

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9 August 1994

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

## COMMITTEE EVIDENCE

The **SPEAKER:** Following the raising of a point of order about the disclosure of evidence taken by standing committees established under the Parliamentary Committees Act, I believe that it raises a number of issues and it is appropriate for me to give a ruling on the matter. Select committees of the House are governed by Standing Orders and, in particular, Standing Order 339 provides:

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

Under recent amendments to the Parliamentary Committees Act, standing committees are also required to conduct their business in accordance with the Standing Orders. However, section 17(4)(b) of the Act provides:

A committee may, if it thinks fit, at any time prior to making a final report on a matter referred to it. . . publish a document relating to the matter.

Section 26 provides:

Except where the committee otherwise determines, members of the public may be present at meetings of the committee while the committee is examining witnesses but may not be present while the committee is debating.

At least one of the committees has used these provisions to suggest that any evidence taken by the committee or documents presented to it are public and may be disclosed without any further permission. There have also been several disclosures in the House by members, presumably on the same basis. My examination of these two sections of the Act have led me to the view that the committee was mistaken in acting that way. That view is reinforced by the new provision in section 24(5)(a) that committees are to conduct their business in accordance with the Standing Orders to the extent that they apply. I have taken the opportunity of discussing the matter with my colleague the President of the Legislative Council and he agrees with my view.

I therefore rule that evidence given before a standing committee of the Parliament, or a document presented to the committee, may not be raised in the House before the committee has reported on the reference, unless the committee has authorised publication pursuant to section 17(4)(b). It follows from that ruling that my view is that disclosure outside the House is subject to a similar prohibition, although that is a matter for the committee and I will not entertain complaints about disclosure outside the House unless it is brought to the House's attention by way of a report from a committee. Let me finish by saying that my concern is for the continued good working of the standing committees. The principles under which select committees have operated have worked extremely well and have led to a constructive bipartisan approach, which I would like to see followed in the Standing Orders.

## TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 275 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow general Sunday trading where restrictions currently apply was presented by Mr Clarke.

Petition received.

A petition signed by 805 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow extended retail trading hours was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

## ELECTION PROMISES

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I give notice that on Thursday 11 August I will move:

That this House congratulates the member for Unley for his courageous stand against the slash, burn and bury economic policies of the State Government, commends his plan for Government backbenchers to ensure that Government promises are not broken and draws to the attention of the House that the Government has already abandoned major promises by cutting expenditure on education and health by a total of \$105 million and slashing 11 500 jobs from the public sector.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for Playford is referring to a contribution which I made—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I take it the honourable member is raising a point of order in relation to the notice of motion given by the member for Playford. I cannot uphold the point of order. If the honourable member believes that he has been misrepresented, he is entitled to raise the matter after Question Time by way of a personal explanation.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I am sorry, Mr Speaker. The point of order I am trying to make is that that was a contribution in a debate. Is it in order to bring in a motion which refers to a previous debate in the House?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has only given a notice of motion. I will examine the notice of motion and if appropriate I will rule accordingly.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. D.C. Brown)—

Disciplinary Appeals Tribunal—Report, 1993-94.

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Liquor Licensing Act—Regulations—Dry Areas—  
Gawler.  
Brighton.  
Moana/Port Lincoln.

By the Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration (Commonwealth Provisions) Act—Regulations—Affiliated Associations.

Industrial and Employee Relations Act—Regulations—Enterprise Agreements.  
Registered Agents.

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

District Council of East Torrens—By-law No. 17—Dogs.

By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. D.S. Baker)—

A review of the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery—  
Consultants Report 1 July 1994.

By the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Beverage Container Act—Regulations—Exemption—  
Two Dog Alcoholic Lemonade.

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

University of South Australia—  
Financial Statement 1993.  
'New Outlook', June 1994.

### TRADING HOURS

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Industrial Affairs):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** In its first nine months of office the Brown Liberal Government has implemented significant but responsible industrial reforms designed to regenerate economic activity and prosperity in South Australia. I am pleased to announce to the House this afternoon the continuation of this reform agenda in relation to the important area of retail industry trading hours and related issues.

In the lead up to the December 1993 State election, the Liberal Party gave three undertakings in relation to this issue: first, to revoke the exemptions recklessly granted by the then Labor Government to allow supermarkets to trade five nights per week; secondly, to introduce legislation allowing enterprise agreements to be negotiated by all retailers; and, thirdly, to establish an independent inquiry to advise on the options for any extended shopping hours and related matters. The Liberal Party has kept each of these undertakings, and has done so to the letter. Labor's certificates of exemption for five nights of supermarket trading were revoked on 2 January 1994. Legislation permitting real enterprise bargaining in large and small businesses in South Australia was introduced in March this year, and it was passed by Parliament on 18 May. That legislation came into effect by proclamation yesterday, 8 August 1994.

The Independent Committee of Inquiry into Shopping Hours was established on 9 February 1994. That independent committee reported to me on 16 June. On 21 June the State Government publicly released in full the independent committee's report. I announced at that time that the State Government would grant an eight week period from the time the report was received to allow for its analysis by the Government and by the retail industry, and for public comment on its recommendations. That eight week period is now concluded. In accordance with this Government's undertaking I am now able to advise the House of the decisions which the State Government has made with respect to this issue. In so doing I make the point that the State Liberal Government makes no apologies whatsoever for adhering to the process which it mapped out before last December's State election, and for allowing this eight week public consultation period. This approach contrasts vividly with Labor's failed policy of making the wrong decisions on the run without consulting the retail industry on matters which affect the livelihood of thousands of businesses and employees.

Responsible policy making in the area of retail industry trading hours requires Government to balance the interests of small retailers, large retailers, retail employees and consum-

ers. This should be done against the background of existing regulation and retail industry developments in other Australian States. As has been clearly expressed by the independent inquiry, the current retail industry trading hour laws in South Australia are complex, discriminatory and in some cases a barrier to fair and open competition. Equally however the views of consumers identified by the inquiry (and in other independent research) indicates that there is a moderate level of demand within the South Australian community for extended shopping hours, but not an overwhelming demand. Where that demand exists, the independent committee found that the most preferred options for extended trading were some consumer access to Sunday trading and some additional late night trading during the week.

Further, the independent committee concluded that any immediate removal of current legislation would adversely affect the viability of some segments of the industry and in particular small traders in strip shops. For these reasons, the State Government has ruled out any move to completely deregulate retail shopping hours in South Australia. This Government will not expose small retail businesses to the forces of unbridled deregulation where these retail businesses have been established and have operated for 94 years in an environment of industry protection. Rather, the State Liberal Government has adopted a policy of providing additional flexibility and moderate trading hour extensions to match the moderate level of consumer and industry demand which currently exists.

In arriving at its decisions in this matter, the Government has also been conscious of the need to lessen the inequities which exist in the current law. Many of those inequities have arisen directly as a result of the piecemeal union inspired deregulation made by successive Labor administrations in this State. Further, the State Liberal Government understands that extensions to retail trading hours involve more issues than simply regulating the hours that the public can go shopping. Any extensions must also have regard for the rights and responsibilities of employers and employees in their industrial relations and the rights and responsibilities of retail tenants and shopping centre owners. Taking these factors into account, the State Liberal Government will implement the following package of reforms to retail industry trading hours in South Australia.

#### Exempt shops

All shops currently exempt will be permitted to continue their exempt status and be able to trade on a seven day basis as now exists.

#### Country shops

All country shops which are currently permitted to trade on a seven day basis will be permitted to continue to do so.

**Week night trading**  
One additional day of late night trading will be permitted in the metropolitan shopping district (Adelaide suburbs) between 6 p.m. and 9 p.m. on either Wednesday or Friday evening. This will be in addition to the existing Thursday night shopping in the Adelaide suburbs. No change will be made to the existing Friday night shopping arrangements in the Adelaide city centre.

#### Saturday trading

Existing arrangements permitting the opening of shops until 5 p.m. on Saturdays will be continued.

#### Sunday trading

Sunday trading will be permitted in the central shopping district (Adelaide city centre) only from 11 a.m. until 5 p.m.

No new class of businesses will be allowed Sunday trading extensions in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

#### Sale of red meat

Supermarkets and food shops will be permitted to sell fresh red meat at all times that those shops are legally permitted to trade.

#### Hairdresser shops

Hairdresser shops will be recategorised as exempt shops.

#### Employment and industrial relations

Work during any extended Sunday hours by existing full-time and part-time employees will be on a voluntary basis only, and existing arrangements whereby casual employees can decline rostered work will be continued. All retailers and employees will be informed of their rights from 8 August, which was yesterday, to enter into enterprise agreements under the new South Australian industrial relations laws as an alternative to existing retail industry industrial awards.

#### Retail leasing issues

The principle of amending retail leasing laws in conjunction with changes to retail industry trading hours has been endorsed, and the following matters have been referred to the Landlord and Tenant Act Legislative Review Team, established by the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- That retail leasing laws be strengthened to permit on a permanent basis core trading hours in shopping centres to be determined by a 75 per cent vote of retail tenants;
- That retail leasing laws be amended to restrict the transfer of operating costs to traders who choose not to trade outside core trading hours;
- That retail leasing laws be amended to permit tenants to form traders' associations and be represented by an agent or an association in lease negotiations;
- That increases in rental in excess of a prescribed sum above the consumer price index be subject to review by the Commercial Tribunal;
- That the process of lodging complaints with the Commercial Tribunal be simplified and made more accessible to small retailers.

The proposed changes in the retail industry trading hours will be introduced on 1 November 1994. The Government has also resolved that amendments giving effect to retail leasing reform will be in operation from 1 November 1994.

Section 5 certificates of exemption have been used extensively by successive Labor Governments in recent years to provide Sunday trading for hardware shops, furniture shops and floor covering shops and, last October, to provide five late nights for supermarkets. In the period 1988 to 1993, the Labor Government granted 883 certificates of exemption to South Australian retailers. Therefore the Government has decided that non-exempt retailers will also be able to apply for and obtain section 5 certificates of exemption to permit the limited extended Sunday, late night and exempt retail trading announced in this statement. This reform package—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:**—maintains the pace of progressive and responsible industrial reform and, in line with the previous policy, it was implemented practically and realistically by the previous Labor Government. I commend these reforms to the House.

## EUROPEAN WASPS

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** I am pleased to advise the House that I have received the report prepared by the Joint State and Local Government Liaison Committee on the problem of European wasps in South Australia. The report is being distributed, along with copies of the ministerial statement. As all here today will know, towards the end of last summer we saw a dramatic rise in wasp numbers in our suburbs, and it is likely that the widespread distribution of European wasps in other States will make the prospect of eradication difficult if not impossible. However, with continuing work, numbers may be kept to an acceptable level.

Members will recall the swift response of the State Government to this community threat. Immediately I set up the European Wasp Liaison Committee, comprising representatives from local government and the State Government. The first and very practical response of this committee was to produce and make available up-to-date information about the European wasp, its habits, ways of locating and destroying nests and the treatment of stings.

My department provided funds for the production of some 40 000 fact sheets, which were widely distributed in April this year in association with the Local Government Association. The liaison committee has recommended that a fund be set up with contributions from both the State Government and local government to enable the payment of subsidies to councils for the destruction of European wasp nests. I am pleased to announce that I have committed \$50 000 to this fund for this financial year. A further \$20 000 will be allocated to a community information program. It is likely to use the distribution of literature, television, announcements, displays and schools to get the message across. It is proposed that the contribution from my department will be matched by local government with an allocation of \$70 000 to the subsidy fund for nest destruction. The Local Government Association will be taking up this matter with member councils.

The second area of activity has focused on identifying strategies to keep the numbers down. A report handed down to me provides an overview of the problems created by European wasps and has focused on practical strategies to combat this pest in our society. As with any pest facing society, it is paramount that a cooperative and coordinated effort be made to reduce the danger. The State Government and local government have worked closely on this problem and, with the handing down of the report, have shown the way for a coordinated approach to tackle the wasp problem.

Importantly, the approach adopted extends to enlisting the support of members of the community to reduce the prevalence of wasps. Members of the community have a vital role to play in any control program and it is clear that restricting the incidence of wasps is a responsibility to be shared throughout the community.

The report has identified that public education and community awareness strategies are crucial in ensuring that people can identify and locate nests that are near to where they live. The community needs to be informed about the danger of wasps, take necessary steps to ensure that nests are eradicated by local councils and strive to reduce the element of personal danger through inappropriate responses when a wasp is near.

Clearly, the findings of the report have taken account of the considerable community input and comment that occurred earlier this year. A summary of the report is made available to members of the public. I urge everyone to read it and any comments will be welcomed by the chair of the committee, Des Mundy, who is the Assistant General Secretary of the Local Government Association.

### PRAWN FISHERY

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER (Minister for Primary Industries):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** A review of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery was commissioned by me earlier this year and was carried out by Dr Gary Morgan, who is an internationally recognised prawn biologist currently working at the Food and Agriculture Organisation's fisheries branch in Kuwait. Members will recall that this independent report was commissioned to ensure that this fragile but important fishery was being managed to sustain the future of the resource. It was also commissioned to allay fears by some fishermen that the long-term future viability of the fishery was under threat as a result of my decision earlier this year to reopen it for commercial fishing.

Dr Morgan was asked to examine the research that formed the basis of the management committee's advice to me regarding the reopening of the fishery. However, I said at the time that I had absolute confidence in the current committee, which had been making recommendations concerning operations of the fishery based on research trawls conducted by the South Australian Research and Development Institute as well as industry advice.

I have to say that, in my view, the management committee under its Chairman, the Hon. Ted Chapman, has done a very good job. I am pleased to be able to report to this House that this view has been confirmed by Dr Morgan. Our prawn fishermen and, indeed, all South Australians can be reassured that Dr Morgan's report concludes:

There does not appear to be any immediate concern regarding the health of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery in 1994.

Even more importantly, Dr Morgan expresses support for the research undertaken by SARDI with his comment:

The work undertaken by SARDI scientists, and used as the basis for decisions related to the 1993-94 fishing season, has, in the opinion of the consultant, been competently performed and accurately and appropriately analysed.

However, Dr Morgan's report comments that the relevance of the survey data prepared by SARDI must be questioned. The South Australian Research and Development Institute has been working through Dr Morgan's report and there has been a subsequent exchange of scientific information. The report has also recommended an important role for the industry by requesting catch results be made available so they can be included in future research analysis on this fishery. I appeal to fishermen for their cooperation in this process.

As the Minister for Primary Industries I will, of course, be asking industry representatives to assist in this process and to make available to SARDI researchers any information they currently have available. I firmly believe that the Government and this most important section of South Australia's fishing industry can now move forward together in a constructive way, working through the Integrated Management Committee process to continue sustainably to manage this prawn fishery for the benefit of the fishermen and, of course, for the State

of South Australia. In closing, again I emphasise two key points:

1. The Government's decision to reopen the fishery in 1993-94 has been justified and the prawn stocks have been found to be in a healthy state.

2. The SARDI research has been competently performed and accurately and appropriately analysed.

Dr Morgan has recommended that further analysis be undertaken by a fisheries economist to ascertain the alternative catch revenues and costs of production to determine the best fishing strategy. This recommendation is currently being assessed by the Director of Fisheries in conjunction with SARDI researchers. I close by saying that most fishermen endorse this report.

## QUESTION TIME

### TRADING HOURS

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Given today's decision by the parliamentary Liberal Party, and given the Minister's earlier guarantee at a retailers' rally on the steps of Parliament House on 8 December last year that he would not permit further Sunday trading as long as he was Minister, will he now tender his resignation?

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Is the Minister aware of a decision by the South Australian Labor Party convention to oppose extended shop trading hours, and can the Minister say whether such a move is consistent with the policy and the practice of the former Labor Government?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I rule the question out of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the honourable member brings the question to the Chair, I may be able to assist him. The Minister has no responsibility in relation to decisions taken by the Labor Party convention or other forums. The honourable member for Ross Smith.

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Has the Government decided to use section 5 of the shopping hours legislation to grant an exemption to shops not now permitted to trade on Sundays because the Government lacks the guts to control its own rebellious backbenchers from voting in accordance with their conscience on this issue?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** The statement as set out explains that very simply, but let me answer the question of the hapless, balding man opposite.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume his seat. There are too many interjections on my left. I do not want to speak to certain members again. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I find the attitude of members opposite absolutely hypocritical. The previous Government used 883 certificates of exemption to justify its

reasons for the extension of shopping hours. I will give you a whole series of reasons. In late November early December of last year there was a deal done with SDA—the union—the Premier and the large retailers to use this exemption specifically so that the previous Government did not have to come into this Parliament to extend it for five days, and they sold out every single small business in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Every single small business in South Australia was sold out by the previous Government. The Government and the union did a deal to get rid of all the small retailers in the supermarket area, and the member opposite has the gall to ask this question. This particular clause was used 883 times; it is in the Act, and I know that members and previous Ministers opposite—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** —thought that this area was a very good one to use and should be used at any particular time.

### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** Is the Premier aware of moves to oppose the privatisation of Adelaide Airport? Are such moves consistent with the claims by some members of this House that they now intend to listen to the community? I was listening to the member for Hart when he said last week that he would be arguing within the forums of the Labor Party for the Government to privatise Adelaide Airport. However, many of the honourable member's colleagues, including his Leader, did not listen to him at the weekend.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I heard with interest over the radio and then heard from the media about this motion put through the Labor Party convention over the weekend to totally oppose any move to bring in private ownership of the airport, a private operator of the airport, private capital to develop the airport or any other private involvement in Adelaide Airport. I also heard the Leader of the Opposition in his keynote speech to the Labor Party convention talk about how the Labor Party will now listen: 'Labor listens.' It would appear that the Labor Party has not bothered to listen to the people of South Australia. Let us look at what the Leader of the Opposition was saying on this issue last year, and I highlight to the House—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Ross Smith for continually interjecting.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** —that the Leader of the Opposition, the then Premier, on 25 May last year actually held a seminar in Hong Kong at which he talked about the potential need to improve Adelaide Airport and to bring in private funds and operators if need be. On 25 May he made a speech to foreign investors who might be interested in investing in South Australia, and then in July last year the former Government announced that it had allocated \$10 million to upgrade the Adelaide Airport and again talked about how it was willing, if need be, and if it had continued opposition from the FAC, to bring in private funds or private operators. On 14 September—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** These are the statements from the now Leader of the Opposition. On 14 September last year the former Premier told the Estimates Committee:

We have no ideological bent one way or the other on what could happen in terms of financing improvements at Adelaide Airport.

They have no strong philosophic basis whatever on this issue. That is not what they found over the weekend. Then, on 16—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I suggest the member for Hart just listen, because he probably wrote most of these speeches as the aide to the then Premier. On 16 September last year the former Premier was again reported in the *Advertiser* as being keen to pursue the privatisation option, and I quote from that article as follows:

The Premier, Mr Arnold, confirmed yesterday the Government was considering a series of options including the use of private enterprise to develop and run the airport. . . here is the State Government indicating its willingness to go further really than State Governments ought to have to.

What happened at the weekend? The Leader of the Opposition was rolled. He was well and truly rolled by the Labor Party Left here in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections. I do not know if members want an early minute but, if it continues, they will get it. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** They go to a convention saying that Labor will listen, and what does it become? Lynn's lament: Lynn being rolled by the Left wing of the Labor Party on this crucial issue of the airport. Here is a man of straw blown by the wind. Here is the Leader of the Opposition who, for the whole of last year, said that we needed private operators and private funds involved in the airport; that we needed an upgraded airport and it could not be achieved through the FAC. What happened at the weekend? He was rolled by his own Party. He was left standing there embarrassed on this crucial issue on which members opposite went to the State election, talking about upgrading the airport and bringing in a private operator, and they now stand absolutely in tatters. As I said, if ever there was a man of straw, it is the Leader of the Opposition, who blows with the wind wherever it may blow.

### LABOR GOVERNMENT POLICY

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** What action has the Minister for Industrial Affairs taken to change the ill-thought policy of the previous Labor Government? Many South Australians have contacted us since the Labor Party convention at the weekend expressing concerns about the ambiguity between the Labor Party convention opinion of what should happen and that of the policy and practice of the former Labor Government.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I was very surprised when I heard the news release on Sunday afternoon that the Labor Party was opposed to deregulation and, in particular, opposed to Sunday trading. I suppose the thing that surprised me was that, looking at some notes the other day, I found that it was members of the Labor Government in 1977 who actually introduced late night trading, and that in the 1980s they deregulated all the hardware stores. That was a bit of a surprise. Then we find that they deregulated the furniture stores, and floor covering shops can now be deregulated seven days a week. It is interesting to find that it was the Labor Party which brought in Saturday afternoon trading and which brought in the extended five nights of trading for supermarkets. Fortunately, now it has been put back in perspective.

Here we have a Party having the gall to say that it has not been involved in deregulation and, more importantly, that it protected small retailers. Every one of those moves could be seen and was seen at that time as being opposed to small retailers. But, when you go on and read more, you find that not only were members opposite involved in deregulation but they were involved with big business, and big deals with the unions. What happened in December last year? The union led by a previous member in this place ran to Coles and Woolworths and sat down with them, then ran to the Premier and did some deal with the Premier—and I wonder how much it cost them, because very quickly—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I said 'I wonder how much it cost them', and very quickly after that we have the Minister coming in saying, 'The best we can do is to slip this through; we will not bring it before Parliament. We will use the section of the Act that is required, section 5, and we will slip it in.' It was in the very press release put out by the then Premier. We subsequently had the then Premier telling everyone in South Australia, 'I believe it is in the best interests of South Australians that we have extended shopping hours, because it will be good for the community.' What a mob of hypocrites! To say, 'We can't have any deregulation, we can't have any changes to shop trading hours' and then, on top of all that, no discussion at all with small retailers—no attempt to sit down and say to small retailers—'We know you have some problems in the leases.'

We know that the Leader of the Opposition did not even bother to sit down and talk to small retailers about retail leases. The single most important issue for small business in the retail industry is the need to do something about retail leases. Members of the Opposition have no thought at all for small business. They have been in the game of deregulation since the 1970s, and it is a joke that they passed that resolution at their convention on Sunday.

#### MBf

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

In light of the statement in this place last week by the Minister for Tourism regarding various allegations made about MBf and its President and Chief Executive Tan Sri Loy, what particular allegations have been made about Tan Sri Loy, and will the Minister table in this place the letters and material he said that he and the Premier have received from Malaysia regarding Tan Sri Loy?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** At the moment I do not have with me a copy of the documents that were sent to us when we were in Malaysia. If I believe that they need to be publicly tabled because they help the public debate, I will do it. If my memory is correct, they were general press clippings that were dropped under a table. I understand that copies were also formally sent to the Leader of the Opposition. The allegations were made on television here in South Australia, and I believe they can be refuted by Tan Sri Loy. Sources informed me today that Tan Sri Loy was not involved with the company concerned for any more than two weeks. In fact, he was put on that board by the Prime Minister of Malaysia, Mr Mahathir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** He was asked to go on that board to clear up the difficulties. He was on that board for

two weeks before he resigned. I also point out that it was the Leader of the Opposition, as the then Premier, who invited Tan Sri Loy to the Grand Prix as a special guest of the Government last year. I suspect that the then Premier did it in good faith. I also point out to the House that it is my understanding that the Deputy Leader—

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I refer to the question of relevance. As I was not the one who made the allegations—it was the Minister—I cannot see the relevance of actions referred to by me as Premier.

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

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** As I said earlier, it was the former Premier who invited Tan Sri Loy to the Grand Prix, and it is my understanding that the current Deputy Leader of the Opposition invited Tan Sri Loy to be a guest speaker at the Business-Asia conference. All I am saying is that it is interesting that members opposite should now take special interest in a man who is involved in a finance company in Malaysia and for whom the former Premier went out of his way to especially invite to South Australia on behalf of the Government. I also point out that significant expenses were paid by the Government to invite to this State a man who has high integrity in Malaysia and was supported by the previous Government in terms of coming here.

#### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** My question, which relates to Adelaide Airport, is directed to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. How will moves to oppose the privatisation of Adelaide Airport affect future development and exports from South Australia?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** If there is one message as a result of the ALP State Convention on the weekend it is this: the Labor Party has not learnt a thing from the 11 December election result. What we saw at that convention is ALP delegates dictate that they will oppose policy direction to open up, rebuild and rejuvenate the South Australian economy. Let us look at some of the facts relative to Adelaide Airport. It is an economically important piece of infrastructure for this State. There are some 2 000 people earning something like \$120 million directly related to activity at that airport. The airport operators spend a further \$100 million in South Australia. The flow-on employment in 1993 was estimated to be some 8 420 jobs, representing 1.3 per cent of GSP in South Australia.

It is well documented that there are inadequate facilities at Adelaide Airport. The single aerobridge, for example, has insufficient space and inadequate parking. This week, three international flights came in at the same time and, because of the weather conditions, it created congestion and difficulty. The runway, at 2528 metres, has been well documented as the shortest runway of any capital city in Australia. That is something we should not have to accept in South Australia. The payload is limited by the runway's length and load bearing capacity. Cathay Pacific, Malaysian and Singapore Airlines all claim adverse effects on their capability out of Adelaide International Airport because of the infrastructure there.

Clearly, we need to rejuvenate the South Australian economy. As the Premier has said now and before the election, the number one priority on the Government's agenda is economic rebuilding and economic rejuvenation for

South Australia. That means getting the infrastructure in place to enable that to happen and to not retard any increase in economic activity, as we saw occur over the past decade under a Labor Government. We need to stimulate export growth and increase inbound tourism. It is estimated that with the proper facilities we could attract, with appropriate marketing from the Tourism Commission, some 14 000 additional visitors to South Australia. On average each visitor to this State spends \$1 220, and over a 20 year period that equates, on present values, to an increase in gross State product of some \$240 million.

In addition to that we need to promote Adelaide and South Australia as a credible, attractive base for international investment and improve our international image. These are the clear objectives of this Government. The South Australian Farmers Federation, the tuna industry and livestock owners have all said that they require additional capacity out of Adelaide to international markets. By opening up Adelaide International Airport with the right infrastructure and letting it develop to its full potential the employment growth is estimated to be something like 680 jobs per year. During the infrastructure phase some 960 jobs will be created for South Australia. We hear much from the Opposition about jobs. Here is an industry, capacity and infrastructure that will build the economic base and assist in that for the next 10 years and beyond. What does the Labor Party do? It walks away from its commitment to allow that to happen. As the Premier has pointed out, it leaves the Leader of the Opposition absolutely high and dry.

*The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Leader of the Opposition has repeatedly made statements about the importance of the upgraded airport, including the option of privatisation to achieve it. The Federal Treasurer said in Adelaide on Sunday that the way to get the upgrade was to involve the private sector in the upgrade. The Federal Treasurer is telling his own Party this and yet it refuses to give the support of its delegates to the ALP national convention to allow the privatisation of Adelaide International Airport to meet these objectives for South Australians: more jobs, economic build-up, rejuvenation and the rebuilding of South Australia's economic base. That is what the Labor Party has walked away from. For 10 years or more in this State it displayed a sign saying 'closed for business'.

I can tell you, Mr Speaker, that this Government has clearly identified—and the Premier has identified this on a number of occasions—that we have taken down the 'closed for business' sign. This State is open for business and will not be held up by the philosophical debates of the ALP State Convention. We want members of Parliament who have a voting responsibility to the constituents of South Australia to ensure that the economic base of this State can be rebuilt again.

**The SPEAKER:** I think the Minister really has answered the question.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Mr Speaker, as we have underlined on numerous occasions, and as the Leader of the Opposition and former Premier has said on a number of occasions, this project is important for South Australia. It is about time the Labor Party recognised that and started to support some real policy options for the development of this State and jobs.

## MBf

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

My question is directed to the Premier. In light of the Minister for Tourism's announcing to this House last week that there have been allegations about MBf, will the Premier release all correspondence and documents between the Government and Tan Sri Loy including the memorandum of understanding between MBf and the South Australian Government and, if not, why not? The Minister for Tourism, in answer to a question last week, pointed out that a number of warnings and allegations were received about Tan Sri Loy and MBf when the delegation arrived in Malaysia. On 3 June 1994 the Premier, in a ceremony at MBf headquarters, signed a memorandum of understanding with MBf regarding the Wirrina development. Under this agreement the South Australian Government made a number of commitments including the provision of infrastructure worth around \$13 million.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Let us be quite clear. We have an Opposition—the Labor Party in South Australia—which is now prepared to go out and knock every attempt to get investment in South Australia. The Labor Party in South Australia, while in Government, was prepared to deal with MBf and Mr Tan Sri Loy, but now in Opposition it sets out to attack him. Let us look at the credibility of the now Leader of the Opposition on this issue. Last night he was quoted on television, as outlined in the following transcript:

Mr Lynn Arnold says that when he was Premier he was given very clear warnings about getting involved in any business dealings with either the man or his company.

That is referring to Tan Sri Loy and MBf. That is how the now Leader of the Opposition was quoted on television last night.

*The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** He is trying to squeeze out of this. The facts are these: on 28 March 1991 the then Minister of Tourism went to see Tan Sri Loy and MBf in Malaysia to talk about investment with the Government in South Australia. On 6 May 1992 the Hon. Lynn Arnold met with Tan Sri Loy in Kuala Lumpur to discuss a whole range of investment options, including MBf investing in tourism facilities in South Australia. That was in 1992.

We then find, according to the Leader last night, that he had been warned not to have any dealings with the man or the company. Yet, what did he do in the week before the election? It was decided to invite Tan Sri Loy to the Grand Prix as the special guest of South Australia. The Government went beyond that and also asked Tan Sri Loy to be a guest speaker—in fact, the key-note speaker—at an Asian business conference immediately after the Grand Prix. How do the two courses of action sit together given that, when he was Premier, the Leader was warned not to deal with Tan Sri Loy or MBf in any way whatsoever, yet during the election campaign the Government invited him to come here and be a special guest and a key-note speaker at a Labor Government sponsored conference?

Where is the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition, who runs around the media trying to tear down Tan Sri Loy and MBf and its first investment ever in a major tourism facility here in South Australia? For 11 years the Labor Party botched every attempt to get a major tourism development in South Australia. We know the way in which the now Leader of the Opposition personally became involved and botched the development at West Beach. We know the extent to

which the previous Government botched the development in the Flinders Ranges and the one on Kangaroo Island. Every attempt by a major investment company to come here was destroyed by the then Labor Government. Now we find the same negative creatures out there trying to knock down every new investment option that this Government can put up. It is the Labor Party here in South Australia that wants to tear down the proposed \$200 million investment at Wirrina. It is shame on their heads that members opposite take such a negative approach to developing tourism and new investment here in South Australia.

### BEACH EROSION

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources advise the current situation with respect to sand replenishment at Semaphore Park and Tennyson? Is further action required to adequately protect properties along the metropolitan coastline?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I appreciate the member for Lee's asking me this question because I know that it is of concern to his constituents. In fact, last Saturday I took the opportunity to meet some of those people to discuss some of these issues. Back in 1989 it was recommended that sand replenishment be used to try to address the problems being experienced along the foreshore at that stage. A foreshore position, 20 metres from the property line, was considered the minimum setback distance if properties were to be adequately protected from a multiple storm scenario. Hard works protection such as seawalls were to be considered only if replenishment proved ineffective in maintaining a 20 metre buffer distance.

Since 1989 Semaphore Park has been replenished four times with a total quantity of 25 500 cubic metres of sand. Despite the sand replenishment, beach levels have continued to fall and the foreshore has progressively eroded as a result of storms. In more recent times, in May and June, the erosion has occurred inside the 20 metre buffer at a number of locations and is within 14 metres of property boundaries at the closest location.

As a result, about 30 000 cubic metres of sand is currently being placed at Semaphore Park to restore a 20 metre buffer and provide additional limited protection this year. Unfortunately, sand replenishment at Semaphore Park appears not to be effective, as the management strategy hoped it would, and I am now advised that my department is considering plans for storm walls in that vicinity.

I also indicate to the House that a report concerning State and local government funding alternatives is soon to be put before me for consideration. I recognise the seriousness of the situation along the coast but, in conclusion, point out that the serious situation now being recognised is a direct result of lack of funding on the part of the previous Labor Government over 11 years. The previous Government refused to recognise the problems being experienced. It refused to put funding into the problem and, as a result, we have significant problems along the metropolitan coastline. It is the intention of this Government to rectify that situation, and the matter is now being considered to arrive at how best we can overcome the problem. The member for Lee can indicate to his constituents the concern being recognised by the Government and the acceptance that action is needed in this area urgently.

### MBf

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** In light of the Minister for Tourism's statement in this place last week regarding unspecified allegations about Tan Sri Loy, will he outline the extent of investigations carried out by the Premier and him into Tan Sri Loy? During the course of those investigations did the Minister, the Premier or any other official have discussions with the Australian Federal Police, the NCA or the Australian Securities Commission? The Minister for Tourism in his statement regarding MBf and Tan Sri Loy referred to allegations raised at the time of the Premier's visit to Malaysia last week and said:

The Premier and I both immediately investigated the issues and found that they were totally unsubstantiated.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his question. As Minister I had general discussions with respect to the requirement for me to ask of my staff what were the issues. I am sure the Premier will respond at a later date to any questions on the discussions I had with him. I fulfilled my general requirement as Minister to investigate the whole issue. I was satisfied that the person and the company with whom I was dealing was a reputable company in Malaysia and one which South Australians and the South Australian Government would be prepared to deal in any of its negotiations.

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** What action did the Premier take during his recent visit to Kuala Lumpur to check on the background of the MBf company, and is he aware of any action by the former Government not to deal with this company?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I am delighted this question has been asked by the member for Colton, because it allows me to put down quite clearly the events concerning any allegations made whilst I was in Kuala Lumpur.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** If only the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would sit there and listen to the facts for once, the Labor Party would not end up in such an embarrassing position.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I saw a transcript of a television program last night which claimed that, apparently, the official line from the Australian Embassy here is that it did not warn off Dean Brown from doing business with either Tan Sri Loy or MBf. That is a very accurate statement indeed, because I made investigations (and I will say why shortly) with the Australian High Commission. It is interesting to note that it was the Australian High Commission that cleared both Tan Sri Loy and MBf. So, of course, it did not warn me off dealing with them, because it gave an endorsement, both to the man and to his companies.

The reason I raised this matter with the Australian High Commission was that, within about three hours of signing the agreement (and it appeared on television in Kuala Lumpur that night), I got back to my hotel room and found, shoved under the door, an envelope. I opened the envelope and there was an unsigned, unnamed letter, which made certain allegations that had appeared within the Malaysian press concerning Tan Sri Loy and MBf. Interestingly, at the bottom



of the letter it stated, 'This has been copied to the Leader of the Opposition in Adelaide.'

So the facts are that the Labor Party and the Leader of the Opposition are willing to stand in this House and run around the media making allegations on an unnamed, unsigned letter. But the matter goes further than that, because when I, as a result of this letter, then raised the matter with a number of senior Malaysian officials and also with the Australian High Commission, both sources cleared Tan Sri Loy and MBf. I further highlight the fact that there is no evidence which I know of and which has been presented to me, as Leader of the Government, that shows that the former Government had been warned concerning Tan Sri Loy or MBf by the Australian High Commission. In fact, the Australian High Commission presented just the opposite evidence to me—that they were cleared.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** If that is the case, why did we have the Leader of the Opposition running around yesterday telling the media that he had been told not to deal with this man or his company? Why was the Leader of the Opposition making those statements yesterday? Why is he raising these supposed allegations in the House today? Why is he giving any credit whatsoever to this issue that has been raised if members opposite are now claiming in the House that they were not warned and there was no adverse evidence whatsoever against Tan Sri Loy or MBf?

The other question that the Leader of the Opposition must answer today is: if they had been warned about him or his companies, why did they invite him to South Australia as a special guest of State? Why did they make him a key note speaker at their Asian business conference? Why did they allow that group of companies to continue to operate the ferry between Cape Jervis and Kangaroo Island? They are fundamental questions, and the Leader of the Opposition must get up this afternoon and answer them in this House unless, once again, he is seen as that man of straw who blows with the wind for political fortune.

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** My question is directed to the Premier. Has the Premier, a Minister or any Government official met or spoken to Malaysian MP Wee Choo Keong about allegations he has made against Tan Sri Loy and MBf in the Malaysian Parliament? If not, will the Premier or one of his Ministers meet with Wee Choo Keong to test the veracity of his allegations against Tan Sri Loy and MBf?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The answer to the question is, 'No, I haven't spoken to Mr Wee.' Mr Wee is in contempt of the High Court of Malaysia. Mr Wee has been sentenced to two years in gaol. Why would I, as Premier, want to run off and speak to someone who made some allegations about an investment in South Australia and who, first, is in contempt of the High Court of Malaysia and, secondly, has been sentenced to two years in gaol? I would have thought there would be more appropriate people to talk to for information.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I just highlight that the very question that I have been asked by the member for Hart this afternoon suggests that that is the sort of information on which he relies. That is the sort of Opposition we have in South Australia—a very negative Opposition. It is an Opposition that is prepared to raise allegations on an unsigned, unnamed letter. Incidentally, the interesting thing about the letter, which was sent to me as Premier and a copy

of which was sent to the Leader of the Opposition, is that it apparently came from, as it said, 'concerned Australians living in Malaysia'. One only had to read the letter to realise that the person who wrote the letter did not have English as their native language. The person who wrote the letter had great difficulty in coming to grips with the English language.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** No wonder any Tom, Dick or Harry could rope in and catch the former Premier of South Australia; no wonder he made the political and economic blunders that he did; no wonder he got us into the trouble that surrounded Hindmarsh Island and other developments; and no wonder the Opposition lost the sort of money that it did through the State Bank and SGIC when the Leader of the Opposition makes a naive, incompetent statement as he has just made across the House. The fact that I should be putting any importance at all on an unnamed, unsigned letter that was poked under—

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** Why didn't you investigate it?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Well, I did.

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

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

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Of course I investigated it, as would any thorough Premier, but I will not stand up in the Parliament and make an absolute fool of myself by repeating those allegations in public—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** —when, in fact, the Labor Party of South Australia at least could have had the decency to check this with the Australian High Commission in Malaysia, which would have been the appropriate authority, because it would have got exactly the same response as I did from the Australian High Commissioner, from the Malaysian Government and from a number of other sources within Malaysia.

## FRUIT EXPORT

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries. What action has the Government taken following the decision of the United States to reinstate a suspended import standard that will result in four large shipments of oranges, now on their way to America, having to be repacked upon arrival at an overall estimated cost to growers of about \$2 million?

A little over a week ago the first charter shipment of Riverland navel oranges, the first of this season, arrived on the east coast of the United States. It was obvious that these oranges were going to live up to their reputation of the past two years, since the industry got back into the United States after 17 years. The North American consumers regard these oranges as being of excellent quality and they are highly sought after. However, it is of extreme concern to the Riverland citrus industry that the United States authorities are now reconsidering their current import standards.

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** I thank the honourable member for his question and for his assistance in bringing to a successful end some very delicate negotiations that have gone on over the past two weeks. I also note his constant advertising of the Riverland, part of that advertising being the very colourful tie that he is wearing today.

As the honourable member has said, a couple of weeks ago it came to our attention that the first shipment of Riverland citrus fruit was to lob on the east coast of America, but that shipment was quarantined. This market was opened up only two years ago after being closed for 17 years. A tremendous amount of work and effort went into getting this market open again and into getting through the protocols that were put in place to stop it.

We were concerned that this situation would mean that further shipments—and some were already on the water and others are planned for the season—could have been put at risk. Not only did the US Department of Agriculture claim that it had found a form of mite on the oranges but it was also saying that the fruit would have to be repacked for further inspection.

Quite rightly, the Department of Primary Industries in South Australia sent its General Manager of Horticulture, Barry Windle, accompanied by David Cain from the Citrus Board, to the United States. They flew directly to Washington to see whether they could negotiate their way through the problem. They have been in constant telephone contact with us in South Australia and, of course, with the honourable member in his electorate to see whether we could work our way through it.

Because many of the citrus growers were very angry about what would happen, it would have been very easy for us immediately to try to impose barriers on the import into Australia of navel oranges from Sunkist Growers Incorporated. We resisted that by saying, 'Let's work through the bureaucratic process, and at the end of day we will then have to look at some other matters.'

When the two negotiators had finished with the Department of Agriculture in the United States, there was not a lot of joy. However, they went to Sunkist and asked, 'Do you realise what is going on?' I publicly thank Sunkist for saying, 'We do not realise and we do not want to be a part of it.' With the help of Sunkist, the officers in America have managed to sort out all the problems for this year's shipments. We will now work through in a sensible way how we can ensure that these exports continue in the future.

Once again, it is very important, before we jump to conclusions in these situations, to get our people to America, or to any other country, to discuss the situation sensibly and to talk to the commercial people operating in those countries about the ramifications of things that might happen if we cannot come to a sensible conclusion. We have been able to do that and I commend not only the honourable member, who has worked very hard to ensure that this continues, but also Barry Windle and David Cain, who are on their way back to Australia now, for their very hard work in bringing a delicate situation to a good conclusion from South Australia's point of view.

#### MBf

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Will the Minister for Tourism confirm that the Malaysian Central Bank is still carrying out its own investigations into MBf after almost two years and, in light of this, will he please advise the House how the Premier and the Minister's own investigations into Tan Sri Loy could be completed so quickly and conclude that all allegations were totally unsubstantiated? In November 1993, Malaysian MPs called on the Finance Minister in Parliament to instruct the Malaysian Central Bank and the Security Commissions of Malaysia to investigate Tan Sri Loy and

MBf. In reply, the Malaysian Minister of Finance advised the Malaysian Parliament that Tan Sri Loy's activities had been under investigation by the Malaysian Central Bank since September 1992.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I am not aware of whether the accusation or the question put to me by the member for Hart is accurate, but I can give the Parliament the following information. A simple investigation of MBf as a finance company shows that it is the largest finance company in Malaysia with in excess of 12 billion ringgits in assets. There has been a suggestion that some \$400 million worth of ringgits would cause a problem for its financial base. I suspect that, if you took \$400 million away from \$12 million, you would find that the company was still a very financial asset based company.

I understand that the loans that according to accusations have been causing problems were rehabilitation loans, that they were taken out during the recession in the 1970s and that all of them had been approved by Malaysia's central bank, Bank Negara.

#### UNIVERSITY PLACES

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** Has the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education seen a report provided to his Federal counterpart about the allocation of university places and is he concerned about its implications for South Australia?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** This is a very important question. Yes, I have seen the report and I am concerned, because it is suggested in this report, first, that South Australia and Victoria lose places at our universities to Queensland, in particular, and northern New South Wales. Furthermore, it is suggested that there be no further increases in expenditure on higher education.

South Australia cannot afford to be put in that situation and I intend to fight any such recommendation as hard as I possibly can. I invite the Opposition to support the Government in any opposition to moves to take away university places from South Australia. It would send a signal to would-be investors and would-be students that South Australia is in some sort of decline: on the contrary, we are in a recovery mode and we have a bright future.

This sort of proposition would be self-fulfilling. It is my intention, in conjunction with the universities and Victoria, to present a united front to oppose any moves to take away university places or funding from South Australia. The report is out for consultation over the next few months, but the political battle has started. As I indicated earlier, I invite the Opposition and all South Australians to join in opposing any such suggestion, which is clearly against the interests of South Australians, both now and in the future.

#### SUPERANNUATION

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Did the Treasurer mislead the House on 19 April this year when he restated the Government's commitment to supporting existing levels of benefits and relative Government contributions to the pension and lump sum schemes for Government employees? He said:

There are no plans to change the current arrangements.

The Treasurer has announced today the closure of the main State and police superannuation schemes and the establishment of a new scheme based on reduced State contributions. This breaks major election promises given to the Public

Service Association that a Liberal Government would support the current level of benefits in the pension and lump sum schemes, that the lump sum scheme would remain open to new members under a Liberal Government, and that a Liberal Government would maintain its relative contribution to pension and lump sum schemes. This decision also contradicts the advice given to the House by the Treasurer on 19 April.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** We debated this Bill during the last session of Parliament. I thought members were here for that debate and that it was all said at the time.

#### STATE ASSETS

**Mr BASS (Florey):** My question is directed to the Treasurer.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BASS:** What action is the Government taking to improve the management of State owned assets, and has the Government developed a proper asset register?

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Treasurer does not need the assistance of the member for Giles.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The member for Giles could not assist anyone. I would like to apprise the House of the fact that our asset register does not exist and did not exist under the previous Government, but we are trying to put one together rapidly. It is interesting to note that the financial statements put out over the past two years actually included a valuation of the State's assets. When we came into Government we said, 'Where is this asset register?' but, of course, it does not exist. We believe that, as regards this asset register, the way in which the previous Government calculated the State's net asset worth was either by spitting on a finger and putting the finger in the air or by telephoning agencies to determine their best guess.

We have ascertained that there were a number of ways of valuing assets; indeed, we do not even know how many assets we have as yet, because we are still putting them together. Some departments work on historic costs; others work on historic written down costs; others work on replacement costs; others on current written down replacement costs; others on market to market costs; and some work on a best guess. That is the state of the register.

When we said that we would have categories of land and facilities, networks and moveable assets, regarding land and facilities alone 3 000 categories came out of the public sector. The system has become totally unmanageable. Many person years would have to be spent on compiling this register. It is an absolute shambles—an absolute disgrace. We will have to spend a lot of time and effort on this matter, because the previous Government made no effort whatsoever to quantify its asset base. We are making every attempt at least to get a register on a comparable basis across Government which has some standard categorisations off which people can work so that we can report accurately. We are doing some work to ensure a consistent method of Government valuation.

The current proposal is to examine the deprival value, which has been recommended by the Industries Commission as the most appropriate method of Government valuation. If any members opposite wish to be given information on deprival value, I will be only too delighted to give them a briefing. This is an absolute shambles with which we are trying to come to grips. It will not happen within the next six

months, but every attempt is being made so that by 1996-97, when we will have accrual accounting, we will have an adequate asset register.

#### WASTE CONTROL

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Does the Government have a strategy for waste minimisation material reuse and recycling which will negate the need for mega landfill tips such as the proposed rubbish tip at the Highbury quarry?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** We do have such a strategy; as a matter of fact, it is something on which I am working very closely with the new Waste Management Board, which has been established to liaise closely between the State Government and local government. It is important that a number of issues are dealt with as a matter of urgency by that board, such as the finding of adequate markets for recycled materials. As I move around the community, I find a lot of dissatisfaction on the part of people who over a long period have gathered materials that can be recycled only to find that because of the lack of markets they are being taken to dumps.

I have received representations from the people to whom the honourable member refers, and I understand their concern. This Government is doing everything it can to encourage people to recycle materials and to look carefully at waste minimisation, because that is what it is all about. If we can encourage and provide incentives to industry to reduce the amount of waste and packaging, we will have fewer materials to be disposed of, with less need for dumps. I am aware of the concern expressed by the constituents of the member for Torrens, and I will continue to address this matter.

#### HOUSING TRUST RENTS

**Mr WADE (Elder):** Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations explain the rationale behind the increase in rent for pensioner cottage flats and say over what period this increase will be spread?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** I am pleased to be able to announce to the House and to the people of this State that last week I instructed the South Australian Housing Trust to spread the cottage flats rent increase, which was brought in on 1 July, over a period of 12 months. I think that, historically, it would be worthwhile to recount the circumstances under which the Housing Trust came to me and requested an increase of 2 per cent in the rent for cottage flats. Members would be aware that pensioners live in three types of public housing: bedsitters, cottage flats and regular Housing Trust dwellings. Rent for bedsitters and cottage flats is determined at 16 per cent of the pension, while pensioners who live in regular Housing Trust accommodation pay 21 per cent of their pension—a difference of 5 per cent.

The Housing Trust proposed to me that pensioners in bedsitters and cottage flats should have their rent raised from 16 per cent to 18 per cent to create more equity with pensioners who were already paying 21 per cent for regular Housing Trust accommodation. My initial reaction was that there would be no rent rise at all for bedsitters. As members know, most bedsitters should be demolished and replaced by

something far more upmarket: I find it a distinct embarrassment for people to have to reside in many of them.

The question then arose regarding the 2 per cent increase for cottage flats from 16 per cent to 18 per cent, the equivalent of a rent rise of \$4. The Housing Trust requested that that increase take place in two stages: an increase of \$2 on 1 July and six months later a further increase of \$2, making a \$4 increase for the year. After some discussions last week, I have now requested that the second rise not take place on 1 January, as intended, but that it be deferred for the full 12 month period. The arrangement will now be that pensioners who reside in bedsitters will not have any rent rise at all and pensioners who reside in cottage flats will now receive only a 2 per cent increase, which will be divided into two stages over a 12 month period: the first increase of \$2 to take effect on 1 July 1994 and the second increase of \$2 to apply 12 months later from 1 July 1995.

### LABOUR DEPARTMENT

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs assure the House that the Department of Labour will be adequately staffed to deal with problems which are referred to it? A constituent has contacted me to complain about lack of action by the department. He was employed by a company which was closed down owing a substantial amount of money for wages. He contacted the Department of Labour for assistance but was told that his complaint was not able to be investigated due to a shortage of staff in the department.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** The particular section to which the honourable member is referring has already had an increase in numbers, and is a very vital area of the Department of Labour. As the information required under the award system in particular is very important, it is our intention to make sure that we have adequate staff in that area. Indeed, as we receive in excess of 5 000 telephone calls a month, we will ensure that that area is adequately staffed. If the honourable member could give me the details of the case in question, I will give him a more detailed reply.

---

### MBf

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** In Question Time this afternoon the Premier made allegations that I had run around the media yesterday saying a number of things about Tan Sri Loy, his family and MBf. That is simply not true. I want to put on record what actually has happened. I point out again to the Premier that it was the member for Newland—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader has leave to make a personal explanation.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I remind members it was the member for Newland and the Minister for Tourism who raised the allegations (still unspecified, I may say) in this place. In 1992, when I was Minister for Industry, Trade and Technology—not Premier, as the press report indicated—on a trade mission to South-East Asia, I visited a number of

businesses in Kuala Lumpur. I was briefed by the High Commission and the Australian Trade Commission in Kuala Lumpur at the time. One of the appointments that was put up for me to fulfil was with Tan Sri Loy and MBf. I believe the main reason for that being opposed was that at that stage MBf had already made an investment in South Australia—namely, the Sealink investment—and that it was seen as appropriate for the relevant Minister in this State to meet with that company. I met with that company, and we had an exchange of information about the economy and investment climate of South Australia, and about the investment activities of MBf.

Indeed, I was briefed on a number of particular projects of MBf by officers of that company. I was not given any indication by the High Commission or Trade Commission of any allegations of criminality about the company. The first I have ever heard about that was when I received anonymous correspondence after the Premier's visit to Malaysia. I did not have something slipped under my door while the Premier was in Malaysia. What was said by one of the Australian staff in Kuala Lumpur was that the Malaysian economy was growing very rapidly and, indeed, verging upon overheating, and a number of companies in Malaysia were perhaps getting over exposed. The suggestion was made that MBf might be one of those companies.

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** That was two years ago.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** It was in 1992 when I was Minister for Industry, Trade and Technology. No allegations were made about criminality.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is a personal explanation which is limited in its scope.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I have received anonymous correspondence—I do not know if everyone has, but the Premier indicates that he has—which, I repeat, was forwarded to my office after the Premier's visit to Malaysia. It appears as if the Premier received his information earlier. Once these unspecified allegations were made by the member for Newland and the Minister for Tourism, the Opposition would have been failing in its duty if we had not questioned the matter further. The Minister has raised the issue and we are obligated to pursue it to a satisfactory outcome for South Australians.

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** Much discussion has taken place over the past few months concerning the upgrading of Adelaide Airport: improved facilities; the need to privatise the airport to either an overseas or a local consortium; and, more significantly, to look into extending the runway over Tapleys Hill Road. As the member for Hanson, which has the airport within its boundaries, I have made it quite clear that I support extending the runway over Tapleys Hill Road, provided that Tapleys Hill Road is not diverted. I totally support the maintaining of the curfew and would strongly oppose any changes to it. I also support privatisation of the airport preferring, if possible, to have local consortium ownership. Nevertheless, we must upgrade the airport and, to do that, we must have privatisation. We must get South Australia economically viable again and also boost tourism, which is of paramount importance.

With this in mind, we heard of the Labor Party convention last weekend, probably equating it with *Hey, Hey, It's Saturday* and other comedy relief shows. After copping the hiding of their lives in December, members of the Labor Party still cannot get it right. Disunity, division, faction fighting and squabbles; and these divisions continue to haunt them and to white-ant them, destroying them as a viable, credible Party. The *Advertiser* of 8 August reads—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr LEGGETT:** It is all very well for the member for Hart to open his mouth now: the damage has been done. The article states:

The Labor Party convention overwhelmingly opposed the sale of the airport to the private sector. The Left faction in South Australia had claimed a major victory by getting the conference to condemn the Brown Government and their own Federal Cabinet for moving to sell the airport.

Enter the Federal Treasurer (Hon. Ralph Willis) with a statement that blew the Opposition clean out of the water again. The Adelaide Airport, he says, will not be upgraded until it is sold to private operators. This, of course—contrary to the terribly feeble attempts by the member for Hart at the moment—is commonsense and will mean that the airport will not be upgraded until it is sold. His warning severely embarrassed the State branch of the Labor Party which, only hours earlier, had voted to oppose the sale to the private sector: a stunning defeat, as has already been stated today, for the Leader of the Opposition. It is a classic case of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing.

Is it any wonder that Premier Brown called the decision 'astounding'? He says that it shows that the ALP is still brawling between its union and political factions. It was then left to the Opposition Leader and the member for Playford, who is called the Left wing power broker, to try to pick up the pieces. Certainly, it can be likened to *Hey, Hey, It's Saturday*, with the two comic strip characters, Ossie Ostrich and Dicky Knee. With considerable pain, I am sure, the original motion before the convention was amended to recognise the need for the terminal to be upgraded and the main runway extended. The motion also called for the FAC to commit itself immediately to a major upgrade, but it was the Federal Treasurer, whose statement, according to the media, really did the damage to that convention, because he said:

But it would be the case, I think, that under private ownership you would be more likely to see intensive activity to try to develop that airport. Privatisation would mean that there would be some fast-tracking of expenditure on airports and more likely to be local people concerned to improve the airport and give it a higher priority than would come from a centralised body like the FAC.

That is exactly how the Opposition floundered last weekend, and it continues to flounder, to miss the mark and to slowly drown. Look at them over there: drowning men. The 7.8 per cent swing that is needed to win Spence for the Government at the next election seems now a very real possibility.

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** What a very amusing contribution from the member for Hanson today. However, I do note that eight months into this Parliament he still has to read word for word his five minutes contribution to this debate. Have they not been a sombre looking lot today? I do not know what happened in their Caucus meeting today, but it must have been a ripper. There have been very drawn faces on the back bench today, and the number of oncers is expanding. In our best estimation some months ago we thought there were probably six to eight oncers; after today's decision, it is more

like 12 to 14. We saw the member for Unley on the *7.30 Report* last night condemning any change to shopping hours. We saw the member for Norwood on television last night condemning any changes to shopping hours. We have seen the member for Colton and his 50 000 signature petition condemning any changes to shopping hours.

Every single backbencher on the Liberal Party side of the House has condemned any changes to shopping hours. But where were their guts? They have all queued up to get on Channel 7 and Channel 9. They have all wanted their 15 minutes of fame, to get on television, to get in the press and condemn any changes, and what happens? They wimp out in Caucus. They get some mealy-mouthed solution from the Minister and the Premier to save face—and he does not even have the guts to bring a Bill into this Chamber. He wants to change it by regulation. The Minister for Industrial Affairs knows that he cannot get it through the House, because members opposite will cross the floor.

The Premier and the Minister for Industrial Affairs know they cannot deliver their Caucus on this, because the members for Colton, Unley, Norwood and right throughout the Liberal Party backbench will cross the floor. It is pathetic. Nothing has so typified the vacillation and the incapability of the Premier to deliver firm decisions. This Premier and his Ministers are incapable of making a decision. Even when it is a tough decision, they cannot handle it. They cannot handle the heat in the kitchen. We have had inquiry after inquiry; committee after committee; we have had an extension of deliberations with the excuse, 'We will need more time to consult'; and then they go to jelly. I say to those five Cabinet Ministers who want total deregulation that, whilst I totally disagree with them, at least they had the guts to take on their Premier; and, no doubt, that is permeating throughout the Liberal Party as they all challenge him.

We all saw the member for Norwood on television last night: he took on the Premier. The member for Unley took on the Premier last night, and the member for Colton took on the Premier last night. And congratulations: you won! The backbench of the Liberal Party has defeated the Premier and the Minister and have made the Premier and Minister look foolish. The Premier and Minister today looked foolish with their decision. We also heard much today from the Premier about what may have happened at the Labor Party convention on the weekend. I look forward to seeing how the Premier goes at his convention on the weekend, when the Premier lines up with his fellow wets to challenge the dries led by Senator Nick Minchin. We will see whether the Premier can drive through his requirements in the Party for preselection against Senator Nick Minchin, because I suspect on that score Senator Nick Minchin and the dries will win the day and we will see the Premier rolled by his Party.

Before he walks into the Chamber and tries to have a go at this side of the House for what may have happened at the Labor Party convention, let us look at what might happen at the Liberal Party State Council this weekend. I might add that the Liberal Party does not have the guts to admit the media to that meeting, and nor does it have the guts to allow it to be televised because it is a weak, closed Party. As one media person said to me on the weekend, 'It is more like afternoon tea with the blue rinse set than a policy debate.'

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** After listening to that load of tripe, when the member for Hart clearly knows the mess that the Labor Party is in at the moment, it is good to get on with the job of governing and getting this State back into

order. I was not very surprised when I turned on the television at the weekend, because I thought that I would see infighting within the Labor Party, yet I saw shadow Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition having a crack at the Liberal Party about what it will supposedly do in a catastrophic manner with the budget on 25 August. It is amazing when the Labor Party comes out with these sorts of statements that it never wants to remind the public of South Australia who caused the problem, who drove this State into destruction in just 10 short years, who increased the deficit by about 900 per cent in that time, who did not fund any of the liabilities that we should have been starting to fund for our children's future and who did not have it in its heart to look after this State. This State, until the previous Government came to power, was one of the best States in Australia.

Of course, the previous Government did nothing to fix the problem. All it did was watch while the problem blew out. In fact, it blew out year in, year out for the last five or six years that it was in power. Who will fix the problem? The Brown Liberal Government will fix the problem, and it is the Brown Liberal Government that is already well on the way to achieving that. The Labor Party cannot stand that because it hits a raw nerve. I often wonder whether members opposite have any nerves at all, particularly when it comes to accepting their pay cheques every month. The fact is that members opposite probably have one raw nerve left. They cannot stand the fact that we are getting on with fixing this State. Of course, 'Do not blame me Lynn', who in my opinion is one of the better, more decent members opposite, has been put in there to try to plug the gaps. However, when you have as many gaps as the Labor Party of South Australia, not even a man like Lynn Arnold can plug them.

In trying his best to put on a bold face in front of the cameras, even he, as good an actor as he may be, is not able to really get the message across to the public about the increase in taxes and charges that the Brown Government will supposedly bring in. Let me remind members opposite that, under the Arnold-Bannon Government and under those Opposition members still here today, we saw the highest increases in taxes and charges of any State in Australia over that period. They were much higher than any other State. What happened under the previous Government? The State went further and further down the gurgler. Today we have a chance to get this State back in order.

I have spoken in this House on many occasions about the good things that are already happening. You never hear those things supported by members opposite. The classic case is the Worrina project. It is a real opportunity for this State and particularly for my electorate, which is screaming out for job creation and development. We see members opposite almost hoping that the Worrina project will not get up. How disgusting!

What gall they have to carry on like this when the people of South Australia are clearly saying that it is about time we got on with some development. Here we have an opportunity to bring in the largest and greatest tourism project for South Australia. Members opposite are almost gloating about the fact that they are trying to destroy that opportunity. How about getting behind us? How about recognising the fact that Asia is a large trading partner, and how about opening the door with us and saying, 'Welcome to South Australia. We look forward to many partnerships with you in the future.' Of course, the Labor Party does not know much about development. We saw \$2.5 billion worth of development lost by the Labor Party. People put up their hands and said they wanted

to have a go. What happened under the former Labor Government? They were not given that go. What is the result? High unemployment, massive debt, lack of replacement of infrastructure and a very slim chance for our children.

Today we have an opportunity. The opportunities are there, and we will not let the 11 members opposite, who are obviously still hell-bent on destroying this State, stop us from getting on with the job. The Liberal Party consults with the people, and clearly we did that with respect to trading hours. The Liberal Party was not bought off by a couple of big boys like the Labor Party was just before the election because it needed a few dollars to try to have another crack at us before it left Government. We sat down and consulted. In united and typical Liberal Government fashion we had a meeting this morning where a united result came out for our Government.

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** Earlier today I asked the Premier a question about the privatisation of Adelaide Airport. I have had trouble relating the statements made in *Hansard* by both the member for Hart and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition with statements made on the weekend. I would like to refer to those statements, particularly from the member for Hart. I refer to page 61 of *Hansard* of 3 August, where the member for Hart said, 'I consider very few issues—

**Mr QUIRKE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I believe the member is quoting directly from the *Hansard* of the current session of Parliament, and that is against Standing Orders.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Playford is correct. It is not appropriate to quote from *Hansard* for the current session. I ask the member for Mitchell to refrain.

**Mr CAUDELL:** On 3 August—if I can remember exactly what happened in the House—the member for Hart made a number of statements, and in that regard I think he said something about the need for development. He said that there was nothing more important for development in this State than the upgrading of Adelaide Airport. He went on to say that the Federal Airports Corporation (FAC) had been given long enough to upgrade our airport and that it was time to privatise the airport, extend the runway and upgrade the airport. Later in his speech, the member for Hart went on to say something like, 'I would urge all members to consider this issue carefully because it is an important issue relating to the development of South Australia. I am prepared to stick my neck out in terms of the Labor Party.' They were the words of the member for Hart.

Unfortunately, on the weekend he obviously did not stick his neck out long enough because his head is still attached to his shoulders. Obviously, he did not attempt to put that point of view to the convention: the point of view in favour of development and prosperity in this State. On 3 August the Deputy Leader of the Opposition told the House, 'But we will also be patriots, putting our State's interests before Party concerns.' When I listened to these statements and related them to the activities on the weekend, I had a good giggle when I heard the Labor Party come up with its campaign slogan: 'Labor listens.' It is obvious that the Labor Party is listening, but it is listening to the wrong people. Labor obviously listened to Marcus Clark but unfortunately it forgot to listen to the Treasury. The Labor Party listens to the trade unions but does not listen to business or small business, despite the rhetoric of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in his speech on 3 August.

The Labor Party obviously listens to interest groups such as the Left wing of its Party, but it does not listen to the general community. The Labor Party does not listen to the community or to the member for Hart, who said that there will never be an issue as important to the development of this State as the upgrading and improvement of Adelaide Airport. The Labor Party obviously listens to interest groups and not the community when it comes to the issue of shop trading hours. Nothing is more important than ensuring that we continue to attract to this State people who are looking to invest in shopping centres and businesses and who need to obtain a worthwhile return for their investment. They will never get that return while their businesses are shut, unable to trade and unable to satisfy the consumers of this State.

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** The contribution made by the member for Mitchell was a curious one. I wanted to hear what the member for Mitchell would have said on television last night to Leigh and the gang at Collinswood. It was said on that program—and I was waiting for him to get up and say that it was wrong—that he supported deregulation because his office is at Westfield. What was also said on that program, which I thought was outrageous—

**Mr CAUDELL:** On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, the member for Playford has made a statement in the House, in relation to the ABC news program last night, that is totally wrong.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member is not drawing attention to a point of order: it is simply a personal dispute.

**Mr QUIRKE:** Last night I was looking forward to seeing the member for Mitchell have a bit of courage, come on television and say where he stands. After all, a few others told us last night that the back benchers had the numbers. Who was telling us that? We had the conscience of the Liberal Party, the conscience of the backbench—the member for Unley. We also heard for the first time from the member for Norwood: he opened his mouth. I have not seen him since December last year. He comes in here and he is always writing—I do not know what he is writing. I never hear him say anything. Occasionally, he gets up and asks a question or two, but last night there was no nonsense about it: he and his mates had the numbers to ensure that there would be no change to shop trading hours in South Australia. It must have been a ripper of a meeting this morning. It is always said that, when the jury is out for a while, it will come back with a finding of ‘innocent’, as people could not make up their minds and the guilty party will probably get off on a majority vote.

Today we noted that the meeting went on and on. The Liberal Party could have used it as a fundraiser. A curious statement was made in the House today that things will not stay the same, that the CBD will be open for Sunday trading and that there will be another night’s trading in the suburbs. I would have thought that, after such a long meeting at which everyone would have vented their spleen (particularly after last night’s television program), we would have seen a group of members refreshed and happy with the decision. I have not seen one who looks even remotely pleased that the Liberal Party has ratted on only most but not all of the promises it made. It told the big supermarkets that eventually it would deregulate the lot. It is fascinating to hear members use the very mechanism that they criticised so much last year, namely, section 5.

The member for Norwood is well known for changing not only sides and positions: I could use more colourful language in regard to someone who was once in our left wing, and that seems to impress members around here so much. The member for Ross Smith and I will give the members for Norwood, Mitchell and Unley an opportunity. We will see how the conscience reacts. We will move to suspend that mechanism, which the Minister intended to use today because he knows that he cannot rely on the numbers in this House in relation to this issue, as there has to be a limit in terms of ratting on all the promises made. That limit will be evident in all the preselection colleagues of the Liberal Party of South Australia—the storekeepers who are lining up out there. If they think that they have been listening to the storekeepers, they should wait until the news of today starts to filter through.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I will refer briefly to the comments of the member for Playford. It is incredible to hear him and his colleagues opposing Sunday trading when they were the ones who introduced it. It is quite incredible. If ever there was a hypocritical situation, it is the one that applies right now. I would love to know their policy. Obviously they do not know, but it would be a waste of time my trying to find out, as they would not have the foggiest idea. Sunday trading applied before the last election but, now that the Liberal Party is bringing in restricted Sunday trading, members opposite do not like it and are trying to make a political issue of it. It is a pity that there is not more cooperation in this State and that, after the election result, the Labor Opposition does not realise what the people of this State have said: they want unity and bipartisanship in decision making to get South Australia back on track.

What have we had in this Parliament in this session? We have had harping and negative questions being asked in Question Time. I do not know what members opposite are trying to do. They would say that they are trying to embarrass the Government, after all the embarrassment that they have caused.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Exactly, as the member for Ridley said. Today we had a witch hunt against a Malaysian development, yet we heard that members opposite were wine and dining some of these people in earlier times. I am staggered. We have no doubt about why this State went downhill and why the former Government was not able to run this State. It lost \$3.15 billion before the last election: it was like a rudderless ship. I wonder how many of the 11 members we will see back after the next election. The way they have been going, they need to change tack by 360 degrees, otherwise they will have had it at the next election. Their Leader is simply hanging on, possibly for a few months. He indicated that being in Opposition was like being on long service leave, but it seems as though he has been on extended long service leave since becoming Leader. It is obvious that some members opposite are waiting to take over. It is a question of when and a matter of timing. They have not got anything right so far, so I doubt that they will get their timing right in this instance.

It is an embarrassment to hear the member for Playford carry on in the way he does, given that he knows that his own Government used the exemptions relating to shop trading hours on 883 occasions. He has the gall now to ask, ‘Why is the Government using that method? Surely a Bill should be introduced.’ Obviously, he is putting forward a complete fallacy.

What I wanted to refer to today is the fact that the Liberal Party is well under way in achieving one of the promises made before the last State election, namely, to seek to freehold shacks given life tenure over the past few years. I was pleased to have the opportunity on Wednesday 22 June to join with members of the Shack Site Freeholding Committee in the electorate of Goyder. We started at Wallaroo, North Beach, and proceeded to Balgowan, Chinamen's Well, Black Point and Rogues Point on the first day.

I was impressed and pleased with the composition of the committee—which is headed by a former member of this House, the Hon. Peter Arnold—and with the way in which the committee set about its undertakings on, I think, the first occasion it had gone to have a look at the shacks. The Minister recently said that the committee was well under way with its investigations. I wish it well with its deliberations. I had hoped to go into a few specifics about shacks, but time in this grievance debate will not allow it. I hope it will not be too long before decisions are made about the unacceptable situation in relation to life tenure shacks so that people can have real tenure and will know what the future holds for them in what is an integral part of our lifestyle in this State.

---

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 4 August. Page 100.)

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurana):** I am pleased to support the motion and I am happy to reaffirm my loyalty to the Queen of Australia and to her South Australian representative, Dame Roma Mitchell. I take this opportunity also to reaffirm my loyalty to the Australian flag and to the Australian Constitution. Prior to my contribution, I congratulate the mover of the motion, the member for Chaffey, on his outstanding speech. I appreciated such a balanced, well researched address, which put down our Government's achievements and forward program succinctly, without the unnecessary theatre associated with some members opposite.

In this contribution, I want to focus, first, on those areas of reform which were initiated in the previous session and which I believe have been significant. It is impossible in the allocated time to cover all the Government's achievements in that first session, but I do not want it to be interpreted that those that are missed are considered to be unimportant. In the area of health, the significant effect of casemix will be felt through increased efficiency and cost savings but, most importantly, not at the expense of patient care or adequate service delivery. The Noarlunga Hospital and the Noarlunga Health Services are excited about the introduction of casemix funding because of the added opportunity it will open for their services. The Noarlunga Hospital received accreditation in April this year, and that is an important achievement for such a new establishment.

The health services at Noarlunga provide a unique integration of hospital and allied health services linked to community health. The expanded possibilities under this Government's health reforms are important and should be noted. One of the key areas that requires reform in Australia and South Australia is family and community services. The Department for Family and Community Services needs to

work hard to ensure that, by its activity, it can demonstrate that a Liberal Government's policy of family unity and promotion of the family is its prime aim. Unfortunately, I believe it has a long way to go. I am confident that, under the direction of the present Minister, this desired direction will succeed.

As an indication of this, the department has already set in train the Keeping Families Together Program, which is designed to allow intervention into families in crisis and to address issues causing family rift. No longer should it be acceptable that the solution is to separate the family structure as the first choice: rather, it is a last resort. Naturally, there will be situations where the breakdown of the family will be unavoidable, but it is my belief that in the past it was accepted that the separation process was the automatic one, and I do not accept that this should continue.

I am particularly unhappy at the community perception that young children can decide, for whatever reason, that life at home is too difficult and opt to become the young homeless. Before those who are just waiting to misinterpret my words jump in, let me say that I see departments such as FACS being there for genuine cases, and there are genuine cases. However, let it also be understood that there are plenty of non-genuine cases, where the system is being used to advantage. This is the group who opt to become the young homeless. When a situation exists in our society where a daughter of 14 years or a son of 13 years can say and believe, because of examples they know about, that all they need to do is to visit the social worker at FACS and tell a good story to be successfully classified as homeless and supported away from the family, we have a problem.

Quite often the family does not know the child's whereabouts, and I know personally of families in Noarlunga that have disintegrated because of the stress that these situations have caused. This is the image that our Government must work towards removing, and the creation of the Office of the Family is a step in the right direction: it will provide advice to families and make available programs and services to promote family life.

During my term in Parliament, I look forward to seeing dramatic changes in this area. I am pleased that our Government has introduced the 24-hour domestic violence phone service, as it is an important service to victims, who in the past have been left largely in a wilderness. This service, linked to the Domestic Violence Bill, which was passed in the last session of Parliament, finally recognises domestic violence as a crime with a declared penalty.

The extension of the seniors' card directory to include an additional 50 businesses is a great success for our senior citizens and a vote of confidence in the program by business. Community achievements during the past session of Parliament have been numerous, but most notably I wish to acknowledge the hours of dedicated volunteer work put in by the women to promote this the centenary of women's suffrage. I have had the privilege to address many groups during this time, and I feel a great sense of satisfaction about the coming together of groups of women from many varying backgrounds and interests to celebrate the one thing—votes for women and the privilege to stand for election to this place.

I place on record my support for the changes made in the past session of Parliament in the areas of law and order and the justice system. The push by the Minister for Emergency Services and the Attorney-General is a clear response to the majority of South Australians. To see the changes and decisions criticised in the media is amazing when, in every



meeting I attend, in every survey that I conduct and in general contacts to my electorate office, the concerns are clear: people want those who are guilty to pay the price and to serve an adequate sentence, and they want the innocent to be protected. I put on record my encouragement to the Government to push ahead with this reform, which is long overdue. Our truth in sentencing, stalking and domestic violence legislation, and changes to the sexual abuse laws against children are a start. The collocation of the MFS and ambulance service is an obvious and sensible thing to do, with agreement from both bodies, and I encourage continuation of this practice wherever possible.

My background interests and my area of study would not allow me to leave out the achievements of the Minister for Primary Industries in support of the 250 Land Care groups and the introduction of measures to control South-East dry land salinity. There is ongoing support for sustainable cereal cropping through two programs, Right Rotations and Nitrogen 600. Secondly, an area of immense achievement during our Government's first session of Parliament involved business and promotion, and industry reform and investment. I must say that I had to have a chuckle when I read that the member for Hart offered to sit down with our Government to tell us how the State operates. He said, 'You cannot shoot any bird that flies past in terms of investment.' May I remind the member for Hart of the several eagles that went down under his Government. It could not even keep the sparrows aflight. Thank goodness our Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development does not spend time with such losers.

An annual additional 7 500 full-time jobs have been created since January 1994. These jobs have come from a significant influx of expanded and new business in our State, for example, Motorola, Australis, Mitsubishi, the Wirrina Resort and the \$20 million SAGRIC/Kinhill Engineers irrigation project in Shandong province, where South Australian made irrigation equipment is being produced to service four provincial cities and to water 4 500 hectares of orchard.

The \$200 million redevelopment of the Wirrina Cove Resort on the far south coast is a particularly exciting boon for the southern electorates. Packages can now be developed to sell various parts of the southern area with or without conference connections. The added jobs that this will promote in our southern region are needed. Investments in the wine industry of \$300 million to \$400 million over the next three years will be made possible by innovations such as the reuse of Aldinga Beach sewerage water by our Government. The bonus of this vineyard production is that it adds an economic use to good agricultural land in our Willunga Basin, hence it will protect it from future urban sprawl. This same area was to house 70 000 people under the previous Government's plans. The loss of agricultural potential and ecotourism possibilities would have been tragic for our area.

The announcement by Mitsubishi Motors of \$450 million to manufacture new vehicles in Adelaide is a great boost to southern employment. It must be put on the record that securing all these new business investments has come about as a result of the added confidence in this Government and the negotiating skills of the Premier and the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing and Small Business.

Initiatives under the latter mentioned portfolios, such as the Rebuilding South Australia Program, have led to 3 500 inquiries and the creation of 900 new jobs using the provision of the WorkCover subsidy alone, and 27 small businesses

have been assisted in becoming new exporters under the Exporters' Challenge Scheme. Our Government's \$100 million commitment to the construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway matches the Northern Territory Government's commitment. It is hoped that in the near future the Federal Government may take its eyes off flags and republics long enough to address the real issues facing Australia.

The significant changes made to industrial relations in the last session of Parliament have been quickly accepted by business and workers and will lead to enterprise bargaining to benefit all outside of the need for union interference. The fact that, since the end of compulsory unionism by this Government, union membership in the public sector has dropped to 30 per cent is clearly an indication of the relevance with which employees view the union movement in the industrial relations system. The fear campaigns waged recently to scare people back into membership were subtle and simply have not worked. WorkCover reforms effective on 1 July 1994 are aimed at saving \$20 million a year with the bottom line still the protection of genuinely hurt workers.

There have been and are ongoing improvements in education in South Australia, with the bottom line being an improvement in the education outcomes of our children. The fair discipline policy will give principals greater power to expel some students and will be trialled in 1995. School violence is not and will not be accepted by this Government. I intend to work through the problems of school violence openly and frankly, and I invite others to do the same. The problem cannot be ignored and will not be adequately addressed until we accept that the problem exists and work together to rectify it. Our basis for the ongoing education policy is to give students a sound base of skills and knowledge, and basic skills testing literacy and numeracy will commence in 1995 for years 3 and 5 students.

I am particularly happy about that because parents constantly tell me that they feel in the wilderness under the current system because they have very little idea of how their child is doing in comparison to other children of the same age and the accepted norm for the age group. Continually I hear the frustration of parents who have bright children and feel that they are not adequately pushed to excel. It is obviously a hangover from the attempts of a Labor regime to remove competition and acceptance of excellence from every walk of life, where the average is okay and to promote excellence is seen as elitism. It is time to put this philosophy well behind us.

As announced by the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education recently, the excellent work started by our Government in DETAFE through the employment broker scheme has employed 102 people in full-time jobs at the end of training. At last we are training people for real jobs and not simply training people to remove the embarrassment of the numbers on the unemployment list.

Thirdly, the reform program that was so successful in the last session of Parliament will be continued and most particularly in the area of public sector reform. The streamlining of ETSA to improve our competitiveness, the corporatisation of EWS, the total reorganisation of SACON and a program of land asset sales by the Urban Land Trust are well in train.

I would like to place on record my sincere thanks to the South Australian public sector for the patience and goodwill that have existed throughout the very difficult changeover period. The TSP program, which has had an overwhelming response, has placed immense pressure on departments under

change and added pressure for those left behind to restructure the department.

Tourism marketing boards are being established to promote regional tourism, which will be important to the promotion of our southern region with its varied and widespread facilities. I must put on record my appreciation of the work of the member for Mawson in putting into place the tourism information centre at McLaren Vale to serve the whole of the southern region. Reforms have been developed to help seniors, such as the health of older persons policy, and the seniors' information service is being established.

The two community-based X-ray screening clinics to be established are a very important reform in health. The second mobile unit will certainly be a great support for country women. The development of the State conservation strategy and sustainable development of the State's water resources are to be welcomed and are long overdue. The Minister for Environment and Natural Resources should be congratulated for these initiatives. The much talked about and long overdue third arterial road will finally be made a reality by our Government. That project is a clear indication of our recognition of the needs of our southern community.

Finally, I want to record for the House the various achievements and initiatives in the Kaurna electorate. First, I put on record my appreciation of the level of community participation in my advisory groups and in public meetings. At first it was difficult to get community participation in Kaurna, because many residents had never been asked for their opinions before. There was a certain level of suspicion about why they were being asked and about what I was going to do with the information. However, that suspicion has now been well overcome and the community involvement is excellent. On reflection, it is not hard to understand the public's suspicion when one considers the attitude of the Opposition, put into words in this House recently by the member for Hart, when he said:

You never set up an inquiry unless you know what the outcome is.

That is a fairly cynical view on the part of a member of Parliament—someone who I would have thought should be going out and seeking the views of the community on every issue.

The improvements to the Lonsdale train and bus station, as promised prior to the election, are well under way and accepted well by the community of O'Sullivan Beach. The amalgamation of the upper and lower primary schools of O'Sullivan Beach are progressing well with full participation and cooperation of the school staff and parents.

The Noarlunga College theatre management needs to be congratulated for achieving the agreement of the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra to perform in Noarlunga. The performance was superb and the theatre is a valuable asset for Noarlunga. The new FACS building was opened recently, as was the Seaford Rise Primary School and the Seaford Catholic School.

Community consultation on the proposed Seaford 6 to 12 school has been extensive. It is recognised that the new school will be commenced in 1995 and opened in 1996 with intakes from years 7, 8 and 9. This is an important project for our electorate and will provide, at last, an opportunity for students to attend a high school in their own location. The excellent work of Alan Young and his team at the Noarlunga TASS Centre must be recorded. Stage 1 of the Aldinga community police station was opened in May by the Premier.

The staff of this police station have integrated well into the local community. The large number of reports over the last two months of operation clearly justifies the establishment of the facility. I look forward to many members of the community now reporting crime which previously had gone unrecorded because of lack of belief that the police would respond to our area.

The Aldinga area has an improved bus timetable following consultation with the community, and further bus routes are being trialled through other areas within the electorate. Moana and Moana South coastal car parks are now covered by a dry zone classification. Additions to Noarlunga TAFE to the value of \$11 million are well under way. Two new youth officers have been placed at Christies Beach police station to administer the new Juvenile Justice Act. The southern sports complex which has been constructed in my electorate will give an added boost to local facilities, and the \$1.5 million that this Government has put towards that will also aid community facilities.

The Government will continue to push ahead with its reform agenda in this current session of Parliament. We will be looking forward to a slightly more positive contribution from the Opposition than we are used to seeing. Most importantly, as a State, I believe we will be fighting for our very existence, fighting to maintain our independence of a central domination and that control that seems to be becoming ever closer from Canberra. I support the motion.

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** Members on the Opposition benches have spent a lot of time over the past week quoting their interpretation of things I have said in Parliament. It is interesting that just one member of the Opposition is present, and she, just this minute, came into the Chamber. I say to those members of the Opposition who are skulking in their office that, if they want to quote what they think I said—and I refer especially to the member for Playford—they should come in here and listen instead of trying to put their own interpretation on those speeches, which I doubt they have read.

I refer, in particular, to the member for Playford, who last week on radio, regarding a matter which I had raised in this House, accused me of having found a conscience because I lost 3 per cent of the vote. I suggest to the member for Playford, who is very good at selectively quoting the record of this House, that he should come into this Chamber more often to take a more intelligent part in the debate, or at least to listen. In that context, I refer to my speech in this Parliament on 23 February 1994. In the context of the Supply Bill and with reference to the Opposition I said:

Day after day they hurled at us the title 'economic rationalists'. I put to you, Sir, that after the member for Playford's speech tonight that mantle sits rather more perfectly on his shoulders than it does on the shoulders of many members on the Government benches. I commend the Treasurer and the Premier for their courage in going to the electorate and promising what we would try to achieve: to help the people and to fulfil a mandate which the previous Premier and his predecessor introduced into this place—a mandate for social justice for the people.

Indeed, in my Address in Reply speech, my first contribution in this Chamber as the member for Unley, I said:

That does not excuse the necessity for our accountability before the people.

With reference to Bannon's election defeat in 1993, I said that the beginning of that defeat started in 1985, and that, if we looked at the election victory and the characteristics of Governments which successively followed that election

victory, we would see a profound lesson for all members of this House, not the least being those members who sit on the Government benches. I said further on that same day:

We are very worried because there will be a huge responsibility on members on this side of the House to act not only as a constructive Government but to see if we are doing anything wrong and to act as an effective Opposition, because it is already obvious that there will be no Opposition worth noting coming from the other side of the House.

If anyone thinks that any member on this side of the House is prepared to allow this Government to be like the former Labor Government, they have a lot of thinking to do.

Finally, I refer the member for Playford to my speeches on the Wiltshire Aboriginal education program on 9 March 1994, the Domestic Violence Bill on 11 May 1994 and the Criminal Law Consolidation Bill on 4 May 1994. Before the member for Playford comes in here or goes on the radio playing the hypocrite, let him look at the speeches I have made in this place consistently and the speeches I made during the last Parliament which always—I put to you, Mr Speaker, as a person who was here—have been in favour of the people first, the people second, the people third, and accountable Government. Then let him say that anything I have said in this place is inconsistent or adopts a different point of view from one I have adopted previously. On that count, I would like to say that there is and will be no disloyalty from me as the member for Unley towards my Party or, more importantly, my electorate.

My sole reason for contributing in this place is to assist this Party to be the best and most effective Government it is capable of being. If my raising of certain issues and my questioning of the Government assists it in being a better Government, I would count my job well done and I believe that you would also. I would like to conclude this portion of the speech by saying that, in relation to the past week, a day is a long time in politics but a week can apparently be an eternity. One comment I would like to make is about those in this city who purport to be political commentators. They are entitled to their opinion, I respect their opinion, and I have never in this place before commented on their opinion; but I would hope that when they seek to express an opinion it is one that is based on fact, is well-considered and is one that represents a balanced viewpoint of what was said or what occurred.

In relation to a couple of press comments made recently, I must say that, while those people are aptly entitled to make those points, if they want to be political commentators in this State and want to be taken seriously, they should inform themselves and serve the people of this State by making important and proper comment rather than writing articles which suit a particular whim and which are not properly researched. One of those articles contains the following sentence:

Brindal, an overly fervent John Olsen supporter. . .

I want to say this: anything I have done in this Parliament has nothing to do with any personal friendships that I might have. I have never denied my personal friendships with people and I do not intend to start now. There is a saying in Shakespeare that I have always held to be true, and it is this: 'Those friends that thou hast whose adoptions tried, grapple them to thy heart with hoops of steel.' I do not think that there is a place in our society for people who walk away from their friends. I have friends and I stick by that. I deny that that makes me overly fervent or overly anything. I have friends; I am not afraid to stand up for my actions; I am not afraid to

admit to what I have done. That is the beginning of it and that is the end of it. Anyone who would make more of it is a fool and ill-advised—and enough said on that matter.

The Address in Reply speech deals with the Governor's speech to this House about the intentions of the Executive Government in this session. Those intentions are both laudable and commendatory. Many speakers before me have spoken on what the Executive Government has achieved in the nine months that it has been in power and what it hopes to achieve over the next few months. However, I wish to spend some of the time available to me today to put forward issues we might consider for the future, because if there has been a consistent failing of previous Labor Governments, especially previous Bannon Governments, it was the lack of any dream at all.

There is a line I think in *Joseph and his Technicolour Dream Coat*: 'Any dream will do.' In that context all members of this House in the last Parliament were almost praying that the then Government would do something, that it would have some dream or some vision, because it was so paralysed by inertia, so lacking in anything other than a reason for its own preservation and some justification of its own efforts that it completely lost the plot. As members of the then Opposition, it is true to say that we would have given something for any vision at all, let alone what we got, which was absolutely nothing.

Referring back to what I said previously about friendships, I recall well, when I came into this Chamber, having a discussion with somebody who entered this Parliament at the same time as me, at which time we both discussed quite seriously what could happen in the unlikely event that John Bannon should no longer be Premier of South Australia and a member of the Labor Party. My young colleague, a Labor member of Parliament, absolutely refused to concede that that was any sort of possible scenario, or even humanly possible. He believed that John Bannon would be Premier in this House, sitting where the Minister is at present, right up to and including the end of this decade if that was his choice. I raise that in this context because, while members of the Opposition are busy commenting on what happens on this side of the House and in this Party, they should first look to their own housekeeping.

The previous member for Ross Smith led them for 10 years. He was the Premier in this place and was 'Mr 75 per cent' and they put him up daily as the scythe cutter, the Grim Reaper of the Opposition, and said that no-one could stand in his way. He was 'Mr Immaculate', 'Mr Perfect', 'Mr Everything else'. Where is he now? And more importantly where are they now? The man who led them and who was, in effect, their super hero for 10 years has now been treated worse than anybody. He has been outcast; he has been despised; he has been rejected and they basically do not want to know him. Let me say to the members opposite: my friends are my friends, and I will not walk away from them in the same way that the Labor Party has walked away from the man who was their Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I notice that the number of Opposition members has now doubled to two; but I must admit that the quality has not improved from that which was here a few minutes ago.

**Mr Quirke:** What happened to you? You got done like a dinner, didn't you?

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member will have a chance to make his response. I call him to order.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The honourable member might have the profile of Tiberius but he has the political brain of Caligula. He is the sort of person who will come in here and appoint his horse consul one day.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Yes, as the member says, even that is complimentary. I do not know what the member for Playford thinks he knows.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Unley has the floor, with or without the horse.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I do not know what the member for Playford thinks he knows. He appears in this Parliament to have set himself up as some sort of political commentator on the Liberal Party. I suspect that the member for Playford is worried about his seat. He sees the declining vote in Playford. He realises that, contrary to the propaganda which he puts out about us having a lot of 'oncens', indeed he might be for the high jump after the next poll. He is looking for a job. The job he wants is to join the ABC or the *Adelaide Review*, or somewhere else, as a political commentator on the—

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Playford interjects that he would like to interview me. It would give me a great deal of pleasure. I would give anything to be interviewed by the member for Playford after the next election, provided I was still the member for Unley and he was an interviewer with someone else. I think every member of this House would willingly be interviewed by the honourable member opposite under those conditions.

As I said, the Bannon Government was about self survival. The Bannon Government had no vision. Sometimes it did not even have the vision between the day it was speaking and the next election. This Government is clearly committed to two priorities. One is a strategy for the present and the second is a strategy for the future. This Government and this Premier has clearly laid down that it sees itself, and will act, as a long term Government, a Government that acts every day in the best interests of South Australians but a Government that, in acting in the daily best interests of South Australians, does not forget the future and makes adequate provision for the future.

In that context I wish to raise a few suggestions today, one of which, being topical, is the preservation of our coastal foreshore. I believe that every member would have read with some dismay of the erosion which continues to occur along our beaches and which is always compounded by the late winter and early spring storms but which, from news reports yesterday, looks as if it is increasing. I would remind the House that in the last Parliament, when we were not on the Treasury benches, I addressed this House several times on the need for the preservation of coastal dunes and on the Somerton Park sandhills in particular. Today I acknowledge the Minister's concern about this issue and that he has established a greenhouse committee. I would urge that, through the resources available to it, the Government take up this matter with the Federal Government, because I believe that greenhouse warming is now a proven affect; that there is a mean rise in sea level. I would remind members of the House that—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I am finding it difficult; I know I should not respond to interjections, but the member for Playford has just told the member for Mitchell that he doubts that he would learn anything by listening to me. I doubt that he is capable

of learning anything, so I do not mind if he keeps reading and does not listen, because he has not learnt anything in four years; why should he change in the next quarter of an hour? Greenhouse warming is a serious issue, especially in a State where, on settlement, all the land between Port Misery (or Port Adelaide, as it is now), Thebarton and the Patawalonga, with the exception of that coastal strip, was natural swampland. So, many of our suburbs are not so very high above sea level, and any rise in the sea level may and probably will have very serious implications for this city. So, I would certainly support the Minister, as I am sure would all members on this side of the House, in looking seriously at the possible implications of the rise in the mean sea level and what measures the Government can take to protect the property of its citizens and the amenity of its foreshores.

I read in the editorial comment of the *Advertiser* something with which I have some sympathy, namely that the State cannot necessarily be expected to protect every asset of every individual willy-nilly. However, this problem will affect not just one individual but many individuals and may have serious ramifications for this city and for other coastal towns throughout South Australia. So, it is a matter which is of national importance, which must be addressed and for which the resources must come from the Federal Government. It is a matter which must be looked at by universities, by the CSIRO and by the national Government. The Federal Government is so busy interfering in the minutiae of State politics that it often forgets the big picture.

We formed this Commonwealth from a federation of the States to look after that which was in the best interests of us all. It seems today that the Federal Government is more interested in interfering with our backyards and in things with which it has no right to interfere but, when it comes to the big picture and things it can and should be looking at, it is away with the pixies. It is away doing something else. It has decimated the CSIRO, one of the finest research organisations of its type not only in this country but possibly in the world—a very fine organisation—while it has run around pursuing its pie in the sky ideas in a trite effort to make political capital and ignore the important issues confronting Australia in the future.

The Federal Government is more interested in arguing about a republic than in the fact that in the end it might lose part of a city. That is about the measure of those who hold power in Canberra. In connection with our own Government, I have spoken on many occasions in this House on the Sturt Creek and the preservation of our waterways. I note with absolute pleasure this Government's commitment, time and money permitting, to re-establish as much of the natural watercourses of the Adelaide Plain as we can, and some second generation parklands along that plain. In my electorate of Unley there is a problem with flooding, caused by the various creeks that flow through that city from the Adelaide Hills. One of them enters the city of Unley via the Glenside Hospital, flows through the southern parklands of the city and out into the city of Unley, and that is prone to flooding.

I believe it would be a very good use of the resources of the cities of Burnside, Unley and Adelaide and, hopefully, also with the facilitation and perhaps some resources of the State and Commonwealth Governments, to pond that creek in the vicinity of the south parklands to make an aquatic area very similar to that which exists in Rymill Park. That would make a place of leisure and of beauty but, in that creation, fulfil some very important conservation goals, one of which could be the return of some of that water to the aquifer

beneath; another of which would be to control the flow of water and so create a flood mitigation scheme that will be of great benefit to the Patawalonga at the bottom end of the system and to the residents of Unley on the way through. It is a scheme which I believe would beautify this city; which would retain and reuse water that is in short supply; and from which nothing but good would come, and I commend it to the Government's consideration.

I would like also to speak about the North Terrace precinct, which seems eternally to occupy the mind of the Adelaide City Council and which has not escaped the deliberations of this Parliament. I suggest to the Government that we should now be looking clearly towards the year 2000 and the centenary of our Federation. In that context, I suggest to the Minister for the Arts that she look seriously at demolishing the whale house at the Adelaide Museum. The whale house was built in the 1920s as a temporary structure, and it masks from North Terrace some of the most distinguished colonial buildings in this country. Straight behind the whale house is the old military barracks, a building of unique colonial value and of a distinct beauty of its own type. If the whale house were knocked down, that complete structure would be exposed to North Terrace and would be flanked by the institute and by the museum, which are beautiful and matching Victoria buildings. Those buildings would flank a vista of colonial splendour, and the whole of North Terrace would be enhanced in the process.

**An honourable member:** It is noted that the member for Playford is leaving.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I am glad the member for Playford is leaving; I cannot concentrate when he is here.

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Playford is interjecting out of his seat.

**Mr BRINDAL:** If a suitable sculpture were to be put in place between North Terrace and the colonial buildings, we could make the vista both historic and symbolic. I know that in Cowell—and I hope that it is still available—is a particularly large piece of jade that has been suggested to me should be placed in that area and carved with an Aboriginal motif to show the link between North Terrace (which is the vibrant, contemporary aspect of the city) and the barracks (which is a living record of the historical development of this city). If that walkway were linked through a sculpture depicting the Aboriginal heritage of this State, we would have a symbolic walk that showed that the journey from colonial South Australia to contemporary South Australia was accomplished only through and with the contribution of Aboriginal culture, which was here before white settlement of this country. That, to me, would be a fitting enhancement of North Terrace and a fitting contribution of this State to our centenary celebrations.

I would also suggest that the Government look very carefully at the red building on the corner of Frome Road and North Terrace. That building was once owned by the School of Mines and is currently owned by the South Australian University. It was once the home of my old school and that of the previous member for Unley, Mr Mayes, Adelaide Tech. In time that building should be acquired by the Government because the university has already announced that it is shifting largely to a city west campus down near the Jam Factory. I believe that building should be acquired by the Government and turned into a museum of technology, similar to the world class Powerhouse Museum in Sydney.

At one stage we had a museum of technology before the Powerhouse Museum was ever thought of, and I believe it is the type of museum that our young people and many of our old people in this city would find worth having and find very rewarding as a hands-on learning experience which we could share with our children. The building is ideal for it. It has wonderful stained glass of inventors and physicists and, as I said, it is an ideal building. This would be an ideal use for the building and it would enhance North Terrace as the cultural precinct for which it is famous.

There are many other things that I and other members on this side of the House could say, but the main message is this: the Governor's speech in opening Parliament was a speech to South Australia of hope and new direction. They can chortle and bleat on the Opposition benches as much as they like, but I clearly heard their Leader and their leaders in a political sense say that they had lost the trust of the people of South Australia. That is true; they did lose that trust at the last election. The Opposition should remember that. The Opposition does not want to, but it should remember that because on this side we are quite prepared to remember it.

We might have a few battles on this side of the House that might be a bit more public than they are on the other side, but in the Liberal Party that is called democracy; it is called expressing a point of view. Certainly, I remind the member for Playford that, if he had done a little bit more in the last Parliament to keep his Executive Government honest, if the Ministers were not so anxious to get a sweet from the head prefect and so sat on their hands and said nothing, if he and the back bench had not sat on their hands and said nothing, a few more of them might be here today. I remind the member for Playford that there were some members on his side of the House whom I put on record as being much better members than he will ever be who are not here now because they failed to heed the lesson of the last Government. They failed dismally and let Opposition members now not play the hypocrite and tell us how to run this State.

They have no idea; they had no idea; they will never have any idea. The Labor Party will only step forward when the bover boys opposite are done away with and when it gets some real people who stand up for real people, who know what politics is about, who are prepared to represent South Australians fiercely and honestly, and who are more worried about their electorates than about the power politics in Trades Hall, or indeed about trying to invent and sustain internecine warfare on this side of the House.

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** I find it interesting that the member for Unley recognised the lack of thought for the future in the Address in Reply and put in a few suggestions of his own because that is something I want to address: a vision for the future. I congratulate Her Excellency the Governor on her address to the Parliament. It was a ceremony conducted with dignity and grace on her part. The speech itself was headed: 'Recovery through Reform.' It went on to outline very little that will assist recovery and precious little of anything of a truly reformist nature. The Kennett Government in Victoria and the Greiner-Fahey Governments in New South Wales were swept in with an agenda for reform—one which has been extensively copied by the current South Australian Government.

Post Hewson, the Brown team election statements were deliberately vague and short on actual policy. There was no real agenda. I assume that the Liberal policy was not detailed because the failure of Dr Hewson to win a Federal election

was widely perceived to be partly due to the way he laid all of his plans on the table to be exposed and picked over rather than relying on the Labor Government to lose the election. The Liberals, I thought, were not about to take that risk in light of the State Labor Government's problems with the State Bank and its poor showing in the polls. Now I am wondering whether I might have been rather too generous to the Liberal Party. It seems increasingly to me as though it in fact had no policies.

When bracing myself for a Kennett style flurry of action and energy on the Liberals' assuming Government, I was met with a soft landing in the form of a series of reports and reviews—a Government which might have known where it was heading but did not know how to get there. When I complained about the seeming lack of policy direction in community health, a member opposite interjected that I should look at the Liberal Party policy document. As a new member of this Parliament I hesitated to give advice, but I would have thought it obvious that when in Government one needs to have more policy input than a few paragraphs in an election campaign document, especially a Liberal Party policy document. You need to be able to tell sections, departments, and clients of the Public Service, for instance, where they are going, whether they will be there in a couple of months time and what direction they should be taking.

Nowhere is this lack of direction more evident than in the Government's approach to targeted separation packages. The Minister for Industrial Affairs has been saying that all those moving from the Public Service have done so entirely voluntarily. He must know that that is not so. What has happened is that rumour has been allowed to circulate within departmental corridors. There have been dark hints that sections will be reduced to skeleton staff, privatised, or simply abolished. Employees have been faced with the choice of taking a reasonable package or a possible future with no real job. I have been disappointed to hear employee after employee say how much they like their job as, say, an ETSA linesman, or an EWS worker, or a road worker, but they were so uncertain of their future job satisfaction or the future of their department that they were about to take the package. They all now face the prospect of finding another job in light of South Australia's high unemployment environment.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** Well, the loss of over 11 000 public servants for a start.

*The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** You are adding to it. So much for the way in which this Government treats its employees and its clients: the public of South Australia. It has created uncertainty, confusion and distrust. Where is the innovation, the direction, the future for South Australia? Where is the blueprint for this State? We have nothing but a faded sepia snapshot of the Playford era, blurred and distorted by the passage of time. This Government's philosophy is, as again aptly described by the member for Unley, one of a slash and burn approach, accompanied by a Playfordian desire to buy in a few industries in competition with other States. Part of this strategy, if it can be dignified as such, is to create a low cost State. This means low wages and reduced conditions for workers.

This Liberal Government approaches the problems facing this State with a negative, destructive view. I contrast this with, for example, the Federal Labor Government's approach to high unemployment and the challenges of restructuring the economy. The Federal Government came up with the Working Nation document, which was achieved with wide

support from the industrial movement and business. Working Nation is an effective package, which combines a vision for the future with a pragmatic map of the way to achieve these ideals. It is a consensus view which enhances its chances of success.

Contrast this with a State Liberal Government in South Australia, which bull-dozes through measures which have been agreed to behind closed doors with special interest groups. Classic examples are the WorkCover and industrial relations Bills. Another salutary example is the clumsy handling of the contract for the outsourcing of the Government's information technology requirements. Craig Mudge, the head of the Government's task force, said the following in the magazine *Managing Information Systems* of July this year:

Using Government procurement as a lever for industry development is a lever you can only really pull once. This is so important to the State's economic development that we've just got to get it right. It's just one of those questions you don't have backup for. When a great general was once asked about the backup plan on one of his campaigns he said, 'This is one so important we don't have a backup.' We're in the same position. We've got to make this work.

Well, that is wonderful—no backup plan because it is too important an issue. If this is the strategy being used by this Government, I would suggest that it reconsider where its true vocation lies. It may well be that it does not have the talent and ability to do its current job.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** I was not in the previous Government. Ralph Willis suggested on the weekend that there was not much intellectual merit in State Government proposals for compensation for Hilmer report reforms. He should look at a number of this State Government's proposals. He might find a lack of moral merit and commonsense as well. The shopping hours issue is also shaping up to follow suit. Despite their rhetoric during and after the election campaign about supporting small business, the Liberals have now well and truly got into bed with their big business mates.

While continuing their pre-election stance of pacifying any interest group going and prevaricating right to the end, the Liberal Government is now moving to the strings being pulled by the big end of town. The losers in the introduction of Sunday trading will specifically be small business, small retailers and the shop assistants who will lose their Sundays. More generally, it will be families. This is biding fair to be the pattern of Liberal Government decisions. Although we hear a lot of talk from the other side about the importance of the family unit and the need to support our way of life, what is actually happening is that Liberal policies are weakening our family-based community, and this is illustrated quite well in the decision to introduce Sunday trading.

That day of rest when the family can participate in sport and/or religious observation, or whatever it likes, is now on the way out. It is weakening the pattern of our society. The household sector is also to bear the brunt of most of the burden of cost-cutting operations. Business, which is to be the major beneficiary, is not being called upon to make a commensurate contribution to the process of debt reduction. Families now face cuts to public schools, health, and family and community services, and an increase in the cost of basic services, such as water and electricity in an environment of widespread employment and uncertainty about Government direction.

In my electorate many families rely on the South Australian Housing Trust for housing and a sympathetic attitude

to their problems. The Minister for Housing seems determined to paint an image of tenants getting too good a deal compared with those in the private rental sector—all a prelude, no doubt, to savage cuts in public housing. Again, this is part of the traditional conservative approach of blaming the poor and disadvantaged for the situation in which they find themselves—the ‘they should pull themselves up by the bootstraps’ line. It ignores the role that Governments can play in making life difficult for certain sections of the community. For example, this Government is looking to raise further revenue through increases in fees and charges. These charges are, by their nature, regressive, and a State Government with any decent program of reform would be looking to wind back these sorts of charges.

Time and again I have heard the story of a family just making do when it is hit with a fine or charge of \$50 that it just cannot afford. We have the ordinary people—the families that this Government purports to represent—shouldering the major burden of debt reduction for this State. Further, we are told that any tax rises will be due to a broadening of the tax range rather than an increase in the tax rate. ‘Broadening’ is, of course, a euphemism for lowering the tax level at which taxes begin. It is not too difficult to see who this affects—the lower end of town. Once again, we have those least able to pay bearing the brunt of cuts. I speak today on behalf of my constituents, many if not most of whom are most vulnerable to the effects of this Government’s policy. I call on this Government to have a bit of flair and vision for the future in its government and to employ a bit of lateral thinking in its policies rather than relying on the old slash, burn and bury policies that have been used and discredited by previous conservative Administrations. I have seen no example of innovative thought by this Government or any determination to do things better.

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** I am amazed that after 10 years and then some of Labor Government in this State and country, the member for Napier comes in here and bleats about the fact that we now have a larger number of people who are poverty stricken than apparently was the case before Labor came to office. Labor has been in power in South Australia, until a few months ago, for most of the past 25 years, yet our position relatively speaking as a State economy is worse off compared with the States which we were ahead of at the time Labor first won office and Frank Walsh became Premier after 28 years of Sir Thomas Playford’s reign, in which we saw unprecedented growth.

The honourable member has lectured us by reading a prepared statement to the House this afternoon, telling us that taxes are regressive. What the devil were Don Dunstan and John Bannon doing to this economy during their terms as Premier if it was not increasing taxes and charges and making us the highest taxed State in the Commonwealth by a mile?

*Ms Hurley interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** We will put right the mess that Labor has left behind. We simply have to accept the fact that Labor allowed this State to get itself into debt. South Australia overspent and also allowed some business enterprises to use the taxpayers’ guarantee to take us into a parlous state of affairs from a per capita debt viewpoint, to the point where we must now accept the fact that we have overspent as a State and must therefore accept a lower standard of living. We have to pay yesterday’s debts, thanks to the ALP. That is where the problem came from—gross incompetence on the part of the ALP, not only in South Australia but also in Canberra. I agree

with the Member for Napier. Taxes are regressive. Go and tell Mr Keating that. He was the bloke who generated the recession we had to have to produce the kind of poverty about which the honourable member bleats. On a number of occasions during my time in this place I have inserted into *Hansard* tables to illustrate the points I have just made.

I do not need to refer to any other authority to illustrate further the validity of what I am saying. It is well known that the mess we are in was created by the incompetence, ignorance and flat earth mentality taken by the Labor Party in its approach to government and responsible administration.

I point out to the member for Napier that an additional 7 200 full-time jobs have been created in this State since the beginning of the year—not even since the day of the election—to the end of June. A number of major investment decisions have also been taken which are increasing the confidence of people and small business in this State to go on, take heart and expand their enterprises and thereby the economy and through that, job opportunities for the people about whom the honourable member bleats.

It is unfortunate when taxes and charges rise. They are regressive, and they are just as regressive as increases in interest charges. When we need to collect that revenue to meet the debts and pay off some of the capital involved in those debts, we must accept that what is left in our purse, just like in a household, is less and the standard of living we can expect is less—thanks not to the Brown Government but to the Bannon Government, the Arnold Government and the Keating Government. Let us lay the blame where it belongs.

Since we won office, we have Motorola, Australis, Mitsubishi, the Wirrina tourism development and the information technology, following decisions to be made soon, about which both the Premier and the Minister for Industrial Affairs have commented in recent days. We have created the Economic Development Advisory Board, under the chairmanship of Ian Webber, to advise the Government on economic development, to streamline the processes that were there before and to make them function better. We have restructured the Economic Development Authority to bring under one umbrella the major agencies with responsibility for facilitating business development.

I also point out that we have a new General Manager of Regional Development appointed within the Economic Development Authority to oversee the encouragement of development in regional South Australia, and that is more than can be said for the kind of policies pursued by the previous Government. Furthermore, deregulation initiatives have been increased through the establishment of a Business Regulations Review Committee, which is in the Department of Premier and Cabinet and which has already got its own Director.

We have seen the legislation introduced by the Minister for Industrial Affairs to facilitate enterprise bargaining and to get rid of a blight on society—unions which do not pursue as their primary reason for existence the interests of the people who pay subscriptions to them. I am talking about unions such as the Public Service Association and the South Australian Institute of Teachers. They have been concerned not about the terms and conditions of employment of their members but about a political agenda; they have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars condemning the kind of propositions which have been put forward by the Premier and this Government both prior to and since the election; and they have achieved nothing for South Australia other than to expand the dollars going into advertising agencies which have

prepared the work to go to air and into print on their behalf. That is an absolute abrogation of their responsibilities and the reason for their existence.

We have also seen WorkCover reforms, which have begun since 1 July and which we know will save us about \$20 million a year. Those are the sorts of things that have been necessary. It is not proper for us to expect to get journey accidents to and from work paid for where they are not part of the job, yet that was costing us a hell of a lot in the form of regressive costs on business.

Certainly, we have had to tighten stress provisions and appoint a new nine member WorkCover Board, with the amalgamation of WorkCover Corporation and the Occupational Health and Safety Commission. The arrangement that is now afoot to duplicate the Occupational Health and Safety Commission within the structure of WorkCover, under a Ms Jane Powning, to my mind, is a waste of time and money and has to be halted. If ever there was a Socialist in her outlook and attitude, it would have to be that woman. She does not really understand what workers' safety is about.

Safety is safety, and you cannot compromise on that point. If a worker's safety is at risk, it is not appropriate to pay that worker more money to take the risk of injury where that risk is unacceptable, yet that is the attitude she has when she says, 'The arrangements for occupational health and safety ought to be the domain of negotiation between the social partners,' which is jargon for saying, 'You can work it out between the union and the employer's representatives.' That is real garbage. If a worker is at risk, a worker is at risk. The sooner we get away from that sort of notion that she is putting forward, the better off we will be. All that will do is injure more workers and cause the enterprise that provides jobs more problems.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Exactly! That's the kind of thing that she is saying is okay: pay the coal miners not \$400 a week but \$1 000 a week. She is taking the attitude, 'Let them die underground; it's okay, if they are getting \$1 000 a week, for them to die.' I do not agree with that, yet that is the approach she has taken. It is about time, then, that she was exposed for what she is. I am very happy to have the support of the members for Napier and Torrens in the remarks that I have made in that regard.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members will cease interjecting.

**Mr LEWIS:** The major infrastructure improvements that we have initiated since coming to office are, for instance, a determination to improve the facilities at Adelaide Airport to enable us to get not only tourists into this State and out again with comfort, safety and some expedition—a good deal more than was possible yesterday at our airport—but also, and perhaps at least as important, other exports (because tourism is an export, when it involves international visitors to this country) which are perishable and highly value added and which are worth a great deal in terms of jobs and profits to us as a State.

We suffer here because of years of neglect. Given that, in the past 40 years in general and the past 10 years in particular, Labor Governments have ignored the necessity to give us a level playing field with the other major capital cities of this country in terms of airport facilities, is it any wonder that we are seen as a branch office? We in South Australia cannot be sure that our perishables will get off the ground, simply because we do not have the length of runway necessary or the adequate facilities to enable rapid loading to occur with

certainty. We need to provide that infrastructure. It has been provided in Sydney, Melbourne, Perth, Darwin and Brisbane at taxpayers' expense—funded from the public purse. The capital expenditure was all part of public works. Now they have what they want. Mr Keating is quite happy with his approach in the Hilmer report to say, 'We'll look after the marginal seats to give ourselves power in Canberra from around the cities of Sydney and Melbourne and, as for the rest regional Australia, we'll see you in the marketplace, and do you in the eye if we can get away with it.'

That is just not good enough; we have to do better than that, because we are discriminated against here in South Australia in that we have not been provided with the facilities on a *quid pro quo* basis and have not therefore been able to develop the kind of enterprise we are seeking.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Labor did nothing; it sat on its hands. The airport facility that is there now to cater for such international trade as we have and tourists from overseas that we get was established in the Tonkin years been 1979 and 1982. It was achieved as a result of a bit of bullocking.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Indeed, he achieved something in the three years that he was there, and I am grateful to the member for Mawson for reminding the House that subsequent to that time all the Labor Party has done is take us backwards with social programs that we can ill afford, when we dither and twiddle our thumbs to the extent that we are going further into poverty day by day. It is a pity that more journalists did not treat the now member for Kavel with greater respect for his integrity from the position of objective journalism when he was Leader of the Opposition in 1985 and 1989, because if we had won the election in 1985 and 1989 the mess in which we now find ourselves would not have occurred. I dare say, for the benefit of members opposite, that there might have been a few more of them in this Parliament; there might have been a greater measure of equality of numbers in the representations from both sides of politics—left and right. However, as it stood, members opposite lied their way into office in those election campaigns and, having got into office, quite happily repudiated the promises they had made.

I have been astonished by the questions I have heard during Question Time not only today but during the short time since the election. One would think that members of the Opposition, small in number though they be, had been in Opposition for 10 years and that the mess in which South Australia finds itself was not of their making, when it most certainly was.

I found it difficult from the Opposition side during those years to get any attention given to anything beyond Gepps Cross or the Tollgate. I find now, within six months of our coming to office, that my ministerial colleagues and the Premier are willing and ready to listen to the kinds of propositions that have been advanced by the people I represent. These propositions will enable them to expand the economy in their towns and localities in which they live, add to South Australia's overall gross domestic product and expand the number of employment opportunities in those places. On the other hand, during the 10 years of Labor Administration we saw an attrition process resulting in a run down in the number of Government employees—public servants—and Government agencies, and a run down in the standards and levels of service being provided to those communities.



We have seen policies that have adversely impacted on people engaged in business, particularly in primary industry—rural production, as in the case of my electorate. The impact of those policies pursued in Canberra has reduced the profitability of primary production by increasing costs and lowering farm gate prices through, more particularly, the dirty float of the dollar and the transfer payments and punitive charges levied on these people regardless of their ability to pay. No concern whatever has been apparent, for instance, for the plight of those people even now, when they have cars which are commonly at least 10 years old and which run on leaded fuel. The Prime Minister simply said, ‘We will put a punitive excise on the fuel they use.’

Those people cannot afford to change their car. What that means is that the hapless families will travel less distance and, in terms of finding any social contact whatever, it will compound the problems of those poor families living on farms outside the towns. As evidence is coming out more each day of the kind of effect that is having on rural people, members will do well to remember that they did not cause the problem; these people did not cause the difficulties they face as individuals in their families and the community: they were caused by policy settings pursued by the ALP here and in Canberra.

I am pleased to say that as a Government we now find ourselves in a position to seriously entertain the kinds of submissions that have been made. The Premier and the Minister on the front bench can now entertain the kind of propositions recently put forward on behalf of the Rural City of Murray Bridge for instance, we would not mind having another prison in that general locality in addition to the one at Mobilong, whether on the same site, in duplication of that site or somewhere nearby.

We need to have our water filtered, something that everyone in the metropolitan area takes for granted. We certainly need to be given clearer guidelines and incentives to make better use of the irrigation water we have there, so that it goes not only to irrigation but, first, through incentives

provided by Government, is put into ponds which can produce fish and more than double the amount of economic benefit and more than treble the number of jobs that can come from a new industry that will be created.

We are well located to take some of the pressure off the freeway and Adelaide’s north-south corridors by locating freight forwarding agencies and yards there from which delivery can be made by travelling radially into the metropolitan area in less than an hour. The mean journey time from any freight forwarding yard in the western suburbs or in the Salisbury/Elizabeth area—or, for that matter, around Lonsdale—to dispersed parts of the metropolitan area to which freight may have to go would be at least equal to or greater than the amount of travelling time involved if the freight forwarding yard were located at Murray Bridge. I could go on, and I would be pleased to do so for anyone who wishes to be better informed about those kinds of initiatives.

However, I now wish to turn to some research that I have been doing recently that will enable us to understand the stupidity of spending more and more money on squeaky wheels and less and less money on expanding our economy and job opportunities that would allow people to take care of themselves and their family and be accountable for what they do in their life. We need to recognise that the Federal Government, about which I have complained recently during the course of my remarks, has substantially reduced the amount of money it is supplying for research into primary industries, particularly agriculture, forestry, fishing and overall rural industries. To enable me to better illustrate the points I wish to make, I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a table which sets out the amount of money that has been appropriated as opposed to that which came from non-appropriated sources to provide the funds for that kind of research over the past few years comparing the years 1979 to 1980 with 1993 to 1994.

**The SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member assure me that this table is purely statistical?

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes.

Leave granted.

	1979-80						1993-94						Check
	Appropriated		Non-Appropriated —industry funded		Total	Appropriated		Non-Appropriated —industry funded		Total			
	Per cent	\$	Per cent	\$	Per cent	\$	Per cent	\$	Per cent	\$			
Agriculture	25.2	127.052	35.6	23.111	26.4	150.163	20.574	89.147	15.383	66.657	20.763	155.804	155.804
Forestry	4.1	20.694	5.8	3.764	4.3	24.458	2.442	10.583	1.853	8.031	2.481	18.614	18.614
Fishing	3.4	17.326	4.8	3.151	3.6	20.477	1.848	8.009	1.876	8.130	2.151	16.139	16.139
Rural	32.8	165.072	46.2	30.026	34.3	195.098	24.938	108.055	19.040	82.502	25.395	190.557	190.557
Land (EAED)	4.4	22.138	6.2	4.027	4.6	26.165	5.769	24.998	4.382	18.988	5.862	43.986	43.986
Ag/Forest/Land	33.7	169.884	47.5	30.902	35.3	200.786	28.785	124.728	21.618	93.676	29.106	218.404	218.404
Total		187.210		34.053			55.571	133.053		101.490		234.543	

**Mr LEWIS:** This table sets out in 1992 dollar terms the amount spent on this research. In 1979-80 from appropriated sources, for instance, in respect of agriculture, \$127 million of a total of \$150 million was spent. However, in 1993-94 the amount appropriated was only \$89 million in comparable dollar terms. There has been a substantial fall. An amount of \$20 million was spent on forestry from appropriated sources of revenue in 1979-80, while only \$10 million—slashed to half—was spent in 1993-94; \$17 million spent on fishing was slashed to \$8 million; and overall rural was slashed from \$165 million in 1979-80 to \$108 million in 1993-94.

It is a clear indication that the Federal Government does not understand the stupidity of pursuing policies such as its Better Cities program, which is scurrilous anyway. It stole the money from the funding for medical research. The fool of a Deputy Prime Minister we have took the money from medical research and ploughed it into paving bricks—as if that is going to improve the health and welfare of people in our cities. It does not create one additional home or one additional job: it simply reduces our capacity to do the medical research necessary to address the sorts of problems that I have drawn attention to in this House, such as breast cancer,

prostate cancer and so on. The money has gone into cosmetic improvements and appearances for the sake of that man's ego, so that he can point to something he did, as a memorial to him. When those paving bricks, over which traffic is driving, have broken up and gone to dust—as many of them are in many of the cities around Australia right now—he will have visited on his head the kind of contempt that he deserves for doing that.

In the meantime, an analysis of those projects into which the money would have been put, say, in the CSIRO had the money not been slashed, or into the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI), shows quite readily the cost benefits in relation to the ten projects that I have looked at, including four projects in pest and disease control, four in plant breeding, one in mechanisation and one in forest products. The length of time over which those projects have an effect varies from around four or five years up to 25 years or so. They have been evaluated on a national perspective, although in many instances there was immediate implementation in the localities in which the research was done. Conservatively estimated, the level of benefits that have been generated from those projects varied from the net present value (where you take cash flow in the future and bring it back to the present time by discounting it from each year in the future to the present time) to \$28.9 million in 1990 for disease control in lucerne, for instance, to \$813 million for take-all control in wheat, and that is using a 5 per cent discount rate in calculating that NPV. The total of the present value of the costs that were involved in the 10 projects was \$161 million. We outlaid \$161 million on those projects.

Mr Speaker, do you know how much those projects brought as benefits to the economy? Would you guess? It was not \$320-odd million, which is double that amount, and not \$640 million, which is quadruple that amount, but it was \$2.371 billion. That was the net benefit to the national economy of those projects, giving a cost benefit ratio of just over 15:1, at a 5 per cent discount rate. We cannot get that from the Better Cities program, and we do not get that from the other kinds of idiot policies that have been pursued by Labor in this State and federally in the past decade. Yet the Labor Party has hidden what it has done to primary research in this State and in this nation by requiring industry to contribute more into the research dollar that is spent, increasing the costs of that research in consequence of the policies it pursues, and thereby reducing the amount of effective benefit we can get. For every extra dollar we were to put into that program, we would get \$15 back. That is not a bad return.

Can any other industry that you know of, Mr Speaker, or that any member opposite knows of, show a yield as good as that? Yet indeed that is the record for the CSIRO, and it is high time we recognised the value of that kind of scientific research in providing for us the sort of welfare gains that will be achievable if we invest our money wisely in this country's economy. It is not good enough for us to simply apply the money where there are squeaky wheels, on the sort of 'radfem' programs of the hairy armpit brigade at Sunday afternoon barbecues and so on, and financing the gabfests that have been going on over the past 10 years into the Left Wing's objectives for the abolition of the Federation and the introduction of a unicameral Parliament in Canberra. That is a waste of money. That is not addressing the problem. It is not improving the productive capacity in this country's economy.

The place we need to be spending that money to get real return is through the research programs that can be undertaken in the universities, particularly the Waite Institute of the University of Adelaide, in conjunction with SARDI and with the CSIRO, based upon the kinds of figures that I have therefore used to illustrate the point that I make. For any honourable member who wants to see that information properly and better documented than I am able to provide for them here, they can look at Ted Hensel's report on the matter. He prepared that with Brian Fisher, who is the Director of the Institute of Plant Production and Processing and the Executive Director of the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics. That is where we need to go with our focus so we can improve our wealth and thereby improve our welfare, because if we can expand our economy at that rate we will be doing not only 4 per cent per annum but something like the results which have been achieved, and better, by our neighbours to the near north, of over 10 per cent per annum. The sooner we focus our efforts and energies in the public sector in that direction the better.

**Mr CUMMINS (Norwood):** I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Today I want to speak about certain matters that have concerned me for some time. Prior to the election the Liberal Government had a policy supporting community organisations in South Australia which are involved in welfare, and that was our stated policy prior to the election. When one looks around the State at the present time, one could be forgiven for believing that community organisations or organisations independent of mainstream government and universities may soon be under attack. The Liberal Government must, in my opinion, be wary as to empire building of public servants. Ministers should make sure that they are not snowed by heads of departments who are empire building to the detriment to the community as a whole. One hopes that South Australia will not become a version of *Yes, Minister*.

Within that context I wish to address the question of the welfare of ageing people from non-English speaking backgrounds, in particular Italian and Greek peoples. The Italian and Greek communities, which predominantly came here in the 50s, are rapidly ageing. For example, some 26.2 per cent of people born in Italy are 56 to 67 plus years of age. One of the great beauties of those cultures is that the family is of great importance but, in a sense, the result of that was that a lot of the menfolk went out to work, had contact with Australians at work and learnt the English language, but the converse in relation to women was that they stayed home and looked after the children and, as a result, some of them had no English at all or, alternatively, English that was very poor. The result is that the literacy rates of the females in the older age group, 55 and 65 plus, are half that of their male counterparts. In addition, females have a greater life expectancy. So one can say that there is a problem with ageing females from non-English speaking countries, and those problems will increase as time goes on. In fact, some of the Italian and Greek organisations are now running classes to teach elderly people English.

It is also true that as they get older people from non-English speaking cultures revert back to the customs of their mother country and also revert back to their mother tongue. In the future these facts will present unique problems in the area of the welfare of elderly Italian and Greek peoples and all peoples from non-English speaking countries. I had the great advantage of having an Italian stepfather, Giovanni

Ragghianti, now deceased, who to some extent sensitised me to the problems of non English speaking people. He came to South Australia in 1927, and I was acutely aware as a child and later as an adult of the needs he had as he got older and particularly his isolation and need for his own culture.

Amongst others, two very notable organisations in South Australia specifically cater to the needs of Italian and Greek people. The Coordinating Italian Committee Inc. represents over 70 Italian organisations and is run and controlled by its members, and most of its work is done by elected volunteers. As its name suggests, the organisation coordinates and promotes education and culture and particularly the welfare of Italian Australians and aged Italians. It had an income of about \$330 000 in 1993, of which only \$94 378 was from grants received; \$121 000 of that income was from the Italian festival. Hidden in that 1993 budget was \$31 685 for an aged care worker, and I will deal with that issue in a minute. The committee has recently employed a full-time pension officer, funded by the organisation itself, to assist applications for Italian pension schemes.

One would think that that must indicate the extent of the crying need of elderly Italians and also that mainstream government departments are unable to help in this area. When I say 'departments' I am talking about both State and local government departments. This is borne out by my experience of doorknocking in Norwood. I doorknocked an Italian lady who did not speak English, and I had to get an interpreter to go to her house. It turned out that her husband was dead, she was a widow and entitled to an Italian war pension and she was unable to get any assistance from anyone. I am glad that the Coordinating Italian Committee has now employed someone to help people in that situation. That committee, or CIC, as it is known, has also purchased a new bus for the home and community needs of the elderly.

The Liberal Government recently extended funding for a full-time aged care worker for CIC and for the Greek Welfare Centre. Once again, most of the Greek Welfare Centre budget in 1993 was raised by its people rather than relying on grants. In fact, 40 per cent of its budget, about \$54 000, was raised by the Greek people. The Greek community spirit, as with the Italians, has ensured that the volunteers run the bulk of the organisation's work, a massive saving to both the State and Commonwealth Governments.

In relation to aged care, amongst other things, the Commonwealth Law Reform Commission discussion paper No. 57 of April 1994 on page 22 states:

The department has identified a number of groups of older people who may have needs that cannot be readily met within the mainstream funding framework. They may face barriers to getting services. The groups the department has identified are people from non English speaking backgrounds.

That is an independent Commonwealth Government report which basically confirms what I have been saying to this House today. The Aged Care Reform Strategy mid term review 1990 to 1991 states that by 2001 older people from non English speaking backgrounds will comprise approximately 25 per cent of people 60 years and over. Because of the greater and earlier migration of Greek and Italian people to South Australia, the problem in South Australia will come on earlier and deal with greater numbers than the Australian average because, as we know, greater numbers of Italians and Greeks came here compared with other States like Victoria.

What conclusion should we draw from what I have put to the House? First, we can say that we are fortunate that the Italian and Greek people are so strongly community-orientat-

ed and look after their own. The consequence is a massive saving in grants. Secondly, we are also fortunate that the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia and the Italian Catholic community and clubs help their respective communities.

It is fatuous to say or to believe that some Government departments or councils will be able to replace the functions of CIC and the Greek Welfare Centre—and forget for the moment the costs that I have talked about. One might ask the question 'Why?' Where will they get the bilingual welfare workers with strong community and church connections who will be sought out and accepted by the elderly Greeks and Italians? Secondly, where and when can they do it and how long will it take to build up trust amongst elderly people? It is difficult enough, as we all know if we have elderly parents, for them to trust people and to know what they are doing. Just think of the situation of elderly people from non-English speaking backgrounds, many of whom who do not speak English at all or, alternatively, are not very fluent in English.

The Greek Welfare Centre has been open since 1979, and the Coordinating Italian Committee Incorporated since 1978. They have built up a network and community links to truly serve the Italian and Greek communities, in particular the elderly Greek and Italian people. The Labor Party, when in power, would not guarantee funds for CIC and an aged care worker and, as a result, and due to insecurity in respect of funding, the aged care worker resigned in December 1993. The Labor Government, one might say cynically, at election time offered funding to CIC to appoint an aged care worker to 30 June 1994. It is always very helpful to community groups when an election is about to take place. I am proud to say that the Liberal Government is presently funding the aged care workers of the Greek Welfare Centre and CIC until December this year—and, I might say, well out from an election.

When it looks at the economics of the situation and at the increasing needs of elderly Greek or Italian people and the small cost to the Government in overall terms, the Liberal Government, I am sure, will continue to fund aged care workers for these organisations. It is obvious that, because of the migration to this State in the fifties, and because of the ageing population of Italian and Greek people, in future we will need more aged care workers as we go into the year 2000. I would say to this House that not to fund these people would be to betray the trust and hope of people from great cultures who came here and contributed so much to our culture and heritage.

What would South Australia be without the struggle and ultimate success of the Greek and Italian people? One could be pardoned for saying, 'a pretty uninteresting and boring place.' The elderly Italians and Greeks have made their contribution to this State: we should ensure that their well deserved retirement is fruitful and happy. CIC and the Greek Welfare Centre will ensure this as far as possible, and I hope that this Government and this House, including members of the Opposition, will ensure that in future they get all the support they need.

I now turn to another subject. I was approached recently by a Mr William E. Sagar, who has an alias of 'Captain Anywhere alias Mr Nobody'. He describes himself as an observer, satirist, political hoaxer and nice guy and gives his address care of the Bridal Suite, Plaza Hotel. For some years Mr Sagar has been selling balloons in Rundle Mall and Norwood Mall. He makes them up into animals and sells them to people as they come by. He and several other people

who work in the city mall at all hours, all days and nights, have been concerned for some time with the problem of what the papers call 'street kids'. This group takes the view that the whole matter of teen delinquency and homelessness has been mishandled and that the Government should have a fresh look at the problem. They describe the way the media has treated the problem as promoting communal hysteria and say that that is due to the media's poor coverage of what they describe as complex issues.

I might say that all these people are employed within the environs of Rundle Mall. They claim that Rundle Mall suffers from the side effect of being a gathering place and social focus for what they describe as skylarking teenagers. They tell me that a number of elderly and frail people complained about feeling intimidated by groups of teenagers who gather outside the Rundle Mall premises of the McDonald's hamburger chain, blocking pedestrian right of way and using bad language. They say that, whether the fears and concerns of these elderly people are real or imagined, it is in fact a communal area and it is unfair for one group to lower the tone of an area.

That is not meant in a critical way about these young people, but these people are saying that something should be done, and something more imaginative than has been done in the past, to help these teenagers. They suggest that perhaps the energies of these young people should be catered for by an outdoor roller-blading rink or music venue, which could be provided at minimal cost by corporate sponsorship. Apparently many teenagers go down the Mall wearing roller blades and they are probably a hazard to themselves and other people using the Mall.

These people also tell me that drug dealing is prevalent in the inner city area and one of these people—I will not say which one—has personally witnessed many transactions of drug dealing in Rundle Mall by street vendors. Apparently there are literally street vendors in Rundle Mall who sell drugs to people in the Mall. These people believe that these sensitive issues deserve to be investigated—but not investigated by way of media speculation and the emotional way in which the media attempts to deal with these issues.

They pointed out to me that there are not only full-time street kids but also part-time street kids in the inner city area of Rundle Mall. They claim it has become a gathering place for teenagers experiencing family pressure who migrate to the city to seek succour from their peers and escape their emotional stress in drug use. These people also say that there are, as I said, part-time street kids or, as they call them, temporary street kids, who are children who come into the Mall, stay a few days and then go back home. They say that some of these children are legitimate refugees from serious family dysfunctional homes. They say others are using the street to escape appropriate parental discipline.

It means that if we look at these street kids we must have a more sophisticated approach to the differentiation of the groups to help solve the problem. It is no good to look at them and put them all in the same classification and have great media hype about street kids who we imagine are sleeping out every single night of the week, drugging, breaking into places and the like and getting involved in crime. That is not the reality of the situation. It needs a more sophisticated approach to determine who these groups are, where they come from and what their problems are.

This group of concerned people go on to claim that the attempts of parents to discipline their children are undermined by the seductive power of what they call street culture. They

say as a group that they have been concerned and almost outraged by the eyesore of teenage homelessness and the sad spectacle of adolescent beggars wandering the streets in a narcotic and half starved daze. These people have worked in the streets themselves. Some of them have had unfortunate backgrounds themselves and I have no doubt that they are able to determine whether someone is wandering the streets in a narcotic and half starved daze.

I am saying to the House that we should have another look at so-called 'street children' without the emotion and approach of the Adelaide media, hopefully with their non-involvement, and in due course I believe we should be considering employing some sort of welfare workers, perhaps partly subsidised by the Government and trained to go into the Mall and the city area to investigate what the real problem is and try to present some solution to the Government so that we can do something about solving this problem involving street children.

I am assured by this group of people that they know of others working for various community organisations in the city environs. There are people who are connected with church organisations who have been helping the so-called street kids. In due course I hope to have a meeting with some of these people to attempt to sort out a solution to this problem for the Government. I do not wish to say more, but these people have signed a letter to me to show their concern. Many of these people work in the Mall, including newspaper sellers, people who sell food in the outdoors, people who sell balloons and people who are well aware of the environment. These people are not just do-gooders—and one does not want to be rude—from certain organisations who come up with these highfalutin ideas about and solutions to problems in the Mall. These are people who know what the real problem is, and it is about time that we started listening to them in order to arrive at some solution to this problem.

Debate adjourned.

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

#### **MOTOR VEHICLES (LEARNERS' PERMITS AND PROBATIONARY LICENCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

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

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

Leave granted.

This Bill was first introduced on 12 May, in the last days of the last session. The Bill seeks to vary the penalties for failing to carry a learner's permit and a probationary driver's licence. However, it will still be compulsory for learner and probationary drivers to carry their permit or licence at all times when driving. This requirement is considered necessary as an aid to the Police in the enforcement of learner and probationary conditions.

Under existing legislation, a learner's permit or probationary driver's licence is cancelled and the holder disqualified for a period of six months, if the driver fails to carry the permit or licence when driving. In addition, the driver is liable an expiation fee of \$42.00.

The Government considers that the present penalty is out of proportion to the offence. This view is strongly supported in the community.

The Bill removes the compulsory carriage requirement from learner's permit and probationary licence conditions and establishes the requirement under a separate provision.

From a national perspective, South Australia is presently out of step with other licensing authorities. In New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and the Australian Capital Territory, where it is also compulsory to carry the learner's permit and probationary licence, only a monetary fine is prescribed for failure to do so. In Tasmania, Western Australia and the Northern Territory, there is no requirement for the permit or licence to be carried.

A consequential amendment to the *Summary Offences (Traffic Infringement Notice) Regulations 1981*, will establish a penalty of \$46.00 for the offence of failing to carry a learner's permit or probationary licence. The offence will not cause the permit or licence to be cancelled and will not result in a disqualification being imposed.

This approach is considered to be far more equitable and will have the effect of bringing South Australia into line with most other licensing authorities.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### *Clause 1: Short title*

##### *Clause 2: Commencement*

These clauses are formal.

##### *Clause 3: Amendment of s. 75a—Learner's permit*

Clause 3 removes from section 75a of the principal Act the requirement for the holder of a learner's permit to carry that permit at all times whilst driving a motor vehicle. This section currently makes that requirement one of the conditions of holding a learner's permit, which means that a person who contravenes the requirement is liable, upon conviction, to cancellation of the permit and six months disqualification under section 81b. The requirement to carry the learner's permit is now to be placed in new section 98aab.

##### *Clause 4: Amendment of s. 81a—Probationary licences*

Clause 4 removes from section 81a of the principal Act the requirement for the holder of a probationary licence to carry that licence at all times when driving a motor vehicle. Like section 75a this section currently makes that requirement a condition of holding a probationary licence so that cancellation and disqualification under section 81b apply where the requirement is contravened. The requirement to carry the probationary licence is now also to be placed in new section 98aab.

##### *Clause 5: Insertion of s. 98aab*

This clause inserts new section 98aab mentioned above. The new section provides that the holder of a learner's permit or a probationary licence must carry that permit or licence at all times whilst driving a motor vehicle, and must produce it to the police upon request. A division 10 fine is prescribed for contravention of these provisions.

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

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

(Continued from page 128.)

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** I support the Address in Reply motion and wish initially to address several local matters relating to my electorate of Newland. It is with great pleasure that I congratulate small business enterprises in our community for achieving public recognition of the services that they provide effectively and efficiently gaining community support for their hard work in a difficult private enterprise market. The northern region small business awards recently recognised three small businesses in Newland by presenting, in one instance, the best fruit and vegetable award to Sam Femia of Sam's Fruit Market in the Saint Agnes shopping centre; the best coffee shop award to Kaye Lavis and Bev Williams of Tree Top Coffee Shop, Tea Tree Gully; and the consumer choice category award to Maria and Roland Evans of the Tea Tree Gully Garden Centre.

In an economic climate that has dealt harshly with small business entrepreneurs and in an economic climate perpetuated by the massive incompetent and financial mismanagement of the previous Labor Government it is therefore heartening

to acknowledge the survivors who battled with little incentive and who helped to shore up our basic economy by their endeavours. I publicly commend these three small business owners and managers whose efforts were recognised by receiving these well deserved northern region small business awards. A further success story to come out of the Tea Tree Gully area is the Glenara winery. The Verralls, who run Glenara Wines in Upper Hermitage, are this week waving goodbye to 50 cases of 1990 dry riesling which is leaving from Port Adelaide on a ship bound for England.

The Verralls have been wine makers for years and were granted an export licence in July 1991. They received their first export order two months ago. In the only three wine shows that they have entered their wine, they have won three gold medals. The 1993 Glenara rhine riesling won a gold medal and was judged champion wine at the Uraidla and Summertown show against the best competition from the Adelaide Hills. I recommend to any member of this House, who would care to take some of their constituents and enjoy some good South Australian wine, that they attempt to take a trip into the hills of Tea Tree Gully and visit the Glenara winery. I congratulate them for their efforts over the year and the hard work that they have put into that business.

I now turn to a recent Government program launched by the Minister for Transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) which has my total support. I complement the Minister for this innovative program called the 'Driver Intervention Program.' I doubt that members would disagree with the view that too many of our drivers are ill-prepared for the consequences of being involved in a car crash. The Government wants to change that, hence the reason for this initiative. Novice and young drivers are significantly over-represented in road crashes. Recent statistics, produced by the Office of Road Safety, indicate that one in every 10 probationary licence holder is involved in road crashes each year. Of these, over 60 per cent are responsible for the crash. Age, lack of experience and an attitude of 'It won't happen to me' appear to be the significant factors causing novice drivers to crash.

A trial phase for the program has been set up whereby only those learner, permit and probationary licence holders who are domiciled in the Adelaide metropolitan area and who are apprehended and convicted of driving a motor vehicle while alcohol is present in their blood will be compelled to attend a driver intervention program lecture. Failure to attend will attract a \$100 penalty plus a victim of crimes levy. The lectures will be delivered by a panel of persons, including persons disabled through road accidents, ably supported by experts in road safety trauma and substance abuse.

The driver intervention program is one of many important initiatives of my Government in the eight short months since the State election. Driver attitudes and behaviour on our roads must be addressed in positive ways that reinforce the reality of what happens to people who drive without regard to the potential for serious harm either to themselves or to others on the road. I trust that this measure receives bipartisan support from all members of the House.

Another issue of concern which impacts upon the electorate of Newland and adjacent north-eastern areas, which has been actively instigated and encouraged to create fear amongst our communities and which involves the most cynical and hypocritical political exercise, bringing even greater shame and humiliation to an already decimated Labor Party Opposition, is the question of the Modbury Hospital. The member for Spence, as the Opposition spokesperson on health, attended a public meeting on 19 July. He fuelled the

emotions of our community by deliberately being untruthful and stating that the Opposition is totally opposed to any form of private involvement in the Modbury Hospital and that the previous Labor Government had not taken any steps towards private involvement at Modbury. Not only did the member for Spence expound these untruths to the members of the public who attended that meeting but his outrageous fabrications were supported by the Federal member for Makin, Peter Duncan.

I recently heard a rumour suggesting that Peter Duncan was thinking of returning to State politics. If that rumour is correct, Peter Duncan might have considered that, in assisting to create this highly emotional diversion in our electorates, he would profile himself back into the State arena. Scare tactics and fear campaigns are most definitely now the trademark of the Labor Party, and its dicing the truth to achieve those aims only epitomises the lack of integrity shown by the Labor Party over the past decade. The member for Spence and the member for Makin have been caught out in this cynical disregard for the truth: in July 1989, five months before the November 1989 election, which brought me and the member for Spence into this Parliament for the first time, the intention to build a private hospital at Modbury was made public.

The former Labor Government called for expressions of interest for a new and/or expanded hospital service in the northern metropolitan area of Adelaide. The member for Spence was a member of the Government in April 1990 when a proposal was accepted in principle for a stand-alone private hospital facility on the campus. The developer was given 12 months to provide a detailed submission for consideration by the honourable member's Labor Government. It is duly recorded that the proposal fell through, following the same pattern as many other development proposals involving the previous Government.

In May 1991, approval was withdrawn because the time limit had expired. In April 1993, the Government asked the Modbury Hospital board of management once again to look at the option of an integrated private hospital development at the Modbury Hospital site and further private sector involvement in privatising some of the services at Modbury. Perhaps the member for Spence suffered from the same long service leave syndrome currently afflicting the Leader of the Opposition, or perhaps he was having an out of body experience when all this was happening. Or perhaps the out of body experience occurred at the public meeting on 19 July, when the member for Spence told the meeting that the previous Labor Government had not taken any steps towards private involvement at Modbury Hospital.

Seven days prior to the last State election, a public advertisement calling for expressions of interest was placed in the local and national media. It invited proposals regarding the provision of a private hospital on the Modbury Hospital site and private sector funding for public patient facilities, as well as proposals for mutually beneficial cross servicing arrangements between the public and private sectors. The member for Spence, supported by the member for Makin, told that public meeting that the Opposition was totally opposed to any form of private involvement in Modbury Hospital.

I find this whole sorry exercise, undertaken by a State Labor member of Parliament and a Federal Labor member of Parliament, to be totally disgusting and offensive in the extreme. To use the emotions of the people in our community—the sick, injured, elderly and families with children—to make them fearful of losing necessary and

essential services, purely to chalk up political point scores against the Government, must rate high on the 'How low can you go?' scoreboard.

I am pleased to see that the member for Spence has decided to come into the Chamber to join the Government side. I think he is out of order in so doing, but I hope that he takes notice of the comments made. It is the aim of this Government to maximise public patient services, and to this end tenders will again be called with all options open.

I wish to move from the subject of hospitals, but I remain in the same arena: I refer to health, specifically women's health as it relates to breast cancer. The Government has announced certain initiatives that deserve mention as they are significant steps to support health prevention programs already in place. Two new community based breast X-Ray screening clinics will be established and a second mobile unit will augment services to country women. My support and concern for this area of women's health and the steps I have taken to increase the resources essential to this area are well documented in this House. Therefore, I am most pleased that two further screening clinics will be available to South Australian women.

I will take a moment to inform the House of the importance of the provision of a second mobile unit to provide this significant service to country women who are isolated by distance and who lack the range of services provided to metropolitan resident women. They are generally disadvantaged in health provision services. Looking back at research I have undertaken in the past, I am disconcerted to note that a higher rate of breast cancer appears to exist amongst country women than amongst their city counterparts. By looking at national trends and working out the death rate per 100 000 women, all of the same age, I note that our death rate from breast cancer is higher than the Australian average for all age groups except the 60 to 69 year olds. Of 100 000 Queensland women aged 55 to 59 years, 52 would be lost to breast cancer over a 12 month period but, of 100 000 South Australian women of the same age, 76 would be lost.

Looking at the city-country mix of women, we find that when we allow for a different age distribution of the female population in Adelaide and country areas there are several distinct differences in life chances. The most obvious is in the 80-plus age group. Any group of 100 000 Adelaide women aged 80-plus would lose 177 of their group from breast cancer whereas a group of 100 000 rural women would lose 275 over the same period from the same cause. Of course, we do not have 100 000 rural women aged 80-plus in South Australia; we have only about 5 000. But the relative chances stay the same, even if we calculate the rates on the basis of groups of 1 000 women. The city group would lose 1.765 (about two) of its members and the country group would lose 2.746 (about three) of its members. The other group which shows up clearly as having different life chances is the 40 to 49-year-old age group. Whereas the city group of 100 000 women would lose 29 of its members, a country group of 100 000 women would lose 52.

The figures that were produced in 1989 showed that 234 South Australian women lost their lives to breast cancer. The breakdown of those figures from the total of 234 shows that 170 city women and 64 country women died in that year. This poses the question: if we lost 170 Adelaide women and 64 country women to breast cancer, do these figures reflect the distribution of the population between Adelaide and country areas or do they reflect the distribution of services?

With this question still to be determined today, members of this House will understand my recognition of the Government's initiative to support country women by implementing this significant resource in the battle against this insidious disease that kills more than 2 500 women throughout Australia every year.

I should like to recognise the contribution made by the former member for Flinders, Peter Blacker, who fought with me to have the first mobile unit introduced, and the present member for Flinders, who has fought hard to maintain service provision to country women and who supported my call in the previous session for increased resources in this important area. I also recognise the contribution made by the member for Elizabeth, who provided bipartisan support in this House when my last motion on this subject was debated.

I now turn to education. In that specific area, Clare McCarty and the South Australian Institute of Teachers Executive have continued to follow their political masters, the Labor Party, and honed their skills in scare tactics and fear campaigns by spreading the most obnoxious distortion of the facts, attacking the Audit Commission and selectively choosing statistics and building their own interpretations around them.

Some of the comments have been made throughout all communities in South Australia. An example of those is when the teachers union claimed that half of Adelaide's schools would close or amalgamate if the Government accepted the report's recommendations. That statement was made in May this year. A further statement made by Clare McCarty on the steps of Parliament House in May referred to 185 Adelaide schools as being still under threat from closure. Further comments were that the teachers union feared that about 2 700 members could lose their jobs and a large number of schools could be closed or merged. A further SAIT release on 5 May stated:

Effectively, 90 per cent of local schools are under threat if the Government proceeds to cut education services.

Clare McCarty, as reported in the *Sunday Mail*, again in May, said:

If the Audit Commission's recommendations are implemented, we know exactly what schools will be closed, and there are 183 in the metropolitan area.

Ms McCarty also claimed that the audit would result in about 3 000 teaching staff being made redundant and put about 185 metropolitan schools under threat of closure or merger.

Of course, this is completely all emotive nonsense and hardly rational thinking or debate. The Audit Commission reported that the State was spending \$350 million more than it earned each year. The Government has decided that public expenditure will need to be reduced by \$300 million to balance our budget. Education's share of the budget cuts is \$40 million over four years, and that is equivalent to about 3.5 per cent of our total budget of \$1 200 million each year. The Government has now received 2 354 submissions in response to the report from schools, their communities and other interested parties. It is important to note that the Premier and Minister have stated that not all the recommendations of the Audit Commission will be accepted by the Government. The report is not and was never intended to be a blueprint for education.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mrs KOTZ:** Well, I'm sorry that you weren't in the House earlier, because you would have heard my opinions on the health area. However, I am sure that the honourable

member can pick up a copy of *Hansard* and read them for himself. The Government will continue to use the same policy that the former Labor Government used for the consideration of closure and amalgamation of schools. This means that schools will be considered for closure or amalgamation only after extensive community consultation. Both before and after the election, we have said consistently that the ball park number of school closures over the coming three to four years will be about 40.

Claims by Opposition members and union leaders that the Government might close over 180 schools in the metropolitan area are indeed outrageous and designed to cause a climate of fear in our schools. These claims are having a destructive effect on school communities, as in some cases parents are actually withdrawing students from schools on the basis of these fear campaigns. The Government is a strong supporter of the introduction of basic skills testing, particularly in the areas of literacy and numeracy.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs KOTZ:** I am glad to see that we have bipartisan support on that issue. From next year, we will be introducing testing of all students for literacy and numeracy in years three and five. In August this year, a number of schools will be involved in a pilot program to run the tests. We have already sought expressions of interest from schools and have been encouraged by the early response to participating in this pilot program on a voluntary basis. The program will enable the Government to provide a system-wide response to the claims that are made over the years that standards in our schools are declining. At the moment, we can provide no objective evidence one way or the other to respond to such claims.

The Government has rejected the suggestion from the Audit Commission that we could achieve the \$40 million cuts by cutting up to 1 000 teachers from our schools and increasing the number of students in every classroom in the State by about two additional students. The Government wants to minimise the number of teacher cuts and the effects on class sizes throughout the State. That is why we are exploring expenditure cuts in a variety of other areas; for example, we have announced a further 10 per cent cut in the size of the central office and regional offices which we believe will save us between \$3 million and \$4 million. Other areas which we are exploring for expenditure cuts are school cleaning, school bus transport services and the school card scheme.

The scare campaign run by SAIT, the unions and the Labor Party has also suggested that PAT (Permanent Against Temporary) teaching positions will all be converted into contract teachers. This is not correct. What the Government has said is that the current agreement between the Institute of Teachers and the department, which says that only 2 per cent of our total teaching force can be contract teachers and 98 per cent of our teaching force can be permanent teachers, has to be changed.

The effect of the current policy is that over 1 100 permanent teachers are currently having to fill temporary positions, with some teachers being moved term by term, from school to school, to fill in contract teaching positions. This current policy reduces the flexibility of the department and certainly lowers the quality of education that we are able to provide to students in all of our schools. However, we will increase the percentage of contract teachers only on a gradual basis. It certainly will not be the basis of converting all permanent against temporary teachers (PATs) into contract teaching positions.

The Government still intends to increase resources in the early years of education in the 1994-95 budget. Questions are also asked about that matter in our electorates, and those questions are being turned around by SAIT, which is asking where, if we are going cut the education budget by \$40 million, does that leave the Government promises in relation to devoting more resources to the early years of education. I state again that the Government intends in the 1994-95 budget to increase resources in the early years of education. We will continue to build in additional resourcing for important initiatives in this area through each budget introduced in this parliamentary term.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mrs KOTZ:** I do not consider that members of the Labor Party are terribly brilliant in the area of anything to do with finances, so I am not surprised that they do not fully understand how to trim a budget and still come up with efficiencies. At least it will not be \$3.5 billion that goes down the drain at the end of this budget session. Whilst we might not be able to do as much in our first budget as we most certainly would otherwise have wished, we will start the process of increasing resources in this most important area. For example, we have already provided additional resources in the important area of speech pathology services to schools. We will also be increasing the level of resources and services in the important area of assessment of children with suspected learning difficulties. Our key priority in this area will be the early identification of students with learning difficulties and following through with additional resources to do something about it. It is our view that money spent in the early years of education is money well spent.

Much of our research has shown that assessing and addressing problems in the early years is far more effective than trying to catch up with bandaied measures in the latter years of schooling. To suggest that the Government has not lived up to its promises of increased expenditure in this area of important education is a further untruth. The public school system—comprising students, teachers, staff and parents—is not at all supported by an unrealistic and immature poison pen approach to the debate on changes which seek to maintain and improve the quality of education throughout South Australia.

The budget to be introduced has to be trimmed because of the massive incompetence of previous Labor Governments, which has left this State with a Government having to pay out \$1 million per day in interest. If that \$1 million per day were available to this State and this State Government to allocate to all the areas of service provision that the various communities in South Australia expect, we would not be making explanations about budget cuts today. In terms of law and order, those millions of dollars could support the community policing policies we have talked about and will implement as budgets continue to be introduced throughout our term.

Community policing would put more police into our community to support it and to rid people of their fears emanating from the rise in crime. Unfortunately it was many years ago, but South Australia used to have one of the best health systems provided not only in Australia but internationally. That health system has now almost been decimated by the amazing incompetence of a Government which sits on the Opposition benches today and which still cannot come to terms with the fact of its own incompetence.

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to Her Excellency's speech.

The hard decisions are being taken by the new Brown Liberal Government and they are being implemented, but not without some pain. Fortunately, these decisions, while tough, are being tempered by reason and consideration for the effects on individual communities. This was evident when the Cabinet made the decision not to close the prison at Port Lincoln. Closing the prison would have had a huge impact on the economy of Port Lincoln, removing 34 jobs and 54 inmates, many of whom have families living in the city of Port Lincoln. The effect on the employees at the prison and their families would have been particularly severe as finding alternative jobs in the area is much more difficult than in larger centres.

The community made it clear that it wished the prison to stay, with the City Council and many individuals forwarding submissions to the Minister. The Minister visited the city and was impressed by this strong local support and, in particular, the willingness of the staff at the prison to make the changes necessary to achieve the Government's goals for efficiency within the prison system. It was a magnificent community effort and everyone benefited.

My electorate of Flinders is one that has been hard hit by the rural recession. Tourism, industry and manufacturing, and diversification in our primary industries will all be necessary in the future to help the region to survive. Recent good rains have helped farmers regain prospects of an average harvest in most areas, although some will be grateful to get back just the costs of their seed. With present grain prices, the return from an average crop is only break-even, and this is being eroded by the gradual increase in the exchange rate. There must be a much better understanding and better practical support from the Federal Government if this vital part of our economy is to regain its economic strength and play its part in reducing our internal and foreign debts. The State Government is doing its part, but it has limited resources.

The exemption from stamp duty on the transfer of the family farm from one generation to the next has been welcomed, particularly by the older generations. Also the ability for farmers to transfer mortgages from one financial institution to another free of stamp duty has been applauded by the farming sector. For the first time farmers have the ability to shop around for credit, and already some of them are benefiting from this fact. They are at last able to negotiate a better deal from their banks and reorganise their finances. These State Government initiatives have helped this important industry.

Many of the older farmers, who came through both the Great Depression and then the good times, are now again experiencing recession and are more than ready to hand on the current struggle to the young people. These younger farmers, who have the youth and enthusiasm, are best able to pick up the challenges necessary to work off the debt that many farms now suffer. Also, the young farmers incentive scheme, now backdated to 11 December, is helping to keep young people interested in an agricultural career during this difficult period. The scheme is aimed at assisting those young people who would have no chance otherwise of gaining a start in farming.

However, we are still losing too many of our young farmers who cannot see a future on the land. We have only to look at the composition of some of our football teams in the country to see how rural South Australia is being eroded. Around the Wudinna area six football teams were playing in the league every Saturday, but now only three combined teams are fielded from the same region. At the towns of Arno



Bay and Port Neill the situation is even worse. In the area between those two towns and the district of Wharminda seven teams were playing football, but now only one team can be filled.

Sadly, with the loss of farmers, the towns are imploding, some businesses are closing and some banks are being reduced or removed. There is a great need for regional development before these towns disappear altogether. I have been encouraged by the strong view of the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development (Hon. Mr Olsen) that he wants to see regional South Australia progress as well as the city regions. This attitude and recognition that South Australia also exists beyond Gepps Cross is very refreshing.

Much has been happening in the bush in relation to conservation and better land management. The Government's land care initiatives have been most welcome, with more than 250 groups dedicated to better land management being formed in country areas. In the electorate of Flinders the endeavours of our farmers have been recognised with Roger, Margaret, Ricky and Katherine Neild from Cleve gaining the 1994 Commonwealth Development Bank Ibis Award. This is the State's major conservation award for primary producers. Mr Neild, who chairs the Eastern Eyre Peninsula Soil Conservation Board, was proud to say that conservation practices were becoming widespread on Eyre Peninsula. In another initiative to strengthen farm management and increase farming skills, the Government has increased the level of assistance provided to farmers for the drawing up of farm management plans. The Government is to be commended for increasing the funding for farm planning to \$2 000 to \$3 000 per farmer.

I wish to now spend some time talking about a different type of farming, namely, our tuna farming. Last month the Premier, Hon. Dean Brown, while he was visiting the Flinders electorate, signed an agreement with the Tuna Boat Owners Association. This will ensure the continued cooperation of the Government with the association, to enable the creation of much wealth and many hundreds of jobs in the tuna farming industry. An extension of the Adelaide Airport runway will assist this industry to become even more profitable for South Australia. It is encouraging to see that steps to increase the length of the runway are indeed well and truly on the Government's agenda. In all, 35 tuna fish cages have been established in Boston Bay. Valued at about \$1 million each, they contain approximately 1 500 fish or 40 tonnes to 50 tonnes of fish. This new industry is a world leader and people are coming from around the world to see it. This year production from the fish farms is valued at \$55 million. Two years ago it was \$2 million. This is an amazing growth for an industry in which I believe the best is still to come.

Aquaculture is also set to boom in Flinders, due to our expansive coastline which offers enormous scope for these enterprises and our clean, unpolluted water. We now have three onshore abalone aquaculture farms, and they are relatively close to producing shellfish for the cocktail abalone market. Attached to one of the abalone farms we now have an oyster hatchery which is starting its first season's production. This hatchery will provide oyster spat for the many oyster farms that are established and for those that are being planned in our coastal waterways. This will relieve our oyster industry's dependence on spat produced in Tasmania and the risk of spreading disease and predators.

The oyster industry is rapidly expanding its production and will soon need markets outside of South Australia. Only a few years ago there was a single oyster lease in Coffin Bay. It is an exciting time for the aquaculture industry in South Australia. The industries must continue to ensure that they supply a first quality product to local and overseas markets. One area that is still posing a problem is theft of the high value products from these leases. Through the cooperation of the aquaculture industries, the police and the State Emergency Service the position has improved considerably.

The rock lobster industry has recently experienced a lower catch but very good prices. It is well managed and continues to support the pot licence system for limiting the catch to sustainable levels. They believe that it is the only practical way to maintain control with the limited Fisheries inspectors available and the very large fishing grounds. A particularly important step in the fishing industry was taken by the Minister for Primary Industries, Hon. Dale Baker, with an undertaking to ban netting in Coffin Bay and to investigate netting closures in other bays throughout the State. It is my belief that the survival of many of our coastal towns will depend on increasing the stocks of King George whiting. It is clear that a fish is worth much more to the tourist and recreational sector than it is to any other sector of our economy. In addition to net bans in order to increase fish stocks, the activities of illegal fishing must be crushed with stiffer penalties being imposed, including confiscation of equipment.

Talk of undersized whiting measuring 9½ inches netted from South Australian waters being sold to the Eastern States fish markets I consider to be based in fact. Viable line fishermen living with their families in our small coastal towns and a thriving tourist industry with the accompanying business, health and education services will ensure that these towns survive. These industries are therefore the best way to use the King George whiting resource. There is a real possibility of restocking our bays with whiting fingerlings bred in captivity. This new and exciting initiative would assist the fast recovery of the King George whiting stocks, which are presently at dangerously low levels.

All our hopes for the fishing and aquaculture development will be dashed if we do not protect our present clean water. In May, while in Port Lincoln, the Minister for Infrastructure, the Hon. John Olsen, opened the new sewage treatment works. This signalled the end of raw waste water entering the sea from South Australian cities, a great first in Australia. There are more local pollutants yet to be cleaned up, but the big risk to our clean waters comes from the ballast water dumped from overseas and local shipping. Tasmania has the Japanese *Sea Star* threatening its aquaculture and fishing industries, and already we have some introduced organisms in our coastal waters. Before the situation is irretrievable and our industries are ruined, we must ensure that ballast water disposal is regulated by national laws. A Federal task force to look into this threat has recently been implemented. However, I believe that this will not be effective without representatives from all States to unify our approach to this problem and ensure that the controls can be efficiently implemented and policed. The task force must work quickly, as any day could see the introduction of an organism or disease that will be devastating.

Of great concern to the commercial and recreational fishing communities and yachtsmen is the inadequate radio coverage provided for Eyre Peninsula and Kangaroo Island waters. The waters in the Bight are particularly badly

serviced, with weather forecasts being not only inaccurate because of the limited information about sudden changes being available to forecasters but also impossible to pick up by radio. Transferring all forecasting facilities to Melbourne has created an information black hole as far as these brave key people are concerned. Similarly, I have been advised that, since the closure of Adelaide's facilities on 31 January 1993, there have been seven fatalities at sea, where there has been a strong perception that inadequate radio communication has proved to be a limiting factor in rescue attempts. It must be recognised in relation to the fishing industry that these people are in one of the highest risk occupations. This is a very unsatisfactory situation, which must be urgently addressed, and I urge the Government to lobby the Federal Government to ensure that adequate services are provided to our people at sea.

Tourism is another industry set to develop under the restructuring introduced by the new Government. Tourism is dependent on maintaining our clean environment, providing things to see and having plenty of fish to catch. However, it is also dependent on providing the ability for tourists to get to their destinations in relative comfort. In the Flinders electorate this means good roads, particularly the ring route on Kangaroo Island. With \$200 million to be spent on a resort at Wirrina, it is to be expected that the numbers of tourists on Kangaroo Island will increase dramatically. Already, the unsealed tourist road on Kangaroo Island is totally unsatisfactory and inadequate. The local council cannot be expected to fund and maintain the type of road that is necessary for a State tourism push. Perhaps a tourism category is needed in the arterial road funding criteria, or an increased budget should be allocated for roads under the Minister for Tourism's direction.

With our clean water and pure, white, sandy beaches, safe access is needed not only to the beaches but also to the sea. Boat ramps and jetties abound in the electorate of Flinders, and I believe it is time for a licence to be charged on all recreational fishermen who use these facilities. This fund could be administered by those who contribute, and used in a similar manner to the Parks and Wildlife trust funds. Initially this money could be made available for any compensation to net fishermen for fish stock replenishment programs, which restock the bays with King George whiting and other fish, and for boat ramp and jetty replacement and maintenance. Eventually, the fund would be available to be used for the provision of all services required for the enjoyment of our coastal environment.

This is particularly necessary in the electorate of Flinders, where so much of the area is devoted to national parks. We have Flinders Chase on Kangaroo Island and large areas on Eyre Peninsula that are wonderful tourist attractions that also preserve our natural fauna and flora. The Flinders Chase National Park, a planned walking trail from Port Lincoln to Coffin Bay, the Point Labatt sea lion colony, the viewing of the white pointer sharks and the tuna farms are all tourist attractions of world-class standard that can be developed further in the next few years. I also want to devote some time to the initiative of groups in the electorate.

The Port Lincoln High School sailing team recently won the 1994 Epiglass National Secondary Schools Team Sailing Championship conducted in Geelong in Victoria. As the Australian winners they will compete against New Zealand in Port Lincoln in September. This win, the second in three years against the best from the other States, is a great achievement and a credit to the sailors, their coaches and the

community that funded them. It will help to put our great State on the map. The achievements of our young sailors need to be given more media exposure. The people in the electorate of Flinders are resourceful and resilient, and I believe are an inspiration to other South Australians.

The Elliston Airport project, undertaken by the small community of 250 residents and 1 400 in the district, is memorable. They put in 5 500 hours of voluntary work valued at \$320 000 to build their new airstrip. This effort was rewarded in a tangible way by the Premier (Dean Brown) when he visited the town in July. As well as opening the airstrip he provided a cheque to the community for the lighting of the airstrip. This means that a small town now has a modern air link to facilitate exports and tourism in addition to the mantle of safety provided by the Flying Doctor Service's having access, day or night, winter or summer. Incidentally, this was the first visit to the town by a Premier since the Playford era.

All over my electorate are instances of self help projects with facilities at schools, hospitals and other community venues benefiting from community input through in-kind support and with money from fundraising. The Parndana Health Centre on Kangaroo Island and the boat ramp at Port Neill are further examples of this community spirit. Water resources are critical in the Flinders electorate, as they are in most other regions of South Australia. Better water supplies for Streaky Bay, Elliston and Port Kenny are needed to allow these towns to expand. The Kingscote District Council has been granted \$750 000 State and Federal funding to trial innovative water treatment technology developed in South Australia, to overcome water quality problems. It is hoped that similar funding can be provided for other towns in need.

Industry and manufacturing, with an emphasis on value adding, are being encouraged within the electorate. Funding assistance for development and expansion is being made available by the Government with grants of \$5 000 being offered to prepare professional business plans to companies involved in import replacements, new exports or value adding of agricultural products. The Tuna Boat Owners Association agreement mentioned earlier in my speech undertakes to develop a soft pellet for the production of food for the tuna farms, using local products. This project will take much effort but, if successful, will save a \$20 million import bill for fish food imported from foreign countries.

It will also provide additional jobs on Lower Eyre Peninsula and add value to some of our primary products. People must be given not only the opportunity to develop their ideas but the feeling that the Government supports them, rather than just seeing them as unpaid Government employees and a supplier of tax dollars. So many people say that, if it were not for all the form filling and red tape associated with employment, they would employ more people. It is unfortunate that so much effort has to be made merely to offset the actions of the Federal Government. While the Brown Government has limited resources to assist, it is encouraging and strongly supporting regional development.

Some initiatives I want to highlight and applaud are the new enterprise bargaining agreements, payroll tax and WorkCover rebate schemes, which amount to 10 per cent on existing staff who help to earn export income and 50 per cent for additional staff. These new schemes are all helping to encourage our businesses to expand. A reduction of 20 per cent in electricity tariff charges is another Government initiative that is appreciated, particularly in the country region

where many of our costs tend to be so much higher than in the city.

Mr Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to the state of the Kingscote General Hospital, which is in urgent need of upgrading. In fact, I suggest that the previous Government pulled down better hospitals than this to build new ones. I have asked the Minister for Health (Dr Armitage) to keep the upgrading of this hospital at the top of his list. I am confident that the Brown Government recognises the need for a facility that fulfils its obligations to provide adequately for the health and welfare of the people of Kangaroo Island. While on the subject of Kangaroo Island, I point out that it was through the untiring efforts of the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. Dale Baker) and his staff that finally we have been successful in gaining the services of an experienced and competent livestock officer to service the island.

As the House is aware, education is of great importance in the country region and, with 33 schools in the electorate of Flinders, the Audit Commission's report caused a great deal of anguish amongst teachers, parents and students. This was fuelled by scare tactics from Labor and the unions. Fortunately, both the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. Rob Lucas) and Premier Dean Brown have visited Flinders and undertaken to look after our country schools and protect the services they are providing, particularly in isolated areas.

I am encouraged that in private talks with respected and responsible school teachers the Government's initiatives in reducing the bureaucracy in the education area have been welcomed. One well respected principal said his workload would be reduced in proportion to the reduction of the bureaucracy. He said he would be able to spend more time in areas where it was important, with his own teachers and students. What a refreshing change and what a saving of resources. The retention of the music teacher for the Wudinna, Warrambo and other smaller schools in that region show the degree of compassion that this Government has for education. The Government has shown that it is committed to retaining and providing a good country education service despite the difficulties caused as a result of isolation and the added difficulty of lack of funds.

Council amalgamation is of great interest in Flinders. We have nine councils in the electorate trying to provide adequate services to local communities, with falling values of rateable properties restricting their ability to raise funds. Some councils are investigating amalgamation. These are difficult processes as they involve valid concerns about the effects on the community and strong loyalty within each council for the local community. I support fully a careful assessment by councils and local communities of the relevant benefits and potential problems and, in the end, a democratic decision by the people directly affected.

In conclusion, it has been a great eight months for the new Government. It would have been even better if the former Labor Government had left some money in the coffers instead of the debt that we have inherited. However, the people of South Australia have shown that they understand the problems facing the new Government. I am honoured that the people of Flinders chose to put their faith in me to represent them in the new Government, and I can assure them that I have been having a say on their behalf at all levels, including Government Party meetings and on the Primary Industry, Regional Development and Industry and Manufacturing Ministerial Committee meetings. Also, I applaud the willingness of Ministers to include visits to the electorate in

their busy schedules. We have averaged more than one ministerial visit a month since the election. I support the motion.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon):** First, I wish to congratulate and thank Her Excellency, Dame Roma, for the dignified manner in which she conducts herself as Her Majesty's representative and for the intelligent interest which she has consistently shown in public affairs in South Australia. Also, I congratulate the member for Flinders, who has just spoken, for her diligence in attending to community affairs within her electorate and for the obvious enthusiasm that she shows for her political career. It is good to see, and it has also been good to be seated in this Chamber listening to the various speeches of members and to recognise that there have been some very good, well informed and well considered speeches full of local knowledge, concern for the electorate and the well-being of electors, particularly on the Liberal side of politics, and I emphasise that. The majority of speeches have been free from acrimony, with no attempts at character assassination.

Members have generally been attending to the task in hand which is resolving electorate problems day by day and presenting themselves well in Parliament. I do not think that, since 1975 when I first came into politics in Opposition and was the recipient of a good deal of attention from the Premier downwards, I have heard quite so much acrimonious debate and personal criticism handed out by way of interjection and deliberate insertion in debate. I do not think that is good for the general tone of politics. I make that as a passing observation after some 19 years in politics, and members can take it or leave it for what it is worth.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The member for Hart, who is interjecting, is probably an exemplar of what I am saying. He is deliberately interjecting. I deliberately did not listen. I did not hear what he said. I am sick of it. As I say, it has been the worst since 1975 when I came into politics. They generally say that small quantities can be made up for by quality but I think the present Opposition has a long way to go before that maxim can be met.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** There you are, you see, I am getting applauded and am descending into public acrimony and personal denigration of character. It is something I said I would not do because I have refrained from it for the past 20 years. That is the end of it. The member for Unley was reflecting earlier and said that he would have liked to see a dream emerging from the ALP Government when it was in office but he never saw it. He reflected on the musical *Joseph and the Amazing Technicolor Dreamcoat* which was obviously popular beyond my years, and said that any dream, will do. I do not disagree with the member for Unley on many issues but on this occasion I do because we all realise that under the Labor Party the dream that we were all looking for really was there, but it was a nightmare. It was the worst of dreams for South Australia.

The member for Unley was very kind in his comments about the former Labor Government. I believe that the electorate of South Australia obviously recognised the merit of my remarks when it saw the State Bank. The State Bank was like Shakespeare's *Henry IV*. It came in two parts: the good part and the bad part. The good part has been groomed for stardom and ultimately will be sold to the highest bidder. The bad part is still there as a gambling debt. It is little more

than that. It is a gambling debt sitting as a millstone around the necks of present and future residents of South Australia—we as current ratepayers and taxpayers and our children and possibly their children as future taxpayers. I refer to the losses from the State Bank part I and II, SGIC and from a host of other investments including Beneficial Finance and Scrimber. I also refer to the affair that the Premier would like to forget down at Dreamland or Marineland or whatever it is—the names are synonymous—which did not materialise at the coast where there was a failed project. The State was literally full of these schemes which were put up and collapsed.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am still not listening to the member interjecting. I remind him that we have had the Treasurer speaking only two days ago about having to bail-out the Remm project and the Collins Street, Melbourne, project (State Bank and SGIC) which have lost over \$1 billion. A couple of buildings have lost \$1 billion between them in valuation. They are sitting there as bad bank assets waiting for appreciation of value so that at least we may retrieve something.

Whether we ever retrieve the interest, let alone the principal, remains to be seen. This is a problem. They still have to be maintained. The debts have to be serviced; they have to be run. I visited Melbourne to look at this Collins Street building, which is fantastic. It has two frontages, running through from two main streets in Melbourne, and hardly a commercial frontage on either of the two main ground floors. It has corridors running down the sides connecting those two streets but again with no commercial venture. It has literally several storeys of building from the ground floor upwards with nothing available. It is simply a great atrium with lift shafts. The action does not start until you are several storeys up.

While it may be a wonderful building, it really is a terrible commercial venture to lose so much commercial potential at ground level, where people coming off the street could use that building. I simply could not believe that anyone would have designed a building in the heart of commercial Melbourne and present so little commercial frontage for the first four or five storeys. It is a disaster, but so much for that. A high degree of bitterness seems to be emanating from the Opposition. An apology would have been appropriate, for example, at its annual general meeting held during its conference over the weekend.

Some suggestion should have been made to the public, 'Well, we really made a terribly bad mess of it. We are sorry, we will try to rebuild. We will listen', as the then Premier said. For four years, while we were telling the Government it had acute problems with the State Bank, SGIC, and all the rest of it, all we got in Opposition was ridicule. The then Premier and his minions, the Cabinet—it was really a shadow Cabinet because it did as it was told—kept reassuring the Opposition and saying, 'Look, you are pulling the State down. You don't know what you are talking about. Everything is fine.' The ostrich kept his head in the sand while all around the State was crumbling.

The Labor Party could have at least apologised for its ineptitude, but no suggestion of it. And, rather than accept the fact that it was guilty, collectively, the members of the Opposition who did nothing to stop their Cabinet and their Premier from going deeper and deeper into the mire, simply keep firing away at the Government saying, 'Ha, ha, we will bring you down. You're oncers.' I have news for you lot over there in Opposition: the same thing was said to me by Donald

Dunstan, Geoff Virgo, Jack Wright and all the Ministers back in 1975, 'You're a oncer.' Even the Liberals said I was a oncer, so I should have believed it.

I had a 16 per cent swing just to take the seat. It was a safe Labor seat and the boundaries are still very much what they were then. If there is any word of reassurance that I can give to Liberal members on this side and discouragement I can give to the members on the Opposition side, then I simply say ignore the critics, the sceptics, and the scoffers. Do your own thing. Look after your electorates as best you can and you will survive on your own reputation. Another thing stands through from all of the lobbying and all of the political pummelling that I received during the first four or five elections.

I tell you what, if I had known that I was going to face an election in 1975, 1977, 1979, 1982 and 1985 (five elections in 10 years) when I first came in, you would never have seen me within 100 miles of this place. I thought one election every three years was a fair thing, so that in 10 years I would have seen three elections, not five. Anyhow, I came in and decided to make the best of it. One thing which stuck in my mind from an attack on my representation to the Electoral Boundaries Commission by Chris Schacht and Hugh Hudson one year, was a comment from Hugh Hudson, where he was decrying something I said by telling me that the electorate of South Australia is generally very kind to its sitting members.

He said, 'If you go through the period since the inception of the State, South Australia has an excellent record for not throwing out sitting members who have performed well.' The irony of that, of course, was that Hugh was thrown out at the next election with a 10 per cent swing in Brighton. Hugh kept telling Graham Gunn and me time and again in the members' lounge, 'Look, Gunny and Harold'—it was Gunny and Harold. I do not know why he called Graham Gunn Gunny, but he would say, 'Look, Gunny and Harold, you're working too hard. Why don't you do what we do', referring to himself and Jack.

I will not tell you the recipe that he gave as it would be reflecting on Hugh, and I had a great deal of admiration for his mental acuity. He said, 'This is the way we operate and, if you want to live long, you will do the same thing.' I said, 'Hugh, that is a recipe for failure.' My advice to members on this side is to listen to the members who are still here—the Gunnies and the Harolds who have been here for, in the case of the member for Eyre, 23 years. They should work their electorate and look after the people, and they will look after them. They do not have to listen to the acrimony that comes across from the other side by way of debate or interjection. They should keep that in mind.

**Mr Foley:** Tell us something else from the past, Harold.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I will—I will go on. Now that you mention it, I had a comment to make about the past. I was told that I had a record majority, that the pendulum would swing back and that with it would go most of the backbench. If we think back, one does not learn much from history. We saw Malcolm Fraser elected with a record majority and everyone said that he had done it—that was it. At the next election Malcolm Fraser was in again with another record majority. At the next election Fraser's personal popularity was down to 17 per cent and everybody said that was it, but he came in with another record majority. There were three in succession. You have to say that the pendulum had gone as far as it could go.

Bob Hawke then came in with a record majority. We saw four records in succession. If anybody says that you cannot

have a record following a record, do not believe them. We had four of them in succession, and it is still three to one against at Federal level. Members opposite should rest assured that the Brown Government is secure and will further secure its position by dint of diligent and prudent management.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Members like this are probably our best guarantee of success; I accept that from the member for Unley. I cheerfully predict that all Liberals on this side will be returned and that the marginal seats opposite are the seats that are still extremely vulnerable. I would not rest easy if I were them: I would far from rest easy. I would be looking at the results and shuffling them. Rather than attacking members on this side and wasting our blessed time hour after hour in this place, if I were them I would be out plying my wares in the electorate. Mark my words: take a little bit of advice from a survivor.

Why do I think that the Brown Government is secure? I suppose that the recent poll conducted by McNair—which, incidentally, I have never felt was a poll upon which I should put too much credence as it tends to be slanted towards the Labor Party—came out with the heading in the *Bulletin* of 9 August, 'Libs dominant in SA'. It stated that the Brown Liberal Government in South Australia had surged even further ahead of Lynn Arnold's Labor Opposition, according to the latest AGB McNair *Bulletin* survey, and that at 54 per cent the Government is now 23 points ahead of the ALP, which languishes on 31 per cent.

It went on to say that the Liberals were ahead in both the city and the country and, strangely enough, that the city was slightly ahead of the country, and that is most unusual for a vote anywhere in Australia. It augurs well for the future of politics in South Australia and for the Liberal Party. This article has been quoted by other members. It states that Dean Brown is ahead on personal popularity and favoured as Premier. I notice with some interest that the Opposition reappointed its caretaker Leader to look after the Party at the annual general meeting a few days ago. I have seen that happen before and I have seen the end results. I shall continue to watch that situation with great interest.

I am an extremely parochial member of Parliament, so I was concerned when I received a copy of the very good local newspaper in the South-East—it has been running for well over 100 years—the *Border Watch*. I learnt from the front page that a Melbourne survey group, Syntec Monash, following a plethora of reports that have been put out about regional development in South Australia, has listed the regions across Australia and put them in order of likelihood to succeed over the next seven years, 1992-93 to 2000-2001.

I was not too happy when I saw that it was predicted that Adelaide would have an annual growth rate of 3.5 per cent. I thought that we could do better than that. That is just about the Australian average for the past two to three years. In fact, Australia is predicting about 3.5 per cent. Europe, where I was two or three weeks ago, has a growth rate of 8 per cent to 10 per cent and it is predicted that China, one of our very close neighbours, will be the world's largest market. That means it will beat Canada, the USA and Mexico as one bloc and it will beat Europe as another bloc. With about 500 million or 600 million population, China in its own right will be the world's largest trading bloc, and this is predicted by European, British and American economists to take place within the next eight to 10 years. There is tremendous potential there. So 3.5 per cent compared with China's 14 per

cent and Europe and North American percentages more than double ours does not offer a great deal of promise. The rest of Australia is not given a good score in any case by this Syntec Monash report.

The report stated that the South-East has the potential to do better than any of the other rural regions in the State. That is not really a great pat on the head because we have a wonderful sub-Mediterranean, not full Mediterranean, climate and plenty of water. Then we have potential in the wine and horticulture industries. I wondered whether these people from Syntec Monash had even been to the South-East to report, because there are so many things that they do not seem to have taken into consideration. They say that the South-East is somewhere down at 26 in potential rather than much higher, where it should be.

Among the things I would have liked them to refer to are, first, the most precious commodity that we have in South Australia, water, of which we have an abundance sitting beneath the massive limestone plateau which stretches from Kingston in the South-East right through to Melbourne. It is a huge limestone plateau, one of the world's largest, with plenty of water, provided that we look after it. We also have adequate rainfall in the South-East, although most of it falls in the winter. We have relatively dry summers, but we get about 32 inches (about 800 millimetres) around Mount Burr and Mount Gambier. That is pretty good by any standards. It is on a par with the climate in Sheffield, where I came from. It is probably why I like and live in Mount Gambier. We have the water, the rainfall, a pleasant sub-Mediterranean climate, good growing seasons and reliable wheat crops. We had a drought in Mount Gambier—the only drought I can remember in the 40 years that I have lived there—and the rainfall was down to 16 inches. However, there are many regions in South Australia which never achieve that level but which are wheat farming areas.

So, it just shows how good the South-East is. We have great potential in agriculture and horticulture, which are areas that we are not really strong in at the moment because we are concentrating on livestock, sheep, the dairy industry, fine beef, Herefords, fat lambs, meat and wool. The potential for a change is certainly there from those activities into more intensive farming in horticulture and to supply not only Australia but South-East Asia and China with the food which obviously those areas will need in the coming decades. As I said, we have the water, the climate, the land and an intelligent industrious population in my electorate. In addition to that, already we have about 100 000 people in the upper and lower South-East. They are very intelligent. More people in the South-East pass matriculation and qualify to come to university than arrive at university. So what happens? They stay in the South-East—under-employed, I suppose, mentally—ready to commit their great mental facilities towards to any development. I recommend the South-East and its people to any person who is thinking of coming in to employ.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Well, the honourable member bought his Baedeker map and came down to my electorate when I was overseas. I thought it was nice of him to come while I was away. I would have asked him to my home for dinner. If the honourable member thinks that I would not have done so, I remind him that Terry Groom, Don Ferguson, Kevin Hamilton and others were invited to my home for dinner, along with my parliamentary colleagues, Dorothy Kotz and Bruce Eastick. We in the electorate are not politically divided: we invite people to come down because we like

people. The honourable member might have got an invitation to my home if he had just let me know he was coming. I thought he was pipe dreaming when he said he was going to take back the electorate in the next election.

If the honourable member is going to take back 73 per cent at the next election, that side will be empty—incidentally, just like the House was for the first half hour of this debate after dinner. We adjourned two of the Bills without even a single member of the Opposition being there. I could not believe it; we could have put the Bills through and passed them. But we thought, 'We'll give them a chance to debate them.'

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Well, I think you will be talking to yourself. You will be a little bit like Lee Kuan Yew. You will have to appoint an honorary member over there so that you can just talk to him and pour your news over him.

**An honourable member:** Appoint a party!

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** That just won't happen.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I know, but when you've gone they've picked up tremendously.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** That'll be the day when I see 18 pigs dressed in Essendon guernseys flying over my house—you know, the red and black jumpers. They will be flying across. There will be 18 of them; there will be a full footy team. That will never happen. Even at Federal level we still score well above the 50 per cent needed to win the seat, I can assure members. In the South-East, we have fine timber assets and, of course, they stretch into western Victoria, too. We have State and private mills, and the Woods and Forests at Mount Gambier, Nangwarry and Mount Burr. We have the private mills SEAS SAPFOR, CSR Softwoods, McDonnell's and others, and they are ready to export a variety of timber products. For example, CSR just won a \$50 million per year sales export market to the United States and has built a new forming mill, which will employ 160 new staff.

We are exporting woodchip to various countries overseas. Of course, we are sending a lot of woodchip to the pulp and paper mill at Snuggery, which is now just outside my electorate. All in all, the wood industry looks very good. I hope it will look good when the forest report is released, and I think it is ready to be released within the next few weeks. If it fulfils the dreams of the member for McKillop, the Minister, who would like to see the wood moved on a quicker rotation, more timber would be made available, and that would help to satisfy the world markets which have been crying out for good quality soft wood since the North American clear felling practice in the Rockies was stopped in order to protect the hooded owl. They are having problems with the wildlife because of clear felling.

That augurs well for South Australia's and the rest of Australia's planted forests—that is, man-made forests—because we are ready to meet their requirements. It is a reversal of what has been happening for decades with America flooding our markets—we can start sending it back.

The wines of the South-East must have been totally ignored by that reporting firm, because in the past 12 months, as I have driven up and down from Mount Gambier to Adelaide through Coonawarra, Naracoorte and the Padthaway vineyards, I have noticed that every week more and more paddocks, generally with *terra rosa* soil, which produces high quality wines, are being planted with vines. Of course, the value of export in wines was predicted this week to rise over

the next few years from the \$250 million export value a year that we currently have to about \$750 million. That is a threefold increase, not just a doubling. We are talking about exports involving another \$500 million. So, we will have up to \$750 million in wine exports alone. I cannot help thinking that these people must have missed that point. The vine plantings will continue, I am sure, with BRL Hardy and others having invested hundreds of millions of dollars into plantings and development of vineyards.

Crayfish alone is worth \$33 million a year. There are also feed stocks, which I have not yet mentioned, and the potential for vegetable crops, which used to be grown extensively until Wattie Pict closed down its operations in Mount Gambier and moved back to Melbourne. There are fodder crops and manufacturers and another commodity that is obviously needed in any industrial community, that is, a good fuel source. We have the interstate grid—the link—which brought 500 kilowatts to Mount Gambier and then through to Adelaide, and we have the Adelaide to Mount Gambier link already established. We found gas at Katnook and one of several other drill holes that have been put down has shown a commercial amount of gas to supplement the Katnook production. That gas is piped through to Mount Gambier and Snuggery, and I have no doubt that it will provide fuel not only to the South-East but probably to Adelaide as well in the years to come. Plenty of things will be happening.

There are many other areas that I could mention, but the beatification of Mother Mary McKillop must have tremendous significance not only to Penola but also to Mount Gambier, the South-East, Adelaide, several Victorian towns and, of course, Sydney. There will be a beatification or a sainthood trail, which I believe will carry tens of thousands of tourists across Australia in the coming years, with the Pope himself coming to Sydney in the new year and sainthood, I believe, being not too far beyond that beatification. All in all, I think that the South-East is doing very well.

**Mr EVANS (Davenport):** In supporting the motion, I congratulate the Governor on her speech, which outlines a very positive direction for South Australia and our rebuilding program for the State. I wish to outline in my address tonight some of the problems which face the seat of Davenport and which need to be addressed during this term of this Government.

In particular, I wish to speak about the lack of a police station, and certainly the lack of police, within the area. The Blackwood township has a police station, but it is simply not staffed. The police station building has been there for years. The previous Labor Government in its wisdom removed it as a 24-hour station and made it a part-time station. The notice on the door suggests that police are available at the station if staffing allows. It is unfortunate that the Darlington Police Station, to which Blackwood is aligned, very rarely has available personnel to staff the police station. If any anyone wishes to report a crime at Blackwood or to go to the local police station they will very rarely find anyone there to take the report of the crime.

Other than Craighburn Farm, there is no more important issue to the Blackwood district than the lack of police. Over the past 18 months there have been numerous serious crimes, which previously had not occurred in the area when the police had a higher presence. In particular, I refer to armed hold-ups, rape of school girls, arson at the school and arson at local businesses amounting to well over \$2 million. It is so bad now that the Blackwood Post Office sends me a monthly

report of all the crime and graffiti that occurs on its property, and it has removed all the chairs and public telephones from outside the premises simply because of the huge cost to the community in maintaining those facilities due to the vandalism and graffiti that occur.

Unfortunately, one of the local businessmen took the matter into his own hands and now finds himself charged with assault. That is ultimately what will happen if the Government does not provide a greater policing presence during this term. Some businesses have had to close due to the lack of insurance. They have been knocked off so many times by vandals and criminals that their insurance companies have told them they can no longer get insurance for public liability or burglary. Therefore, the businesses have had no option other than to close. One of the businesses in the area has been broken into 24 times in 18 months and that is totally unacceptable. Even the local scout groups are having problems. A group of youths gather at the Blackwood Post Office, which seems to be the centre of attraction for this group, and the scouts are so scared that they will not put their scout uniforms on to walk past this group: they stop to get changed into their scout uniforms behind the hall or the bushes and then walk down to the scout hall. That is the sort of fear that exists in that group about the problems that exist within the area.

The feeling about the lack of police in the area is so strong that the various Neighbourhood Watch groups have asked me to call on the Mitcham council to introduce dry zones in the area. So, we held a public meeting asking the council to do so, and from that public meeting a committee was formed. That committee included councillors and a number of youths themselves who wanted to be on the committee, and as the local politician I was also a member.

We met for about two months to discuss various ways in which Blackwood youth could best be helped. The youths themselves were very cooperative and I congratulate those involved in the process, which was a very positive one, very important for the district. They came back with a number of positive suggestions in relation to what they would like to see happen in the Blackwood area, such as a late night pool hall, community pictures and job training programs for the local area. In relation to all their ideas, every single option included the need for a police station within Blackwood. There was not one option suggested that ultimately did not relate back to a police station in Blackwood.

The Government has announced in the past eight weeks that a Business Watch will be established in Blackwood, for which the Blackwood Chamber of Commerce has been calling now for nearly two years. That also is a very positive step and, as a member of the Chamber of Commerce, I can say that it is very grateful for that facility being established in the next six weeks. Also, our sixth Neighbourhood Watch group, the Belair Neighbourhood Watch group, will be started, having taken nearly two years to get up and running. So, those are two good positive initiatives that are being taken.

I congratulate the Chamber of Commerce on not being negative on the issue of unemployment. It has decided to set up an employment broking service in the Blackwood community, and I have volunteered my office to run that service. The Chamber of Commerce will actually go out and source with the local employers jobs which are available in the local district and which may be filled through people who live locally.

It will develop a register and advertise jobs which specifically try to target employing local people. Quite unashamedly, it will try to employ unemployed people from the Blackwood or Mitcham Hills area. Obviously benefits to the community will follow if more young people are employed in the local district. Employment will give them responsibility and teach them teamwork, as well as job skills. It will also give them an income and provide them with independence. The Chamber of Commerce is to be congratulated on taking up that initiative and providing that positive influence in relation not only to the situation of local youths and their future but also the problems of the district.

The community is convinced that what the Government should be doing is selling the current Blackwood Police Station site, which is somewhat out of the centre of Blackwood, and establishing a shop-front police station. At the public meeting the community clearly indicated that that would be quite acceptable. I have already written to the Minister offering to source a shop if he tells me the rental that he wishes to pay and the size of the shop he thinks appropriate. So, the ball is really now in the Minister's court as to whether or not the Blackwood community will ultimately get a shop-front police station.

I place on record my appreciation of the outstanding service we get from the police who currently service the district from the Darlington Police Station. On every occasion on which I have contacted the Darlington Police Station the police have responded positively, given the resources that they have. Quite often they have provided extra surveillance in the area by way of foot patrols and horse patrols. They have provided plainclothes police officers and, at some stages, undercover police officers in an effort to solve particular problems, especially at peak periods. Therefore, I have no criticism of the police. I believe that they do an outstanding job in the Blackwood area, given the resources they have. I would like to see more resources given to the police so that a shop-front police station can be located somewhere in the Blackwood community.

I congratulate the Minister for Transport in another place on her announcement about the reinstatement of railway guards, etc., which I see as a positive move, and it is one that is greatly appreciated in the Blackwood area. Because of this we will see a reduction in vandalism on the various forms of transport. I think it is up to parents, not only in Blackwood but also in other communities, to start educating their children and encouraging them to become involved in volunteer organisations, so that they learn that there is much to be gained by giving to the community rather than taking.

I believe that over the past 10 to 20 years there has been an attitude ingrained into our youth that the Government owes them a job and an education and that it will give them everything. I see that as being a problem, and it is one that is arising all the time in the Blackwood area. I am sure that it is an Australia-wide problem, not merely one relating to Blackwood. I would ask parents to encourage their children to become involved in volunteerism, whether that be through a service club, serving on a volunteer committee, or through the scouts, etc. I think there are some positive things to be gained by being a volunteer. I think young people value their community assets far greater if they become a volunteer, and this is an area where parents can have a very positive influence on their children's lives if they take the trouble to encourage them to become involved in volunteer groups.

A second matter that will need to be addressed by this Government in the long term is the traffic problem that exists

in the Blackwood area. Members would be aware that I have spoken previously about the problems that will occur in the district if Craighburn Farm proceeds. That matter has now been resolved in the courts and the first stage will proceed. The Blackwood district has enormous problems with traffic, involving not only local traffic that is trying to get out of Blackwood down the two main arterial roads but also traffic which comes through the developments further south of Blackwood and which uses Blackwood as a thoroughfare to get to Adelaide for work or shopping.

A classic example of this problem occurred last Friday evening. When a train stopped at the Blackwood station the traffic banked up at the Blackwood roundabout. That train stopped the flow of traffic in Blackwood because once the roundabout is blocked you cannot go up or down the Blackwood main street, Shepherds Hill Road or Coromandel Parade: every single road is blocked. I have checked this situation for the past two Friday nights, and it is a common occurrence. When Craighburn Farm proceeds—and it looks as though it will—it will add a further 800 cars to the problem. If the Blackwood experimental orchard, which the Government has announced it is disposing of, goes to housing that will add a further 120 cars. If you add an extra 900-odd cars to the problem, one can see that the Government really needs to address the traffic problem in the Mitcham Hills area.

Anyone who travels down the Old Belair Road in the morning does so at their own risk. Only in this week's *Messenger* I note that one of the local residents has built a brick wall to protect their home, because they believe a car will go straight through the corner and miss and go straight through their house. There is no doubt that the Old Belair Road cannot take the current amount of traffic on it, let alone what will be on it once the Craighburn Farm buildings are built. So, the Government really does have to take the bull by the horns on the issue of traffic in the Belair and Blackwood area and do something with the Old Belair Road.

I have previously written to the Minister for Transport on this issue, suggesting one of two things. Possibly a bypass road could be built, not dissimilar to the Gawler bypass, which would take the traffic that comes from south of Adelaide and transfer it around the township of Blackwood so that the traffic does not go through the main street. While that will solve the main street problem, it will not solve the problem of traffic going down the Old Belair Road or Shepherd's Hill Road. The second suggestion that is worth considering is that the Minister may wish to make Old Belair Road two lanes down for an hour in the morning and two lanes up for an hour in the evening. The New Belair Road can be used as a detour for any cars that are inconvenienced by that move. That would give the peak traffic exiting Blackwood and entering Blackwood at the end of the day the greatest opportunity to move through the township in the shortest possible time. Both those suggestions are really only short-term solutions; ultimately, the Government will have to spend some big dollars on the traffic problems out of Old Belair Road.

Another problem that the Minister for Transport is addressing—and I am pleased to see that it will be fixed in the next 18 months—is the problem of the Glenalta crossing, which is on the main road between the Belair and Blackwood townships. Every time a train stops at the Glenalta station, the arms of the crossing come down to stop all the traffic, even though the train is not actually going through the crossing. So, I am pleased to see that the Minister has finally agreed to fix that problem and that it will be solved in the next 18

months. The other traffic problem that will need to be addressed ultimately is the problem that exists on the corner of Cashel Street and Rugby Street in Pasadena, adjacent to St Mary's, and I have written to the council on that matter in the hope that it will resolve that issue within the next 12 months.

Another point that will be discussed within the life of this Parliament is the review of the various cemeteries that exist within Adelaide. This is particularly important to the residents of Pasadena. Pasadena is the home of the Centennial Park cemetery, and there has been a lot of discussion over the years about the possibility of mausoleums being introduced to South Australian cemeteries. Certainly, the Pasadena Residents' Association—of which I am a member, and I have attended most of the meetings over the past three or four months and prior to the election—has always raised fears about the possibility of a mausoleum going into the Centennial Park Trust. I have therefore taken every opportunity to encourage that community to partake in the review of the cemetery regulations which is now being undertaken by the Minister. It is important that it take that opportunity, because if it has concerns about mausoleums this is the chance to voice its opinion.

Adjacent to the Centennial Park cemetery and Pasadena is the Daws Road High School. I wish to congratulate the Daws Road High School on its outstanding efforts and achievements over the past 12 months. Members may not know that the Daws Road High School suffered three fires within 12 months approximately three years ago. It had enormous changes of staff and leadership positions as a result of the stresses built up by those fires.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr EVANS:** It is in my electorate, and I am on the school council. As the member for Ross Smith should know, every member of Parliament is automatically on the high school council. He may not be aware of that. I am on the Daws Road High School council, as I am on the Blackwood Primary and High School councils and the Hawthorndene Primary School council. The Daws Road High School has been successful in stopping the decline in its student base. It went from 800 to 400 students in two years because of the fires. It has now built the school up to about 450 students and has just won a tender for a four court gymnasium and weight room to be built at the school, and that is a tremendous achievement for the school. It has also secured the tenure of the Patch Theatre at the school. We have all heard of the Tower Art Centre and the outstanding activities that go on there.

Recently, I had the pleasure of attending their Japanese exchange, attended by 16 students and three teachers from Japan, and five of the Daws Road High School students are flying back to Japan as an exchange. They have instigated a very positive program into that high school. I am aware of the excellent support the school also gets from the member for Elder. The school is adjacent to his electorate, and I know that he gives it excellent support, for which I thank him. It is actually right on the street that is the boundary, so the member for Elder and I are always crossing paths at the Daws Road High School. It is tremendous to see the school achieving such positive results, and I am pleased to see that the Minister for Education has guaranteed the school that it is not targeted for closure, which is a very positive thing, and I congratulate Hayden Linke and his staff on the excellent results the school is achieving.

The other school that I wish to mention tonight is the Belair Primary School. The Belair Primary School has gone



through a discussion process now for nearly three years about the possibly of collocating the junior primary site to the senior primary school site, a move of about 500 metres across one road. Eventually, the school decided that it would collocate and, under the previous Government, commitments were given by public servants that the Government would fund that collocation. It has now come to light that there has, in fact, been no budget allocation for that school, either now or in the forward estimates committee, and the Belair school has been advised that, unfortunately, its collocation will not go ahead in the next two years. That is one of the things that I will be fighting for over time. The school community had a number of public meetings, which I chaired. I went to about 18 of the 20 meetings that discussed this issue. It was a very important issue to the Belair community and I do not intend to let the matter rest there.

On a more positive note, the Coromandel Valley Primary School has been fortunate to gain a \$650 000 allocation towards the upgrading of its school, something that is desperately needed. The school has had an enormous population growth. It has zoned itself off because of that population growth and now has about 520 students. For those 520 students the school has only one netball court and one basketball court as far as its recreation area goes. It has a small oval, and when it rains there is no undercover area for the students, and at Coromandel Valley it does rain a little: it is one of the wettest areas of the State. I am pleased to see that the Government has honoured the commitment to upgrade the Coromandel Valley Primary School by some \$650 000, and I am sure the people at Coromandel Valley appreciate the support given to it by the Government.

I should also mention, of course, the excellent support given to it by the member for Fisher. This school is adjacent to his electorate, and a number of his constituents' children attend it. The member for Fisher has certainly been one of the big supporters of Coromandel Valley Primary School. We congratulate him and thank him for his commitment to that school. The other school that I wish to mention as needing facilities is Clapham Primary School, which has now been fighting for five years to try to get a sports hall or activity hall. It has been unsuccessful in any type of funding, Federal or State, and it is something on which I am working with the school community, to try to get extra sporting facilities for the Clapham Primary School.

The final topic I wish to touch on very lightly tonight is the Blackwood Experimental Orchard. That orchard has been in the Government's ownership for some years, and the Minister has now announced that the Government intends to dispose of the land. He has set up a public consultation process, for which I congratulate him, which will take some eight weeks. After the eight weeks' consultation process there will be about a four month period during which the community will have a chance to report back to the Government on its wishes. Community members have previously raised a number of concepts they would like to develop for this land.

'Farmettes' was one suggestion; a sports facility for the Coromandel Valley Primary School was another. The land is almost adjacent on one corner to the Coromandel Valley Primary School, which desperately needs sporting facilities. Someone suggested that it should be left as a park such as the Cleland Reserve. Another more interesting suggestion is that the arts community of the Hills wishes to develop it as an arts village. At least 10 artists working in the Mitcham Hills area are prepared to sell their own homes to develop an arts village on the land, which would consist of their own homes with

their workshops adjacent. There would be tea and coffee rooms so that tourists could visit the area, see the artists working in their workshops and not only see visually their product but also see how the product is made. I think that would be an excellent thing. It would be something unique to the district, and I hope that the group puts in a submission to the Minister, so that it can be given due consideration when the future of the Blackwood Experimental Orchard is under discussion. With those few comments, I support the motion.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Tourism):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** This afternoon we received a media release from the Deputy Premier dealing with the new superannuation scheme for Government employees. I should say that it is really the non-superannuation scheme for Government employees, but it includes a couple of little chestnuts. We are told—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** Hang on; I will handle the broken promises tonight. I want to deal with the broken promises, so let me get going. On the day when a number of promises have been broken, the member for Ross Smith is dead right: a number of promises were taken to the slaughter block today and poor old small business out in the community has been given a kicking again. The member for Ross Smith is right, but I must say that the Minister for Industrial Affairs was not the only one slitting the throat of promises today. This media release contains another promise that has gone down the tube. The media release, which contains a couple of lovely chestnuts, states:

The Deputy Premier and Treasurer, Stephen Baker, said today a proposed new Southern State Superannuation Scheme (Triple S)—

I can see four—

would be available to all Government employees including police, as well as casual employees who had not been eligible to join the State Lump Sum scheme.

The Treasurer there refers to employees who had not been eligible to join the scheme in time, yet on about 19 April he said that no-one had anything to fear, that the scheme was going to carry on as it always had and that he had no plans to change it. What the Treasurer did not tell the House was that the next day there was a meeting in his office where a committee was put in place to change that very scheme. The Minister must have been having a very bad evening. What happened after that, as we know, is that the good Treasurer came into the House and said that the scheme was closing not next week, not in a couple of days but 'yesterday', and no-one could join.

However, there was an anomaly because someone with a loose tongue spoke to Channel 10. Although the Treasurer closed the scheme on the Wednesday, those people in South Australia who had not joined the lump sum scheme and who watched the Channel 10 news on the Monday received advanced warning, and I am told that 1 000 new applications to join the scheme were received in the first hour of the next day. What kind of a scheme have we got since the old scheme was closed?

I should point out that those poor members of the State Bank—the 598 superannuants around there—had been browbeaten out of their defined benefit scheme some months earlier. The Treasurer's media release today states:

The new scheme will commence on 1 July 1995—a very important date—and provide retirement benefits on a par with those generally available from employer sponsored schemes in the community.

That is another important point. It will be the same as some of those schemes out in the community. I will inform the House why it will be important in a moment. The statement continues:

The level of employer support of the new Triple S scheme will be equal to the statutory required level under the Commonwealth's Superannuation Guarantee legislation. . .

In other words, the Government will pay the absolute minimum that it has to pay under Commonwealth law. The statement goes on:

This compares with the average level of employer support of the existing State and police lump sum schemes of 12.2 per cent and 12 per cent respectively.

I will explain that. This scheme does not give one miserable dollar above that which is required from Canberra. Members may say that the superannuation guarantee charge is less than 6 per cent, but that is when we refer to 1 July 1995, because that is when it goes to 6 per cent. The statement makes it look like the employees are doing pretty well out of it and that the Government is giving employees 6 per cent. It is not doing that at all. It is giving absolutely nothing more—not a cent more than what the Commonwealth Government has made sure it must provide for Australian workers.

With respect to the Police Force, the media release states:

Mr Baker said membership of the new scheme would be compulsory for police officers who will be required to contribute at least 5 per cent of salary.

A police officer had to contribute 5 per cent under the last scheme. The only difference was that they received a deemed benefit of 19 per cent: their own 5 per cent and the rest made up by the Government. We now find that police officers will put in their 5 per cent and the Government will put in its 6 per cent. Of course, it will go up because according to the sliding scale introduced by Canberra—and not this miserable shower opposite—it will go up to 9 per cent by the year 2001. This could mean that we will have a situation where two police officers are going along in a car with both paying 5 per cent of salary into superannuation. However, one will have a defined benefit equivalent to 19 per cent going into the scheme and the other will have 11 per cent going into the scheme. Both have the same obligations and both have the same work but under this Government one will be treated much better than the other.

Earlier in my contribution the member for Ross Smith asked me about the promise made by the Liberal Party prior to the last State election. The promise was that nothing was going to happen to change the present arrangements at all. The PSA, the police and the nurses were all told that. What is worse, the story did not change until the day the Audit Commission brought down its findings. The committee just happened to reach its findings on the same day that Parliamentary Counsel just happened to have a Bill prepared in respect of this matter, and the whole lot came in here together. What we found was that another set of promises had been ratted on. Indeed, where this was concerned—

**Mr Clarke:** Has he honoured any promise?

**Mr QUIRKE:** I have not found one yet. That is not quite true. I think he did honour some of the promises to some of the supermarkets. Some will be open. He did honour some promises to some of the smaller stores because some will not have to open on a Monday and a Tuesday, but they will have to be happy with that because they will be open the rest of the time. The poor old hairdressers have really been fixed up, well and truly. There has been too much said in this House today about people who require the services of hairdressers, wigmakers, and those sorts of things. It is a rather controversial topic.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** Indeed, you need a wig too, son. At the end of the day what we find—to take the jocular out of it—is again a group of people who, unfortunately, at the whim of this Government have had their retirement plans ripped up in front of them. In the future you will find two people doing the same job, whether it is in the Police Force or some other arm of the Government, receiving different remuneration. We will, of course, be pointing out all of these broken promises.

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

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I want to use the time available to me tonight to highlight the plight of farmers, particularly at the moment with the weather and what the Government and the department can do to help. Farming at the moment, as you, Sir, would be aware in your vocation, as a long-term lifestyle and as a profession, is not a viable vocation. The plight of our farmers in South Australia and Australia generally can only be described as desperate. Why? It is because of the low commodity prices, the high local costs and now the vagaries of the weather, that is, drought. South Australia is not in a drought situation as yet, as is most of Australia, but the signs are not good.

If we listen to our long range weather forecaster, Lennox Walker, and to the Bureau of Meteorology they are telling us that we are in for a warmer, drier September-October. That is news we do not want in South Australia. I do not believe them because I am an optimist. I hope that we will get those rains at the end of the season. We will have a later season and we will get a reasonable crop. The situation in farming generally will not improve in the short term. ABARE does not forecast huge increases in commodity prices, particularly with wool. It is improving but only slowly. Wheat prices are flat, particularly now that our markets are being pernickety with what they buy in relation to protein and continuing overseas subsidising.

We are very worried about this El Nino effect that some of our meteorologists tell us affects our weather. Apparently, El Nino is visiting us in a couple of weeks. We must retain our food producers. We are still producing the best quality food in the world at the lowest possible cost. As a Government, we must further assist our farmers, otherwise we will not have people on farms producing food because it will not be viable for them. Huge costs are involved: the costs of tools of the trade; the cost of living in the country; and, the income, far from being guaranteed at best can only be described as poor.

What the Government has done in the past few months has been very much appreciated, particularly in relation to the stamp exemptions for land transfer, finance conveyancing and vehicle registrations as well as the young farmer assistance scheme. Also, the deregulation of the Meat Hygiene Authority has been well received. Allowing red meat to be sold in

the same way as any other meat in shops will certainly be a great help to our beef and mutton producers in South Australia. We must do more to help our farmers and our rural dwellers generally.

The legal situation relating to farm registration and compulsory third party on vehicles is a concern at the moment. Personally I am taking it on board to try to reach a situation where farmers are completely covered should they have an accident with a farm vehicle on the road. Currently some doubt exists under the compulsory third party rules. Agricultural research must be an ongoing endeavour. Our State department has had a fantastic record over the years and, although we have run into economic straits, we must not curtail that research because the runs are certainly on the board. Farmers would not be as effective as they are had they not been able to use the research of the Department of Agriculture, the now Department of Primary Industries. We must cut costs and red tape.

With freeholding of land we can save administration costs. Every 12 months farmers have to sit down and pay rates, taxes, leases and rents. I am a great believer in freeholding land to save administration costs both ends—to the Government as well as the time and hassle to the farmers and landholders. Farmers spend much time paying rents and leases, as does the Government. We should expedite the freeholding of perpetual leases, as has been the case in the past. We must make it easier and encourage our farmers and landowners to do it. We have some Crown leases that need go the same way—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** At what cost? A landholder should pay up front 10 years' rent or lease plus an administration fee. The Government would be better off, and in the long term so would the farmer, both on leasehold lands and on most of the Crown lands.

I refer also to on and off farm fuel costs, which is a huge expense for farmers. Diesel used for tractors is not taxable. However, modern day tillage-free farming or minimal till farming means that we are not using tractors as much. It is with the trucks that we are paying maximum dollars with regard to fuel excise. Carriers pay huge amounts in excise both federally and State. One of my constituents—a truck driver—owns five trucks and the Federal excise charged is 30.75¢, plus State excise, on every litre of diesel. Our South Australian excise is as expensive as any at 10.23¢ per litre. We can compare it with Queensland which has a zero excise, Tasmania at 6¢, and New South Wales and Western Australia at 7¢. In South Australia, for every litre of diesel you are

paying a total of 41¢.

It is unfair that that tax hits inequitably on rural people, particularly farmers. It is all very well for money to be spent on roads, in particular country roads, but we know that the money has not been spent over the past 15 years on roads. The people paying the most tax have the worst roads and I am very concerned about that.

Other charges about which we can do something to help rural people include electricity, water and telephone charges. Telephone costs to rural people are prohibitive. How many people can the average farmer telephone before being into STD calls? It is a very small percentage compared with the number Adelaide people can make. I refer also to tax deductibility and incentives. Farmers must be encouraged to invest back into property, plant and equipment, in fences, soil fertility and fodder conservation. We must encourage farmers to help themselves. There must be assistance for plant replacement. We had investment allowances, which have just been taken off, and depreciation allowances. We must put them back to encourage farmers to modernise their plant. We must also dismantle the iniquitous capital gains tax, which gives no incentive at all.

We have equalisation and taxation problems. The problem with farming is that it is all boom and bust—huge incomes one year and none the next. We must provide farmers with a way to equalise their income so that their taxation is predictable and controllable. No farmer asks for subsidies, but most international competitors are subsidised. We heavily subsidise some of our manufacturing industries, particularly the car industry, but we do not give anything to our farmers. I think we should introduce fertiliser subsidies, promote soil fertility and stop the farmers from mining. We should be able to buy on the same markets and on the same terms as we have to sell.

The high cost of off-farm wages in Australia is prohibitive, but Governments are waking up. Australian farm workers receive very low wages. If they claim for WorkCover, they get only 80 per cent after 12 months. I find that unbelievable. We cannot expect anybody to live on that sort of wage, particularly when it is taxed. The situation is not sustainable.

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

Motion carried.

At 9.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 10 August at 2 p.m.