

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 4 August 1994

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn)** took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 3 August. Page 63.)

**Mr WADE (Elder):** Before I commence my Address in Reply contribution, I must make a few comments on the contribution of the member for Hart. Having taken copious notes throughout his speech, I went through them last night applying logic and sensible, reasonable argument. I ended up with one small piece of paper containing two comments that I think could be relevant. The first comment from the member for Hart was that we are a State of very meagre means, and the second was that the Premier should talk about national issues. I think that reflects the view of the previous Government (the present Opposition)—it has still lost the plot; it is not with the program; it does not understand what is going on. When this State is in dire need of restructuring, the Opposition's only comment is that we should talk about national issues. So much for the contribution of the member for Hart.

I commend Her Excellency on her speech, which has again set new positive directions for our State's economic and social recovery. The Brown Liberal team promised 12 000 new jobs in its first 12 months in office. In our first six months we have created an additional 7 200 full-time jobs in the private sector: that is real jobs with real career prospects, and that does not include the positive potential that will arise from business investment in our State by Motorola, Australis, Mitsubishi, Wirrina and BTR Nylex, to name just a few. We are well on the way to meeting our target.

It has been said that CES figures rise as a result of people relisting their names with their local job centre as they gain confidence in being able to procure meaningful, long-term employment. In my electorate of Elder, confidence is such that we have had an increase in employment of over 5 per cent in the last month alone. In addition, the number of people who have registered at the job centre dropped from 999 in January to 674 in June this year—a drop of 36 per cent. Those two figures together indicate without a shadow of a doubt that my constituents are seeking and gaining work of a permanent nature.

These are not pseudo-Government jobs that take them off the social security figures; these are real life jobs for people who want to work. My constituents are not afraid of work. They are the lifeblood of our economy, and their manual, technical and managerial skills are again being put to good use. The light at the end of the tunnel, which Mr Keating turned off as a result of the recession, has been turned on again by a State Liberal Government that has put people and prosperity first on its list of priorities. Profit brings prosperity to all; greed brings grief to many. The greedy and self-serving interests that have plagued this State for nearly a decade have been given notice—your days are numbered!

We are a Government for the people: we support individual effort, small business growth, corporate cooperation and efficient community services. We will enforce our mandate

for changes that enhance the lives of our citizens in spite of the massive debt that we inherited from our inefficient predecessors. Businesses must trade out of this debt with none of the impediments that are the legacy of Labor. We have started the ball rolling with our legislative, economic and public sector reforms. These reforms are essential for my constituents in Elder as it contains thousands of businesses which employ many hundreds of local people.

Local business prosperity has a direct impact on their quality of life. I have initiated local business meetings in Elder to find out the needs of Elder's business community and to bring these needs to the attention of and action by our Liberal Government. Significant industrial relations reforms will encourage innovative working patterns that reflect the needs of people and businesses alike, under the protective umbrella of minimum working conditions that must apply to all enterprise agreements. Federal legislation that allows unions to intrude into non-union enterprises and intervene in enterprise efficiency agreements has brought to a halt industrial flexibility for employees under Federal awards. Only six non-union firms have sought enterprise flexibility agreements within the Federal sphere. This is a national disgrace, when one considers that the majority of employees under Federal awards choose not to be union members.

The unions intrude to prevent change; they are still in the greedy 1980s, when the union officials were prepared to sacrifice employees' jobs to maintain their own personal power base. The power base has changed in South Australia. We are achieving the one thing that unions and uncontrolled bureaucracies fear the most: we are empowering the people. South Australian awards run parallel to enterprise agreements. Our Government knows that efficiency is not bought at the expense of basic human rights and that people need to tread gently from one comfort zone to a new comfort zone. Our transition is orderly and people-conscious, for without an effective and motivated work force we are doomed to an era of industrial inertia. The words of Niccola Machiavelli, an early political philosopher of some note, ring as true today as when he wrote them in 1512. He wrote:

It must be remembered that there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to handle, than to initiate a new order of things. For the reformer has enemies in all who profit by the old order, and only lukewarm defenders in all those who would profit by the new order; this lukewarmness arising partly from fear of their adversaries, who have the law in their favour, and partly from the incredulity of mankind, who do not truly believe in anything new until they have actual experience of it.

We have changed the laws and we have opened the doors for South Australians to actually experience the exhilaration of working to agreed rules, not those imposed by traditions or selfish vested interests. We have set the stage, provided the props and written the script. South Australian people and, in particular, my constituents in Elder will ensure that the play is a resounding success.

Our initiatives in WorkCover reforms have allowed employers to concentrate on working conditions over which they have control. Responsibility for areas not in their control, as in the case of a person travelling to or from his or her place of work, has been placed back onto the individual concerned. Employers can be responsible only for activities, processes and machinery over which they have some degree of control. Whether a person comes to work by car, bus, bicycle, motorbike or by foot is outside the control and direction of the employer.

Therefore, it must be the individual's responsibility to take due care on such a journey. Stress provisions have been tightened to emphasise work related stress and to isolate stresses which can impinge on a person's life but which are not directly related to work. Again, the employer can remove only work related stresses and has no right to interfere in the personal life of employees. Therefore, the employer cannot be held responsible for personal non-work related stress. We estimate that these and other WorkCover reforms will save the South Australian taxpayer up to \$20 million a year.

New directions in business and economic reforms require innovative structures. The newly created Economic Development Board is advising the Government on economic initiatives. The Economic Development Agency encourages business development, particularly the growth of our regional areas, areas that have been ignored over the past decade to the detriment of our State. The New Exporters Challenge Scheme has already assisted and supported 27 small businesses to enter overseas markets. Let us have no doubt: overseas markets will be the lifeblood of our State. We cannot rely on interstate trade. We must trade overseas to the north of us, with our Asian neighbours.

We have created a national first, a Council for International Trade and Commerce, where 20 country and region specific chambers of commerce and business councils are collocated to promote bilateral trade relations with other nations. South Australia receives nearly three million visitors a year. The city of Adelaide itself attracts over 1.6 million of these tourists each year, yet we still capture only 5 per cent of the international tourist trade where 10 years ago we captured 8.5 per cent of that trade. Today we are suffering a legacy of 10 years of neglect by Labor. We have restructured the Tourism Commission to create a positive climate which supports the tourist industry and which will promote regional tourism destinations.

Initiatives in economic and industrial reform have set new standards of excellence from which all Australians will benefit, in particular South Australians and especially my constituents in Elder. We promised the people greater protection, and our domestic violence, stalking, truth in sentencing and child protection laws are the first steps in responding to the public need. We promised the people better public transport and created TransAdelaide as part of a new, flexible, viable and efficient public transport system. We promised the people that we would protect the aged in retirement villages, and the Retirement Villages Act 1994 and its attendant regulations have brought this promise to swift reality.

We promised the people that we would improve the quality of education in our State and, through the Early Years of Education strategy, additional funding will be allocated to improve learning outcomes for students in the early years of schooling. In our education system over the years we have developed the three Rs. Over the past decade the students have learned a fourth R, that is, respect for themselves. We will now teach them a fifth R: responsibility for people and property. Large bureaucracies are barriers to creativity, for those within them and those serviced by them. Such bureaucracies administer the *status quo*. Bureaucracies are there to do things right: it is the responsibility of Government to do the right thing. Our Government regards public sector reform as an essential ingredient in the process of rebuilding our State's economy.

A major facet of that reform is well under way with the reassessment of all public sector positions and the removal

of those positions surplus to the requirements of this State. ETSA is refocussing its operations towards the competitive national grid. The EWS is being corporatised. SACON will focus on asset management, and the South Australian Housing Trust is undergoing a comprehensive review. One has to physically list the structural and economic changes which have been implemented and which are to be introduced in order to comprehend the enormous steps the Government has taken in its first six months in office in its drive to rejuvenate an alien economy and a dispirited populace. It was Socrates who said:

We trained hard. Every time we came under new leadership we were regrouped and reorganised. At the end of all the reorganisations and regroupings, nothing much had changed.

We must not let this happen in the public sector. We must not forget the human face of change. There are those in the public sector who will welcome change as a mechanism that will enhance their current positions, promote new skills acquisitions and open new career horizons. However, there are personnel who may react in other ways. One such reaction could be, 'She'll be right', an attitude adopted by those who have been through it all before and who have survived. The tactic is simplicity itself: obey the minimum legal and procedural requirements to keep out of trouble but still operate the same way that has worked for the past 20 years, believing that all this restructuring new deal nonsense will all blow over as the Government moves on to new targets. Then it is business as usual.

There may be those who will pay lip service to these changes but who privately maintain their fixed, outmoded attitudes although publicly espousing the virtues and necessity of change. In reality, it is business as usual. In a time of rapid change it is expected that many public sector employees will experience feelings of insecurity, anxiety and uncertainty. Things are not the way they were. Things will never again be the way they were. This Government is steering a fresh course through uncharted waters towards a brighter future. It is the responsibility of Government, which has initiated these changes, to ensure that the change process is controlled and handled competently. We are a hands-on Government: we must not take our hands off until we are confident that the restructured public sector is itself professionally committed to the direction we have set for it and our State. It is a direction that must be based on sharp, focussed strategic planning. Unclear goals will result in business as usual. I have been approached personally by public servants who welcome with relief the opportunity to throw off the shackles and get on with the job. We must not let them down.

Our Government must not allow our ideals or our ideas to slip between fixated bureaucratic cracks. In my maiden speech to this Parliament, I emphasised the need for Government departments to remove the blinkers that had, for nearly two decades, focused many of their activities within restrictive and unproductive parameters. This focus has drawn deep lines of demarcation between departmental responsibilities and activities.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr WADE:** I thank the member for Unley. In a changing world it is imperative that these lines be redrawn and in some cases removed entirely. This Government was elected to manage South Australia through a financial minefield of debt. We also vowed to help those who were and remain the true victims of past Governments' practices. They are the poor, the aged and the needy. We must not forget that the public

sector has been entrusted with taxpayers' money to provide a service to the taxpayer. As a Government of the people, it is our responsibility to watch every cent spent. I am saying nothing new. My grandmother had a saying that was old when she was young: 'Take care of the pennies and the pounds will take care of themselves.' The financial fiasco that we inherited has meant that we must watch every cent and every dollar spent. It is imperative that we do not throw the baby out with the bath water.

Respite services for more than 80 intellectually disabled children will falter and collapse within eight months unless there is an injection of \$15 000 in new State funds. The Federal Government will match this \$2 for \$1, and the total of \$45 000 will keep these vital services afloat. It is a real community based scheme involving three part-time staff and more than 80 community volunteers. It cannot be allowed to go under. The health system, in its formalised structure, could not cope with 80 intellectually disabled children at one time. My constituents of Elder have one community based health service at Clovelly Park. It is understaffed and under-resourced, but it is still trying to cope with the community's needs. Should any one of my constituents in Elder need immediate counselling, the centre can fit them in, at the earliest, 12 weeks from first contact.

**Mr Brindal:** Too bad if they kill themselves between now and then.

**Mr WADE:** I agree with the member for Unley. The situation is atrocious. The demand is great; it must be looked at immediately. It is a matter of priority that Elder's existing community based health service be adequately funded and resourced. In addition, the building structure itself cannot cater for current needs and will not cater for future needs. It must be extended so that it can provide the service for which the taxes of the people of Elder are paying.

There are many longstanding community needs in my electorate, and I was elected by the people of Elder to represent their interests. I will do so within the philosophy and the policies of our Liberal Government. I will continue to do the job that my constituents in Elder want done, and I will do so without fear or favour. I commend the Government on its initiatives to date and on its continuing commitment to the people of South Australia.

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** I support the motion and, in accepting the Governor's address, I also feel that it is important to look at the achievements of the Liberal Government since its 11 December election, to look at the strategies we have put in place and then to look with confidence at the direction in which we as a State are heading. On 11 December 1993 a new era was signalled for South Australia. The Government was elected with a clear mandate for a partnership with industry, business and the wider community, working together to take South Australia into a new era of real achievement and ultimately a much better future for our State.

As a Government, we were elected to implement and achieve four clear objectives: to rebuild the economy to create real jobs; to put the State's finances into order and reduce debt; to restore confidence in the accountability of Government and the Parliament; and to re-establish pride and standards in key Government services. We have all had the opportunity to examine the details of the financial statement released by the Treasurer, Hon. Stephen Baker, on 31 May 1994. The statement is all about correcting the State's finances, and there is no doubt that South Australians elected

the Liberal Government to get on and do this and at the same time rebuild our economy.

Over the next few months, some pretty tough decisions will have to be made. If these decisions are not made by the Government now, South Australia will be in a much worse position in four or five years. The financial statement is all about the future of South Australia, the building up of the economy and making sure there is an opportunity for the future of all South Australians. If we do not fix our debt now, the human cost in four years will be far greater.

If you look at the approach we are taking in addressing our four key objectives, you see it is not an approach of slash and burn or just an across-the-board cut, as the former Government applied year after year as it tried to reduce its Government expenditure. What we are doing and what we have done is to look at how we can deliver Government services more efficiently and more effectively. Most importantly, that is why we have decided on outsourcing and competitive tendering. If the service is from within Government, we are making sure we do it better and that it is done to a world class standard. The lifting of the level of efficiency of Government itself can be seen in areas such as public transport, the outsourcing of data processing, and in making sure that the construction and maintenance areas of the Government are done by competitive tendering. In the health area, very importantly, it is by instigating casemix and setting clear standards for hospitals to adhere to and, secondly, by making sure there is a policy of contestability, which means that, if it is done in a hospital by Government employees, it must be up to a certain level of efficiency.

Our key objectives alongside the financial statement have set broad parameters for framing the August budget and making sure not only that South Australia will be a better place in three or four years but that we will have a State with renewed confidence, investment and job opportunities. Her Excellency the Governor highlighted in her speech the additional 7 200 full-time jobs that have been created in South Australia between January and June 1994, and already there are major investments that have boosted and will boost employment. These include Motorola, Australis, Mitsubishi and the Wirrina tourism development. Within the southern region, which takes in my electorate, there has been an increase of 2 469 new businesses registered to the end of June this year. Again, I stress there is confidence in the Government and the new era.

Our Government has a huge mandate and four very clear objectives. But what I have not mentioned is the prime force behind this mandate—the South Australian people. Families and individuals have been there to give us the opportunity to work cooperatively as a team for the betterment of us all and, in this the International Year of the Family, our Government has established an Office of the Family to demonstrate our continuing commitment to family life. The Office of the Family will continue beyond 1994 and lay the foundations for the rest of the decade.

The Office of the Family will seek input from the community on matters affecting families and make sure that trends and issues are channelled back through policy advice to the Government. Family impact statements will be required from the Government agencies to guide policy. This initiative aims to keep family issues on the agendas of business and the community. This will ensure that South Australia is at the forefront in promoting and enhancing family life.

As Chairperson of the Joint Committee on Women in Parliament, I would also like to acknowledge the inclusion

of the member for Elizabeth, Ms Lea Stevens, and the member for Torrens, Mrs Robyn Geraghty, on the parliamentary benches towards the end of our first parliamentary session. Together with all the women in Parliament, I hope that the work of our joint committee is fruitful and will provide an insight and direction on what we must do to ensure that more women can choose to make a career in politics.

My own electorate of Reynell, which I am sure by now all members know, particularly by its positioning with the most beautiful beaches on its west and the famous Southern Vales on the eastern side—what more could a person dream of—has welcomed the changes that the new Government has brought.

My electorate office is centrally located at Morphett Vale and it provides an open and welcoming place for residents to seek help and assistance on matters of concern to them and also enables people to let me know what they think about changes affecting their lives and this State. Decision-making at grassroots level provides for the basic principles of a democracy—something that many politicians appear to lose sight of.

Implementation of major road/traffic work at both Morphett Vale and Hackham West will address serious road safety concerns for local residents, and the construction of the new primary school on the Woodend Estate will be a welcome relief to the many families who have made this area the place to build homes and bring up their children. After many years of being promised a school within the local area, our Government was able to bring this project to fruition with an opening date targeted for January 1995.

Earlier in the year I spoke about the Safe Communities project, an initiative of Healthy Cities Noarlunga Incorporated. The project is now well and truly under way with the reference committee being recently established. On 28 July the inaugural meeting of the reference committee adopted: to establish the reference committee as the inter-sectoral committee required by the World Health Organisation safe communities criteria which has the overall strategic responsibility and direction for the project; to receive and adopt the project overview statement; to authorise the application to the World Health Organisation for membership of the international safe communities network; and to establish a management committee and instruct the committee to report to the next meeting of the reference committee with a two to three year strategic plan for the project.

Our community also has many achievements in progress, one in particular being the Stars netball team, a team of young women, all under 16, who have been invited to play netball in Greater Manchester in January next year. The families and members of the team have been working extremely hard to raise the funds needed for the whole team to travel to the United Kingdom, and I have enjoyed assisting the team with its efforts, whenever possible.

The move to Noarlunga by the South Adelaide Football Club will be a major boost to the southern region. With the completion of the southern sporting complex and the South Adelaide Club rooms due early next year, sport will have a real focus in the south. Many residents are looking forward to SANFL games being played locally, and again employment opportunities will be provided with the opening of the new complex.

Working with the community for the community is what this Government is all about. Our Premier and his Cabinet Ministers have spent many hours within the community

addressing public meetings, lunches, resident and business groups, answering questions and keeping people informed. As the local member, I have appreciated the time made available by the Premier and Ministers to assist me within the electorate and, most importantly, for getting out there to hear what people have to say.

Another group I would like to acknowledge is the Southern Business Network, a small group of Noarlunga business people who have got together to promote business in the southern area, particularly Lonsdale. This group organises monthly business breakfasts and once a year hosts a business expo to give the community a chance to see what we have and what can be achieved locally.

Being part of a large back bench has its problems, particularly when it comes to office space and crowded meetings, but there have also been a number of positive aspects: sharing the workload, being able to assist each other and sharing ideas and information. Each electorate may be different, but our constituent problems are very similar.

As a new member of this Parliament, like many others I discovered that a lot of learning was to be done and, for those more chronically gifted than I, a lot of patience was practised in order to accustom the newer members to a Westminster culture. Like many others, I have a great appreciation for the staff of this Parliament and would like this opportunity to thank them for their assistance and the support that has been provided.

I also pay tribute to the late member for Torrens, Mr Joe Tiernan. His memories will be with us for a long time. Joe was a friend and colleague and someone special who knew how to make your day. Earlier this year I lost one other special friend, Mr John Nicholls. John assisted me throughout my campaign and, even when his health was failing him, he was still there pushing me along and sharing his worldly advice. John had a way of inspiring people to do what was right. His commitment to his church and to the community reflected this and I was pleased with the decision of the Willunga council to name a reserve in John's honour.

Not only have I had the opportunity to meet and share the concerns of my local community, but also I have met with groups such as Friends of CAFHS in the South-East. I have visited rural members of the South Australian Branch of Australian Women in the Local Government Association and, alongside the Leader of the Opposition, jointly launched Helen Keller Day on 27 June. Helen Keller Day, which is celebrated world-wide as an awareness event into the needs of the deaf-blind, passed quietly in South Australia, but for some it was a landmark. In South Australia a new committee has been formed to address the needs of the deaf-blind and, by highlighting a day for this significant event, much is to be achieved. This year, 1994, has been a year of many significant events: many of us celebrated the end of apartheid in South Africa, our State played host to the international women's basketball, we had the honour of being home to the best soccer and netball teams and, just recently, we welcomed home members of the reigning world champion women's hockey team. It was a great achievement for sport and greater still for Australia.

In closing my contribution to this Address in Reply debate, I thank my family for their support, love and tolerance of the many hours I spend away from them. I also thank members of the Reynell Branch of the Liberal Party for their help, friendship and commitment to me and my electorate. My staff—Janine Carger and Vanessa Catterall—I thank for their dedication and the many hours they put into assisting me

and my constituents. I thank the community that has accepted me as its member of Parliament and given me the opportunity to represent my electorate.

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I commend Her Excellency the Governor for her fine speech in which she outlined the positive and progressive programs being followed by her Government. Our Governor is a great South Australian and we should be proud of her many achievements.

In the short time that I have been a member of this House I have noticed a dramatic change in the mood of the South Australian people. As I move about my electorate of Lee I see the continual growth of a positive attitude fostered by the policies of our new Government. This new 'can do' approach to doing business in South Australia is one of the greatest achievements of the Brown Government. I thank and congratulate, on behalf of my constituents, the Premier and all his Ministers for doing so much in such a short space of time.

The negative policies of the previous Administration left this State in a financial, social and cultural wasteland. The disasters of the Bannon/Arnold years will never be forgotten or forgiven by the people of South Australia. They drained our business and personal finances. They ran down our infrastructure and allowed the quality of our children's education to decline. They invested our future in one giant poker machine, pulled the handle and lost. Those sad days are now well and truly over. The people cast their verdict on the Bannon/Arnold legacy on 11 December 1993. On the same day they put their faith in a new Administration dedicated to reform and renewal, and they have not been disappointed.

Motorola, Australis, Mitsubishi and the Wirrina tourism development are but a few of those major investments so far announced. In the first six months of the Brown Liberal Government an additional 7 200 full-time jobs have been created in South Australia. That is 7 200 people who now have a brighter future, thanks to the efforts of the Government. That is 7 200 people who no longer have to wait in the dole queues for Government hand-outs. That is 7 200 people who are now proud to be productive members of the community, who can provide for their families and save for their future. That is 7 200 people who can be given a chance that was previously denied to them. All this has happened because of the reforms this Government has introduced, reforms that were opposed by the poor excuse for an Opposition that sits in this House, and by its masters in Trades Hall —those dinosaurs of social and economic decline. This Government has introduced new industrial relations to facilitate enterprise bargaining, reforms to WorkCover and deregulation initiatives.

This Government has also kept its promise to abolish the greatest insult to individual rights that existed in South Australia: compulsory unionism. No longer shall we pass by a building site and see a 'No ticket no start' sign pinned on a wall.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr ROSSI:** We are talking about South Australian awards, not Federal awards. We cannot do anything about that until the Federal election. The Government of South Australia now sits in the people's House on North Terrace rather than in its previous residence of Machiavellian intrigue and dishonour on South Terrace. The Liberal Government has also moved to reform and repair the damage done to the services provided to the community of South Australia. In

health, this was particularly long overdue. I received many messages of support and praise for the introduction of casemix funding from people who work in various fields within the medical profession, and the reduction of surgical waiting lists for elective surgery will be greatly appreciated by the citizens of this State.

As a member with an electorate situated in the western suburbs, I met the board and members of the staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital only a couple of weeks ago. I was impressed by their optimism and willingness to take on new challenges. I would like to say in this House how much I appreciate the work done by the doctors, nurses and staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I know that it has not always been easy, particularly under the previous Administration, which showed such little interest in improving the standards of health care.

One of the most important Government services in need of reform was education. Unfortunately, the loudmouth, Ms McCarty, the head of the teachers' union, was not content to waste \$100 000 of her own union members' money on running for a seat in the Legislative Council. Having been soundly thrashed in this democratic contest, she tries to ignore the mandate given to this Government by the people of South Australia by opposing what is proposed and deliberately misleading the public about the extent and nature of the reforms to education. Parents have been, for many years, very unhappy with the quality of education provided to their children, and this is why I know they will support the introduction of basic skill tests in aspects of literacy and numeracy in 1995.

That is why I will support, when it is introduced, the Government's early years of education strategy, which will lead to improved learning outcomes for students in the early years of schooling and develop their children with a sound base of skills and knowledge for further education. The lack of discipline in some schools is being addressed through the planned fair discipline policy, which will include principals having greater powers to expel some students. In areas where they are needed new pre-schools and schools will be built and greater efficiencies will be gained through reforms to the management of education in South Australia.

Many of us who serve metropolitan electorates do not see the hardship of those who work on the land, but as one who lived for many years on a property near Keith in the South-East of this State I know how much my fellow South Australians have suffered in the rural depression. I am so pleased to see this Government doing so much to help those battlers on the land. The Government's stamp duty relief for intergenerational transfer of farms and for rolling over rural debt was one of the first initiatives of the new Government, and I commend the Minister for bringing this about. It should help to allow the young people to take over the family farm without any extra debts caused by Government taxation interference.

The number of young people working on their family properties has been declining as the recession has caused them to leave the land in search of employment elsewhere, and anything done to reverse this trend is a step in the right direction. It is not often recognised that the people who work on the land are often the most environmentally conscious. Yet this only stands to reason, given that they have the most to lose from environmental degradation. The recent appointment of Mr Ian McLachlan, as Federal shadow Minister for the Environment, by our new Federal Liberal Leader and the next Prime Minister, Alexander Downer, was treated with surprise

and scorn by some people of the more ignorant variety. These people had egg on their face when, soon after, Mr McLachlan was awarded a prestigious award for protection and restoration of the natural environment on his property. I know that the South Australian Government is working alongside the farmers and graziers in solving environmental problems. We city dwellers have much to learn from our country cousins.

As a backbencher in this Liberal Government I, too, have been busy serving my electorate. One of the most positive aspects in working in the Brown Government is the way in which Ministers have made themselves available to discuss issues of concern and to listen to the views of backbenchers. I would like to thank my Ministers for their cooperation and openness. Naturally, in the past seven months I have been very busy getting acquainted with the duties expected of a member of Parliament, and I have enjoyed my work in assisting my local residents. I am very pleased to report that my electorate has directly benefited from the policies of the Liberal Government with SABCO announcing a major increase in its work force and the opening of the Sunripe Food Factory in Royal Park by the Premier in May. Further work has been done on the lakeside revetment steps in West Lakes, and I am grateful for the support I have gained from the Minister, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, who is as concerned as I am about the poor state of these steps and the need for their repair as soon as possible.

I know that the local residents appreciate that something is at long last being done to fix this problem. The winter storms have seen further sand erosion on the beaches at Semaphore Park and Tennyson, to the alarm of local residents. I attended and participated in a local meeting in Semaphore Park in May and would like to thank publicly Mrs Valda Arland for her efforts on behalf of her local community. The Government was quick to act. Sand replenishment was completed recently, and discussions between the State Government and the local government on the building of a rock wall are proceeding. I have also been working on alleviating parking problems in the West Lakes area during matches at Football Park. After I had written to the South Australian National Football League about the problem, it agreed to resume warnings over its public address system, and the local council parking authorities have been most cooperative. Furthermore, I intend to introduce a private member's Bill during this session of Parliament that will lead to a further alleviation of the problem caused. Other issues that I have been working on with local residents include the fight against the building of a waste transfer station in Royal Park.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Lee will resume his seat. The member for Spence is continually interjecting across the Chamber. The House has been conducting itself in an appropriate manner this morning. The continued chatter is not necessary or desirable, and it will not be accepted by the Chair any longer.

**Mr ROSSI:** Problems after hours at Seaton High School, Housing Trust issues, neighbourhood violence and graffiti are problems on which I have been working very hard. The level of crime is still a major concern to people in my electorate, and they are very pleased to hear about the Government's new truth in sentencing legislation that was introduced in the last session. I know that the Minister for Emergency Services has been particularly busy working on new ways to reduce the crime rate and the launch of task force Pendulum is but one of these. This joint operation between the police and

Neighbourhood Watch groups is a step in the right direction, and it should lead to a more effective fight against the criminal elements in our society.

Whilst on the subject of Neighbourhood Watch groups, I am very pleased to have a number of excellent groups within my electorate that are doing a great job. Mr Ted Coyle, coordinator of the Semaphore Park group, is a great worker for his community and a fine example of how other Neighbourhood Watch coordinators should operate.

I was looking forward to the resumption of Parliament for many reasons, not the least of which was once again to engage in debate with the Machiavellian member for Spence. I was surprised, however, during the recent recess to find myself in strong accord with comments reportedly made by the honourable member about the performance of most of his socialist Labor mates in another place. I have long thought some of those members to be less than conscientious in the performance of their duties, and I was pleased to see the honourable member bring this fact to the attention of the electorate. I feel sure that the electorate will reward him by removing one or two of these worst offenders at the next election and installing hard-working Liberal members in their place.

I would like to congratulate the person who seems to have taken on the role of Leader of the Opposition: Ms Samela Harris, gossip columnist extraordinaire at the *Advertiser*. It seems that she has taken a particular interest in my career in recent times, although I am at a loss to understand why. The dear lady seems to be rather obsessed by a completely erroneous story concerning my supposed expulsion from this place over the issue of a pie. From all reports so far, the pie was of a common meat variety baked by that well-known Adelaide establishment, Balfours. I do not know from what source she got the story, but as you, Mr Speaker, would no doubt testify, I have yet to be expelled from this place over any issue, least of all one involving a pie.

This new self-styled Leader of the Opposition seems to be about as accurate in her statements as previous Labor leaders. However, at least she does have some flair for the theatrical, and future contributions made by members opposite may not be as boring and out of date as they were in the past session of Parliament.

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** It is good to see such a full contingent on the Opposition benches this morning—all two of them. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and I congratulate Her Excellency the Governor on the presentation of her address.

Her Excellency spoke of the many accomplishments of her Government—and there have been many—during the first session of Parliament. She elaborated on the vision and planning of the Brown Government for this session and the critical years to follow, at a time when we must continue to reverse the massive depression that was caused, of course, by the Labor Government between 1983 and 1993. The reforms of this Government have already been successfully implemented, and there have been significant achievements that will ultimately see this State economically viable again.

I will briefly examine and highlight some of the very crucial measures undertaken by this Government since taking office. First, I refer to the area of economic development. Obviously, the focus in South Australia's economic recovery must be the creation of new jobs: that is of paramount importance and clearly the heart of the matter for South Australia. Already this has been done very successfully, with

the focus on 7 200 jobs having been created in this State between January and June this year.

Major investment decisions have also been made by this Government to further boost job opportunities. Some of these investments include Motorola, Australis, Mitsubishi and the Wirrina tourist development. It should also be emphasised that in the first five months of this year over 3 500 inquiries have been received about the Government's Rebuilding South Australia Job Creation Program, which has led to the creation of 900 new jobs under the WorkCover subsidy plan.

New industrial relations legislation to facilitate enterprise bargaining and to end compulsory unionism was also introduced during the first session of this Parliament, together with WorkCover reforms operational from 1 July, which are aimed at saving up to \$20 million a year. Those reforms include the abolition of most journey accident claims, which of course became a farce; further tightening of stress provisions; and the appointment of a new nine-member WorkCover Board with the amalgamation of the WorkCover Corporation and the Occupational Health and Safety Commission.

The Government is also focusing on the upgrading of the facilities at Adelaide Airport, which of course is located in my electorate of Hanson. This remains a top priority if we are to attract investment, trade and tourism to South Australia. The Government is exploring alternative ownership options for the airport to enhance opportunities for improving facilities and extending the runway over Tapleys Hill Road. The Tourism Commission has also been restructured and is clearly now better placed to capitalise on future opportunities.

In the area of education, which is of special interest to me as a former educator, a new fair discipline policy is being finalised, which includes giving significantly more power to principals in relation to the expulsion of some troublesome students. I see this as a very positive, practical and creative move by this Government. A number of schools, including those in the Hanson electorate, have already expressed a keen interest in introducing fair discipline codes on a trial basis in 1995. As I stated in a speech I made during the first session of Parliament, I believe that this fair discipline policy will signal both a stronger approach to discipline and the need for greater cooperation between schools, students and families.

I commend the Minister, the Hon. Mr Lucas, for his overall handling of the education portfolio since this Government came to power. He is doing an outstanding job. I believe that we must continue to embrace some of the fundamentals of the past which form the basic foundation of education and life. I refer here to basic discipline, which affects not only individual families but also the wider family of the community. Undoubtedly this Government's policies of bringing back respect for authority and discipline are very important. Many educational ideologists continue to howl for rights and liberties but are stunningly silent on corresponding responsibilities. It is imperative in our community that authority and freedom be in balance and harmony.

In the area of further education and training the Government is seeking to optimise funding, employment and training opportunities and will liaise closely with local government to ensure a statewide approach to obtaining a maximum benefit from negotiations with the Commonwealth.

Health is one of the most crucial areas for Government, and it is an area that has been sadly neglected, mismanaged and abused by the previous Government for the past 11 years. With the introduction of casemix funding from 1 July the Government will continue to emphasise enhanced service

delivery, efficiency and productivity—something which was sadly lacking under the previous Administration. Casemix will allow bonus funding pools enabling hospitals to carry out more elective surgery over and above the work performed in 1993. This should reduce quite significantly surgical waiting lists, which is of great importance to our community. As Her Excellency stated in her address, in the area of women's health two new community-based X-ray screening clinics will be established in the metropolitan area to increase screening capacity and effect a movement from part-time hospital-based clinics to full-time community-based services.

During the first session of Parliament I was elected to the Social Development Committee, which was later directed by this Parliament to examine rural poverty in South Australia. The interim report was tabled in Parliament and further evidence has subsequently been taken by the committee. It is therefore encouraging that the Department of Primary Industries is providing stamp duty relief for intergenerational transfer of farms and for the rolling over of rural debt. The Government has also given financial support to marketing initiatives of the South Australian Farmers' Federation.

My previous employment as a teacher and counsellor, together with my involvement in church ministry, has meant a deep involvement with families. One of the most significant sources of anxiety of the contemporary Australian concerns, I believe, the breakdown of the family unit. This is the International Year of the Family, and, of course, it has been much publicised during the year. I applaud the initiatives that have been taken by this Government. The Department for Family and Community Services is maintaining its commitment to keep families intact, together as a unit, and to keep children out of departmental care. The keeping of families together program is, I believe, a major and very important initiative, which has been undertaken in partnership with the private sector. This initiative will ultimately be extended to families in crisis areas in the Iron Triangle region. This is a wonderful initiative, because it is being extended to that area for the first time.

An office will also be established to provide advice on the needs of families and the types of programs and services which will be beneficial in promoting family life in South Australia. This is a very positive move indeed. Tragically, street violence and domestic violence are still very much a part of our society. I applaud the Government's initiative and insight with its introduction of a 24 hour domestic violence free telephone service. Linked to this service will be the launch of a domestic violence zero tolerance campaign later this year as a community education initiative.

I would like to talk briefly about the question of women in Parliament. On 3 May in Parliament I supported the resolution for the appointment of a joint committee to inquire into and report on matters regarding more opportunities for women in Parliament. I am honoured to have been elected as a member of that joint committee. The South Australian Women's Advisory Council has also been established as a part of this Government's commitment to significantly upgrade women's policy advice. The council is focusing on four main areas, which I think are very important: women and representation; women and the economy; women and violence; and women in regional and rural areas.

Celebrations for the centenary of women's suffrage are continuing across South Australia with widespread involvement by both the public and private sectors and other individuals. Those celebrations will culminate in a street parade and festival on 18 December, exactly 100 years after

Parliament passed the historic Act which made South Australia the first place in the world to give women both the right to vote and to stand for Parliament.

I would like to talk briefly about emergency services and correctional services, and I am proud to be a member of the committee. Legislation to enable the private sector management of prisons and the outsourcing of prison services will be introduced during this session. Interstate and overseas experience demonstrates that savings of about 20 per cent to 45 per cent are achievable at the same time as we deliver better education and rehabilitation programs. The new Mount Gambier prison is to be expanded with Labor's cost inefficient 56 bed prison being expanded to 110 beds at an additional cost of \$2.5 million before it is commissioned. Work is scheduled to be completed by 23 December 1994. The establishment of partnerships with the private sector will allow the establishment of industry in our prisons—and I applaud this—thereby assisting to generate meaningful work and rehabilitation programs, something which, again, has been lacking during the last 11 years of the Labor Administration.

The successful establishment of the Aldinga shopfront community police station will be followed by other similar stations at sites which will be progressively announced throughout the year. The launch of Task Force Pendulum on 28 July 1994, a joint operation between a police task force of 90 hand-picked officers and Neighbourhood Watch groups, will target the high crime rate which is a legacy of the former Government.

The task force will operate initially for three months. The South Australian St John Ambulance Service has located one crew from the Unley ambulance station at Wakefield Street MFS headquarters for a 16-week trial period from 4 July 1994 to assess the viability and practicality of collocating ambulances at selected fire stations to get a better balanced coverage and response to emergencies. The new ambulance board will work toward further fee reductions for the 1995-96 year, following the first phase of fee reductions announced for 1994-95. Elective carrying fees have also been reduced by 15 per cent, and emergency carrying fees frozen at 1992-93 levels, following a restructure of ambulance operations. Legislation to recognise the contribution and protect the existence of CFS volunteers will also be introduced into Parliament during this session.

I believe that the new Statutes Amendment (Truth In Sentencing) Act, which became operational on 1 August, is of strategic importance to the community and one which has been welcomed by the majority of South Australians. It is a very impressive and important Act. This Act will end the flawed sentencing and parole laws introduced by the former Government in 1983. The new law effectively means that the sentence imposed by the court will be the sentence that that prisoner serves. For instance, if an offender is sentenced to 15 years gaol with a 10 year minimum period, he or she will be eligible for release only after the 10 years has been served, and violent prisoners will not be allowed on the streets until they have earned the right to do so. I would also like to commend Minister Matthew in his capacity as Minister for Correctional Services and Minister for Emergency Services.

As we know, 1994 is the International Year of the Family, and we continue to celebrate also the centenary of women's suffrage in South Australia. As I previously stated, I am proud to be one of two male members elected to the joint parliamentary committee of inquiry set up primarily to report on matters regarding more opportunities for women in

Parliament. As we continue to emphasise the family in 1994, I believe we still must take positive steps towards solving the escalating crime rate and the disintegration of our families. I applaud the many initiatives the Government has made in this area since December. I do not wish to see a return to puritanism or to legalistic dogma, but we must have social reforms for the disadvantaged, for the unemployed and for the victims of social abuse.

During the first session of Parliament, the media highlighted the class of 1993, the new members of Parliament on the Government benches of this Forty-Eighth Parliament. I am proud to be a member of this elite group. We are totally unified. We applaud the leadership of Premier Dean Brown and his Cabinet Ministers and the reforms undertaken by this Government so far. The only sad note is that, during the first session, one of our esteemed members, Joe Tiernan, passed away and has been sadly missed. The media and the Opposition—all 11 of them, although we only see one and half or one and three-quarters at the moment—have made sport of the fact that we have a very large back bench and that some of us are only temporarily occupying seats. We hear that cry constantly from the Opposition side. As I told the *Advertiser* on 16 July 1994, such comments do grate; I must confess that, but I do not deem myself a loser in anything I undertake. Comments such as 'oncers' and 'here today, gone the next' simply make me dig in harder with more and more determination as I represent the people of Hanson.

It is also worth briefly reviewing comments I made in this House on 22 February in reference to marginal seats. In that speech I highlighted three examples of how members in very marginal seats defied the swing in elections and are still well and truly occupying their seats after being told that they were 'goners', 'oncers', here today and gone tomorrow. I referred to the former member for Mount Gambier, now Gordon; the member for Newland, who won her seat in 1989 by just a handful of votes; and, of course, the former member for Hanson, now the member for Peake, who was constantly told throughout the 1970s and 1980s that he was a scrap bin job. He, of course, is back yet again and thriving on the job. In fact, he is thriving so much and looking so well that the opportunity of serving another term in Parliament could easily eventuate in 1997 with a run in the seat of Spence, which went to preferences in the December election and which is a seat that needs a swing of only 7.5 per cent.

A candidate of the calibre of the member for Peake would, I believe, quite comfortably win that seat and hold it for the Liberal Party. That also would make the whole of the western suburbs Liberal. If members of the Opposition continue to perform as they have been—all 11, although there are only two in the House at the moment—all the class of 1993 will be back, and there will be more of us to torment and haunt members opposite in the future. Members opposite should just look at their numbers, because they would not want them to be reduced any more. In fact, they cannot even get a cricket team together. I look forward to the challenge of this session, and my electors can be assured—

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**Mr LEGGETT:** I can hear the drivel coming from the other side—all one of you—it is loud and clear. Again I say that my electors can be assured that I will continue to be a strong voice in this House.

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** First, I congratulate Her Excellency on reading the speech that she did the other day. Indeed, I wish her all the best in her job as the representative



of the Crown here in South Australia. Having said that, I remember that last year, about a week and a half before the State election, I had a couple of persons in the car, one well known to members here, whose judgment I thought was very good. In fact, they were giving me some kind words about how they thought the State election campaign was going, and they said, 'Look, John, you don't have to worry at all. You've got no hassle. You'll certainly get home.' I thought: well, who am I to argue with that? They were very nice words to hear. I am following the member for Hanson here. They went on for about five to 10 minutes and gave me what I thought was a reasonable analysis.

I thought: this is very good. They said not only would I get back but then they mentioned other seats. I started to wonder a bit, but I thought: these people are a bit smarter than me. Then they told me that the Government was going to win the State election, and by then I knew that I was really in trouble and that the advice I had been given was wrong, because I have made it clear—and I made it clear on polling day—what I thought the chances were. In fact, I still have a bottle of champagne provided by Channel 10 because I predicted 10 seats.

The member for Hanson made a number of gratuitous remarks about the possibility of a potential stoush in Spence. Let me tell the member for Hanson that a number of people would relish such a stoush, if that were to happen. My money—although, of course, I am not a betting man, as I have told this House many times before—would be on the member for Spence. Anyone who can stay awake at night as long as he does to go on the Bob Francis show night in and night out not only has a maximum audience penetration but will wear down any candidate.

However, the member for Spence does not need me to defend him. I followed closely the logic of the member for Hanson because, for a while, his was a good and refreshing address. True, he included all the usual atrocities about the previous Government, the unions and all that sort of stuff. If you take all that out, most of what he said was not too bad and he was starting to make a bit of sense. He was just starting to get there when suddenly he came in with this business about the member for Peake who, I am sure, has much better things to do with his time than going into the electorate of Spence and getting slaughtered. Certainly, until that came up, his comments were just like the conversation in my car. I was listening and thinking the honourable member was starting to make some sense.

The honourable member told us that the class of 93 will be here well into the future. I do not know: he is a bit closer to the Almighty than I am in many respects and he might have some inside information. I do not know. It is possible that he has that inside information and knows what is coming down in the electoral map. He obviously has some idea of what will happen three years into the future. The member for Hanson was winning me over until he came to what can only be called the OK Corral of South Australian politics, that is, the possibility that the member for Peake and the member for Spence would lock horns in the same electorate. We would all like to see that spectacle. Thus far, I have listened to comments about one atrocity after another that the previous Government is supposed to have committed. We also heard a series of other atrocities committed in South Australia over the past six to eight months. Indeed, I heard the backbench tell me how wonderful it is, and I want to dwell on that.

I do not want to start talking about oncers around here, but I find it interesting that we now have an appointed conscience

for the backbench. I read in the paper the other day that this appointed conscience comes in the form of the member for Unley. He made a few remarks and claimed that the backbench will monitor closely any failure by the frontbench to keep the promises it made. That was an interesting statement. The member for Hanson can go now—I have finished with his contribution and am now dealing with someone else.

The member for Unley made a number of statements. Clearly, it took him about eight months to realise that a number of promises have been broken, and it took him only 48 hours to work out that they had found another patch of votes in Unley that made the seat a little less safe than what he thought. I now understand that the pendulum is just over 11 per cent, but before it was 14 per cent or 14.5 per cent—

**Mr Brindal:** It was 14.6 per cent.

**Mr QUIRKE:** I am grateful to the honourable member. What is the new figure now?

**Mr Brindal:** It's about 11.5 per cent now.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass):** Order! The member for Playford has the call, and I do not want conversation across the Chamber.

**Mr QUIRKE:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. Clearly, 3 per cent of what was seen to be a rock solid safe seat has now gone and, shortly after the discovery of this change in the ballot box, we have the appointment of the member for Unley as the conscience for the backbench. That is an interesting appointment. The member for Unley has a lot of talent, and I have said that on many occasions. It is sad that he has been overlooked as much as he has by the current Administration.

*Mr Buckby interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** That is fine; I will get around to you in a minute. It is interesting that the member for Unley has been overlooked as much as he has, because there are a number of positions that the member for Unley could hold successfully in this Parliament but, unfortunately, the people who run the Liberal Party in this House have not seen fit to follow the wisdom of my words on this matter.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** I bet that you will doctor some of it, though. The interesting thing is that the member for Unley has finally discovered broken promises and hypocrisy. We saw one of the best examples of that during Question Time yesterday. The member for Hart asked a question which related to a public meeting of the Economic and Finance Committee that morning. It was an open meeting. A member of the fourth estate was there for the whole meeting. In fact, an *Advertiser* journalist taped the proceedings.

What happened was that a member asked a very pertinent question of the Government. This has happened before: it happened not so long ago. In fact, a question about frequent flier points was asked by the member for Hanson, and that was the result of a public meeting on 30 March. So the member for Hanson asked the same question. Did we hear anything from the appointed conscience then? No, we did not. All we saw was a wink and a nudge that somebody had put the member for Hanson up to that question.

I do not want to say any more because I would be divulging private conversations, but the content of those conversations was along the lines of, 'We beat you; we got there first on the frequent flier points.' I applauded that. I thought it was good politics. It was not a good conscious but it was good politics. Yesterday, the member for Unley asked in a point of order whether it was appropriate that information gleaned at a public meeting—which the whole world could

have attended, and in fact the *Advertiser* taped the proceedings—could be used in a question asked in this House.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I ask whether it is appropriate for other members of this House to comment on points of order made to the Chair wherein a ruling of the Chair is requested. I believe that Standing Orders allow any member of this House to take a point of order and for the Speaker to rule accordingly. Is it then appropriate for other members to comment on the taking of points of order?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I do not consider that the honourable member has a point of order.

**Mr QUIRKE:** I was not reflecting on the point of order or on the Chair's ruling: I was reflecting on the honourable member who made it. I am quite happy to say that the honourable member displayed a degree of plain, blatant hypocrisy. At the end of the day—

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise again on a point or order, Mr Acting Speaker. It is out of order for the honourable member to reflect on other members. He has clearly said on the record that he is reflecting on me, and I ask that he withdraw.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. Will the member for Playford withdraw the comment?

**Mr QUIRKE:** Yes, I will withdraw it. I think the facts speak for themselves. At the end of the day what we have is a member who has appointed himself the conscience of the backbench. I do not think he took a vote on that position because, he if had, it would have been the only vote he has won around here. Where that is concerned, I think it would be something we could commend him on.

Some of my other learned colleagues in this House would be very disappointed if I did not mention them. It has now been eight months since the past State election. It has given us time, in our little huddle, of which we are constantly reminded, to examine and assess the worth of some of the new Government members and to comment on their performances.

*Mr Leggett interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** The member for Hanson would like me to make a few comments about him, but I have already had my two cents worth on that. There are a few members to whom we should give some accolades and who I think have done a very good job, both in opposition and in government.

*Mr Leggett interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** I read it in the last Festival of Light newsletter. I looked down the left-hand column to see who the big gurus are. At the end of the day, a number of members have made a significant contribution to this House in the past eight months. One is a person to whom I have given some brickbats before, but I think he has settled in with a good sense of humour and has done a good job, and that is the member for Mitchell. I want to single him out as a person who has gone up a great deal in my eyes.

Anybody who defends this Government's record on Housing Trust rents and, with a straight face, tells the world three days before the Torrens by-election that the bulk of his Housing Trust tenants were staying awake at night worrying about the Housing Trust debt should be mentioned in this House. He has done a good job, and I would like that on the public record. The member for Mitchell has copped a great deal of criticism in this place, some of which was well founded but, in this exercise, the member for Mitchell has shown that he can get up in this House and absolutely defend the indefensible. And what is more, he can do it when about one-third of his entire electorate will be affected accordingly.

That is a very gutsy performance, and it should be recognised in the House.

There are a few others. I will not say too much now, but in recent times the member for Lee has also shown a great deal of courage. Whenever a member attacks a significant percentage of his own electorate, he shows courage that most members do not have. I wondered, when I saw him walking around the other day with his crutches, whether some of his constituents had not got hold of him in recent times, but I am told that the ladies within the Liberal Party will be doing that. I understand that that particular program is well in hand. That is his prerogative. He needs to be congratulated for showing courage in that situation—for doing what very few other members would ever have dared to do, regardless of what they thought.

There are a few other members who, in the past year or two, have deserved mention. The Minister for Industrial Relations is another member to whom I would like to draw attention. Not only has the Opposition been impressed with the promises that he made to small business before and after the last State election but we were also impressed with the promises he made to big business and the fact that he seemed to promise both of them the opposite. He seemed to promise small businesses that they would have an unfettered right to trade all day Sunday and at other times: and he seemed to tell some of the big supermarkets that fairly soon there would be deregulation and they could set about the small shops.

I do not know how that will be sorted out in this place, but I must say that that Minister has impressed me as being the most intelligent of all the Ministers throughout the whole of this year. He managed to get all his Bills through this House and most of them through the other place, and that impressed me no end. In fact, I predicted on the side that he would get most of what he wanted from the Australian Democrats, because that is not a hard exercise for the Liberal Party, as has been shown over the years. But I will not reflect too much on the role of the Australian Democrats in the political process. I would suggest that the Australian Democrats are much more akin in political terms to one of the oldest prosti—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I believe it is wrong to reflect on proceedings or votes in another place, and I believe that the member was doing so.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for Playford has mentioned the Democrats, but I do not believe he has reflected on them. There is no point of order.

**Mr QUIRKE:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. In fact, I didn't; it was a Freudian slip. I was about to say 'members of the oldest profession on earth'. There are two professions which argue about that, one of which is the lawyers. I would be happy for members to take either. There is no problem for me. I did not use that word. Only half of it came out, and I am sure that by the time I get the *Hansard* record not even that half will be there.

The Minister for Industrial Affairs has shown a great deal of intelligence in the way that he has approached a number of quests during this year. However, the Opposition thinks that even on shopping hours he will find that a very interesting task. There are a number of Liberal members on the back bench—and I am not sure what the view of the conscience is—who are looking with a great deal of interest to see what happens on a Sunday as well, and so they should.

In terms of others to whom I should like to draw attention, if ever there was a case of a little boy getting into the cookie or jelly beans jar, it is the Minister for Correctional Services. It would be remiss of me not to make a few remarks about his role. There are very few people in Australia who like that job. I have to go back a long way in this House and my memory to find anyone who enjoyed being the Minister for Correctional Services. However, I must say that the present Minister shows absolute relish for his job. I think he enjoys his work, and I commend him for that. It is very unusual to get a Minister who enjoys that sort of portfolio, and I think it says a lot for that particular Minister. He has shown the Opposition that he will execute that task—an unfortunate choice of words—with a great deal of relish.

I could single out a few others who in the past eight or nine months have done a pretty good job, but it is difficult to find too many on the other side of the House who fit into that category other than those whom I have mentioned so far. However, I will mention a few on the Opposition side. Given that on 11 December we faced a disaster of proportions that we would have to go back to the 1932 State election to top, I think that in the past eight months we have held together very well. We won the Torrens by-election. We had an excellent candidate there, and I think that soon she will show her mettle in the Chamber. The other by-election was at Elizabeth. I believe that the member for Elizabeth showed in the by-election campaign and in the two months or so that she has been in this place that she is a person of considerable ability.

There is no doubt that the shadow spokesperson on Industrial Relations, the member for Ross Smith, has had a big impact here. Indeed, I think he has had more warnings in the past 24 hours than most members were given in the entirety of the last Parliament. The member for Ross Smith has certainly made his mark in this place. Not to be upstaged, the member for Hart has done an excellent job. Indeed, the member for Hart—or, as we used to know it, Semaphore—has taken over from Norm Peterson and performed some excellent work not only in this House but also in the shadow portfolios that he holds.

In my remaining time I will refer to one other person. I am talking about the Deputy Premier—a man to whom very few members warm up, but it is reasonable to say that in Opposition he did not do a bad job for the Liberal Party. He would get up one day and attack the Government on the State Bank and SGIC, get up the next day and attack SGIC and the State Bank and get up the day after and attack the State Bank and SGIC. But in general, he held the Liberal Party together pretty well in this place which, for a group of people like that, is an achievement in itself.

However, I notice in today's *Advertiser* a couple of interesting comments. It outlines the promise that is to be one of the next atrocities to be dragged to the execution block. I am interested to know what the conscience and the rest of the back bench will do about this. Not only did we have the Audit Commission telling us earlier this year about Housing Trust rents and what would happen to the pensioners and the welfare recipients but also we found that we would have an awful lot fewer State civil servants than we were told would be the case before the State election. Also, not only did we find that EWS rates and a whole range of other charges—something in the order of 400 of them—went up but also we now find that the Premier's pledge, according to the front page of today's paper, is in doubt. I will read the Premier's pledge as reported in today's *Advertiser* as follows:

Mr Brown said the Government would stand by its pre-election commitment not to introduce any new taxes or increase tax rates.

This is a quote. It further states:

'Taxes are part of the high price South Australians are now paying for the financial mismanagement of the State by the last Government,' he said. 'We have had a decline in business activity, but a subsequent increase in the rate of taxation and we want to turn that around.'

He goes on to say in the pledge:

In the past 11 years we have been the highest taxed State in Australia and that must change.

I do not mind somebody taking a little liberty, but that was a bit rich. One of the problems is that South Australia was nowhere near as high taxing as most of the States to our east. However, I do not want to quibble about that. The essence of what the Premier said was that under this Government taxes were not going up and there would be no new taxes. But what did we find yesterday? We found the Deputy Premier softening us up for the budget in a couple of weeks. What did he have to say? John Ferguson in the *Advertiser* makes it clear: he certainly picked it up from the press conference. The article states:

State taxes could rise to help pay for \$165 million rise in interest payments expected this financial year. The Treasurer, Mr Stephen Baker, said yesterday that the Government was considering increases to pay for its net annual interest bill. 'I am not discounting any measures at this stage—I am simply saying when the budget comes down it is going to be a tough budget.'

So much for the Deputy Premier's support of the Premier! I understand that at the press conference a reporter asked the Deputy Premier whether the Premier might have to resign as a result of this budget because the Premier had promised that if he did not keep to his word on taxes he would resign.

Instead of the Deputy Premier's giving a ringing endorsement and saying, 'No, that will be totally unnecessary,' he said, 'I do not think he will have to.' One must say that that is a pretty gutsy performance from a Deputy Leader, to make a statement as equivocal as that about his Leader. The Deputy Premier, I suspect, is preparing us for some tax increases but certainly for the implementation of a large amount of that Thatcherite box of spells called the Audit Commission. We might find certain members, the conscience and indeed the rest of the back bench making all sorts of statements.

However, I will make a couple of predictions in my finishing remarks, and that is that members of the Government will say one thing in the House and another when addressing the media or their electorates.

**Mr Brindal:** Bullshit!

**Mr Quirke:** The conscience interjects a very unparliamentary word, from the rear-end of a bull.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass):** Order! I believe the member for Unley made a comment as he crossed the floor of the Chamber that was not parliamentary and I would like him to withdraw that comment. Would the member for Unley return to his place, please. I ask him whether he would withdraw the comment he made as he walked across the floor of the Chamber.

**Mr Brindal:** I am not sure what comment the Acting Speaker thinks I made.

**Mr Quirke:** You said 'Bullshit'.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I do not need help from the member for Playford. As the member for Unley got to the middle of the floor he said 'Bullshit', and I ask the honourable member to withdraw that comment.

**Mr BRINDAL:** If that is what the Acting Speaker thinks I said, then I withdraw it.

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** I have much pleasure in supporting the motion expressing the House of Assembly's thanks for Her Excellency's speech, which opened the second session of the forty-eighth Parliament of South Australia. The matters raised by Her Excellency require the attention of all members in this place and in particular the attention of the Government in the rebuilding of the economy of South Australia. Of a number of issues raised the Governor indicated that the Government will continue the reform of the public sector. This will be achieved via the repeal of the Government Management and Employment Act and its replacement with new public sector management legislation, which will give chief executive officers more authority for the management of their agencies.

Through that greater authority those CEOs will achieve greater autonomy; greater flexibility will occur within their departments and, as a result of that, improved services to customers should ensue. The second point of reform which will continue is that of ETSA. The aim is to streamline operations thereby ensuring that the State has a competitive power generation authority. Mr Acting Speaker, I am sure that you are aware of the Hilmer report and its implications for power generation throughout Australia and would note that Victoria is producing power cheaper than South Australia.

As a result South Australia is unable to sell power to Victoria apart from occasions when a heat wave is still occurring in Melbourne and a cool change has passed through Adelaide. Other than that the flow of power sales into South Australia is at a lower price than we can produce. Recently I visited Leigh Creek with the Minister and other members of the Government to view the coal mining operations. We were very impressed by the changes that are occurring and the increases in productivity which are lowering the cost of power generation in South Australia.

At this stage, the one sticking point appears to be that of the rail charges by Australian National to ETSA for the shipping of coal from Leigh Creek to the Port Augusta power station. I would suggest that that will have to be reviewed, and if that price can be reduced South Australia can well become very competitive in power production in Australia. Along with that reform of ETSA will come the corporatisation of the EWS. This has been spoken of for some time. There are service areas of the EWS which may be performed by private enterprise, but there are also areas of EWS, particularly that of control of our reservoirs, which must remain within the EWS, as it is particularly vital to South Australia, which is, of course, the driest State in Australia.

Recently, I viewed the reservoirs, which are in my electorate, namely, the South Para, the Barossa and the Warren reservoirs (and I might add that levels there are particularly low), and it was stated to me by the CEOs who were there that pumping will continue from the Murray until we receive adequate rainfall. However, I was concerned at the low levels of our reservoirs for this time of year. It shows that we really do require some very strong spring rains to ensure that enough run off occurs to fill those reservoirs and thereby reduce our costs of pumping from the Murray.

The reorganisation of SACON is another of this Government's reforms that will occur within the next 12 months. The focus of SACON will be moved towards asset management rather than repairs to those assets, and I envisage that much

contracting will occur out of those SACON jobs that have previously been held by employees. Often this raises the issue of contracting out. The Opposition, and in particular Labor Governments across Australia, have been very critical of contracting out. This principle occurs in many areas of the world, and I will cite just a few. Currently, Germany, Sweden, Spain, Britain, the US, Japan, New Zealand and the USA use contracting out procedures for public services delivered to the community. Great savings can be made in this area.

Often, as it happens, those people who have been performing the job within the Public Service form groups, tendering for that very contract and winning the contract and thereby retaining their jobs. As a result of that, we receive a service supplied to Government at a lower cost because those former public servants start up enterprises of their own. They know how to do the job better because they have been in the job for a number of years. They know ways to greater efficiency and timesaving. So, when it comes to putting forward a tender for that job, they are almost at somewhat of an advantage compared to those people in private enterprise.

As a result of that, you will find that many of those employees in other countries have won the tender and retained the very job that they were doing in the workplace. This is particularly so in the area of cleaning activities within Government departments. Contracting out for those services is occurring in a number of areas now, especially within schools. I refer to a school in Victoria, where the cleaning bill was \$165 000. The school council looked at that and decided there was an option for tendering that contract. Through the school council the fees have been cut to \$65 000. The additional \$100 000 is available to the school community to upgrade the facilities within that school. That is what I call a win-win situation: the school won; the school community won; the students won; and the Government won because the job was done at a cheaper price.

Many benefits can result from this approach. However, there is a warning in relation to contracting out, because it has been found overseas that contracting out requires a monitoring of those contracts. Many companies that have won contracts require a monitoring process to ensure that the letter of the contract is carried out. As a result, increased services and efficiencies have been gained. In addition, another tier, so to speak, is created in the form of employment, involving those people who monitor the contracts. Contrary to what members of the Opposition, or members of the Labor Party in Australia, would believe—that we will lose a great number of jobs—often there is a corresponding gain in the number of jobs as a result of this approach. However, it is important to carry out that role, otherwise there is a danger that particular aspects of contracts may not be performed in accordance with the contract. The reforms I have mentioned in the Public Service are aimed at reducing the cost of operating Government and, as a result, reducing our budget deficit.

I turn now to the Audit Commission report, which the Governor mentioned in her speech, indicating that since she had last addressed the Parliament the report had been delivered to Government and that a number of issues arose from it. The first and most serious of those issues is that the cost of running Government in South Australia exceeds the receipts to Government by \$350 million. Obviously, this Government—or even the previous Labor Government if it had been returned to power—could not ignore this figure. I suggest that many of the cuts that we are being forced to

make would have had to be made by the Labor Government had it continued in office.

South Australia's net indebtedness was also examined by the Audit Commission, which found that that net indebtedness and other unfunded employee entitlements equalled \$9 099 per capita or 47.3 per cent of the gross State product as at 30 June 1993. I suggest that that is a most serious situation and, if this Government ignored it, we would be forgoing the responsibility given to us by the electors on 11 December 1993. Undoubtedly many unsavoury decisions will be made over the next six months and also within this term of Government. However, they are being made in order to get this economy back on track after leaving the rails over the past 10 years.

The Audit Commission report also pointed out that borrowings used by the previous Government to bail out the State Bank, to finance schools, hospitals, police stations and other public works do not generate extra revenue to service the debt but impose a continuing burden on the State budget. This shows that the current policy adopted by the Brown Government in generating employment and attracting additional industry to this State is most important, because it is there that we will be able to gain within our State budget and to service the debt that we have inherited; it is not from the revenue that will be collected from such an area.

The audit also revealed that the South Australian taxpayers' funded debt had, under the previous Labor Government, tripled in real terms in the space of two years. For instance, as at 30 June 1990 that debt was \$2.1 billion, rising to \$5.8 billion by June 1992, and to \$6.1 billion by June 1993. In addition, total unfunded superannuation liability was \$4.4 billion and that debt would be growing at a rate of \$200 million per year if no action had been taken to fund it. This was a matter about which the Auditor-General expressed concern also. Again, it is an area which has to be addressed by this Government and for which it has to take responsibility.

The audit also addressed the impact of the State Bank disaster. Interest costs in the general Government sector have doubled as a result of the State Bank disaster. As a proportion of our operating revenue that interest has now risen from 4.4 per cent to 8.8 per cent or an additional \$300 million in interest payments per year. What could we do with \$300 million per year in the areas of education, public hospitals and crime prevention in this State?

In addition, the State lost its triple-A credit rating. It was downgraded to AA-minus and the impact of that was to increase the borrowing rates on loans, resulting in a higher cost to the State in interest rates. The audit has identified the debacle left by the previous Labor Government. It has shown the enormous challenge that confronts the Brown Liberal Government. Through reform this Government will deliver its (pre-election) promise, and that is to return this State to economic viability.

I now turn to the positives and the achievements made in the first seven months of this Government. This Government has kept its election promise of attracting industry to the State. The investment made by industries such as Motorola, Australis and Mitsubishi, together with the recent winning of the Orion aircraft upgrading, has shown the commitment of this Government and of the Minister for Industry in ensuring that industry is attracted to South Australia. The perception of this State is changing. It is no longer perceived as a basket case and there is a feeling of extreme optimism. Part of the attraction has been the Government's commitment to the

reform of WorkCover, where approximate savings of \$20 million are estimated, and its commitment to the new industrial relations legislation, which will deliver more flexibility to the workplace in South Australia. That flexibility will result in a more competitive workplace and one which will attract more industry to this State.

Things change, and many years ago we would not have wondered whether or not the communist bloc within the Eastern European countries would still exist. Things here must change as well. We must change with world change, and the world is looking towards more flexibility in labour markets. A recent criticism of the Australian Federal Government was that the supposed micro-economic reform, which has been touted for many years, is particularly slow. The word 'reluctant' might be a better description of it. However, it is through that micro-economic reform and the greater flexibility arising from it that this country will move ahead, and it is only when the Federal Government grasps that matter by the throat that we will move ahead. However, to date, it has been a very slow process.

Debate adjourned.

*[Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2 p.m.]*

#### TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 73 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow extended retail trading hours was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

A petition signed by 591 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to cut education funding was presented by Mr Kerin.

Petition received.

#### MURRAY RIVER

A petition signed by 120 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide clean, filtered water to households and other users depending on water from the Murray River was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

#### GROUP ASSET MANAGEMENT DIVISION

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I wish to inform the House of the latest advice I have recently received in respect of the Group Asset Management Division (GAMD). This information is another stark and sorry reminder of the financial debacle inherited by this Government. GAMD was created by the previous Government as the so-called bad bank to deal with the non-performing loans and assets of the former State Bank. Members will recall that the previous Government paid or provided \$3 037 million under the indemnity agreement to the former State Bank and GAMD to cover losses with a limit set by that Government of \$3 150 million. GAMD reported a loss for the 1992-93 financial year of \$287 million, which was based on valuations for the Myer Centre and 333 Collins

Street, which I regarded at the time as unsustainably high. In Estimates Committee A on 15 September 1993, I stated:

We will probably see some further provisions and write downs given that two major properties, namely, Remm-Myer [the Myer Centre] and 333 Collins Street, are above local valuations in both instances. . . I would expect on the GAMD figures provided in the 1992-93 accounts. . . that the loss could well be as high as \$150 million [during 1993-94].

During the election campaign last year, the Liberal Party made an allowance in its financial strategy for a further \$100 million provision for losses arising from GAMD. One reason for doing this was the decision by the former Government to take the Collins Street property into GAMD. However, shortly after taking office I was assured that the losses predicted by GAMD would be contained within the original indemnity figure, advice which I made public earlier this year. Sadly for the people of South Australia, my original prediction last year has been borne out. A detailed analysis and evaluation of GAMD assets has now revealed that GAMD is likely to report a loss in the order of \$127 million for 1993-94. This figure is still subject to audit and finalisation by the GAMD board.

The main reason for the loss being around the level I predicted last year is the reduction in the valuations of the Myer Centre and 333 Collins Street, two properties that the previous Labor Government was instrumental in ensuring were to become massive burdens on South Australian taxpayers. At 30 June 1993 the Myer Centre was valued at \$205 million. Again, as I predicted, this valuation has been shown to be unsustainable. At 30 June 1994 the Myer Centre was valued at \$155 million for the purposes of GAMD's 1993-94 accounts. State Bank advances for this project, which were actively encouraged by the former Government, including holding costs and interest forgone, totalled \$916 million producing, on the current valuation, losses of the order of \$761 million, a direct cost to the South Australian taxpayer.

Another property on which the valuation has been significantly reduced, as I predicted in September 1993, is 333 Collins Street, Melbourne. At 30 June 1993 GAMD carried this property at \$220 million for the purposes of its accounts. I have been advised that the latest valuation of this property as at 30 June 1994 is \$188 million: a reduction of \$32 million. Members will recall that, under these arrangements approved by the former Government, SGIC exercised a put option in respect of this property in July 1991 that required SGIC to pay a net price of \$465 million. The reduction in the valuation of the Remm Myer Centre and 333 Collins Street properties alone contributed \$82 million to a loss of the order of \$127 million expected to be reported by GAMD for the 1993-94 financial year.

If this loss is added to the \$3 037 million provided under the indemnity, the total amount is \$3 164 million, greater than the bail-out limit of \$3 150 million set by the previous Government for property and other losses carried by GAMD. The former Government moved 333 Collins Street into GAMD last year after SAFA was forced to take it off SGIC's books the previous year. It is interesting to note that the assurances from the former Premier and his Treasurer, that no further bail-outs would be required, were made even at the time they were deviously shifting the 333 Collins Street disaster into GAMD, hoping it would be able to absorb what now prove to be unsustainable losses.

Let me make the extent of these losses, which can be blamed directly on the incompetence of the previous Government, perfectly clear. Take the Myer Centre: the total bill to

date, including holding and interest costs, is now \$916 million. If you subtract the latest valuation of the centre of \$155 million, the loss to date is \$761 million on one building. We could build three buildings today for that price. Now adding 333 Collins Street into the equation, the total cost including interest payments is now estimated at \$620 million. If we subtract the current valuation of \$188 million, we end up with a cost to the State of \$432 million. The bottom line of the cost of these two buildings, caused by the incompetence of the previous Government, is \$1 193 million—with the lowest teachers and hospitals, I would add.

On a more positive note, the two properties in question are now attracting interest from buyers in the commercial property market, although I will not make any predictions on the likely prices we may eventually receive for these buildings. This latest \$127 million loss for GAMD and the notional figure of \$3 167 million, exceeding the indemnity limit, will not have an impact on the budget. Arrangements are in hand, to be finalised when the final audited accounts of GAMD are available, to deal with the loss. Amendments have been made to the deed of indemnity under which GAMD operates, which will allow me, as Treasurer, to determine how this loss is to be absorbed, and to do so without any impact on the budget.

In closing, I draw members' attention to new arrangements relating to GAMD. The South Australian Asset Management Corporation (SAAMC) has been created out of the continuing legal entity formerly called State Bank. SAAMC has a significant task to carry out, including management of GAMD assets upon the merging of the operations of these two entities. The board of SAAMC has absorbed and restructured the former GAMD and has set aggressive targets for the wind down of the portfolio over the next two years. The new management has already achieved collections of \$190 million in the first three weeks of July this year. I am advised it is likely that SAAMC will operate at a loss in the first year, or possibly the second year, of its existence given the need to manage GAMD assets and a range of other assets. Forward estimates are presently being prepared by SAAMC. My present expectation is that SAAMC will make a positive contribution at or towards the end of its operating life as it seeks to optimise the value of the assets under its control.

### GAMING MACHINES

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** In a statement to the House on 19 April this year, I announced the Government's intention to introduce a Bill in the Budget session to amend the Gaming Machines Act 1992 to prohibit certain profit sharing arrangements and to prohibit the holders of gaming machine dealers' licences or their associates from holding gaming machine licences in this State. I wish to advise that the Bill introduced yesterday also includes an amendment to restrict the eligibility of the holders of general facility licences to hold gaming machine licences, effective from 1 August 1994.

The original justification for the introduction of gaming machines into this State was based on the need to improve the financial viability and stability of the club and hotel industries. The general facility licence category was only included because there were many premises which to all intents and purposes were hotels and which had had their

hotel licence converted to a general licence. However, the Liquor Licensing Commissioner has advised me that an Adelaide restaurant has successfully applied, under the existing legislation, for a licence to operate gaming machines.

It is feared that the approval of this application has the potential to open up a Pandora's box unless a limit is imposed on the range of general facility licence holders eligible to hold a gaming licence. The general facility licence category covers areas such as catering operations, restaurants, vessels, theatres and planes. Under the provisions of the Act, you could have a gaming machine in a stretch limousine. The Bill will restrict the eligibility of holders of general facility licences to hold gaming machines to; first, those who hold a general facility licence in respect of premises which were previously the subject of either a hotel or club licence and where the Liquor Licensing Commission is satisfied that the operation is similar to that of a hotel or club; and, secondly, the holder of a general facility licence where in the opinion of the Commissioner the premises are recognised as the State headquarters for a particular sporting code, or are major sporting venues and, in the Commissioner's opinion, the operation is similar to that of a club. I also wish to inform the House—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Under the provisions of the previous Government, any restaurant in town could have poker machines. I also wish to inform the House that gaming machine operations in hotels and clubs in South Australia commenced on Monday 25 July 1994 with a total of 682 machines in 28 venues going live on that day. The launch of the gaming operations has been widely applauded as an outstanding success. I am advised that the Independent Gaming Corporation's central monitoring system, which monitors the operations of all gaming machines in hotels and clubs, has performed faultlessly and that on one day of operations our State had more gaming machines on line to the monitoring system involving multiple venues and machines for a variety of manufacturers than any other jurisdiction in Australia and possibly the world.

The successful launch is in no small way due to the extraordinary efforts of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, Mr Bill Pryor, and his staff who work tirelessly not only to ensure the integrity and security of the operation but also to protect the interests of the hotel and club operators who have invested millions of dollars in this new industry. The commissioner has received 267 applications for gaming machine licences for the installation of 6 644 machines. So far, 218 licences have been approved for 5 500 machines throughout the State, with venues continuing to come on line. As at Monday 1 August, 919 machines had been installed at 39 venues.

These installations have progressed only after overcoming significant problems with the quality of machines delivered by gaming manufacturers as well as supply problems with one manufacturer, namely Aristocrat. Other people and I have been stunned by the pathetic standard and significant number of substandard machines—machines which cost on average around \$10 000 each—that have been delivered by manufacturers into this State. The quality problems have included missing, wrong or faulty parts, delivery of unapproved game software, incorrect hoppers, and graphic faults, just to mention a few. This unacceptable situation was raised with the manufacturers, and I am pleased to say there has been an improvement in the quality of machines now being delivered into this State.

On the supply front, a major machine manufacturer, Aristocrat—which was delivering some of the worst machinery that we have received in the State and which has been actively soliciting business in South Australia—has secured a major share of the market but has failed to supply the machines for scheduled installation dates. I am advised that, at the same time Aristocrat was assuring clubs and hotels that shipments of machines were on the way, it was advising the Liquor Licensing Commissioner that it was unable to supply machines for scheduled installations. As a result of the delay in deliveries of Aristocrat machines, the Liquor Licensing Commissioner has had to approve some partial installations to allow venues that are still awaiting the delivery of Aristocrat machines to begin gaming operations with machines that have been delivered by other manufacturers.

The State Supply Board, the official purchasing agent of the machines, has notified hotel and club operators of the supply problem with Aristocrat machines and has given venues the opportunity to cancel or change their orders. I also pay tribute to the efforts of State Supply and its staff in getting these machines through the system. Clearly, Aristocrat's supply problems will affect the progress of installations in venues, particularly if hotels and clubs choose to wait for these machines and then request partial installations in the interim. This issue is one that the hotel and club industries, as the purchasers of the gaming machines, must address. In view of the above problems, it is indeed a tribute to the efforts of various parties in this State, in particular the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and his staff, that gaming operations actually commenced on 25 July and that it was such a success.

#### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. R.B. Such)—

Department for Employment, Training and Further Education—Corporate Review and Report, 1993.

#### QUESTION TIME

##### STATE BANK

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

Given the Treasurer's ministerial statement, why did he advise this House on Thursday 10 March 1994:

I am more than satisfied that we have GAMD and the State Bank back on track, and I will continue to ensure that we get value for money and a return on those non-performing loans.

In the light of his statement, given that he has changed the board and management of GAMD, does he now have full confidence in the board and management of the SAAMC?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Unfortunately, the Leader is still on long service leave. Will the Clerk of the House please supply the Leader of the Opposition with a copy of my ministerial statement?

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** A second one.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Yes, a second one. I find it absolutely extraordinary that that question was asked by the Leader of the Opposition. I could have written that question as a dumb question for him to ask. Seriously, I said in the statement that we were advised when we came to government, because I was sure when we were in opposition that the figures I looked at meant that indeed there were further

losses, that the written down value of those premises had not been revealed in the accounts. I questioned the valuation methods being undertaken by the officers of the GAMD at that time. It is on the record for anyone to see.

When I came to government and questioned those officers, I was given an assurance—an absolute assurance by those officers—that the indemnity would not be breached and I said, ‘I do not believe that: check it.’ They came back to me and said, ‘Minister, we stand by our statements to you that the losses have been fully catered for.’ Indeed, I was right, the specialist advice was wrong and the Leader of the Opposition has made a contribution to this State of losses totalling \$1 193 million, and I would expect that he would keep quiet on this issue. I can think of all the schools, the hospitals and the police—we can go through the whole budgetary process and list the difficulties that this Government has had to overcome because of the efforts of the former Government.

I can think of all those issues, and the last thing that the Leader of the Opposition should be asking about is the history of the losses associated with those two principal buildings. It was a sick and sorry saga of decisions which were simply incompetent and in which he was involved as Government Leader: he was seated at that Cabinet table. Indeed, his management set up the indemnity. It is quite clear to me that the Leader of the Opposition did not listen to the ministerial statement. I ask him to re-read the statement, and re-read it again, and he might understand what is in it.

#### ALICE SPRINGS TO DARWIN RAILWAY

**Mr KERIN (Frome):** My question is directed to the Premier. What recent action has the South Australian Government taken to seek the construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway?

**Mr VENNING:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, are you aware the clock is not working?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the Chair is aware of that.

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

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** As the Deputy Premier said, we could offer the Opposition unlimited time and it still could not get it right today. In answer to the honourable member’s question, I highlight that this is one of the issues I raised with the Prime Minister last week in Canberra. The Prime Minister indicated to me that he was relying on the Wran Committee—the committee he appointed, I think about 12 months ago, chaired by a former Premier of New South Wales, Neville Wran—which is looking into the operations of how Australia can be taken through Darwin into Asia. I think it is a very important committee because it has significant ramifications for South Australia as well.

The Prime Minister said that he would be relying on the findings of the Wran Committee as to whether or not the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link should proceed. I understand that the Wran Committee has received a large number of submissions from a range of parties. The South Australian Government has made a very strong submission to that committee advocating that the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link should be built. The Wran Committee has appointed its own consultants, Travers Morgan, to investigate and report on a number of key factors concerning this rail link. Those factors include key variables such as a cost benefit analysis, the full construction cost of the project, other financial issues that would arise (including ownership of the railway) and the matter concerning how the railway would benefit Australia in both the public and national interest.

Also, there has been an exchange of letters between me, as Premier of South Australia, and the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, and we have decided that on a joint basis we will establish a coordinating strategic committee to continue to pursue this issue and look at the mutual benefits for both South Australia and the Northern Territory.

Of course, the construction of that rail link would be a huge boost to this State for a couple of reasons. We would have the chance to participate in the construction project itself, with the possibility of concrete sleepers being produced in Port Augusta, and the rails could be manufactured only at Whyalla. So, it would be a huge task for the long products division of the Whyalla steelworks.

South Australia would be one of the great beneficiaries from this rail link as we would be able to get containers of fresh foods—products such as milk, meat, chilled foods and so on—and manufactured goods very quickly into the South-East Asian market. It is a project that I think jointly as a Parliament and State we need to pursue very vigorously. The honourable member can be assured that we will continue to pursue this matter with the Wran Committee in the hope of a positive finding being made by that committee.

#### ELECTION PROMISES

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):** Does the Premier stand by his promises of no new taxes and no increase in existing taxes—that is absolutely black and white, not brown—and his further promise, ‘I will resign as Premier if I am forced to introduce new taxes or increase the rate of existing ones’? Also, will he remind the Treasurer of these promises?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Let me make it quite clear: I stand by the commitments that I gave prior to the election. What a hypocrite the Leader of the Opposition is even raising this issue in Parliament, because in 1989 he was a member of a Cabinet that went out and made a commitment to the people of South Australia that over the following four years there would be no increases in taxation in this State. What was the consequence? South Australia suffered the biggest increase in State taxation of any State in the whole of Australia. If you want evidence of that, just read what the Audit Commission had to say. Then there was the commitment that there would be no reduction in teacher numbers. The Leader, the then Premier, together with his other Cabinet colleagues, gave the commitment that there would be no reduction in teacher numbers. What did they do? They slashed teacher numbers by 1 200.

There was a further promise that there would be no reductions at all in public sector employment, yet the Labor Government reduced public sector employment by 7 600 positions. What a hide the Leader has to stand up this afternoon and talk about election promises. I am prepared to stand by the statement I made before the election. It is a shame for South Australia that the Leader of the Opposition did not stand by the commitment that he and his Cabinet colleagues gave before the 1989 election. He is like an arsonist who, having burnt down South Australia, wants to stand here today and gloat over the ruins in which he has left the State.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** If the Leader of the Opposition wanted to be certain of his facts before making a fool of himself in the House today, he should have looked at the



transcript of what he said yesterday, namely, 'I don't expect the Premier to be resigning.' So, that throws it right back to the Leader of the Opposition, who quite clearly—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:**—is the hypocrite, because he was a member of the Cabinet which for four years broke every basic fundamental promise that the then Government had made to the people of South Australia in 1989. But not only did it do that: it then destroyed the State's economy in the process.

### MARALINGA LANDS

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** Can the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs advise the House of the Government's position on the ownership of the Maralinga lands after the Commonwealth clean up?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I thank the honourable member for his question, because it is important for all South Australians—particularly people in the Maralinga lands—and, indeed, after a lot of effort from people in South Australia, for people throughout the Commonwealth and the United Kingdom to recognise that what happened caused a great disadvantage that must be redressed. The State Government certainly does intend to return the Maralinga lands to Maralinga Tjarutja, the Aboriginal landholding body. We are keen to facilitate this as soon as possible, once an indemnity from the Commonwealth in relation to any of the seriously radioactive, contaminated land has been granted to the State. It is important for all South Australians, be they Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal, that the indemnity be granted from the Commonwealth, hence we are pursuing that.

There has been some misunderstanding about what that meant—that is, that the Government did not wish to hand back the land. That is not the case. I have addressed that issue with Mr Archie Barton, the administrator of Maralinga Tjarutja, and with legal representatives of Maralinga Tjarutja and made that quite clear. They certainly understand and are sympathetic with our position.

To give clear direction and evidence of the Government's commitment that we are intending to hand back the land in the longer term once that indemnity has been granted, we have decided already that the Maralinga village and the airstrip will not be subject to any indemnity. The reason we are doing this is that all the advice we have from the Public and Environmental Health Division of the South Australian Health Commission is that the land is uncontaminated, based on present knowledge, and hence is not in need of Commonwealth indemnity. As far as the transfer is concerned, it is obviously for the lawyers to work out the terms. For instance, we clearly need to be covered as a State in case the Commonwealth decides not to continue with the clean-up, or something like that.

However, given the present circumstances, we intend not to seek an indemnity for the Maralinga village and the airstrip. Of course, this has quite dramatic consequences for Maralinga Tjarutja, because it has been rumoured that the Commonwealth may be intending not to utilise that approach as one of the forward thinking plans to give employment, training and so on to the Aboriginal people. The Maralinga Tjarutja people tell me regularly that they are very keen to utilise the clean-up money to provide both employment and training, not only for people in the Maralinga lands—the Maralinga Tjarutja disadvantaged people—but also that it

will be an enormous stimulus to the whole economy of the West Coast. By removing the Maralinga village and the airstrip from any future indemnity we are immediately opening up the possibility for Maralinga Tjarutja people to be employed in appropriate fencing, maintenance, housing construction and so on, rather than having the Commonwealth say, 'We don't know whether it will be handed back to the Aboriginal people in the longer term. Therefore, with the clean-up, we will bring in transportable homes, utilise them and then take them out again.'

Obviously, it is in everyone's interests if the money for the clean-up can be applied for future employment, housing, training and so on for the Maralinga people. As I said, the Government's position overall is that it certainly intends to hand back the land *in toto* once the indemnity has been granted. However, we have given a very clear direction by indicating to the Commonwealth Government that the village and the airstrip are not part of that indemnity process.

### GAMING MACHINES

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier at least match the \$1 million contribution to be made by the Independent Gaming Corporation to assist victims of gambling—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** This is not a joking matter; it is serious. Or will he fulfil his promise to South Australians by introducing legislation—

*Members interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mitchell is warned.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:**—limiting access to poker machines? On 26 July 1992, the then Leader of the Opposition, now Premier, told a rally on the front steps of Parliament House—in his mood of saying anything to anyone who would listen—that, when he became Premier, 'You can be assured that I will use my best endeavours to ensure we don't have poker machines here in South Australia.' I would be interested to know what he is proposing to do and what he has done since the last election to honour that commitment.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The Leader has asked whether I will match what the industry is giving, dollar for dollar, in terms of dealing with the people who are affected by poker machines. First, Archbishop Faulkner's representative and Archbishop George came to see me on Tuesday afternoon. As a result of that discussion, and at my request, they have promised to prepare a detailed submission to the Government, and I have promised to take that submission to Cabinet. Therefore, on that matter, I think it is appropriate that we wait until after the two Archbishops formally forward their submission to me. Let us look at the record of the Leader of the Opposition regarding this issue, because when he was Premier his Government made a commitment to put \$2 million a year into helping families adversely affected by poker machines. When we came into Government, we found that no money whatsoever had been provided in the forward estimates. Where is the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition who, having undertaken to give \$2 million a year,

did not even bother to provide that amount in the forward estimates?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Culance and the member for Hart will not continue to have a private conversation. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Further, the former Government decided not only to deceive the people of South Australia in that regard but also to use poker machines. Knowing that poker machines could not possibly be operative during 1993-94, it still decided to put \$7 million into the 1993-94 budget as income from poker machines to help plug up its budget to get it through the 1993 election by claiming it had an operating surplus. That is the shabby sort of politics that the then Premier and now Leader of the Opposition played regarding poker machines in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Let me make quite clear that I am not a supporter of poker machines, and I have never been a supporter of poker machines. In fact, I have spoken against poker machines at every opportunity in this House, and I have voted against poker machines in this House. Unfortunately, when the former Premier and now Leader of the Opposition was in Government, his Government decided to force this legislation through before I was even a member of the Parliament. Unfortunately, therefore, I did not have a chance to vote or to play a part in trying to stop this legislation from coming into effect.

#### EMPLOYEE OMBUDSMAN

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Has the Government made any decision in relation to the appointment of an Employee Ombudsman, and when will the new Industrial and Employee Relations Act commence?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** It is with pleasure that I announce that Gary Collis has been appointed to the position of Employee Ombudsman for South Australia. For 11 years he was an assistant secretary of the Australian Workers Union, which is now combined with FIMEE. He was a union official—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** No, it isn't. He was associated and affiliated with the UTLC. The reason for appointing this gentleman is that we believe it is absolutely critical that we have a person who has the employees' interests at heart. However, we also appointed him because he understands enterprise bargaining. During the past three years he has worked with industry on the side of both the employee and the employer to develop some of the most interesting enterprise bargains that have been developed in this State.

It is interesting to compare the appointment of Mr Collis with the hypocritical comments that were made when this Bill went through the House: that the Government would obviously put in some right wing stooge, someone who had no involvement with employees and would not understand anything about employee relations. I think the member for Ross Smith could be credited with that type of comment both inside and outside this place. South Australia has employed the first Employee Ombudsman in Australia. This is the first time someone has been appointed who is not and will not be driven solely by the union movement but who will actually

get out there and support the 70 per cent of people who are not members of a union in their rights before the enterprise agreement commissioner. I recommend to the House the appointment of Mr Collis.

#### EDUCATION POLICY

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Will the Minister, as Minister for TAFE and representing the Minister for Education in this House, assure the House that TAFE lecturers and school teachers will not be penalised if they make public or media comments about Government policies including broken promises in respect of education and TAFE?

The Minister would be aware of reports in the *Melbourne Age* claiming a heavy-handed approach by the Kennett Government against teachers who have publicly criticised Government policy including budget cuts. In Victoria a teaching service order prohibits teachers from making public comment unless authorised by the Department of School Education. The order has only been vigorously enforced following recent criticism of the Kennett Government's education cuts. There have also been allegations in Victoria of funding reprisals against schools following media comments by staff. Will the Minister give an assurance that that will not happen here?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** That is an interesting question from someone who was a member of a Government which gagged school principals. No such instruction has been issued to TAFE staff, and I understand the same situation applies in respect of the Department for Education and Children's Services. However, to be absolutely sure, I will obtain an answer from my colleague in another place.

#### INDONESIAN TRADE FAIR

**Mr CUMMINS (Norwood):** My question—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr CUMMINS:** Yes, thank you, Mr Brindal. My question is directed to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. I understand the Minister led a delegation of South Australian business people and others representing various sporting, artistic and service sectors to Indonesia during the parliamentary recess. Will the Minister inform the House of whether there were any benefits to South Australia from that visit and its outcome?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** South Australia participated in the Australia Today—Indonesia 1994 Trade Fair—very successfully, I might add. There were 120 South Australians representing 60 businesses from this State who participated in the delegation. As the policy thrust and direction of this Government is to create an export market culture and to give encouragement to small and medium businesses to identify opportunities in export markets, the Economic Development Authority, by participating in that trade fair, gave assistance and encouragement and facilitated the small to medium sized enterprises which took part—companies which previously would not have contemplated going offshore to search for export markets. Of course, by opening up export markets they will create sales overseas for South Australian companies which will generate job opportunities in South Australia.

This is the biggest fair that Australia has participated in overseas. South Australia had the largest representation amongst the States. Not only did we have a trade exhibition

but, to make sure that South Australia stood out in the crowd from the other States, we also gave support to the South Australian Soccer Federation to provide a composite soccer team, which played four exhibition matches in Jakarta, undertook clinics for school children and participated in supermarket appearances. In addition, we held a talented and gifted childrens' seminar which we expected 60 people to attend. In fact, registrations numbered over 120, so that a second working party conference was organised during the week as a follow-up. This attracted the Director and Deputy Director of Education from the Indonesian Government to participate in the talented and gifted childrens' seminar.

On the Saturday we staged an aged care seminar to give a clear undertaking and direction to the Indonesian Government of how South Australia, which is at the forefront of aged care, can impart that knowledge and experience to project manage aged care facilities which are in demand in Indonesia.

In addition, there was a charity luncheon at which one of the guest speakers was Ann Middleton, who is recognised internationally for her jewellery design. The funds raised at that charity lunch will enable three Indonesian children to access the Cranio-facial Unit. So, it was not only a trade mission but sport and the arts were included. Ernabella Art participated in an exhibition at the National Gallery in Jakarta. Across the board, South Australia was well represented and, in response to advice from Indonesia, from what has been reported in the *Jakarta Post* and from interstate, South Australia did it better. Some of the outcomes of that include: the Tecalemit company recouped on its first day the cost of going to the trade fair. It had some \$5 000 of sales, with a mining trade exhibition to be followed up next month.

The Regency Park school had 10 enrolments. In addition, it had hundreds of inquiries about further information on accessing Regency Park. A water purification company is now setting up a factory in Jakarta to meet what is an unprecedented demand amongst 200 million people, 17 million plus of whom live in Jakarta, for water purification. A media group has signed up a new video education package. The northern Adelaide plains producers have undertaken to open up markets and have secured markets for fresh produce to supermarkets and food in major hotels and, in a joint venture, have solved some packaging and transport problems to access that market. SAGRIC International during that week signed millions of dollars worth of contracts, one in excess of \$20 million to participate in a mapping system, a land title system, for the 13 000 Indonesian islands.

All in all, it was an outstanding success for which the EDA officers who coordinated it and the people with whom they contracted to ensure South Australia's presence are to be commended. We are doing it well—there was a significant potential discovered, leading to contracts and jobs—but we can do it better. The Premier, when he returned from overseas, clearly identified a lack of understanding because we have not marketed Adelaide and South Australia well enough in the past. We need to profile that, and the best way to do it is through tourism and education. They are the areas that we have to concentrate on over the next 10 years to make sure that the real trade potential is opened up for South Australia.

#### ELECTION PROMISES

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Will the Premier renew his undertaking to honour the promises on which his Party was

elected and his undertaking that 'what we say is what we will do'? Major commitments made by the Premier have already been abandoned: the promise to increase expenditure on education resulted in a \$40 million cut; the promise of additional funds for health—

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, this is really comment and debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair does not need assistance. I suggest to the honourable member for Playford that in asking his question he should not comment.

**Mr QUIRKE:** The promise of additional funds for health resulted in a \$65 million cut and, instead of 3 900 jobs gone, we have lost 11 500 from the public sector.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The people of South Australia clearly understand that the Liberal Government was elected on the basis, first, that we would try to fix up the mess created by the former Labor Government over an 11 year period and that we would start to rectify the huge financial problems that the Government of South Australia faced; and, secondly, that we would start to rebuild the economy and create job opportunities.

One has only to look at the national figures that came out a few weeks ago comparing the various States of Australia as to where they stood at the beginning of this year in contrast to the position at the beginning of the recession that Australia went into. Every State of Australia except South Australia had a net improvement in its job position between the beginning of the recession and the beginning of this year.

On the figures presented, this State had lost about 15 per cent of its employment base during that period—15 per cent of the jobs of the State—under a Labor Government. I could not think of a shabbier, poorer and more damaging record to leave anyone. That is the sort of task that the Liberal Government is embarking upon; we have already undertaken a whole range of commitments that we gave before the election. Everyone has commented on the fact that we set down a very tight 100 day program, and look at the hundreds of promises that were carried out in just those first 100 days.

I compare that with what we have had out of our Opposition since the election. First, we have a Leader of the Opposition who says he is on long service leave; we have a Deputy Leader of the Opposition who says that he needs to have some work experience; we have a shadow Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing who says that all his colleagues are lazy—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It must have been the shadow Minister for Health; I thought he also had recreation. They are now starting to point the finger of blame at each other, as we can see from across the Chamber. I have just had a message from WorkCover that it is grateful that it does not cover the policy for this sick Opposition that we have here in South Australia. The people of South Australia are already showing, through their lift in confidence—both consumers and the business sector—that they appreciate the very significant program that has already been put in place here in South Australia, as we promised before the election. It is interesting that it has now spread beyond South Australia.

I had the chance to meet for an hour and a half recently with the Business Council of Australia, which highlighted the fact that here in South Australia we have done more to lift the level of confidence than have most other States of Australia. Members of that council commented on the fact that the policies we have put in place are more impressive than those in most other areas, particularly in terms of making sure that

we have a much more competitive environment in which to be able to attract new investment and, therefore, to create the jobs that are so important and to which younger South Australians are desperately looking forward.

### FORESTRY

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries, where his portfolio responsibilities relate to forestry. When will the review into the State's forestry industry, particularly the Government's own resources, be available, and how will this affect the future management of this extremely valuable South Australian industry?

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** I thank the honourable member for his question, and I would like to pay tribute to the member for Gordon, in whose electorate many of the forests in South Australia are located. He consistently criticised the previous Administration on its management—or lack of management—of forests and, in particular, the way the previous Government managed the Scrimber project, which cost \$60 million and decimated what was previously a very good organisation. The member for Gordon has been at the forefront of trying to ensure that we had some reform in the forest area and the value adding area.

On coming to government, we initiated a review of the forests, undertaken by Australian Agribusiness Consultants, and that report should be available very soon. It will be considered by the Government in the next couple of weeks and will then be available. I am very pleased to report that, apart from consulting in very broad areas and with a range of people in the South-East and the forestry business throughout South Australia and interstate, one of the things that it looked at was whether more timber would be available for the South-East's commercial interests to process.

If we can get that going from perhaps the most conservative regime in Australia in terms of managing forest, it will add to the number of jobs available in South Australia and the wealth we can generate. I can say that I know that one of the findings will be that there is more timber available. All those people in the District of Gordon can be assured that there will be an increase in the number of jobs when that timber is processed. Although the consultation process has taken a long time, it will be very much in the State's interest that at last some of our Government owned entities will be properly run along commercial lines for the benefit of South Australia.

### ELECTION PROMISES

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Does the Treasurer agree with the Premier that the Government has kept its promise to keep increases in fees and charges in line with inflation and, if so, does he deny that any fees and charges have been increased by more than the CPI? The Government has increased over 1 000 fees—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** You just look after Rossi—and charges and at the last count 436 of these had been increased by more than the CPI, including a 280 per cent increase for fish processors.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I could say 'Yes' to the first part of the question and the second part obviously speaks for itself. Some of the fees and charges have not been changed and 95 per cent of the ones that have been changed fit within the category that the honourable member was talking about.

By and large, that is a product of very good management. We have kept them below CPI. Where there have been—

**Mr Quirke:** By and large.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** By and large: 95 per cent is not a bad record. The previous Government batted at about zero on most of its promises. There were certain areas. The honourable member would understand, if he talked to the fish processors, that that occurred at their behest and after discussion with the Minister. I would suggest that the honourable member do a little more homework and check his figures: 95 per cent of those fees and charges have clearly been kept within the CPI, as this Government promised and undertook. The simple fact of life is that we have been doing a service to the people of South Australia by ensuring that charges have not gone up more than the CPI.

### CLIMATE CHANGE COMMITTEE

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** Has the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources reviewed the administration and composition of the State Climate Committee, as was outlined in this Government's environment policy? The State Climate Committee is responsible for overviewing greenhouse effects within this State. Part of our policy prior to the election was that it would be reviewed; is that review being undertaken?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I am pleased that the member for Light has raised this matter today, because during the day quite a bit of media attention has been given to the greenhouse effect and climate change. Over the past five years the Climate Change Committee has been responsible for advising Government on policy relating to the greenhouse issue. This large committee, comprised of over 20 agencies, was responsible for preparing the national greenhouse strategy for South Australia and it also contributed to the development of the national greenhouse response strategy.

The Climate Change Committee, having largely fulfilled its original terms of reference, needed to be reviewed. I indicated that prior to the election, and that is what I have done. In undertaking that review, it was clear to me that there remained a need for some form of coordinating and policy advising committee in order for this Government to meet its commitments, including support of the national greenhouse response strategy which was reaffirmed by the Government earlier this year.

In reviewing the Climate Change Committee, I considered a range of options and decided to establish a smaller committee to be named the South Australian Greenhouse Committee, which will report to me. The greenhouse committee will be comprised of eight Government agencies. The South Australian Gas Company will also be invited to attend its meetings. The committee will be chaired and serviced by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

Its terms of reference include: initiating and coordinating action for achieving the objectives and targets of the national greenhouse response strategy, the South Australian greenhouse strategy and the framework convention on climate change; coordinating policy advice to the South Australian Government on climate change; and monitoring and reporting regularly on the implementation of the national greenhouse response strategy and the South Australian greenhouse strategy. I recognise this as being a very important committee advising Government. I am pleased that as a result of the review this new committee has now been established.

### TRADING HOURS

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** In a meeting with Mr John Brownsea and Mr Jim Davis of the Small Retailers Association held prior to the announcement of the committee to inquire into shop trading hours, did the Minister for Industrial Affairs promise that there would be no change to current Sunday trading arrangements?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** No.

### MBf

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** Is the Minister for Tourism aware of media reports in Malaysia concerning MBf and an Opposition member of the Malaysian Parliament? I ask this question in light of the Minister's and the Premier's recent visit to Malaysia during which they signed a memorandum of understanding with MBf for a significant investment in tourism in South Australia.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I am aware that in Malaysia there have been many media reports about MBf and in particular its President and Chief Executive Officer, Tan Sri Loy. It is important that I lay before the House some information about the person who has been the source of much of what has been written or reported in Malaysia. Wee Choo Keong is an Opposition member of Parliament and a lawyer. In 1992 he represented two former MBf employees who had been dismissed by the company after discovery of a fraud. While representing the two former employees, Wee began making a series of unsubstantiated allegations about MBf and Tan Sri Loy in the Malaysian Parliament. Police investigated the claims made and nothing was proven. Wee then continued to make public allegations against MBf and Tan Sri Loy and, as a result, MBf commenced legal action against him.

Mr Wee was subsequently convicted of contempt by the Malaysian High Court and sentenced to two years' gaol. He is currently appealing that sentence and the matter is pending before the Supreme Court. Mr Wee has also made allegations concerning a meeting between Tan Sri Loy and the Lord President of the Malaysian Supreme Court. We need to be very clear that the person making all sorts of unsubstantiated allegations is an Opposition member of Parliament convicted of contempt. If his appeal fails, he will face two years in gaol and, as a result, will lose his seat in the Malaysian Parliament and his licence to practise law. Malaysia's Attorney-General also has investigated matters raised by Mr Wee and found them to be baseless.

Let us also be clear why I am raising this matter of concern today. The Government is aware that the Opposition has anonymously been given some material concerning MBf in the form of press clippings. The Government also received the same material in Malaysia last month, and the Premier and I both immediately investigated the issues and found that they were totally unsubstantiated, and major business and financial people in the region could not speak too highly of MBf and Tan Sri Loy.

The Government is also aware that a State political reporter is in Malaysia attempting to gather material against MBf. The Government is further aware that the reporter has spoken to Mr Wee, other MPs, MBf and locally based American journalists who have investigated these matters themselves and found that MBf is a highly reputable company.

I point out that MBf, through the company Sealink, already has a significant investment in Australian tourism and is one of the State's largest tourist organisations. It has been the recipient of a number of important tourism awards. The company is about to significantly increase its investment here through a major redevelopment of the Wirrina Cove Resort which will, at last, give this State a significant international class tourism facility—something the former Government kept talking about but never achieved.

One final point that I will make is that, while in Government, the Labor Party itself was courting MBf. Both the present Leader as Minister of State Development and the former Tourism Minister, Ms Wiese, had meetings with Tan Sri Loy in an attempt to convince him to invest in South Australia. These meetings took place in Kuala Lumpur in 1991 and 1992. The Labor Party was not successful in these ventures. It is only since the election of a Liberal Government that South Australia has secured the significant investment in tourism facilities in South Australia.

### TRADING HOURS

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** Does the Minister for Industrial Affairs intend to hold to his commitment made to a retailers rally on the steps of Parliament House on 8 December last year that he was opposed to Sunday trading and that, as long as he was a Minister, he would not permit it?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Within two weeks the Government will be making an announcement on shop trading.

### SHORTS HOLIDAY CAMPAIGN

**Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson):** Will the Minister for Tourism inform the House of the latest progress in the South Australian Tourism Commission's Shorts holiday campaign, which has been one of the State's highest profile tourism promotions in recent years? Many of my constituents in the tourism industry have recently approached me wanting to get involved in the Shorts campaign because they see the great benefit it has for them and the State as a whole and they are keen to hear the Tourism Minister's thoughts on the matter.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** The Shorts program is the most effective national and State tourism program developed by the Tourism Commission. One of the exciting things about the program is that we have had almost a 30 per cent increase in sales due to the marketing of that program in the past six to 12 months. It takes small operators, usually with bed and breakfast options or in the home stay program, and enables them to receive reasonable promotion right across the nation. It is an excellent program because it puts South Australia and regional tourism on the map, and that is really what we all need to do regarding tourism.

I notice that the member opposite who is involved in the bed and breakfast area is cheering loudly for the Shorts program, because it is in the regional development area of the Hills, for instance, that we need to attract more national and international tourism. The Shorts program is a continuing one from the previous Government and is an excellent program that we will continue to promote right around Australia. I congratulate the Tourism Commission and all operators involved in the program, which affords a great advantage for South Australia.

### TRADING HOURS

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs stand by his promise to a meeting on Sunday trading, held at the Adelaide Town Hall on 14 July last year, at which he stated that the Liberal Party will retain the current trading hours for the life of this Parliament?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** As I said in answer to the previous question, within two weeks everyone in South Australia will know the position.

### REGENCY INSTITUTE

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education inform the House of any recent developments related to the construction of residential facilities for students at the Regency Institute of TAFE?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** This is a most exciting development. The provision of residential accommodation at the Regency Institute of TAFE, a \$6 million development, will comprise villas for students from overseas, from other States and from within South Australia. The Regency Institute is a world leader in terms of training in the hospitality industry and is one of the few organisations outside Europe accredited to provide training in accordance with the standards of the Swiss Hotels Association and the *Cordon Bleu* Institute. This provision of residential accommodation will further cement the standing of that institute. At the moment we have about 200 students enrolled at the college to undertake the international program in hotel management, and that number will expand over time. It is a very expensive course currently costing \$15 000 per annum per student, but we have a significant number of students already enrolled, with further expansion to occur.

Another recent development that is very promising is that the institute, in association with the University of South Australia, can now offer a four year degree in hotel management, which again will provide leadership in that industry and ensure that we attract students from around the world as well as from within Australia. So, it is an exciting development. I commend the Federal Ministers Ross Free and Brian Howe for their support in assisting in the financing of this project, which will benefit all South Australians and Australia as people being trained there will be ambassadors for Australia throughout the world. They will take top positions in international hotel chains.

### WOMEN'S HEALTH CENTRES

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Will the Minister for Health advise members of the foundation of his assertion to the House on Tuesday that a number of women's health centres in the immediate vicinity of the Napier area believe they can provide more services by amalgamating? On Tuesday the Minister told the House that the initiative for amalgamating women's health centres was coming 'from the bottom up—not proposed by me or by the commission; it was a movement from within the women's health centres'.

The Elizabeth Women's Health Centre is the only women's health centre in the immediate vicinity of the State district of Napier. The Chair of its board of management, Anne McLennan, wrote yesterday to the Minister as follows:

The board and directors express their complete rejection of this statement and put on record that such a discussion has not taken place, nor has such a decision been made by this organisation. The

board was extremely dismayed to hear of your statement in the House and can only assume that we have been misrepresented in this matter or, alternatively, that you have been misinformed.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The basis of that statement was the fact that there have been a number of discussions, as I informed the House, about the potential amalgamation of the administration of a number of areas providing community health care in the north-eastern region of Adelaide. There have been a number of opportunities where women's health centres—not community health centres—have been part of that process. Indeed, the letter I received on 2 August 1994 was in response presumably to members of the Labor Party indicating my response to the question from the member for Napier on 2 August in which I said:

The fact is that a number of women's health centres in the immediate vicinity of the Napier area believe they can provide more services by amalgamating administration.

In that instance I was talking about the whole area of the north east. The letter states:

You will be aware that our Director has taken part in regional planning discussions over the past six months, during which time the future for women's health in regional arrangements was discussed.

About two weeks prior to the question being asked by the member for Napier, I had a discussion with people in the commission, and with people from the Elizabeth area in particular, about their proposed plans for amalgamation and their desire to potentially go into a pilot program on the basis that they could save a lot of money from administration which would end up providing more services to people on the ground.

I quote from the 5AD news service (12 o'clock on the 22nd of last month), when Marilyn Rolls, the women's health spokesperson, said:

Integration is being considered as a way of making the centres more efficient. . . Integration can work as long as women's health is kept as a separate service.

That is exactly what we are—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** That is not my statement: it is the statement of Ms Rolls, a women's health spokesperson. As I have said on countless occasions, because of the financial constraints on the Government, thanks to the Opposition and the way it ran the State's finances over 10 years—and I make no bones about it—if we can cut down on the duplication of administration in order to provide more services on the ground we will grasp that opportunity gratefully.

**Mr BECKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, what is the policy of the House in relation to the activities of press secretaries in the galleries?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has asked a very general question without giving specific details as to whom he may be referring. It is a matter of practice that press secretaries can go into the top gallery and hand out prepared questions. At the end of last session I received a request from one of the press secretaries of the Leader of the Opposition asking whether, if it was appropriate, questions could be handed out. We had a general discussion and I agreed that there was a course of action he could take. Therefore, it was on my authorisation, as Speaker, that that particular person was permitted to enter the press gallery above the Chair. As the honourable member would appreciate, I am not aware who was in the press gallery because I cannot see.

### BEVERAGE CONTAINER LEGISLATION

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** Did the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources attend the Conservation Council's forum on container deposit legislation last Saturday, and what is the Minister's position in relation to the current legislation?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Yes, I did attend the forum last Saturday, and it provided me with an opportunity to put our position on this subject. As members would be aware, the legislation introduced in 1975 has since been a source of great controversy. Since coming to Government I have been lobbied by both the conservation movement and industry in relation to whether the legislation should be extended. As I outlined prior to the election and again at the forum, the Government does not intend to extend the legislation.

I repeat a challenge I put to industry earlier this year: if industry is able to develop a voluntary scheme that includes a container deposit component I would be prepared to consider it. I believe that, if a voluntary scheme of litter control can be developed which is at least as effective as and hopefully more effective than the current legislation, it makes sense that I should take that into account. I have asked industry to consider that matter, and it is in the process of doing that. An opportunity was provided at the forum last Saturday to put that position. I am pleased that the member for Mitchell raised this matter in the House today.

---

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

**The SPEAKER:** The question before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I have been amused by recent articles in the national press which have criticised Mr Alexander Downer for his 'too fulsome defence' of Bronwyn Bishop following recent gaffes and 'unnamed senior Liberal colleagues' urging Mr Downer to sack his accident prone shadow Minister rather than leap to her defence. Mr Downer's recent public defences of Bronwyn Bishop are totally at odds with the private war he is waging against her. Mr Downer has been personally involved in a strategy designed to further undermine Bronwyn Bishop with her colleagues, the media and the public. Despite what he says publicly, Mr Downer is working on a strategy to dump Mrs Bishop. However, he believes the timing must be right to enhance his leadership and to appear strong, reasonable and fair in doing so rather than its being seen as a spiteful tactic to remove a potential rival.

In the meantime, the Downer strategy will be to let Mrs Bishop die the death of a thousand cuts rather than a pole-axing that could make her a martyr in constituency Party branches around Australia where she still has a following. With both Liberal and even Labor colleagues, and with key people in the Canberra media, Mr Downer and his staff take every opportunity to personally discredit Mrs Bishop and to leak information about her. Whilst Mr Downer with his tongue in his rosy cheek makes sure he is seen to defend Mrs Bishop, his staff have been put into overdrive to fan the flames of each Bishop gaffe. Mrs Bishop was given the shadow health portfolio in the belief that she, like several of

her predecessors, would not be equal to the task and eventually would be consumed by her new shadow ministerial portfolio.

Bishop's incompetence and clumsiness have made her undermining by Downer and his staff relatively easy. There were her gaffes about marijuana, tobacco advertising, AIDS funding and her use of staff paid for by an insurance company. Of course, there have been stories about her extraordinary flying-high performance on an Ansett aircraft. Following each of these incidents, Mr Downer and his staff did their best in background briefings and corridor gossip to make each gaffe worse for Mrs Bishop. It was Liberal spin control in reverse.

Alexander Downer has been personally involved in leaking comments made about Mrs Bishop by the head of the Australian Medical Association who was quoted as telling Downer she had 'a lot to learn'. That is why Downer and staff have been spreading stories that he is under enormous pressure from colleagues to dump her. It is called the 'reluctant assassin' scenario. But it is not just Mrs Bishop who has a lot to learn: Mr Downer has shown, with his continuing twists on both the republic and Mabo issues, that he has the inner strength and direction of a weather vane.

Let us look at the republic issue: pro-monarchy to pro-Australian Constitution; a shift to attacking the Queen as 'quaint and irrelevant'; and then on to being a new-age moderate republican because a republic, after all, is 'inevitable' even if it is 'not worth the effort'. Mr Downer's problem is twofold. He is desperate to be all things to everybody, which only works for a while, and he talks in triplicate. He does not know when to stop digging holes he is in, and neither of these attributes will serve his leadership well in the long haul, as Mr Costello no doubt will soon be keen to testify.

Today I mentioned policies in Victoria, involving the controversy about the heavy-handed approach of the Kennett Government to teachers who have publicly criticised Government policy including budget cuts. In Victoria, as I said, a teaching service order prohibits teachers from making public comment unless authorised by the Department of School Education, and that order has now been vigorously enforced.

In Victoria there have been allegations of funding reprisals against schools following media comments by staff. The President of the Victorian Federated Teachers Union (Mr Peter Lord) said Education Department officers had visited schools where staff had criticised education cuts and had made veiled threats about the renewal of contracts. Professor Alan Bishop, of the Education Faculty at Monash University, has said that a 1992 survey on the effect of teacher redundancies had shown that principals, when deciding who should be named in excess, tended to choose those perceived to be trouble makers.

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

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** Following on from my point of order this afternoon, in all the years I have been in this House, I have never known press secretaries to take up so much time of the journalists in the press gallery. The press gallery is here as a privilege to the media to report on the proceedings of Parliament. When I first came here, it was accepted practice to leave your copy of questions or speeches outside the press door. The privilege was then extended to the staff to go in and hand out the material. I object strongly to

a person camping or sitting in there and talking to the journalists when important policy questions are being asked by Government members of Government Ministers. Therefore, it is definitely not fair if people are allowed to go into the press galleries and distract the journalists from what they are doing. As I said, it is a privilege to be here, and the press secretaries are not paid to be in the galleries above the Speaker's chair. The Strangers' Gallery is a different ball game altogether because of its shape and design, and I accept that.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** Now listen, Clips, I wouldn't worry about it. You can't find your pushbike, and you're in all the strife in the world in Spence.

**An honourable member:** Seven and a half per cent!

**Mr BECKER:** That's nothing—it's chicken feed. As long as you have the highest paid Deputy Leader in Australia and are creating mischief, we have no worries in the world. However, one thing is for sure: your Party does not deserve to have the highest paid Deputy Leader in Australia. Certainly, the taxpayers in this State ought to be asking a tremendous number of questions in that regard. One person who looks after 10 people is the highest paid, compared to the previous occupant who had 22 people to look after.

Last evening, while speaking to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, the member for Hart accused me of being nobbled—I do not know by whom or what over—in relation to a meeting about Adelaide Airport. Let us get the record correct, because the State and the electorate get a little tired of this sort of fabrication and false innuendo. On Monday 25 July, I wrote to the person who said they were the President of the City of Henley and Grange Residents' Association, as follows:

It is with regret that I will be unable to attend the public meeting to be held on Thursday 28 July 1994, at the Reedbeds Community Centre, owing to an overlap of engagements. I am required to attend an implementation task force meeting concerning Thebarton Oval, Kings Reserve at the Thebarton council at 7 p.m. The State Government is most concerned with respect to the future development of this reserve, and I am required to brief the Premier on what transpires.

We had been working on a project for that area. A copy of that letter was sent to a Mrs Marjorie Pridgeon and a Mr Barry O'Brien. I thought it was fair and reasonable to let these people know that I would not be able to attend that meeting. By the way, the invitation and the agenda for that meeting, which arrived on the same day a week or so before, stated that I would attend the Thebarton council meeting as a guest speaker.

I called in, just out of curiosity, to see what was happening at the airport meeting. I refused to speak at the meeting, because I had no idea what the previous speakers had been talking about, as it was about an hour after the meeting had started. I did note that it was a poorly attended meeting, and I said so. I also said, when I went to leave (because at that stage of the evening I had not had a meal, I had been to four functions, and I had had a very busy afternoon and evening), that for years I had stuck my neck out on behalf of the local residents and, if they were all who could come along to a meeting, it was a pretty poor reward. For a person who has taken all sorts of risks within his own parliamentary Party, put his own personal ambitions and career on the line for the people, if only 70 people could turn up to a meeting of that nature and importance, really there is no issue, because obviously the people are not concerned. They are prepared to let you go out on a limb, stick your neck out and get

chopped down because, as we know with the *Advertiser*, anybody who sticks up for democracy gets chopped down.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Before calling on the member for Hart, I point out to the member for Peake that I gave certain instructions and permission to an Opposition press secretary with regard to their duties. I will confer with that person. I want to make clear to the member for Peake that I gave instructions and that that person was acting under my instructions. I suggest to the member for Peake that he not be critical or reflect on the decisions of the Chair.

**Mr BECKER:** Mr Speaker, I was concerned because I have never seen a press secretary sit down and talk to the people in the gallery.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** It never ceases to amaze me the sort of trivia that some members in this House go on with. The member for Peake, who has been a politician in this House for some 25 years and who has made a living out of dealing with the media, got stuck into some press secretary who is trying to do their job. I will say something to members opposite. I have watched what staffers have done in other Parliaments, and staffers of the former Opposition used to frequent every press gallery within this Chamber and in the Upper House. They sat next to journalists, they discussed issues with journalists, and they did all they could to push the Opposition line. When we were in Government, we were not so trivial as to complain about it.

A politician who lives by the media, whose career is built around the media, should not criticise somebody for simply performing a function as a minder. There have been Government press secretaries up in that gallery, sitting next to journalists. We have not complained. It is their job. I say to the member for Peake: get off the case of the press secretaries and the staffers and worry about some decent policy issues in this Chamber and not the trivia that you go on about.

I might also refer to the hypocrisy of the member for Peake. We see his pursuit of trivia on the Notice Paper, where we have question after question about Government officers and their use of Government cars, yet the member for Peake goes home every night from work in a Government supplied car. That is the ultimate in hypocrisy. I ask the member for Peake: how about laying off the poor public servant who is going about their job in a Government vehicle? You are absolutely obsessed with putting question after question on the Notice Paper about Government employees, but when you leave this Chamber you go home in a chauffeur driven Government car. I say to the member for Peake: you indulge in trivia, you attack poor defenceless people, and you love to attack—

**Mr LEWIS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. On no fewer than three occasions in the past minute, the member for Hart has used the second person pronouns 'you' and 'your' and, as I understand it, that is simply not appropriate, not allowed. In fact, members must refer to others by their title or seat.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Ridley is correct. The member for Hart will refer to other members by their district.

**Mr FOLEY:** I apologise, Sir: it is a mistake I have made a number of times, and I note your advice. In this Chamber, we as members of Parliament have a responsibility. I say to members such as the member for Peake: do not pick on the poor defenceless public servants, especially those public servants who happen to drive you home in a chauffeur driven



Government car. Don't pick on people like press secretaries to either the Leader of the Opposition or the present Government. They have an important job to do. If we in this Chamber are so holier than thou that we have to sit and scrutinise what half a dozen Government or Opposition staffers do, that is a downright waste of time. I suggest to the member for Peake that he get on with the main game, that is, formulating policy, and not pick on individuals who are simply going about their job.

I had not intended to grieve on that issue today, but I think it is important. Members opposite may not think it is important, but I think it is important to stick up for those people who cannot defend themselves. I am happy to defend Government staffers, even if they work for an opposing political Party, and I am prepared to defend poor defenceless public servants who are going about their job in Government vehicles. They do not deserve to be persecuted by anyone, and certainly not by someone who goes home in a chauffeur-driven vehicle.

**An honourable member:** On the gravy train.

**Mr FOLEY:** Certainly. I will deal with his comments about the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's salary at another time. I say to members opposite—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** We have another member interjecting who also enjoys the privileges of a Government car. I have no problem with people using Government vehicles: I do have a problem with the hypocrisy and the downright triviality of all the issues the member for Peake brings before the House.

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** That was an Oscar winning performance. Mine will be far more sombre in content. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the uncertainty of future family security for our young people. As this is the International Year of the Family we must carefully look at what is happening in our society with respect to the family unit. In some areas of our society the traditional family unit of father, mother and children has been given the tag of 'outmoded', 'obsolete' or 'out of date' and replaced by alternative family lifestyles.

This is resulting in the younger generation growing up in a confusing atmosphere of what I would deem radical change: stepfather or stepmother, no father or no mother, or two fathers or two mothers, according to circumstances. We have read of a lesbian having triplets via artificial insemination and a young man of 21 having already fathered five children to as many women. As the report in the paper says, parental responsibility is not there for his actions; he claims no responsibility. This is surely a time for us to assess and to keep on assessing family law, welfare and society's attitudes so that this undesirable trend of social irresponsibility and behaviour can be corrected—in fact, it must be corrected.

Archbishop George of the Anglican Church said in the *Sunday Mail* of 22 May 1994:

We spend 44¢ per head of population each year on preparation for marriage and \$175 per head each year in making divorce easier. All our emphasis goes into picking up the pieces after divorce and nothing goes into marriage preparation or parent effectiveness.

That statement was made by the Archbishop of Adelaide. It seems to me that, because of marital breakdown, ensuing generations are opting out of relationship responsibilities and are choosing the so-called easy way out. The 1960s and 1970s philosophy of 'do what you like as long as you don't hurt anyone' only fools the person who believes and participates in that way. Society has grown so totally self-centred

that many people have lost the ability to relate properly towards one another, and our school age children are suffering as a result. Because the personal relationship of their parent is so poor—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr LEGGETT:** If members on the other side would just shut up for one minute, Mr Speaker, and let me have a go I would appreciate it. This is a very important issue, but they treat it with levity. Young people have no idea what is involved because of poor relationships with parents in maintaining a fulfilling, lasting relationship. As a former deputy headmaster and pastoral counsellor, I really have to question the moral direction in which we are heading as a society. One thing is obvious to even the most inattentive observer: most people are afraid. They are afraid to face the reality of their inability to interact in a meaningful way with each other. In my capacity as a counsellor I found that this failure is based on a fear to resolve a relationship in case the person gets hurt—it is out of hurt that they are acting.

As I stated in a speech previously in this House, I am concerned that schools may well be teaching sex education, and teaching it very well, but not aligned with social responsibility. A valuable part of marriage preparation could be taught at high school level with group discussion panels and family evenings. As a properly outlined course, this could help to defuse existing family problems at this impressionable and vulnerable age.

The fact that we are experiencing such a high rate of traditional family breakdowns does not mean that the problem is irretrievable or that alternative lifestyles are most desirable. We should have the attitude that a stable, traditional family unit is the ideal and attainable, even in some of the worst conditions which, of course, can be caused in part by economic hardship. The media can play an important part in this area by presenting positive rather than negative reports. Advertising agencies can assist by producing products depicting family situations that teach a crisis resolving theme.

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** They tell me that, when Johnny Weissmuller had stopped playing Tarzan and was living in an old folks home, he would occasionally go around the wards beating his chest and issuing calls to Jane. Indeed, the performance of the Deputy Premier today in his ministerial statement rivals that of Johnny Weissmuller. He told us that he was right all along. It is a quite curious statement, because he quoted what he said during the last Estimates Committee. He went to great lengths to say that he was right and everyone else was wrong. What he forgets to say is that he went on in that committee to say that there had to be a fifth bail-out of the State Bank. In fact, he wanted to ensure that the world knew all about that, because he came in here and asked a number of questions.

Indeed, the Opposition at that time, in the last parliamentary session before the election, made much of the fact that another bail-out of the State Bank would be necessary. Today we had the Deputy Leader beating his chest about how right he was. He got up before the whole Parliament and said that he got it right, using his ego and displaying it to all and sundry. He then said, 'We have discovered these problems. I was right all along.' However, in concluding he said, 'It really does not matter; it will have no impact on the budget. No, we won't be making an announcement in the next couple of weeks of a fifth bail-out of the State Bank, but I was right all along.' I think that is a curious performance.

The other curious performance is his answer to a question that I asked about State taxes and charges. Indeed, I mentioned the issue of fish processing. There was a couple of other issues that I could have mentioned, but I thought that we would let the Deputy Premier come clean and tell us which charges went up and how many went up above the CPI. In fact, on the research we have done, over 1 000 fees and charges have gone up, and 436 have gone up by more than the CPI. In his answer to that question, the Deputy Leader said, 'Well, if you get most of it right then I guess that is keeping your promise. If we get 95 per cent right, that is good enough.'

These statements were made before the election. There was no necessity for the Opposition at that time to lock itself in; it did it willingly; it did it wherever it could. It was as a real 'read my lips' answer: 'There will be no increase.' What we find then, of course, is that they have every reason to put up the cost on this one and that one, and they say today, 'Well, if we get most of it right, that's good enough; that commitment will do.' The Deputy Premier said, 'Maybe the cost of fish processing went up too much, but they were happy about it.' I have to tell the Deputy Premier that they are not happy about it and they have been to see us. They do not like this 280 per cent hike. What is more, the increase in drivers' licences of 5.6 per cent is not all that popular either, and neither are a number of other increases that have occurred.

What do we hear from the Deputy Premier? 'Well, if we keep most of it, we're doing all right.' What we hear from the Premier is: 'There'll be no increase beyond the CPI. You have my word on it; I will resign if it is different from that.' Yet the bloke sitting next to him says, 'Well, if we keep most of it, that will be all right; that's good enough.' If that is the sort of support that the Deputy is giving the Premier, the Premier is in for a pretty rough time during this whole budgetary process.

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** Following what the member for Playford has just said, I do not feel so bad about raising this point, because getting it right is most important. I refer to the speech of the member for Hart last night when I say that getting it right is most important. He said:

I now look at the member for Mitchell who came out in the *Advertiser* a few weeks ago proposing a change to loitering laws. He somehow got the support of the Minister for Emergency Services, but that does not surprise me. But they had to be carpeted by the Attorney-General for daring to challenge Government policy.

I would like to tell the member for Hart that at no stage, at no place and at no time was anyone carpeted. During my campaign, I put out a number of brochures, one of which was entitled 'Stop the vandals before they strike'. It stated:

Colin will push for change to the loitering laws.

It stated further that I would be lobbying the new Attorney-General for change to the laws. That was mentioned to the Attorney-General at a public meeting held in the suburb of Sturt.

Unlike the member for Hart and the previous Government, the new Government is interested in law and order and crime prevention. The Attorney-General put to me his point of view following my letter to him and to the Minister for Emergency Services. His reply states, in part:

Thank you for sending me a copy of the letter which you sent to my colleague Wayne Matthew on police powers and loitering. While I sympathise with your concerns and those of your constituents, my considered view is that the proposal you intend to make goes too far, and I would like to explain why I think that to be so.

He goes on to say:

It is true that police have no power to require a person to state what they are doing. Equally, however, it is clear that, even if they did so, there is no way in which they could verify an answer, and it is not clear what they would do with an answer such as 'I am waiting for a friend to turn up.'

The Attorney-General concluded by saying:

I hope that this information is of some value to you. Thank you for taking the trouble to forward your view to me.

In a newsletter that I sent to my electorate I stated that I would be continuing to do what my constituents asked me to do. I am here to represent the constituents of Mitchell, and without fear or favour I will put forward their views.

The Editor of the *Advertiser* was critical of my point of view. He has the right to his point of view just as the member for Hart has the right to his, but getting it right is most important. Solicitors have the right to their point of view, but so do the constituents of Mitchell, and that must be acknowledged. The issue has been raised within the community on a wider scale. In fact, the community has raised the issue of crimes against the community, such as vandalism, graffiti, breaking and entering, and unlawful use of a motor vehicle. It has raised issues such as: do the police have enough powers; are there enough police in the community; should we not be doing something more for the police; and are we sending them into the community to enforce law and order with both hands tied behind their back?

As a result of those issues having been raised, a public meeting was held at Oaklands Park. It was addressed by the police and was attended by a large number of people. Further public meetings will be held within the electorate of Mitchell to talk about law and order and to determine how we can focus on that issue and what can be done to bring back community safety so that vandalism and graffiti become a thing of the past and people are not frightened that, when they get home and look inside, they will find their home has been broken into.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

---

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! If the honourable member has something to contribute, I suggest he do it through the Chair.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Yesterday, the Minister for Health told the House that I had said at a public meeting at Modbury Hospital that the Opposition is totally opposed to any form of private involvement in the Modbury Hospital. That quote is false. I said that the Opposition was opposed to any privatisation at Modbury Hospital, the plain meaning of which is that it is opposed to the privatisation of public beds. The Minister did not attend that meeting.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 79.)

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** I turn my attention to primary industries. In her address to the Parliament, the Governor mentioned the precarious state of the current season. While good rains were experienced by most of the State last weekend, good follow-up rains will be needed during the weeks to come. As we all know, it is the spring rains that make a season in this State, and unless we receive those rains many farming families, particularly on the West Coast, will enter into a precarious position.

I commend the Minister for Primary Industries for making early representation to the Federal Government seeking an urgent review of the criteria for determining whether an area is eligible for special rural assistance. The ability to declare a region a drought area would be a distinct advantage rather than the situation which exists at the moment whereby the whole State has to be declared. Make no mistake, the farming community is struggling. Low commodity prices over the past three years and the slow improvement in wool prices are making budgeting for farmers difficult and placing greater pressure on the achievement of a good season. The Australian Bureau of Agriculture and Research Economics annual farm survey report indicates that farm income is rising but that farm profitability remains extremely low.

The bright spots for agriculture remain in the wine grape area. Beef prices and prime lamb prices also have risen steadily since 1991-92. This is simply as a result of supply and demand. Sheep numbers in Australia have fallen from 170 million in 1989-90 to 135 million in 1993-94. Subsequently, the crop area sown has risen from 14.8 million hectares in 1989-90 to 17.6 million hectares in 1993-94, as farmers follow markets where higher returns have existed. However, this again brings up the problem of supply and demand. As farmers move from one enterprise to another, the previous lack of supply and high prices in the cropping area have resulted in an oversupply of some grains and, therefore, lower prices.

When this is added to the particularly difficult harvesting conditions that have existed in the past couple of years, grain quality has declined and, as a result, prices have reduced further. However, the trend towards agricultural export, I am pleased to say, continues. In the past 10 years processed agricultural exports have risen from 36 per cent of total agricultural exports to 47 per cent, and farmers in this area should be congratulated. Export products that make up this percentage include: unprocessed products, wheat, barley, greasy wool, and live cattle and sheep. Lightly processed products include: fresh, chilled and frozen meats, wheat flour, milled rice, milk and cream, butter, milk powders, low value cheese and wool, that is, scoured, tops and carded.

In the heavily processed area it includes dried, salted or smoked meats, meat preparations and canned meat, cheese and other processed dairy products, cereal preparations (which includes pasta) and wool, which includes yarns, fabrics and apparel. As can be seen from this, the agricultural sector is well and truly playing its part in increasing exports and export income into this State. One can never accuse the agricultural industry of sitting on its hands and doing nothing.

Further, there should be some good news for the farming community within the next few years as a result of the GATT agreement. The GATT agreement, of course, was finalised last year and the benefits of this are expected to see a price rise in wheat by approximately 8 per cent; in beef, 5 per cent; in sheep meat, 3 per cent; and in cheese and milk powders, 16 to 20 per cent. The latter, of course, shows the very high tariffs that have existed, barring Australian agricultural

products from European markets, and it also shows the very high subsidy level that has been adopted by the Europeans and by the United States of America.

Let me now turn to further parts of the Governor's speech, where Her Excellency outlined changes in the policy on education set out by the Government. This Government will adopt a fair discipline policy within schools, which policy gives principals greater power to control disruptive students. The Government is implementing its program to improve the learning outcomes for students in the early years of schooling. Being a member of the Gawler High School council, I often hear about problems associated with disruptive students and the lack of power that the principals have had under the previous Government to control them. They welcome this policy with open arms since it will give the power back to the school, which will be able to control those students by detention or, in extreme cases, by expulsion.

Another issue that is of prime concern to Gawler High School at the moment is school uniforms. While the previous Government did not encourage the use of school uniforms, it is now the policy of the Gawler High School council to adopt and encourage the wearing of a school uniform that has been chosen by the students themselves, along with a colour code of dress that has also been adopted by Gawler High School students. I am pleased to say that that is now being taken up by many students, and there has been a particularly high success rate in the early years and students in the higher years of Gawler High School continue to be involved. The school council is pleased, because it raises the profile of Gawler High School students within the community, and that is seen to be an advantage not only because they will be known as Gawler High School students but also because it presents a far better recognition for the school.

In the area of sports, I welcome the recent policy announcement of the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing regarding the reintroduction of competition in school sports. I believe this was a particularly detrimental policy of the previous Government. Wherever we go in life, we face competition. When students leave school they have to compete for a job and for everything they do in life. The best possible thing they can do is to start competing at a very early age to get used to the fact that, when they enter the work force, that is exactly what they will need to do to get a job. So I welcomed this announcement.

I refer now to labour market indicators, as released in the July report of the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies. It reviewed the employment prospects and labour market indicators in South Australia and nationally. Labour market indicators relate to vacancies and overtime of employees in this State, and they are optimistic for South Australia, suggesting that South Australia should experience significant employment growth during 1994-95. The report indicates that overtime has risen by 2.5 per cent over the past year and that the number of advertisements for skilled vacancies increased nationally by 3 per cent but in South Australia by 3.5 per cent. The number of skilled vacancy advertisements is 55 per cent above the level of 12 months ago. This shows that this Government's policies in encouraging employment and in encouraging industry to this State are showing up in skilled vacancies, and I commend the Minister for his work in that area.

I turn briefly to happenings within the electorate of Light since I last spoke in an Address in Reply debate in this House. I must commend both the police officers of Gawler and the Housing Trust for their quick action in quelling

disturbances within the Evanston area. The actions of Mrs Chris Hutchins, the Manager of the Housing Trust in Gawler, have resulted in the residents of the Evanston area now being extremely happy with their situation. Residents' meetings are continuing to occur and we are achieving quite a community spirit there, which I am pleased to see.

The Minister for Education and Children's Services has recently announced the establishment of a new primary school for Harkness Heights, and that, with the release of a subdivision for 1 000 homes in the Gawler area, will be a real fillip to that area. The new Gawler Health Centre is progressing extremely well. It is expected that it will be opened in October and will replace the current Hutchinson Hospital in Gawler. The Gawler Health Centre will be a combination of public and private beds and will service an area that will extend from Mallala north to Tarlee and into the Barossa Valley. We are extremely pleased with the benefits that this will bring to Gawler in transferring all the health systems into one area. I commend the Governor on her speech to this Parliament and on the continuing enthusiasm she displays in carrying out her task as Governor of this State. I commend this motion.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I wholeheartedly support the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply. I pledge my loyalty to the Queen of Australia and her representative, Her Excellency the Governor. I also swear allegiance to the flag. I join previous speakers in expressing my condolences to the family of Keith Plunkett. At this time I also remember Mr Joe Tiernan, a dear colleague of ours, who passed away since the Governor made her speech last year. As you would know, Mr Speaker, Joe Tiernan is sorely missed, and his death was a very sad loss. We still think very keenly and kindly of Joe Tiernan and his good wife Myra. Our thoughts are also with the past President of the Upper House, the Hon. Gordon Bruce, his wife Olive, and also Mr Dennis Polkinghorne who was the Parliament's air-conditioning mechanic. Dennis and Gordon are both suffering serious illnesses, and I join their friends and the community within Parliament House in wishing them well while they are sick.

I congratulate Dame Roma on the excellent job she continues to do. It amazes me, being the age I am, that Her Excellency is as energetic and as fresh in her approach to her duties as she is. In my mature years I look forward to trying to mirror a fraction of the energy that Dame Roma has.

The Governor's speech has laid down the blueprint for the way ahead—the way out of the mess for South Australia. Times are difficult, particularly at this time, for our public servants, but the speech gives me heart, as I hope it does for many of my public servant constituents and friends. Her Excellency states:

Public Sector reform is considered by my Government to be essential in rebuilding the State's economic and financial position and reducing unemployment. My Government recognises community concerns to ensure that key services are maintained at adequate levels...

I am encouraged by that and am sure that most of the public servants and people in South Australia generally appreciate the difficult decisions we have had to make. I have only to refer to today's *Advertiser* at page 4, at which the opinion polls tell us that the decisions we have made have been well accepted by the population and the electorate. I am upset that there is only one member of the Opposition here to challenge me on any of these remarks. I continue to refer to the Governor's speech, as follows:

... my Government accepts a responsibility to ensure that public sector employment remains a satisfying and rewarding career option for South Australians and that the work and expertise of the public servants are recognised by the wider community as very important ingredients in our State's recovery.

I hope that at this time all public servants would appreciate those remarks. It has given me encouragement to know that things will improve. The Government has that priority. I now refer to page 5 of the Governor's speech. Luckily, the very night before Her Excellency made reference to the drought we had life-giving rains across most of South Australia. That has given us encouragement because the crops were suffering, the feed situation was bad and generally morale in the bush was very low. The rain was indeed very welcome. However, the forecasts are not good at all. From reading today's newspaper our Bureau of Meteorology tells us that El Nino is visiting us again, and that means a drier end to the season. All South Australians hope that the season is a late one and that we can get cool, damp weather in September and October.

I am confident that South Australia can have an average or above average season. That would reflect prosperity for all South Australians, because we cannot at this time even consider what damage a drought will do. It is coming because the law of averages tells us that droughts occur every so often. Unfortunately, I have to say that we are due for one, and that concerns me greatly. I was encouraged by Her Excellency's reference to the seasonal conditions, as follows:

... my Government... is conscious that some of our farmers could be heading towards a serious drought.

That could still be the case, particularly in areas of the Mallee where my good friend the member for Ridley serves extremely well, but at least the Government is aware of the situation. I also welcome the Premier's intimation that the Government has made representations to the Federal Government seeking an urgent review of criteria for determining areas eligible for special farm assistance. That has always been a problem in the past.

I now refer to page 8 of Her Excellency's speech where, importantly, she referred to protecting the environment, a matter on which I am sure all members would share my concern. The speech states:

Amendments will be proposed to the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act to allow the grant of a continuous pastoral lease as an incentive for improved land management.

Many of my country friends would welcome that comment, because there has been so much insecurity about tenure and ongoing farm practice in our pastoral areas. That is a very welcome comment indeed. Her Excellency then says:

The fragile nature of our soils was emphasised recently when a prolonged dry spell resulted in dust storms earlier this year across the State. Responsible land management is the focus of the State's Landcare system.

I do not think that it could have been avoided because of the extreme dry weather, but I welcome the Government's priority here. I also recognise that there are more than 250 Landcare groups formed in South Australia. Further, Her Excellency states:

The results of an environmental impact analysis of dryland salinity in the Upper South-East will be available soon.

These comments are very welcome because the salinity problems we have in our State, particularly in the South-East, are very serious—much more serious than most people in this House would recognise or understand. I welcome these results. Her Excellency then goes on to say:

This will help my Government to finalise a timetable for the provision of infrastructure to deal with the problem which has the

potential to severely damage much of the State's most productive farm land.

The waterplan is very critical to South Australia's future. Her Excellency refers to this matter as follows:

A South Australian waterplan is being developed to provide a broad policy and planning framework for decision making and action relating to the future sustainable development of the State's water resources.

That is a very critical statement, particularly in the areas I represent. In areas of the Barossa Valley water is a factor that will limit the huge potential of that area. Water is the main limiting factor. There are other areas in my electorate—Watervale, for instance, which is a lovely town—that have no reticulated water. Who would believe in this day and age that this can occur? That is how it is, and I am sure that under a State waterplan we can solve many of our current problems.

I am very pleased that, after eight months in office, our Government has so many runs on the board. An additional 7 200 full-time jobs have been created in South Australia between January and June this year. I am pleased to be a member of the Brown Liberal Government and proud of our achievements so far in extremely difficult circumstances. The runs that have been put on the board have resulted in major investment decisions to further boost jobs, and I refer here to the terrific news we have had involving Motorola, Australis, Mitsubishi, the Orion upgrade recently announced and the Worrina tourism development. Information technology is soon to be the subject of an announcement involving Government outsourcing. We have a totally new economic direction that is being positively received. We have made tough decisions, and the people of South Australia are respecting us for that.

On page 4 of today's *Advertiser*, if anyone has any doubt they can read the statistics of the *Bulletin* poll, indicating that after eight months in office the Government's popularity has increased since election day. I welcome that news; indeed, I savour that fact. We have set in place new industrial relations policies to facilitate enterprise bargaining and end compulsory unionism.

I welcome the statement today by the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education regarding the appointment of an ombudsman in this area: it shows how genuine are the Government and the Minister in this respect, and I welcome that. The announcement has been well received, and I wish the gentleman concerned all the best in the challenging job ahead of him. I hope he will receive bipartisan support from both sides of Parliament.

WorkCover reform to 1 July 1994 is aimed at achieving savings of up to \$20 million a year. We saw a heated debate on the matter in this place, but this money can be saved. We all know of people who need WorkCover to support them. We also know of people who rot the system and make it difficult for the genuine people. Sometimes I wonder about WorkCover. A constituent of mine over the age of 65 years has a small business. Why should she have to contribute to the fund when, being over 65 years, she is unable to receive benefits? That is a problem with the Act, and I have spoken to the Minister about it. I have told my constituent that I will keep battling for her, but it is a problem, and it does not seem right for someone over 65 years to be contributing at the highest level whilst being ineligible for benefits. That is a small anomaly that I hope we can iron out.

I refer to major infrastructure upgrading. Adelaide Airport remains a priority to attract investment, trade and tourism. What is the Opposition's stance on this issue? I heard a tirade of criticism last night by the members for Hart and Ross Smith. Are they opposed to the extension of the runway? I

hear all this noise, but we have not heard a definite statement from the Opposition. We hear all sorts of noises from individuals, but are they opposed to the extension of the runway? If they are, they should come out and say so publicly. Are they opposed to the privatisation of the airport, wholly or partly? I want to hear their argument and see how genuine it is.

The Government has committed \$100 million towards the construction cost of the proposed Alice Springs to Darwin railway line to match the commitment of the Northern Territory Government. At last a Government in South Australia has made a commitment to this vital project. I welcomed the answer to a question asked in the House today. This railway has been a phoenix. For 60 years the issue has been before this place. All sorts of promises are made, and elections have come and gone, but still the railway is just a mirage in the desert. It is high time we acknowledged the politics of this matter. It is not a matter of Government versus Opposition in this House but the politics across Australia that is keeping the railway from our grasp. It is high time we got our act together and made this important venture come about.

I referred earlier to public sector reform, and these initiatives will be included in some of the major legislation to be introduced during the budget session. It will include repeal of the Government Management and Employment Act, replacing it with new public sector management legislation, which will give chief executive officers substantially more authority—power—in the management of their agencies. I am pleased to align myself with the Government with regard to public sector reform, which is vital in the process of rebuilding the South Australian economy. It takes commitment and courage. It is easy to take the popular line. What would the Opposition have done if it were still in power? We hear all the rhetoric and shouting that goes on, particularly last night, but the previous Labor Government actually started on the path that this Government is now following. They started it, but one wonders how far they would have got before they ran out of puff or will. I suggest that it would not be too far, as they were already behind their forecast when the election was called.

Primary industries is a subject very dear to my heart. I refer to the Government's actions in this area, particularly as they relate to eligibility for the young farmer incentive scheme, which has been extended in recent days right back to the date of the election. So many people have contacted me—parents and young farmers alike—to express tremendous interest, but have been very concerned and dismayed when they realised that they were exempt as they had either turned 30 years before this time or bought the farm before the original date. Now that it goes back to December, it encompasses many more people, and I hope that many young farmers will take advantage of this scheme and that it will achieve what we hoped it would achieve.

Government stamp duty relief for the inter-generational transfer of farms and for rolling over rural debt is in place. In my four-and-a-half years in this place I cannot think of a single issue that has been so well accepted as this one, particularly to a small but important sector of this community. The reaction through my office and in the community generally has been fantastic. We are seeing farms changing hands, with younger people taking on greater responsibility when land comes into their name, and we are seeing banks free up interest rates because they know that their clients—the farmers—are able to go from bank to bank seeking the cheapest and best interest rate without having to

pay stamp duty every time they do so. I congratulate the Government and the member for Ridley, whilst giving myself a pat on the back, as two years ago we started this action. To see it now in place and working gives me tremendous pride, having been able to be part of an action that can so benefit a vital part of our community.

The Government has given financial support to marketing initiatives of the South Australian Farmers Federation and I applaud it for that. The Farmers Federation, via its President Mr Tim Scholz, has stuck out its neck in adding value to our products, particularly to Poland—with 'Polwool'—and this initiative from the Government will be a vital help in that area.

I turn now to an issue that is close to my heart, that is, State rights. I fully support and congratulate the Premier on the stand that he took on our behalf at the recent Premiers Conference in Sydney. We have to decide now whether we want government here in South Australia or whether we want decisions made for us in Canberra. We are being snowed. Our authority is under threat. Do we trust those in Canberra to get it right on State matters? It is time to say 'hands off'. Long ago we chose to get together as federated States—not to sell off our State rights. There has been a gradual decay ever since. State rights are under serious threat. All members should realise that—even members of the Labor Party. The member for Ross Smith, even though he is a newcomer, should understand how South Australia would be severely disadvantaged if we gave more power to Canberra.

Sinister moves are being made by the Federal Labor Government to usurp the power and authority of State Governments. Issues such as native title, world heritage, the Hilmer report and many other State domestic matters are being taken out of this State's arena—and we all know that. I do not wish to comment on this matter, but what right does Canberra have to tell the Tasmanians what community standard they should adopt on conscience issues such as homosexuality? What right does Canberra have to interfere in our State industrial awards, and to usurp the power and the actions of State Governments both here and in Victoria?

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass):** Order!

**Mr VENNING:** We have to take these tough decisions. I have no trouble with the comments that were made recently in the media. We have to slash, burn and bury. I repeat and expand on those words for members: slash, burn and bury. To slash is to prune. When one prunes a vine one usually cuts off the old and dead wood. At least we pruned the Labor Party: we well and truly got rid of its old and dead wood. However, that has brought on new growth. We now have to train that new growth along the wire, because the way members opposite have started, at the next pruning, most will go. You have to burn the residue, otherwise it diseases the plant and subsequent new growth.

In continuing this comparison, if the plant is sick and diseased the best way to start again is to burn it and give the next generation a chance. I have no hassle with slash, burn and bury: it is a good way to clean up, start again and give the new generation a chance. Pruning a vine is vital to ensure optimum new growth. Therefore, to slash, burn and bury, although it is a very emotive phrase, is not far from the desired path. We have to reduce State debt: that is our single and most important issue—public debt. We are going further into debt each day, but it is reducing. South Australia is seeing the J-curve that Mr Keating talks about. We are

turning things around. It is a bit like a large ocean vessel, and you cannot turn around a big ship in one minute.

The problem is that the Federal Government is not being as fiscally responsible as South Australia is trying to be. As the Treasurer announced yesterday, interest rates are on the increase with bond rates up 3 per cent to 9.5 per cent. That is very serious news. The Federal Government's inability to cut spending is causing great pressure on interest rates—and don't farmers and banks know it. Our ability to get on top of our inherited State debt is very seriously diminished by this. The State budget will be under increased pressure. Our interest bill will be up \$160 million to \$650 million, or a total debt interest rate of \$900 million per annum. That is totally unacceptable. The Labor Government left us a massive problem and it knew it, because it had already begun action to turn it around.

The member for Hart, after his tirade last night (and I am sorry he is not in the Chamber; I do not like to speak ill of those who are not present), admitted that the former Government had made mistakes. It is a pity the Labor Party did not realise that four years ago when it could have taken more drastic action to turn this State around. We would have helped. We would have backed the former Government in those decisions. We want the Opposition to be responsible and assist with the hard decisions that it began in government, albeit very slowly. People are supporting the Government. In the past couple of days we have heard all this rhetoric—nonsense I should say—about how we are doing the wrong thing; about how people are cross that they elected us. I ask members opposite to check the newspaper, because they will see that the Government is more popular now than it was on election day—and who would have believed it? Members opposite talk about oncers; I will tell them who are the oncers—the 10 Labor Party members—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I am sure the honourable member does not need any assistance. The member for Custance has the floor.

**Mr VENNING:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, for your protection. If we had to go to the polls in the current climate, I know who the oncers would be. The member for Playford does not have a fat majority, either. I notice he has shaved off his beard. I think he is hoping for a change of personality and to hide the past he has shaved off his beard because he is hoping to create a new image.

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** The honourable member will need to shave his head if he thinks he will have any chance of winning the next election.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr VENNING:** I know where the oncers are, and they are the Opposition members. Opposition members should go into the members' lounge and look at the new photographs on the wall. There has never been such an influx of new members into the House in its history. Why? Because the colleagues of Opposition members have gone and allowed our new people to come in. I notice the member for Hart has entered the Chamber, and I invite him to enter the debate.

Page 4 of today's paper—and the member for Hart may have read it—states quite clearly that the Government's rating is 54 per cent and Labor is 23 points behind. It is an absolute disgrace that members opposite carry on like this. Let us see what the Opposition is made of and see whether it can reverse some of these decisions at its State conference this weekend.

What will members opposite do about their three uranium mines policy? Have they even been to Roxby Downs lately? I was there last week, as a guest of Western Mining (and I am wearing its tie very proudly). I saw a monument there with Mr Bannon's name on it. What a disgrace and what hypocrisy. Whose name ought to be on that monument? It should be Norm Foster, because he had the guts to stand up and say 'Yes' when South Australia needed him.

What a fantastic facility we have in Roxby Downs. Members opposite are hypocrites. Also, there should be a monument to my past colleague Roger Goldsworthy for the work he has done towards that project as a previous Minister of Mines and Energy. I think it is an absolute disgrace that people can stand in this House and carry on like they do. The writing is on the wall. The proof is there. It is not a mirage in the desert; it is there for all to see.

In closing, I want to congratulate the Premier, his Ministers and my backbench colleagues on their first eight months in Government. We have inherited a very difficult and serious financial situation, and all South Australia is supporting us in the decisions we have to make: and we are succeeding. Things are changing for the better.

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** I was intrigued by the analogy of the member for Culance with respect to pruning, slashing and burning. Is that the sap rising when the member for Culance stands up to address the House?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I am afraid the analogy is far too subtle for members opposite. I would like to congratulate Her Excellency the Governor on her address to both Houses of Parliament. Her Excellency has made a wonderful contribution to this State over her years of service as Governor. In my Address in Reply, I would like to spend some time reflecting on the past eight months since I was elected to this Parliament.

**Mr Quirke:** And all the atrocities.

**Mr CLARKE:** I will come to the atrocities later. I, no doubt like a number of other MPs, have gone out to acquaint myself better with the electorate, and I have met with a whole range of organisations, school councils, senior citizens' clubs and RSL clubs—those many worthy organisations who give, in a volunteer capacity, outstanding service to the community for no reward whatsoever. The work so many of these volunteers do to service the community for no reward but out of a sense of duty never fails to impress me.

I remember the opening day of Parliament in February this year quite vividly, as I guess do most members of Parliament on the first occasion they are sworn in. I recall looking across to the other side of the House upon the faces of the Ministers, and there they were, sitting up very perky, confident, with their shoes highly polished. They were very arrogant. Indeed, they were very dismissive towards the Opposition, and they wanted to take the world by storm. The backbenchers at that time—and, needless to say, many of them were new, as were you, Mr Acting Speaker, and me—were very proud of their positions. I do not take that away from them, because I was, too. Again, they were equally dismissive of the Opposition, and were extremely arrogant and provocative to members of the Opposition. They could not help but try to poke fun at our paucity of numbers on this side of House and to wish us into Opposition well into the next century and possibly beyond, if one were to believe the contributions made by various backbenchers.

Six months later, after we have reconvened, what do we see? I did not see a lot of smiling Ministers taking jaunty steps on the opening day of this session of Parliament. No, they had just been wrestling with their budget, which will be handed down on 25 August, and they know only too well all the atrocities that they will be committing on the people of South Australia, because the budget is effectively locked away and being printed. The Government knows that it has an extremely restive backbench—and I will deal with that matter in a moment—some of whom believe they ought to be Ministers themselves in lieu of a number of poor performers.

The Government also knows, as I suspect its backbench knows, that this budget will also bring home to roost all its broken promises. It has started early in the Government's term with the Commission of Audit report, where health funding is to be cut by \$65 million, education by \$40 million and police by \$12 billion. If we contrast that with one item such as education, we see that this Government, when in Opposition, promised not a cut of \$40 million in education but spending of \$250 million on upgrading and repairs to schools. Following the Torrens by-election it dawned on many backbenchers opposite that a chink was beginning to appear and, by the time this Parliament resumed this session, many other members opposite realised the awful truth.

**Mr Foley:** The oncers!

**Mr CLARKE:** Yes, that they are oncers, strung up by piano wire, but no-one has yet had the decency to cut them down. They will remain swinging in the breeze, particularly the member for Hanson, for the next three years and four months. I could go through each of them.

**Mr Condous:** Have a look at the latest report and see where you stand.

**Mr CLARKE:** Yes, I knew that would be raised—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CLARKE:** What I have to say is this: the proof of these opinion polls is when the elections are held. Since the election of 11 December last year that is quite true. Since then, on the State scene we have had two by-elections. First, we had the seat of Elizabeth, and certainly the Liberal Party spent heavily in that campaign. Its surplus backbenchers, with nothing much else to do, were out busily campaigning and doorknocking throughout Elizabeth, which has never been done before. Members opposite and all political commentators believed they had a real show of winning the seat.

Indeed, a number of us in the Labor Party were concerned about the circumstances of the electors of Elizabeth having to go back to the polls on three occasions in three months, following a former State member's resigning his seat to avail himself of an opportunity to take up a vacancy in the Federal Parliament. We were concerned that that might have created sufficient angst in the electorate whereby we lost the seat. However, we won it, with a minuscule swing against us and, given that the former member for Elizabeth had been very high profile and an Independent in that seat for about 10 years, one could have reasonably expected the Liberal Party to have a far greater showing in that seat than it did.

Only six weeks later, we had the Torrens by-election. I will come to the member for Mitchell in a moment; I would like him to take a seat, because I hate to talk about a man behind his back. The Labor Party needed a 6.6 per cent swing to win.

**Mr Foley:** What did we get?

**Mr CLARKE:** I'll come to the swing in a moment. Because of the tragic circumstances of the death of the former

member, our new candidate had to be preselected at short notice and out in the field. Overwhelmingly, most political punters believed that, whilst there might be a small swing to the Labor party, it would be an impossibility to win back that seat.

**Mr Foley:** They all thought they were going to win.

**Mr CLARKE:** All Liberal Party members thought they were going to win. Of course, on the day, as we know only too well, it was a 9 per cent swing to the Labor Party.

**Mr Foley:** How much?

**Mr CLARKE:** It was 9 per cent. Unbelievable! If you equate that to a general election, it would make it almost a hung Parliament—all after only a few months. I might add that the opinion polls displayed by the member for Colton in this House show us with a rating similar to that which we have currently or, indeed, it might have been even a little less. I am not particularly worried about those opinion polls if it means we can get swings of 9 per cent in by-elections. If members opposite would like to test that theory, I invite a few of them to resign their seat and have another go.

The member for Ridley is very keen on citizen initiated referenda. Let us put that opinion poll to the test. Perhaps the member for Colton, in a rare display of absolute courage, will resign his seat and contest it. I am sure we can arrange for Mr Randall likewise to throw his hat into the ring and give it a go. We would be more than happy—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** The seat of Kaurna would not prove anything to us, because it is already ours. The member for Colton is far more the litmus test, or the member for Mitchell. The member for Mitchell has a margin of about 9.3 per cent.

*Mr Caudell interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I am sorry, it is 9.4 per cent, he assures me. He is out there keeping them all alive every minute of every day. He cannot afford one of his constituents to drop off the perch in case that drops him on that 9 per cent. I suggest to the member for Mitchell, if he would like to sacrifice himself, we would—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** There would be absolutely no point at all—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I see that the member for Wright has entered the Chamber. Of course, he has a margin of only about 4.5 per cent. I would dearly like the member for Wright to sacrifice himself.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** There is absolutely no point in my resigning my seat, because it is already ours and it will stay ours for a very long time. That is—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** Perhaps we might have to do a duo: I will sign my letter of resignation after you sign yours. I would like to return to the thrust of my speech—the broken promises of the Government. I will refer to shop trading hours. I do not believe that that subject will leave this House for many weeks or months. No matter how much members opposite, in particular the Minister, would like that problem to go away, the shopping hours debate will rage on.

We have a situation where every member of the Liberal Party in this Parliament will actually be put to the test. Their Leader, the Premier, in answer to a question in relation to shopping hours and referring to whether Party discipline would be applied to Liberal members of Parliament, said yesterday:

Individuals have a fundamental right to vote according to how they believe they should vote.

I look forward to hearing Liberal Party MPs who have advised the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association and their constituents that they oppose Sunday trading. I invite them to join the Opposition, because we will be voting four square against any extension of shopping hours on Sunday. There are enough MPs on the Liberal Party side to join with the Opposition and defeat the Government's attempt.

I know that this issue has caused a great deal of angst amongst Liberal Party MPs. They have made a promise to their constituents. It will be interesting to see what happens when we divide on this issue, because the Minister has been saying to the big end of town, 'We will legislate to allow Sunday shopping in the city despite my pledge to the small retailers on at least three occasions in the six months leading up to the State election.' The Minister knows that what I am saying is correct. That will put the acid on all members opposite, particularly those who are oncurs—and there are many. We could form a majority and defeat the Government's legislation.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I would also like to point out the disarray in Government ranks. After only six months we find the member for Lee, for example, disgracing himself and the Liberal Party with his call for the compulsory sterilisation of single mums.

**Mr Foley:** And the Premier backed him.

**Mr CLARKE:** The Premier did not rebuke him. He sent him to be savaged by the member for Goyder. There is an act of savagery. It would be an absolute atrocity to be savaged by the member for Goyder.

We also refer to the member for Unley, and I am sorry that he is not here. For a brief 24 hours he had a rush of blood to his head and acted courageously in standing up to his Premier and advising him to abandon his economic rationalism. Since that 24-hour period, the member for Unley has been extremely contrite. We have all witnessed in this House his getting up on every possible occasion ingratiating himself and grovelling at the feet of his Leader by taking spurious points of order and making interjections during debate and Question Time. It has got so bad that I wanted to send the honourable member to a nurse to check him for gravel rash. It was so appalling: he was covered, head to toe, with gravel rash. He could not flagellate himself sufficiently in front of the Premier to get back into his good books.

He will never get back into the Premier's good books, because he did something unpardonable: he voted for the member for Kavel for leadership of the Liberal Party, unlike the member for Bright, who had the good sense to vote for the winner at the last minute and ensured himself a berth at the Cabinet table.

You, Sir, as the member for Custance, will well recall some Question Times when, because of your doubtful allegiance to the Leader of your Party, from time to time in answer to questions both the Premier and, I think, the former Opposition Leader, now the Minister for Primary Industries, referred to you as only the 'current' member for Custance. That tended to suggest that there was a coup being plotted amongst your delegates for preselection. I would certainly keep my eye on the member for Frome at the time of the announcement of the redistribution of the boundaries. We all know what these country members are like. They are like a



big sheep that would like to jump the fence into someone else's backyard, and I fear it might be yours, Sir.

The member for Elder, again, typified the disarray and despondency that is coursing through the veins of Liberal Party members opposite; he launched an unprecedented attack on the Liberal Party Federal spokesperson for health, Mrs Bishop. He did not just get up in the Parliament and make a speech about it: he wrote a press release in the most exotic of all language, and in very strong language. He released it for all sections of the media to see and begged the media to phone him. No doubt, like the member for Lee, he wanted to raise his profile amongst his constituents; and, like the member for Lee, his public esteem has fallen very heavily. Again, we trust that he will be able to find suitable employment after the 1997 election, because unfortunately for him he will not be here.

We also have a Government and a Minister for Industrial Affairs who have traduced the integrity and independence of the Industrial Commission of South Australia by disgracefully elbowing aside the former President of the Industrial Commission and attempting to foist onto this State as President, so it is rumoured, Mr Brian Noakes of the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Mr Noakes has spent his life attacking the system of compulsory arbitration and safety net awards. This Government wants the poacher turned into a gamekeeper to protect the rights of employees under our State award system.

Unfortunately, for the Minister, it would appear that, under the Act, Mr Noakes may be a little too old to be able to secure a six year term. The Minister can rest assured that I will show him as much consideration and flexibility on any amendments that he may seek to the Act regarding that matter as he displayed towards all the amendments put forward by the Opposition during the last session of Parliament. I will most certainly display all the acts of charity, kindness and care that the Minister for Industrial Affairs showed me during the debate on industrial relations and WorkCover.

We have had disgraceful attacks on the WorkCover system and the abandonment of journey accidents. We had an interesting discussion at a meeting of the Farmers' Federation. You, Sir, were there, I believe, on Tuesday of last week when the Minister explained the type of people he believed the Act covered in respect of journey accidents. In answer to questions from farmers concerned about shearers travelling from Adelaide or remote parts of the State to their farm for the purpose of shearing, the Minister said, 'No worries. If you deem them to be at work from the time they leave the front gate of their home, they are covered.' The Chief Executive Officer of WorkCover, Mr Owens, got up a few minutes later at that breakfast to say, 'The Minister may think that, but the WorkCover board has taken a decision that no journey claims will be paid irrespective of the circumstances.'

You, Sir, would well recall that, because I know you were listening attentively, as was I while I was taking notes. We will have the disgraceful loss of approximately 10 500-plus jobs that the State Government has foisted on the public sector since its coming to office. I say 'approximately 10 500' because we do not have a firm figure from the Premier, whose figures, which are uttered publicly and in this House, seem to change from day to day and from agency to agency.

I also want to touch on what I believe is a very important issue, one on which I hope we can get bipartisan agreement. I refer to Aboriginal affairs. The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs said a little while ago in answer to a question in

Parliament that, by and large, there had been bipartisan agreement with respect to various land rights legislation that was enacted in South Australia during the 1980s. The drafting of the initial Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act commenced under the Dunstan Government but was proceeded with and consummated finally under Premier Tonkin's Liberal Government. The establishment of the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act was supported by the Liberal Party in this State.

**Mr Lewis:** And we introduced it.

**Mr CLARKE:** I am talking about Maralinga. That was supported by the Liberal Party, which is to be commended. So, over a history of about 15 years there has been a fair degree of bipartisanship with respect to Aboriginal affairs. I note that the State Government is intending to bring in complementary legislation with respect to the Commonwealth Native Title Act. However, there are differences between what the Government has put forward in that area and our position, and I believe they have been discussed between the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement and representatives of the Government. Those matters may or may not resolve themselves, but hopefully they will and we can have a high degree of bipartisanship again in this State regarding the passage of this legislation. It would serve no purpose whatsoever as far as race relations in this State were concerned for any member of any political Party to try to stir the race pot.

I therefore sincerely urge the Premier and his Government to take Mr Downer aside and have a friendly talk with him, because Mr Downer's intemperate comments at the Western Australian Liberal Party Conference last week, where he indicated that a future Federal Liberal Government would repeal the Commonwealth Native Title Act, served no good purpose whatsoever. It simply appealed to the most basic of instincts in our society. It is not right. It would be unjust and it would deny the fact that this continent was settled prior to European settlement in 1788. It would do irrevocable damage to our standing and set back race relations in this country. I applaud the National Farmers' Federation—

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I wish the member for Ridley would, on occasion, listen to the National Farmers' Federation and accept that, in the negotiations leading up to the introduction of the Native Title Act in the Federal Parliament, the Farmers' Federation took a pragmatic and sensible position. Unfortunately, the Federal Liberal Party and the National Party flatly opposed that legislation. Any difficulties that may exist with the Commonwealth Native Title Act can be attributed largely to the decision of the Federal Liberal Party and the National Party to opt out of the debate and say, 'We oppose native title totally and flatly. We support Richard Court's viewpoint in Western Australia. We want to appeal to the lowest common denominator in our society.'

I believe that the South Australian Liberal Party can play a particularly important role in national affairs at this moment with Mr Downer as a potential Prime Minister and as the Leader of a major political Party. The Premier and the Liberal Party in South Australia should go to Mr Downer and say, 'In South Australia for the past 15 or 20 years we have had largely a bipartisan relationship on Aboriginal affairs.' That has been to the betterment of this State as far as our race relations are concerned, and we are held in good stead throughout the world and this nation as pioneers in Australia with respect to Aboriginal land rights.

I earnestly urge the Government to speak to Mr Downer to ensure that he pulls away from his path of aligning himself

with Mr Richard Court to align himself with the more responsible elements within the Liberal Party in South Australia—I think the factional term is ‘the wets’ with the Premier being ‘the head wet’. They can play a constructive role, one which needs to be played in the interests of our society in order to give justice to our Aboriginal people. On that note, I close my address.

**Mrs ROSENBERG** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

At 5.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 9 August at 2 p.m.