which will provide education and training for the local community, Wardang Island's future is very bright.

#### STATE DEBT

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** How much will the sale of enterprise investments contribute to the Government's debt reduction strategy?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The honourable member will find out in due course.

#### BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Does the Treasurer stand by his earlier statement in Question Time today concerning the new State Bank logo when he said that the State Bank had consulted with the CPS Credit Union concerning the new logo? The CPS Credit Union has today issued a press release, and I will quote it in part:

CPS Chief Executive Officer Mr Barry Hanna said today the credit union had sought legal advice on the issue [of the new State Bank logo] and believed that the former State Bank would have to abandon the desert pea.

It goes on to say:

Mr Hanna rejected claims by the State Bank Managing Director Mr Ted Johnson that the bank had discussed the matter with CPS 'two or three weeks ago' and had patented its new logo. 'For a start, the logo has not been patented.'

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I thank the honourable member for his question; it is an important issue. I will outline the events that I outlined previously. When the logo came to my attention and was looked at, and the background on the market research was presented to me a few days later, there came the statement, 'We have seen the actual representation of Sturt's desert pea and it happens to be on a CPS credit card.' Also it is important to understand that the State Bank has been running its uniforms with Sturt's desert pea for some two years, so it has been using Sturt's desert pea as part of its promotional effort, too.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** And it is a State emblem, to which I do not think anybody has proprietary rights, particularly in the form in which it is being used in South Australia. In fact, it was an exact replica rather than the stylised version. And just as well because, as we are aware, Sturt's desert pea is used in a number of promotions, as is Montefiore Hill and the rotunda. Some of the State's great assets are used for promotional purposes; there are no propriety rights to them. A member of the steering committee had a discussion with one of the staff members at CPS and the reaction was very positive. They said, 'Well, we can't seem to see a problem,' but it was not put to the test at that stage of saying—

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** Of course not; your boss is denying it.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Just wait till I have finished the explanation. So one of the preliminary questions was, 'Will we have a difficulty using this symbol? It is not Sturt's desert pea: it is a symbol of Sturt's desert pea?' And the response from the staff member, who might not have been qualified to give the answer was, 'It sounds like a good idea; Sturt's desert pea—State emblem.' However, to make sure that it was on a more formal basis, the General Manager, Banking Services, contacted Mr Ken Daniels, the Corporate Services Manager of CPS Credit Union, on Thursday 17 February, because if there was to be an enormous difficulty I would have preferred not to proceed along that line. We had had strong legal advice on the issue, and it is quite clear that we have a right to use it. We did not want to get ourselves into a battle between institutions, so there was an exchange of phone calls between the two individuals. No question, query or problem was raised at that stage. So on legal grounds it is particularly strong; in fact, there is no registered logo. My understanding is that the logo has been put forward for patent.

### HARKNESS HEIGHTS

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** Has the Minister for Housing and Urban Development made a decision regarding the proposed Harkness Heights housing development in the district council of Light?

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** The issue of the Harkness Heights future housing estate is a matter which has been raised with me by two councils. The Harkness Heights proposed estate is an area of land to the north of the Gawler township, but it actually resides in the district council of Light. Light council came to see me recently and put the point of view that the SDP should be approved, based on the fact that it is a sensible extension of the Gawler region and is an area in which people would want to live.

A consultant from the Gawler council also visited me and put a point of view as regards the area to the south of Gawler, particularly as it related to the Urban Land Trust land and some other private development. They believed that planning principles dictate that we should expand to the south and that it was inappropriate that the expansion take place to the north. I am currently taking careful advice from both the Urban Land Trust and my department on the question of planning principles as they apply to the land immediately south of Gawler. It is my view that the Harkness Heights development is a sensible extension of a land development, albeit in the Light district council area. The matters that have been raised by the Gawler council as regards land to the south of Gawler comprise a separate issue. We will address those issues as far as future planning is concerned. But at the appropriate time, when the SDP comes forward for authorisation, I personally will have no difficulty in authorising it unless extenuating circumstances come forward.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the House that Question Time must finish in a couple of minutes.

### PELZ, MS WINNIE

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Given the statements made today by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, can the Acting Premier confirm whether the Minister for the Arts declared in Cabinet her close friendship with Ms Winnie Pelz before she was appointed Chief Executive Officer of the Arts Department without advertise-

ment in order to avoid a potential conflict of interest and to accord with the Cabinet's code of conduct guidelines?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** This is outrageous!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** This is a Labor Party kindergarten operation.

**Mr CUMMINS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. That question implies improper motives against the honourable member, and in my submission it is an improper question.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is contrary to Standing Orders for a member to make improper accusations against another member of this House, and a member is not supposed to reflect upon a member of another House. I accepted the question because I believed that the matter had already been raised publicly; I understand it and, therefore, the Government should have had the opportunity to respond. I point out to all members that reflections on members imputing improper motives will not be tolerated by the Chair.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I want to point out that there were no improper motives: I was simply asking the Deputy Premier whether he agreed with his Minister.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I will respond to the question. It reflects on the questioner. I count members opposite as my friends; some members opposite are very good human beings. Under those circumstances, if I thought there was somebody of outstanding ability who happened to be on the other side of the House, I would have to declare that. The question is quite stupid.

---

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

**The SPEAKER:** I have to inform the House that Her Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the House for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 3.15 p.m. today. I ask the mover and seconder of the Address and such other members as care to accompany me to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting the Address.

*[Sitting suspended from 3.9 to 3.45 p.m.]*

**The SPEAKER:** I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to Her Excellency the Address adopted by the House yesterday, to which Her Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

To the honourable Speaker and members of the House of Assembly, I thank you for the Address in Reply to the speech with which I opened the first session of the Forty-eighth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best consideration to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.



**SEALAND (AUSTRALIA) TERMINALS PTY LTD**

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Tourism):** I table a ministerial statement made by the Minister for Transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) regarding Sealand (Australia) Terminals Pty Ltd.

**SUPPLY BILL**

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

(Continued from Page 268)

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I support the Supply Bill. My grievance today is about youth unemployment. I made reference to the problem in my maiden speech, and it has been a major concern for me for a long time. This morning I was fortunate to attend a talk at the boathouse of the Norwood/Morialta Secondary School, which is in my electorate, and was very much impressed by the Student Representative Council—the young men and women in secondary school who aspire to participate in our society. A wise man once said that youth is such a beautiful thing it is a pity it is wasted on the young. The sad fact is that many of the talents and contributions that youth can make to our society are often wasted not by the young but by society and by Governments that have disappointed and disempowered the young—a society that is not providing opportunities for young people to form a secure base and foundation for their future and, indeed, for our future.

I need not remind the House who has been in power in Australia and in South Australia for the past 10 years: I am sure that South Australians are relieved that there was a change of Government on 11 December 1993. With them I look forward to the reconstruction of South Australia's economy. Unemployment, whether it be amongst the young or the old, is a damaging experience, which has wide ranging ramifications. This is particularly so as Australia has one of the highest rates of long-term unemployed.

The rates for January 1994 are: Victoria, 11.8 per cent; Tasmania, 11.7 per cent; South Australia, 11.4 per cent; New South Wales, 10.3 per cent; Queensland, 10.1 per cent; and Western Australia, 9 per cent. They are still very high in comparison with international standards. This is serious and is causing much hardship for families, especially in rural areas and, of course, in pockets in the metropolitan area which suffer the effects of this terrible disease of unemployment more severely than others. However, today I would like to focus on the problem of youth unemployment.

This State has had an unprecedented growth rate in this area. The current rates for youth unemployment are serious indeed. I must correct myself: in my maiden speech I noted about 40 per cent youth unemployment for South Australia, but the reality is much higher. Tasmania has 43.2 per cent; South Australia, 42.6 per cent; Victoria, 38.3 per cent (and note that there is a Liberal Government there and youth seem to fare a little bit better, but 38 per cent is still a disgrace); Western Australia, 32.8 per cent; New South Wales, 34.8 per cent; and Queensland, 31.4 per cent.

The youth (the 15 to 19 years age group) full-time unemployment rate in South Australia in January, 42.6 per cent, remains higher than the Australian average of 35.3 per cent. Only the Tasmanian youth full-time unemployment rate of 43.2 per cent exceeded South Australia's rate in January

1994. That is a serious matter. When I completed year 12 in 1970, there were many opportunities open to me. I had the choice of tertiary institutions or full-time employment. Sadly, that is not the case for many young people in South Australia. Even for those students who have done very well and worked hard at school, those opportunities are not there, even with excellent results.

I am well aware of members opposite reminding us that we have been facing a world recession, and so on, and I understand the problem that Australia faces with dependence on commodity prices, but who is and who has been responsible for having all the eggs put in the one economic basket in Australia in the past 10 or 15 years? Who has been in power? If that is the problem, why did not we have policies that diversified the economies of Australia and South Australia? We should not be judged according to world recessions but according to the resources we have been blessed with—our talents and what the natural world has given us, not what the world recessions cause.

I can best illustrate this point by citing the case of a constituent in Hartley who spoke to me about his experiences. He also came from a migrant background and he said that, no doubt, when we came to Australia we were in a sense economic refugees. We came to Australia because Australia and South Australia provided greater opportunities than the places we left.

You could work hard and you could achieve, and many of them have. He went on to say:

You can imagine how I feel when I have to see my children migrate to other States and go overseas to find jobs.

You can indeed imagine how someone feels who has been uprooted from their homeland and made a new start in a new country: the migration cycle has to start again. But this need not be the case. As someone reminded me, Italy with little resources has made a lot; Australia with a lot of resources has made a little.

We all have to work together and try to get back to the standards we had in the past in the Menzies and Playford eras. I know they were not perfect; nevertheless, they were periods of great growth and opportunity for all Australians, especially South Australians. We all have to work together constructively to provide opportunities for the young, for they are our future, and if we do not we will be in serious trouble. I do not have to remind the House of the social ramifications of failing to acknowledge the need to provide employment for young people.

There are the problems of youth suicides and high speed chases. It is no good talking about law and order, and so on, if we do not deal with the economic problems and provide jobs. There is drug and alcohol abuse. They must be given long-term meaningful employment, for only then can we restore their faith in society and only then will they feel empowered and able to contribute in this excellent democracy of ours.

A person's identity, especially when they are unemployed, becomes very fragile and in danger of disintegration, and that is especially the case for the young. So, it is in our interests to continue to focus on this problem of providing young people with meaningful jobs.

As a schoolteacher I was only too aware of hidden unemployment, the underemployment and of students who merely came back to do year 12 again, in many cases not because they wanted to improve their results (and I am aware that a lot of them did) but because they had nowhere to go. There were no suitable tertiary places for them and there were

no jobs available. I was aware of a case where a student used to come to fill in Austudy forms to make sure that the right days were on them and, when a teacher refused to acknowledge the days and put the correct days down, that teacher was abused. It is a sorry state of affairs when teachers have to be threatened because—

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member's time has expired. I call on the member for Mitchell.

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** I wish to address my concerns in regard to the South Australian Housing Trust, particularly as it relates to Mitchell. However, I am sure the problems in Mitchell are mirrored in all South Australian Housing Trust regions. The Warradale region of the South Australian Housing Trust is the second largest region with 40 per cent of available rental stocks being in the electorate of Mitchell.

Concerns have been expressed—and direction is required—in particular regarding the tenancing of medium to high density estates. In my area, Drew Court would be an example of this situation. We have a casemix of senior citizens and the young, unemployed and the retired, the ill and the infirm, and the shift workers. These areas cause concern to the long-term tenants of this estate.

Small numbers of trust tenants and their visitors sometimes exhibit unusual behaviour while the actions of some others can be disruptive. The problems that these tenants can cause can be considerable. They are occasionally dangerous and involve a disproportionate amount of South Australian Housing Trust staff's time compared with other tenancies. In most cases those tenants are no different from private tenants and home owners, and they represent a broad spectrum of values, attitudes and standards. Clear practices are needed to protect the vast majority of responsible tenants from the behaviour of a few.

In considering upgrades, redevelopments and new estates, clear policies of assimilation of public housing with private dwellings is required. No longer can we substantiate what has been condoned in the past: rows upon rows of public housing, ghettos of forgotten people hidden from public view. In Mitchell there are areas I would like to put a bulldozer through and start all over again.

The foresight of our forefathers in planning the city of Adelaide was lost on their sons when it came to planning and the building of public housing stocks of the past. In the suburb of Mitchell Park some attempts at this assimilation have occurred with the redevelopments. However, there have not been as many as I would prefer. The 80 houses originally set for demolition prior to 1989, in association with the ill-fated Tonsley interchange, now stand—and only just—awaiting a decision on their future. I am presently lobbying the Minister for a decision to demolish these houses and redevelop in conjunction with private enterprise these 80 housing blocks, thereby further enhancing the quality of life for the people of this suburb.

Maintenance of these buildings, some pre-war, has been deplorable. A case could be made (and I stress that) that the lack of spending on maintenance and repairs over the past decade was deliberate. A very small percentage of one day's interest of State debt would go a long way towards fixing the cracks, the ventilation and heating problems, the painting and the floor coverings, etc., in public housing rental stocks in Mitchell. Unfortunately, that money is gone, spent, never to be used to improve the asset value of our stocks. The spending of that money on maintenance and repair would also

have provided jobs for South Australians and the constituents of Mitchell.

However, the past is past. The future policy of this Government towards South Australian public housing rental stocks is important: the policy of further encouraging existing tenants to purchase their existing property is to be applauded, as it will release funds for redevelopment of old stocks, the purchase of new stocks, increased maintenance and repair—newer stocks needing less maintenance and repair funds—and reduce waiting lists.

In ensuring proper management of our stocks we must also be mindful of the working conditions of the staff who are to implement our policies. The Warradale regional office (which is, as I said, the second largest region) would have one of the worst office facilities that I have seen for a long time.

The facilities are a disgrace and raise serious occupational health and safety issues for the staff of the region. Plans need to be implemented for the redevelopment of office facilities for the Warradale region. We are fortunate to have the development of the Marion regional centre in the middle of the electorate. The majority of the land involved in that centre is yet to be developed. This regional centre, which is owned by the South Australian Housing Trust, the State Government Insurance Commission and the City of Marion, offers opportunities for the future not available elsewhere on the Adelaide Plains. In conjunction with Westfield Marion, with the proposed bus and rail interchange, cultural developments as well as commerce and Government facilities such as offices for the South Australian Housing Trust, the future of Marion regional centre is one of the challenges of the future for this Government.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I want to take the opportunity this afternoon to address a couple of issues of concern to my electorate. First, I wish to clarify some points in relation to conflicts of interest. On a number of occasions—a great many occasions—members of Cabinets of which I was a part mentioned not only their family and financial interests but also close friendships in appointments in order to avoid a conflict of interest. I am surprised that conflict of interest issues should be regarded as being an issue of so little substance by the Deputy Premier. I think it shows an extraordinary contempt for the code of ethics that was much touted by his Premier.

However, I want to take this opportunity to discuss some important law and order issues that affect both my own electorate and the State as a whole. Last July I conducted a survey in the Salisbury area which showed that many local people believed that judges were not in touch with the public's concerns about sentencing. It is quite clear that public concern reflected in that survey showed that confidence in the judiciary was at a very low ebb. The results of that survey were frightening in terms of a lack of respect shown for our judges and magistrates. I was certainly very concerned by the very negative attitudes I found towards judges in particular.

First, let me detail the responses to that survey. I asked the question: Do you believe that Neighbourhood Watch is worth while as an active deterrent to crime locally? The response was: yes, 80 per cent; no, 15 per cent; do not know, 5 per cent. The second question I asked was: The State Government recently introduced stiffer penalties for juvenile offenders. Are these laws too harsh for young offenders? The response was: yes, 4 per cent; no, 79 per cent; do not know, 17 per cent.

The next question I asked was: Do you believe that South Australia's judges and magistrates are in touch with community concerns about crime? The response was: yes, 22 per cent; no, 68 per cent; do not know, 10 per cent. My fourth question was: Do you believe that South Australia's judges and magistrates have increased their sentences to reflect sentences passed by the South Australian Parliament? The response was: yes, 21 per cent; no, 55 per cent; do not know, 24 per cent. The final question was: Is the South Australian Government justified in appealing against sentences passed down by the courts which the Government believes are too lenient? The response was: yes, 84 per cent; no, 9 per cent; do not know, 7 per cent.

Whilst I was very pleased to note the public concern about issues such as Neighbourhood Watch and stiffer penalties, I was very concerned about the community's negative attitude towards judges. I believe it is vitally important that our judiciary maintain its absolute independence: that independence is crucial not only to the maintenance of law but also as a fundamental building block of our democratic society. But independence does not mean being out of touch with community attitudes. It was quite clear that many people in my area of Salisbury felt that judges were ignoring the stiffer penalties provided for in Parliament. There was also a view that judges and magistrates had little contact with decent law-abiding citizens, Neighbourhood Watch groups, and little understanding of local concerns.

After conducting that survey, I believed it was vitally important that our judges and magistrates had a better understanding of local issues and public concerns. So, I wrote to Chief Justice King informing him of the results of my survey and respectfully suggesting a constructive way of improving community understanding of the role of judges, particularly in the area of sentencing.

Following discussions with several local Neighbourhood Watch leaders in the Salisbury area, I suggested to Chief Justice King that a judge and/or magistrate be asked to attend and address a combined meeting of Neighbourhood Watch committee members in the Salisbury area. I believed that such a meeting would be useful for the citizens involved in Neighbourhood Watch and also useful for the judiciary to receive constructive feedback and straight talk from local people.

I was therefore delighted to receive a letter from the Chief Justice, within days, welcoming my proposals for judicial representatives to attend a combined meeting of Neighbourhood Watch committee members. It took some time to organise, because the designated Supreme Court Judge, Mr Justice Mullighan, was involved in the war crime trials. However, in October, Mr Justice Mullighan and Magistrate Jonathan Harry, SM, came to Salisbury one evening to meet with nearly 200 northern suburbs Neighbourhood Watch leaders and people representing victims of crime groups and other groups.

I believe that this meeting was both unusual and unprecedented, but it was an outstanding success. The judge and the magistrate spent some hours answering questions in a very frank way on subjects ranging from sentencing policies through to the rights of victims of crime and, indeed, the role of victims in court procedures.

Justice Mullighan defended the judiciary about claims that it was out of touch with the community. He told locals that judges handing down sentences agonised about the effects of crime on victims. He said:

No-one that I have seen in the justice system agonises more than the judge about the parents who have lost a child, the girl who has been raped, the elderly person who has had the security of her home violated.

Justice Mullighan said it was impossible to satisfy everyone when going through the extraordinary number of issues raised during a trial and in the sentencing process. He said:

When a sentence is imposed you can be sure of one thing, and that is that I will have offended somebody.

I have organised many community meetings in my electorate, as most members have, but I have never had such strong and positive feedback as I had from that meeting. Dozens of people who attended told me that they felt it was a unique opportunity to speak first-hand to a judge or magistrate and to express their views as decent law-abiding citizens about the impact of crime on the community and to express the personal trauma of victims about the offences, the court, the trial process, and the impact on victims of allegedly light sentences.

I also received very strong feedback that Neighbourhood Watch representatives felt that, as a result of the meeting, they had a much better understanding of court processes, of the role of police and, indeed, of the role of magistrates and judges and, importantly, of the huge range of issues that the judiciary has to grapple with in determining sentences. I should add that I also received very strong and positive feedback from Justice Mullighan and Magistrate Harry about the meeting. I am sure that they felt that they probably had been walking into the lion's den and that the meeting would be quite hostile—it was not. I believe that members of the public, the police who attended and the judiciary all benefited from the experience.

I believe it would be a great pity if my initiative in Salisbury were a one-off experience. I want publicly to propose that judges and magistrates are asked by the Chief Justice to get out into the community and to listen. I am sure there are hundreds of thousands of citizens in South Australia who perhaps hold the view, however misplaced, that judges and magistrates live in some kind of ivory tower, removed from the real world and real-world experiences. I am sure also that there are judges and magistrates who believe that they are misunderstood by the public and misrepresented by the media. I hope that the Neighbourhood Watch network in South Australia can be used throughout the State to convene a series of similar meetings.

If they are organised with the blessing and active support of the judiciary, I believe we can go some way towards breaking down the barriers that exist between judges and the public. Judges must be in touch with the real world and must be seen to be in touch with real people, real concerns and real issues. Being independent does not mean being remote or inaccessible to society. The administration of law and justice in our society cannot work properly if the community's respect for the judiciary is at a low point.

I commend this view to the House. I hope other members of Parliament, in a bipartisan way, will take the opportunity to invite judges and magistrates to attend meetings in their electorates. I was somewhat nervous about the reception that the judge and magistrate would receive in my electorate. However, I thought it was a most constructive meeting, which I followed a week later with the then Attorney-General (Hon. Chris Sumner), who also explained our position as legislators, Government and Parliament in terms of the law.

**Mr KERIN (Frome):** I had intended to speak this afternoon about country roads; however, as some of my rural

colleagues have already reminded the House of the deplorable state of those roads, I will broaden the topic. I wish to focus on the State's infrastructure, our present and future needs, the setting of priorities and the avoidance of waste. Many of our infrastructure problems have been exacerbated, and indeed caused, by the shortness of the political agenda. The current infrastructure problems have been caused by the incapacity of past State and Federal Governments to have a long-term plan or vision. At State level, in particular, we have seen the situation arise whereby some urgent infrastructure needs are ignored, whilst other Government departments have virtually thrown money away. Many people scratch their heads trying to understand the allocation of priorities.

We need a greater whole of Government approach to infrastructure. This is well illustrated in my own electorate where we have major problems with roads and schools in particular. Yet, in Port Pirie, we have the infamous bridge to nowhere; indeed, it is a monument to astute political thinking. I also know of a beautiful steel shed built by a Government department a couple of years ago, complete with concrete floor, which will be pulled down in the very near future. Perhaps it has served the purpose of its construction but, as far as I know, the total use for this substantial structure up until now is that it has held one small tin of lawn mower fuel—pure waste. There are many examples of such things.

At the risk of completely boring the House, I must mention roads, at least in passing. The member for Custance, yet again, mentioned the Burra-Morgan road, complete with its history of political backflips and ignorance. The lack of work on this road in the past has handicapped the entire northern part of our State. The penalty paid by the Burra community and all other communities in the north has been immense. Likewise, the Spalding-Burra road is a never-ending saga and, yet again, work recently stopped because of funds drying up.

I am constantly reminded of the Jamestown-Booleroo Road, which is causing much concern and anguish within the area. The two councils involved are thoroughly frustrated by the persistent knockbacks they received for funding on the grounds that the traffic count is not high enough. The reason that the traffic count is not high enough is the state of the road. They have a classic catch 22 situation. Not only is the road dangerous, causing regular accidents, but it knocks the hell out of vehicles; and constant flat tyres is another massive disincentive to users of that road. This particularly applies to women and the elderly at night, as those who have changed tyres in the dark will understand; and I guess not too many city people have had to do that.

As mentioned in the House earlier today, the syphoning off of fuel taxes to prop up general revenue has brought about this disgraceful situation. It is discrimination against country people because they need more fuel to get from point A to point B. This is presently made worse by the fact that, increasingly, many travel longer distances because the shortest route is both too dangerous or too hard on tyres and vehicles. As the member for Mitchell mentioned in his maiden speech, those who have visited Kangaroo Island would fully realise the extent to which poor road quality is handicapping the tourism potential of the island. I think that, despite whatever we do there, unless the roads are fixed the problems will remain.

The condition of schools in my electorate is indicative of a complete lack of long-term planning and the lack of an effective facilities replacement program. The 'as-critical' approach to maintenance has not only seen our children and

teachers having to operate in totally inadequate facilities but has also been a most inefficient use of funds. The amount of money spent 'as-desperate' on many of these old buildings has far exceeded the amounts required to replace those building under a decent facilities replacement program. New roofs, new floors, new ceilings, recladding and new windows on an 'as-needed' basis add up to very expensive and yet old and inadequate buildings.

I renew the call I made in my maiden speech that, to address the current mess in respect of Education Department buildings, we need a 10, 15 or even 20 year rebuilding program with bipartisan support, in the unlikely event of a change of Government within that period. Greater planning and more rigid guidelines for the allocation of priorities are needed. I would like to relate a past experience of mine to illustrate a deficiency in the system of allocations.

The Crystal Brook Primary School had sought school redevelopment for about 40 years. It had been misled and ignored by successive Governments over those years. When my eldest daughter started school seven years ago, I joined the school council. As with so many before me, my first question was: what can be done about the disgusting condition of the buildings? I immediately witnessed the reaction of a group of people totally frustrated by many years of fighting against bureaucracy to have something done. Their spirit had been all but broken. On taking the files home and perusing them I noticed that the system had virtually hijacked all efforts. Even a petition had only gone as far as the western area office at Whyalla.

With some help from the current Minister for Education, I was able to arrange a meeting with the then Director-General. Four of us from the school spent about half an hour with the Director-General, and we walked out of the room with the guarantee of a new school. When we entered the elevator we could not rise a smile at all. We realised there was something wrong with a system that would let that happen. So much for the careful and prudent allocation of priorities! If we had not rocked the boat and done it the wrong way, nothing would have happened.

In my maiden speech last week I also spoke of the disgraceful state of the Port Pirie courthouse. There is no adequate waiting area, no interview rooms, no wheelchair access and so it goes on. This inadequate facility is a classic example of the lack of planning displayed by past Governments. Like roads and schools, it is another example of the impact which a lack of planning for infrastructure spending has on people's lives. The people of Frome and other electorates are paying for this lack of planning in such basic areas as justice, education and transport.

I might add that the lack of roads and facilities in my electorate is accompanied by an abundance of deserted infrastructure, notably, the magnificent structure which is the Gladstone gaol. It is as solid as ever and screaming out to have its facilities put to some practical use. Many railway buildings in the area are empty, gradually being devalued by vandalism and time. There are buildings in Port Pirie, Peterborough, Gladstone and elsewhere going to waste. These and many other structures just lie deserted as a result of the centralisation policies that were foisted upon us in recent years.

I am confident that under the new Government we will experience a greatly improved approach to infrastructure. We already have a commitment to address the problem of unsealed arterial roads, and this will be welcomed by those who live beyond Gepps Cross. As a State, we need to take a

much more corporate approach to infrastructure. You do not see big banks or retail chains doing maintenance and replacement on an 'as-desperate' basis. Like other businesses and organisations, the best facilities at the least cost with absolute minimal waste should be our ultimate aim. Our charter as representatives of our electorates is to use our budget to the best effect in order to provide the community with the necessary infrastructure and services. I am confident that this Government will ensure that this task is better performed than it has been in the past.

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** Already today I have drawn attention to an impending problem of gargantuan proportions in terms of the extent to which it will impact on the communities I represent, although it is of minuscule dimensions in terms of the size of the individuals which go to make it up. I am talking about mice and the plague which we already have but which is about to re-establish itself on Eyre Peninsula, in the Murray-Mallee and at other places. Only a couple of weeks ago, Rachael Rodda of the *Advertiser* drew attention to this problem that is emerging. She has made extensive inquiries into how the situation is progressing and reports that in the Riverland an enormous problem has emerged where mice are ravaging horticultural crops of capsicums, apricots, sweet corn, oranges, nectarines and pears, indeed anything at all into which they can dig their teeth.

To make things worse, Mr Deputy Speaker, as you would know, wherever mice go rats follow, especially if they exist in sufficient numbers, if for no other reason than they feast on the carcasses of dead mice. Sooner or later everything dies and normal predators cannot keep up, so rats find themselves well supplied with food, and they reproduce at the highest possible rate free of disease. As a consequence, rats are a problem in the Riverland as well. From my knowledge of what happened in the Mallee last year, pockets of rats will develop and spread to a greater extent than was the case last year as we go into late autumn and early winter before the normal frosts and/or heavy rains freeze them to death or drown them. Rats do not drown, they swim very well but, if they do not have adequate food and only wet and cold places in which to live, they slow down.

The problem has been identified on the West Coast, and Mr Sinclair of the Animal and Plant Control Commission (APCC) said that bumper crops and unseasonal rains had attracted the mice. Indeed, in my judgment they not so much attracted them but added to their rapidly expanding number. They are ideal conditions for mice. Mr Sinclair went on to say that these areas were not baited last year, so they were the hot spots for another mouse plague. He was referring to locations in any part of the State where landholders could not afford to buy bait. I am dwelling on this topic again in order to make the point that, whilst normally it is responsible to expect the user to pay, it would be absolutely useless to think that we could address this problem by requiring the landholder to buy the bait (that is, the strychnine and the grain) and meet the cost of providing it.

We must now get an adequate supply of strychnine in stock and distribute it across the State wherever there are extraordinary numbers of mice. I am not talking about plague proportions; I am talking about extraordinary numbers, because they will become a plague. If we do not do that we are fooling ourselves. We are requiring landholders who still have some equity against which to borrow, some cash to spend, to buy poison to kill the mice on their property only

to find, as we did last year, that the plague on the neighbour's property will migrate back across their property, leaving a residual problem. That is crazy; it has no basis whatsoever in any technique of disease control that I have ever studied.

It may have been convenient last year for the Government to deal with the problem in the way it did, but it was not responsible, and we will be less than responsible if we presume that we can deal with the problem in that fashion again next year. Let me reiterate: I do not want to see ever again in my electorate or anywhere else the situation of a distraught mother and father having to take their children to the doctor with their nostrils, eyelashes, earlobes, toes and genitals bitten in their sleep by mice, or to see beds in which children had to sleep infested with mice. The linen had to be changed every time they sought to sleep, and often the children were woken during the night by the mice that were sharing their bed.

To my mind that is despicable. The parents simply had to tear up the shredded, soiled and defiled carpets and soft furnishings and throw them out of the house. Somehow or other they got a mouse proof tent and nailed it to the floor in their living room so that they had somewhere to sleep without being disturbed by mice and to keep their food safe from being attacked and defiled by this plague.

I turn now to other matters of concern to me. We have left people in rural South Australia for too long with problems with which they can no longer deal. They can identify the problems, they can own the problems, and they can see ways in which those problems might be solved, but they no longer have the resources to deal with them. Unless we examine quickly the necessity to provide social development infrastructure to support those communities, their collapse will be something for which I will not be held accountable. I believe that the House and the Government recognise that there probably are circumstances that need attention, but those circumstances were ignored in the run-up to the election, largely because the political battleground was in the metropolitan area. The election is behind us now. A good Government has a good conscience, and in all conscience this Government must address those problems before we see a rapid escalation in the rate of suicide, marriage breakdowns and dysfunctional behaviour of children and adolescents. It is not good enough simply to stand by and let it continue—and I will not.

I turn now to some of the stupid statements that have been made by other members during the course of the debate on the Supply Bill. The member for Playford drew attention to a hypothetical suggestion: the sell off of State assets. I presume that his debate will be circulated in his electorate and elsewhere throughout the community in South Australia. His comments were quite out of order in that they misconstrued the circumstances behind the problems. For instance, he said that members will recall that in the late 1970s SGIC picked up compulsory third party insurance when none of the other insurance companies would have anything to do with it. The fact is that the Dunstan Government deliberately held premiums so low that no other insurance company was interested in taking on that liability. That was done deliberately in order to establish a Government insurance office that had a monopoly with a secure revenue stream. There was no other reason for that having happened.

We now find that premiums for third party bodily injury insurance have escalated to the point where they are ridiculous. What is more, SGIC management has not been exactly honourable in the way in which it has handled that income

stream from the premiums and the assets which were procured with it. More particularly now, we as a Parliament should urge the Government to do away with things that are costing the taxpayers money. SGIC is one of those.

If it costs more to sell SGIC by way of public float than the float itself may obtain, the sooner we cut the painter and let it sink, the better. Furthermore, as I warned the then Government regarding the Adelaide Entertainment Centre, long before it ever became a reality, a feasibility study was needed to establish its viability. Previously Kym Mayes, the then Minister, abused me in this place for drawing attention to my concerns about that and its implications for the public purse. We now find that it cannot even operate when it has a 1 per cent subsidy.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Elder.

**Mr WADE (Elder):** I refer today to community based programs—basically the spending of money allocated through the Supply Bill. No matter what Acts of Parliament are passed to protect young people, we will still be faced with situations where a young person is at risk because they cannot live at home. In 1978 the South Australian Department for Community Welfare released a report entitled 'The Development of Services for Young Offenders'. This report was based on recommendations from royal commission into the administration of the juvenile courts Act and the Community Welfare Advisory Committee into Youth Assessment and Training Centres.

One of the major recommendations of the report was the introduction of the Intensive Neighbourhood Care (INC) scheme in April 1979, which was aimed at providing rehabilitative care for young people who had offended and who could not return home but for whom secure institutionalised care was seen as inappropriate. Indeed, to lock up first offenders or to put away children at risk who could not live at home was seen as more of a crime against the child, and rightfully so. The INC scheme was set up to handle those young offenders and was later extended to include children at risk who could not cope with normal foster or family placements but who required virtually 24-hour personalised care and supervision on a one-to-one basis for a defined period of time.

A young person could be placed in an INC family only when he or she would otherwise have been placed in secure care by the court. Therefore, a young person could be placed in an INC family only by the court. The INC scheme was divided into four distinct sections: INC emergency, which involved short-term care for between one to seven days; INC remand, short-term care for between two to four weeks; INC support, care for up to a maximum of six months; and INC adolescent, care for six to 12 months. The basic aim of the INC family was to provide individual care and support for the young person in order to promote new behaviour patterns and survival skills which would help the teenager on his or her return to their natural family.

However, this was not always possible, and assistance was then given to the teenager to find alternative long-term accommodation with a family or to prepare for independent living. While in an INC placement, the teenager attended specialised sessions conducted by personnel within the Department for Family and Community Services to enable him or her to gain those skills necessary for personal and social survival.

For 10 years the scheme worked very well. It was one of the most successful, if not the most successful, programs for changing aberrant behaviour and attitudes and for providing a true safe house for children at risk. Most teenagers returned home to renew their relationships with their families on better terms. Whilst these children were not at home, FACS would have social workers to help the child's family to cope and to help them understand where things had gone off the rails. Like all things that work well, it had to be fiddled with in the name of restructuring, rationalisation and that nebulous concept, social justice.

The year of 1989 was a bad one for the youth of South Australia who needed help. That was the year FACS decided to rationalise the INC scheme. The first step was to lower the remuneration paid to INC parents who cared for these troubled youngsters for 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The daily rate paid was \$34.60, in effect, \$1.44 per hour. FACS decided that this rate was too much, and it was reduced under the new scheme to \$22.85 per day, or 95¢ per hour. The reason given for this reduction was that 'it was based on social justice principles'. That phrase has lost a lot of its appeal for me since that day. It means everything: therefore, it means nothing.

The INC parents decided to form a committee combining the northern and southern regions to make representations to the then Minister of Health, a former colleague who has since left this Chamber. At first that Minister denied that the situation was occurring and then, when he was faced with the written proof of it from his own department, he folded his arms, turned away and did not want to face the youth of this State. The committee tried other avenues; it approached the then Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Mr Steve Condous, now a member in this place, and the then Leader of the Opposition, now Premier, to attempt to rectify this wrong. However, nothing was done.

So that members can understand the situation, I cite the example of a 15 year old adolescent who is under a court order, who enters the INC scheme and who receives a dependent allowance, such as Job Search, which is \$64.30 per week. As I have said, the current rate paid to INC parents per day is \$34.60, the new rate being \$22.85. Under the very successful, workable scheme, \$242.20 would be reimbursed to the INC parent to care for the child. Clothing would be maintained as required by the INC parent. Board would be paid as agreed between the child and FACS. Whatever amount was agreed between FACS and the child was then deducted from that \$242.20. Pocket money was not paid and extras were paid for by the child.

Under the new scheme, that weekly reimbursement of \$242.20 was reduced to \$160, a reduction per week of \$82.20. There are not too many professionals and tradespeople in this State who are willing to be paid \$82.20 less than they were paid last week for doing the same job. Under the new scheme the child was required to pay for their own clothing. The Department for Family and Community Services decided that \$41.10 per week should come out of their allowance of \$64.30 per week and be paid towards clothing. As the child was also required to pay board of about \$25 a week, that left the child with basically little or nothing to cover medical expenses, incidentals and extras.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hart.

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** I refer to an issue which was raised during Question Time and which was mentioned on the front page of this morning's *Advertiser*, namely, the new logo for

the State Bank of South Australia or, as it will now be called, Bank SA. Clearly, what we have here is a conflict between two institutions, and in this instance I have no hesitation in coming in to bat for the smaller of the two institutions, because what has occurred is very disappointing and extremely concerning—concerning from a couple of aspects. I must say that the Treasurer, in his answers to the House today, was less than convincing about the whole procedure of how the State Bank came to adopt Sturt's pea as its logo and about the context of discussions between the State Bank and the CPS Credit Union. The press release, released at 2 p.m. today by the CPS Credit Union, states:

CPS Credit Union is questioning the legality of the new Bank of South Australia logo. CPS Chief Executive Officer, Mr Barry Hanna said today the credit union had sought legal advice on the issue and believed the former State Bank would have to abandon the desert pea.

'We have been using the desert pea as the cornerstone of our corporate image for two years,' Mr Hanna said. 'It is on all of our marketing material—from annual reports to newsletters. Our cheques and Visa cards all have the desert pea clearly displayed. In addition to the question of our established prior use of the desert pea, there is the question of whether State Bank's actions are in breach of section 52 of the Trade Practices Act, which deals with the issue of deceptive or misleading actions. It seems quite extraordinary that the bank should spend \$25 000 to create a corporate image that one of the State's biggest credit unions has been using for more than two years. It is hardly as if they could not have known of our existence. Their headquarters is just around the corner from ours.'

Mr Hanna rejected claims by State Bank Managing Director, Ted Johnson that the bank had discussed the matter with CPS 'two or three weeks ago' and had patented its new logo. 'For a start, the logo has not been patented,' he said. 'We understand that all the bank did was apply for a patent on 15 February when it realised that CPS already used the desert pea as a corporate branding tool.

And that was only a matter of some nine days ago. The document continues:

'That patent has certainly not been approved and CPS will oppose the application. As for the claim that CPS were advised two or three weeks ago, I reject that out of hand. CPS Credit Union has had no correspondence from the bank. Neither I nor any other senior manager have had any contact with the State Bank. CPS have been using the desert pea for two years and if the bank is going on with the idea it had better contact CPS immediately.

It is outrageous to imply—as the bank has done—that we had been advised of the move and had no objection. That could not be further from the truth. We are certainly not State Bank's size, but we do have the interests of 64 000 members and their \$250 million in assets to protect. We will not be steamrolled on an issue like this simply because it appears that adequate research was not undertaken by the bank before the new logo was finalised. And it is not as if we operate in different industries.'

And, of course, they are similar industries. It continues:

'We are both financial institutions, although—for any number of reasons—our public profile is not as high as State Bank's.

The CPS is having its legal representatives look at the issue and I understand it is contacting the bank today. That is the CPS's position on the issue. But what did we have the Treasurer telling us? During Question Time today the Treasurer said:

We searched the register to ensure there was no breach of existing copyright or other trademark that might have affected its use and again we found that the results were clear. We could use the stylised version of a desert pea without any possibility of redress. So, having done that, after the designer came up with this chosen design which enjoyed such strong support and realising that CPS used an advertising device, we contacted CPS about the matter, once very informally and on another occasion . . . on a more formal basis. No questions were raised. Indeed, in one set of informal discussions it was suggested that the wider use of this would help CPS.

The Treasurer keeps saying 'we' in his speech, so I assume that he or some of his officers have had some input into it as well. By way of a word of caution, if I were the Treasurer, I do not know whether I would be using the word 'we' when

it came to discussing the State Bank. Later in Question Time, the Treasurer said:

So one of the preliminary questions was, 'Will we have a difficulty using this symbol?' . . . And the response from the staff member—

this is from the CPS—

who may not have been qualified to give the answer. . .

So the Treasurer is admitting that perhaps they did not speak to the person to whom they should have spoken—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I am getting confused, as the member for Mitchell continually interjects. Obviously you, Mr Speaker, cannot hear it, but it is most annoying from here. The Treasurer continues:

However, to make sure that it was on a more formal basis, the General Manager, Banking Services, contacted Mr Ken Daniels, the Corporate Services Manager of CPS Credit Union, and that took place on Thursday 17 February because, if there was going to be an enormous difficulty, I would have preferred not to proceed along that line.

What the Treasurer said in the House today was that there had been consultation between the State Bank and the CPS Credit Union. That clearly has not happened. It certainly has not happened at any level of authority within CPS and, if any officer was spoken to in CPS, clearly that officer was a junior officer. The Treasurer, in his own answer to the House today, confirmed that when he acknowledged that perhaps they were not talking to the right people. I would urge the Treasurer to have immediate discussions with the State Bank and ask the State Bank to withdraw its logo. It clearly is causing the CPS hardship, and there is no need for the State Bank to continue with it.

That brings me to another point, that is, the quality of advice that the State Bank is still continuing to give to this House. I do not want to comment in any detail on the quality of advice given to the former Government, but clearly there were many occasions—

**Mr Quirke:** I will.

**Mr FOLEY:** Maybe I will comment a bit further.

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** That's right. The member for Playford is dead right. The quality of advice coming from the State Bank over the past three or four years was atrocious—disgraceful advice would probably be a better description.

**Mr Quirke:** It was downright inaccurate and on many occasions out and out fabrication and lies.

**Mr FOLEY:** That's correct. Clearly, the State Bank—

**Mr Condous:** The logo for Frew Street Homeless Youth is Sturt's pea: we don't object to it.

**Mr FOLEY:** Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** The member for Colton may have a view on that; I am not familiar with that issue. I am talking about—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** What I am talking about—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** You are going to get it one day; when you get on your feet—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest to the member for Hart that he address his comments through the Chair and, if he objects to the conduct of another member, he bring it to the attention of the Chair.

**Mr FOLEY:** Thank you, Mr Speaker; I will do that next time. The point I make is that the CPS Credit Union will suffer hardship; the General Manager has acknowledged that publicly today. Clearly, the State Bank should be instructed

to withdraw that logo. Again, I come back to the point: I would hope that this House is better served by the State Bank of South Australia, that the quality of advice it gives to the Treasurer is 100 per cent accurate and that it does not continue with its previous practice under the former Government. Clearly, it is continuing under this Government that that advice is inaccurate and misleading. I am sure the Treasurer will already have spoken to his advisers and certainly to the State Bank's advisers following Question Time today, because clearly the Treasurer was let down yet again by poor advice from the State Bank.

*Mr Condous interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** That is an issue that the member for Colton may have to take up with the CPS. We have here a big institution in South Australia wanting to steamroll over the interests of a smaller institution, and that is not on.

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:** That is clearly not on and I urge the Government and the Treasurer to have discussions with the State Bank and ask it to find another logo that does not clearly impinge on the business activities of another organisation.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 8 March at 2 p.m.



**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday 22 February 1994

**QUESTION ON NOTICE****MINISTERS' TITLE**

59. **Mr ATKINSON:** Why was it necessary to change the title of State Ministers from 'Minister of' to 'Minister for' and will the Government revert to the form used since self-government to

avoid confusion with Commonwealth Ministers who are 'Ministers for' and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** In view of the mandate given to the new Liberal Government by the people of South Australia, it was obvious that a clear change from the past was required. Consequently, a change in ministerial title was introduced to reflect a fresh, forward looking approach to Government management which emphasises the new facilitating role this Government will play in its mission to create jobs, reduce debt and revive the standards of the State's community services.

It is also the case that the title 'Minister for' is used by the Commonwealth and every other State Government (with the exception of the ACT who use both 'Minister for' and 'Minister of'). As far as I am aware, this has not caused any confusion whatsoever between Commonwealth Ministers and State Ministers.

Consequently, this Government will not be reverting to the nomenclature 'Minister of'.