

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 10 August 1994

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

NETTING

A petition signed by 51 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ban netting, excluding dab nets and hoop and drop nets, in Coffin Bay waterways enclosed from longitude 34° 26.5 minutes, from Point Sir Isaacs East, was presented by the Hon. D.S. Baker.

Petition received.

TRADING HOURS

Petitions signed by 161 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow extended retail trading hours were presented by Mr Becker and Mr Condous.

Petitions received.

Petitions signed by 5 288 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow general Sunday trading where restrictions currently apply were presented by Mr Condous and Mr Venning.

Petitions received.

ROAD TRAFFIC, MID NORTH

A petition signed by 66 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to lower the speed limit within the town of Paskeville and to provide appropriate indication of the Bute Road intersection was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

CENTENARY OF FEDERATION

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Centenary of Federation Advisory Committee has released a detailed report today and I am pleased to advise the House of its importance to South Australia. The committee was appointed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG)—in fact, this report will now go to the COAG meeting next week—to advise on the goals, strategies and options for the celebration of the Centenary of Federation in the year 2001. The Commonwealth and all States and Territories were represented on the committee, which met from March this year to consider more than 400 written submissions and to receive presentations from more than 500 people. South Australia's representative on the committee was the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore.

On behalf of the South Australian Government, I made a submission to the committee in March. I commend the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, the universities, a range of State and local government agencies, community organisations and a number of individuals also made submissions from South Australia.

In a letter transmitting the report to me, the Chairperson of the committee, the Hon. Joan Kirner, former Premier of Victoria, has described the submission of the South Australian Government as an 'excellent' one, saying that it 'had a profound influence on the committee, was endorsed by many organisations across Australia and is reflected in the report.'

Central to our submission was the view that the Centenary of Federation provided a very significant opportunity to address the problems of the Murray River: a view the committee has endorsed in its report. It has supported a national project to clean up the Murray-Darling River Basin, with the aim that by the year 2000 no urban effluent will run into the river, water quality be significantly improved and land will be restored.

These were key goals identified in our submission. As the committee has reported, this project would unite all Australians. It would be an opportunity for people from country and city to work together. It would involve farmers, business people, trade unionists, conservation groups, Aboriginal communities, service clubs, women's organisations, senior citizens, the young, and cultural organisations.

The Centenary of Federation Advisory Committee has also recognised two other major projects submitted by South Australia in my submission. It has recommended that COAG should consider the Alice Springs to Darwin railway as a major national transport project for any national infrastructure program to mark the centenary.

The committee also noted our proposal for a National Wine Museum and Interpretive Centre as a means of celebrating the role of wine in Australia's history and economy, past and future. I regard the recognition of these projects by the Centenary of Federation Advisory Committee as an important step forward in ensuring that they receive priority for Commonwealth funding.

This report will now be considered by COAG when it meets in Darwin on 19 August. At that meeting, I will be urging the Prime Minister to recognise the national and international benefits which would flow from the Commonwealth's endorsement of these projects. As well as our submission to the Centenary of Federation Advisory Committee, my Government has also taken a number of other initiatives to secure support for these projects and to ensure that they can proceed quickly when funding arrangements can be clarified.

Within the constraints of South Australia's difficult financial position, my Government is prepared to give financial support to each of the projects identified in our submission. At the same time, it must be recognised that these projects are national and international in their significance and that, therefore, it is appropriate for the Commonwealth to provide major funding support for those projects.

Today's publication of this report is a positive demonstration that South Australia is providing leadership in moulding the future development of our nation. I commend the committee for its work and I particularly thank Jennifer Cashmore and Helen Paige from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, who represented South Australia at some of the committee's meetings and who also coordinated the preparation of our State Government submission.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: My statement relates to the Electricity Trust of South Australia's end of financial year performance. On 1 July some very significant reductions in electricity tariffs took effect, delivering to all businesses in South Australia, and especially to the small business sector, a much needed reduction in operating costs, giving a clear signal that at last they are dealing with a Government that is intent on delivering a low cost business environment. Through these tariff cuts we put around \$37 million back into the economy. We were able to do that because ETSA has delivered on its financial performance targets. The trust last year generated a surplus before abnormal items of \$212.7 million from total revenue of \$901.6 million. Although the revenue was virtually unchanged from the previous year, the surplus was 9 per cent above budget target, allowing a 4 per cent increase in the dividends to \$100 million, which were paid to Treasury.

ETSA has achieved another very successful year of operation and continued to lower its expenditure in real terms. During the financial year 1993-94 the total expenditure was \$688.9 million, down 3 per cent from the previous year. The return on assets remained stable at 16.2 per cent, half a per cent above the budget. It is obvious that during the last financial year ETSA was able to make further substantial productivity gains. This is expressed, for example, in the number of working days lost, which was less than half that of the previous year, or in the number of injuries, which fell by over 20 per cent. At the same time, the average number of minutes when customers were without electricity fell by some 43 per cent. With stable revenue, above target surplus, substantially fewer injuries and time lost, plus better reliability, ETSA has positioned itself well for the competitive pressures which it will face in the future.

These pressures are the result of the Federal Government's demands on the performance of Government trading enterprises and the introduction of the national grid. ETSA has taken up these challenges with commendable flexibility and achieved its efficiency improvements with minimal disruptions. By the end of June, 955 employees had left the trust, 918 of them accepting a targeted separation package. Whilst during the last financial year sales of electricity increased by 2.4 per cent, revenue from these sales actually fell by 1.3 per cent. This reflects a real reduction in the average electricity price of more than 4 per cent.

The Government has translated this reduction into average tariff cuts of over 4 per cent, with some crucial tariffs coming down by as much as 22 per cent. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the efforts of the board, the managerial team and not least the staff of ETSA for their excellent performance during the past financial year.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I bring up the third report of the committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

Mr CUMMINS: I bring up the fourth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr CUMMINS: I bring up the interim report of the committee on citizen initiated referenda and move:

That the interim report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

TRADING HOURS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Why did the Governor's speech delivered to this Parliament only a week ago state, 'During this session you'—being the Parliament—'will be asked to consider legislation affecting regulation of shop trading hours', when yesterday's announcement of extended trading hours by ministerial exemption would see no such Government legislation coming before Parliament?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: If the member for Ross Smith had read the Shop Trading Hours Act he would know that any changes to the sale of red meat requires legislation before the Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GERARD INDUSTRIES

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): My question is directed to the Premier. I note that today the Premier announced the expansion of Gerard Industries. Will any benefits flow to South Australia?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It was with great pleasure that I saw Robert Gerard this morning when he announced formally that his company was to undertake a \$20 million expansion program in South Australia. Gerard Industries produces Clipsal products and is the largest manufacturer of switch and electrical gear in the whole of Australia. More importantly, it has now become a key manufacturing company providing that equipment to the Asian area.

This morning Gerard Industries announced that the company was undertaking a \$20 million expansion which involves a new factory and training facility at Strathalbyn. This gives credence to the regional development strategy of the present Government which the Minister has talked about on a number of occasions. Here is concrete proof that a Liberal Government in South Australia can once again deliver on regional development, which has been lacking for the past 11 years under a Labor Government. The training centre will train young South Australians for not only its operations in this State but also its international operations. This company makes Clipsal products, which are now manufactured in Malaysia, Indonesia and China. About 2 000 people are employed in China manufacturing Clipsal products, and it has about 95 per cent of the top end of the market. People will be brought down from those factories to be trained in Adelaide.

It is also important to note that this company is committed to making sure that it provides training for young South Australians. It highlights the benefits that can be derived by a company that moves off-shore in terms of its marketing and even its production, and through that expansion within the whole of the Asian region job opportunities are created in

South Australia. Gerard Industries still designs the products in South Australia. It tests the products in South Australia, and it will train people in South Australia. In fact, in China I had the chance to see not only Clipsal products being manufactured but also quite a number of products from South Australia, particularly the more complex switch gear products being exported to China from South Australia, and especially from Murray Bridge.

Gerard Industries has gone further than that. It is planning to double the size of its operation at Nuriootpa which again will be an enormous boost for that regional centre. It is also planning to expand its Wingfield operation, which is involved in packaging. This highlights the number of key initiatives that this Government has taken to make sure that industry, if it stays in South Australia, can be competitive. Gerard Industries has been loyally South Australian. It has the majority of the Australian operation in this State. It now employs almost 3 000 people. Apparently, it manufactures a range of close to 10 000 different products. Whilst it has some small operations interstate, and despite the fact that it is a national marketeer with a major share of the Australian market, it still makes those products in this State. So, it is good news yet again for South Australians under this new Liberal Government where we have a commitment for \$20 million of new industrial development and the creation of up to 100 new jobs for this State.

TRADING HOURS

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs categorically rule out any further extension to trading hours within the life of this Parliament beyond that announced by him yesterday and, if not, why not?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I would like to point out to the House, as I did yesterday, the hypocrisy with respect to the asking of all these questions. It is important to read to the House a Cabinet document in relation to the extension of shopping hours for a five day period prior to Christmas last year. Let me just read from the Cabinet document, just purely and simply—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The Chair has been most tolerant. I warn the member for Ross Smith.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I would like to read to the House the Cabinet submission from Minister Gregory on 15 October 1993. It puts into perspective all this nonsense that has been going on about procedures. It states—and I will read it word for word so everybody can hear it—the following:

The granting of an exemption for food stores can be done on application by each store under section 5 of the Shop Trading Hours Act 1997. The relevant section provides:

(1) The Minister may issue a certificate of exemption to a shopkeeper in relation to a shop specified in the certificate; and

(2) the certificate issued under this section will be subject to such restrictions and conditions as are specified in the certificate.

This is the important part of the statement from Minister Gregory:

I have constantly stated that I will not amend the Act during this term of government.

Members should remember that: Minister Gregory said he would not amend the Act during that term of government. He further said:

This statement was, in the main, to deflect any moves towards permanent Sunday trading.

This Minister said that he would use section 5, in the main, to deflect any moves towards Sunday trading. The document continues:

By issuing an exemption under section 5 of the Act I am keeping faith with my statements but allowing the public to choose when and where they shop for foodstuffs. The granting of an exemption to supermarkets would not flow to other industry sectors. . .

The point I am making is that the Minister was using this section to get around the extension of trading hours. All this nonsense that has been put out, particularly by the member for Ross Smith in the past 24 hours, was supported and approved by the previous Government in October 1993 in a Cabinet submission. The previous Government used it not only in this instance but in 883 other instances when this section could be used under an Act that was put together in 1977. They are a mob of hypocrites.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mrs HALL (Coles): Can the Treasurer inform the House of the job cuts to the public sector that would have been required for the previous Arnold Labor Government to achieve its budget targets as outlined in the April 1993 statement Meeting the Challenge? On page 6 of Meeting the Challenge, it was stated:

Nearly \$500 million will be reduced from Government outlays over the next three years through savings achieved in the State public sector which will be used to help reduce debt and free up funds to boost the State's economy.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I understand that hypothetical questions are out of order.

The SPEAKER: The same thought was passing through the Chair's mind. The Chair is of the view that the honourable member's question is hypothetical. I therefore ask the honourable member to reword her question so that it is more appropriate. I rule it out of order and the honourable member will be given the call later in Question Time.

TRADING HOURS

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Will the Premier clarify whether Liberal Party members, including Cabinet Ministers, will have a free vote in this House on my private member's Bill on the Shop Trading Hours Act, or is yesterday's determination of the Parliamentary Liberal Party binding? Last week the Premier advised this House that Liberal Party members have a fundamental right to vote according to how they believe they should vote. Yet this week in a television interview, the member for Unley indicated that members would be bound by the decision of the Party room.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I realise that this is something very strange to members of the Labor Party in South Australia because, before they can even join the Party and become a member of the parliamentary Party, they have to sign a pledge that says, 'I sell out my independence; I sell my soul to the Labor Party; I sell my right to stand up and defend my electorate in favour of the Labor Party.' They have all signed a pledge—all 11 of them—saying, 'I have sold my soul to the Labor Party; I have sold my allegiance to my electorate to the Labor Party.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can understand why the member for Hart has raised this question: it is something totally new and foreign to him.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The member for Playford.

Mr QUIRKE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, members should be reminded not to turn their back to the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot uphold that point of order. The Premier.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Apparently, it was the member for Ross Smith who sold his soul. We all know that they have all sold their soul. I made quite clear last week exactly—

The Hon. H. Allison: Here's the pledge.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We have a copy of the pledge. It states:

Schedule 3—Australian Labor Party (South Australian Branch)—Nomination form for State and National Executive and delegates to National Conference.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Here is the pledge.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will suspend the sitting of the House if the disruption continues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And I might name a couple of members before doing so if they continue to interject while I am on my feet. The Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It states:

Schedule 2—Australian Labor Party—Parliamentary candidate's pledge.

Cross your heart and spit; this is what they have to say:

I hereby agree to be bound by the Objective, National and State Platforms and Rules of the Australian Labor Party and by all decisions of the National Conference, Convention and State Council that do not conflict with such Objectives, Platforms and Rules. I also agree to be bound by decisions of the State Executive that do not conflict with the Objective, National and State Platforms or Rules of the Australian Labor Party or with decisions of the National Conference, Convention and State Council.

I point out that, with regard to a crucial issue such as being allowed to bring a private operator into the Adelaide Airport, they are all now bound to work against the interests of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They even have to go against what they said only last year. On Tuesday of this week I read to the House four statements by the then Premier, now Leader of the Opposition, which clearly showed that last year he favoured bringing in to the airport private operators and funds. This year, he cannot do so because he signed away his soul to the Labor Party of Australia. The real crux of the matter is that the State Executive of the Labor Party can also bind them by the words I have just read out. Those faceless men and women—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —who sit down there on South Terrace—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That is why I say, 'Those faceless men and women'—that is the sort of person to whom I was referring—who sit down there on South Terrace with no accountability to this Parliament or the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WASTE CONTROL

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. Following the restructuring of the Trade Waste Section of the EWS Department, will the Minister advise the House on developments in the intensive program to monitor the flow of heavy metal contaminants entering the sewerage system which aims to reduce these sludges at the source rather than at the point of disposal?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: This is another good news story for South Australia, for which officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department deserve some support and encouragement for the plan they have put in place over the past 12 to 18 months. In addition, I highlight the fact that the procedures they have put in place to meet the standards dovetail perfectly into the Government's approach of minimising the cost to industry and business of doing business in South Australia. Prior to 1993, heavy metals of the digested sludges from the four metropolitan waste water plants were above the American Environmental Protection Authority standards and the New South Wales Government guidelines. Prior to 1993, EWS sludges from our four metropolitan sewage treatment plants faced land use restrictions.

One solution to that at that time was to put in place chemical treatment of industrial and domestic raw sewage inflow to remove the heavy metal contaminants. Preliminary costs of that scheme were put at somewhere between \$30 million and \$80 million in capital, and \$5 million to \$10 million in operating expenditure annually. However, the EWS trade waste section restructured itself and introduced a team concept of operation. That section has operated now for the past 18 months, and I point out that it made itself available for industrial advice seven days a week and on 24 hour call during this period to bring about the results that have been achieved.

The program incorporated a close scrutiny of individual site processes and disposal practices (legitimate and otherwise), with a heavy bias on a cooperative approach with industry towards operator education in chemical treatment and waste management. The heavy metal generating industry in this State predominantly consists of small to medium sized operations. Understanding, controlling and changing existing work practices by cooperation, rather than by reliance on monitoring at discharge to sewer, was identified as the key to success in metal reduction. As I said, some officers spent a considerable amount of time to ensure that these procedures were put in place by the practices, not put in place by chemical treatment that would have added significantly to the cost of industry and capital equipment, and also annual operating expenses.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Many gains through improved work practices have now been established. Customer service at the industrial interface is centred around the authority's being able to advise and assist industry with ongoing

problems, to put in place practices to minimise the problem at the plant rather than discharging into the system to create the problem at our waste treatment plants. That closer, more effective liaison between the trade waste officers and industry has been established to the mutual benefit of South Australian industry and the taxpayers of South Australia. In other words, it is a win-win position. The capital costs have been reduced, as have the ongoing operating costs.

We have removed the cost to industry in meeting these high standards to the extent that the strategy employed by the trade waste section during the past 12 to 18 months has resulted in sludges from Bolivar, Christies Beach and Port Adelaide sewage treatment plants now being free of any disposal restrictions. Glenelg is not in that position at this stage, but significant improvement has been achieved at the Glenelg plant and, hopefully in the not too distant future, that will be in the same position. It is achievements such as this, within sections of Government agencies that are working closely and cooperatively with industry to bring about win-win positions for South Australia, which I think ought to be acknowledged.

MBF

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): In light of the Premier's announcement to the media yesterday that he had had discussions with Tan Sri Loy in Malaysia about establishing a casino at Wirrina, and the granting of a gaming licence for the Wirrina resort, will the Premier outline the detail of those discussions to the House and say what Government assistance, financial or administrative, was offered by him in addition to the \$13 million of infrastructure support already announced?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition once again is going completely overboard, as he invariably seems to do.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Just let the Leader of the Opposition listen for once and hear the facts, because he wishes always to race off and jump to assumptions. On at least three or four occasions since becoming Premier I have had various parties come along and ask, 'What is the attitude of the present Government towards the establishment of a casino?' In another area—it may be in an area to the south of Adelaide, or it may be in conjunction with a potential development—they have asked, 'What is the attitude of the State Government?'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will come to the former Government shortly. It is not an uncommon practice for people to come along to the Premier of the day and ask what Government policy is. I have made it quite clear, and my response has been the same to all parties who have asked me, that the issuing of a new casino licence in South Australia would be the responsibility of Parliament and that, as has been traditionally the case in South Australia—and it certainly would be under our Government—it would involve a conscience vote by members of the Parliament. That is certainly the case with the Liberal Party, and I would hope that the Labor Party would allow that same decency. Therefore, I have said to all parties that I could give no commitment whatsoever; it would be in Parliament's hands, and the Parliament would vote on an individual basis.

There is nothing unusual about that at all: there is nothing unusual about developers coming to me. Let me reveal to the House that it occurred with the former Labor Government. On a previous occasion the former Labor Government came to the Liberal Opposition wanting to strike a deal over the potential development of a second casino in South Australia. The Liberal Party said it would not agree to such a deal. I emphasise—and members ought to realise this—that apparently it is not unusual for developers to approach Premiers, because they have approached former Labor Premiers of South Australia.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I said 'former Labor Premiers'; it was in fact John Bannon, who was Premier at the time. There is nothing unusual about that. The important thing is that people understand—and I am delighted to have this recorded in *Hansard*—that the issuing of a second casino licence will be entirely the prerogative of this Parliament with a conscience vote from its Liberal Party members. I cannot, and would not, give any commitment to anyone. Therefore, I assure people that in relation to Wirrina I have given no commitment whatsoever: I gave the standard reply which I have just given to the House.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mrs HALL (Coles): My reworded question is directed to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer inform the House of the job cuts to the public sector that underlined the previous Labor Government's commitment to achieve its budget targets as outlined in its April 1993 document Meeting the Challenge?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I thank the—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence has a point of order.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I refer to page 36 of the *Members' Handbook* where the grounds upon which questions may be ruled out of order are listed. One of those grounds is requesting information on matters of past history for the purposes of argument.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will allow the question because, as I requested, the member for Coles brought the question to the Chair and I advised her that I believed it to be in accordance with Standing Orders. The honourable Treasurer.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: There seems to be some fierce resistance to this question, and I wonder why. I will read the relevant section on page 6 of Meeting the Challenge, which states that a commitment was made and:

... nearly \$500 million will be reduced from Government outlays over the next three years through savings achieved in the State public sector which will be used to help reduce debt and free up funds to boost the State's economy.

There seems to be a great deal of delight among Opposition members and in their saying that we are into a tough budget and there will have to be some changes and reductions. In fact, it is getting to the stage of gluttony. They are rubbing their hands together and saying, 'The poor old Liberals are on the hook.' We know why we are the hook—because of the mismanagement of the previous Government. It is essential for this House and the people of South Australia to understand that this undertaking was part of the deal made with the Commonwealth Government for the bail-out of the State Bank. The Commonwealth Government did not say, 'We'll give you \$600 million; no questions asked': it said, 'We

expect to see some real reductions in your expenditure levels.' It said that and the Treasurer signed up along the dotted line.

When this Government took over the Treasury benches I found the documents, and they were quite clear: the previous Government had agreed to meet stringent savings targets. We did not get our final cheque for last year until about 29 June, because the Commonwealth had to see a financial statement which was consistent with the previous commitments. It was worried stiff that we were not going to meet the commitment given to it. What underlies that commitment? The former Government had no intention of really meeting its commitments but it would at least sign up and worry about how it dealt with the Commonwealth after the event. Under that commitment the budget had to be reduced by 1 per cent in real terms. The calculation was done that the loss of employment in 1993-94 would involve 3 700 full-time equivalents; in 1994-95, 4 200 full-time equivalents; and in 1995-95, 2 600 full-time equivalents.

If those savings had been met and translated into the operational efforts of Government and impacted on employment within Government, the total result over those three years alone would have amounted to 10 500 people. That was the commitment made; and, when members opposite say they are clean, they are not: they are filthy dirty. Not only did the Labor Party put us in this terrible mess, but the mess has worsened. It knew that it was going to have to measure up at some stage or it would not get its money from the Commonwealth, so let us have a little cooperation and a lot less hypocrisy from the other side of the House.

MBF

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Given the Premier's comments that no undertakings were given to Tan Sri Loy regarding the development of a casino at Wirrina, will the Premier now table the memorandum of understanding which he signed with Tan Sri Loy in Malaysia as well as all other correspondence between the Premier, Tan Sri Loy and Les Penley of Sealink?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition has asked for the tabling of a document which would normally be regarded as a commercial document.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Just hear me out. I stress the fact that the company has spelt out in that document a number of things concerning its proposed developments, and I therefore think the Leader of the Opposition is putting the company at a disadvantage in requiring that it release commercially sensitive information such as that. I am quite happy for the Leader of the Opposition to come to my office, sit down and read the entire document.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Will you put it before the IDC?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am happy for the Industries Development Committee to have the document. It operates as a commercially sensitive body of the Parliament. It is bipartisan, and—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: What about correspondence?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will need to look through all the correspondence but, yes, I am happy basically for the Opposition to go through the correspondence to the IDC as well. That is a very generous offer which clearly shows—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—that the Government itself has absolutely nothing to hide but at the same time is

protecting the commercial interests of the company involved. I am still astounded that the Labor Party in South Australia would want to knock what will be one of the biggest international tourist developments that this State has ever seen. It is so important for this State to put in tourism infrastructure so that we can start to attract tourists from overseas. Why does the Labor Party in South Australia, now in Opposition, want to come out and knock every development that this Government tries to put up? I ask the Leader of the Opposition for a somewhat more cooperative and positive approach. We have evidence today yet again that companies are investing in this State with Gerard Industries announcing a \$20 million investment and the creation of 100 jobs. Therefore, all we want from the Leader of the Opposition and his small bunch of cronies is a somewhat more positive approach to join with the rest of South Australia as they see the level of confidence increase significantly.

CASEMIX FUNDING

Mr BASS (Florey): Will the Minister for Health inform the House of whether Federal criticism of the Victorian casemix experience raises concerns about the implementation of casemix in South Australian hospitals?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Florey for his very important question on something which is the biggest change in the way hospitals and health services have been funded for the past couple of decades. It is a fact that the Federal Minister has criticised Victoria with respect to the way it has introduced casemix. In fact, the Minister described the Victorian system as a basket case. I can only say that politics, like golf, is all a matter of timing. The Federal Minister got it 100 per cent wrong because, on the same day that she criticised the introduction of casemix funding in Victoria, the Victorian Government released part of a survey of the first year of waiting list figures in Victoria after casemix funding was introduced.

Between 1 July 1993 and 1 July 1994 there was an 86 per cent reduction in the number of urgent cases on the waiting list in Victoria and a 15 per cent reduction in the total number of cases waiting. Figures also showed a very significant improvement, as measured by the amount of time spent on waiting lists, where there was a 99 per cent reduction in the number of urgent cases on waiting lists for more than one month. Some basket case!

These are fantastic figures for every Victorian who, under the Cain and Kirner regimes, was suffering. The total number of patients under this system in Victoria in the past financial year increased by 9 per cent. Quite frankly, this makes the Federal criticism of the introduction of casemix in Victoria and its results totally bemusing—even more so because the Federal Government has been suggesting that its policy supports casemix funding. It has been part of a move towards looking at greater efficiency in the hospital system. It has been pushing for casemix funding within private hospital insurance. In fact, only yesterday, on the same day the criticisms were made, the private hospital and health insurance systems announced that casemix funding will be introduced, as the Federal Government has been asking, into the private sector from October this year. That is happening with the support of the Federal Government.

There is no doubt that private casemix funding is a very significant development with national support and shows that casemix is about developing better health care. Concerns about its introduction into South Australia are unfounded

because our system of casemix funding has been based on a great deal of experience within the South Australian health sector and has indeed built on the Victorian experience. As far as Minister Lawrence goes, her criticism is totally unfounded. She should get used to working with Governments that are keen to be efficient, like the Victorian Government, and as the South Australian Government is attempting to do, to rejuvenate the State's economy after long-term Labor regimes have wasted taxpayer's dollars in both States.

I remind Minister Lawrence that at the last Health Minister's conference the States were only too keen to take responsibility for spending more of the health dollar and bringing into play all of these efficient measures that will allow better treatment for patients around Australia. Minister Lawrence's response was, 'We are not going to cede that power or funding to the people who are being efficient'.

On the subject of casemix, I ask members to remember former Minister Blewett who was, supposedly, the architect of Medicare. He was one of many Ministers to desert the Keating ship, including Dawkins, Duffy, Kerin, Richardson, Kelly, Staples and so on. In his valedictory speech former Minister Blewett said, 'Casemix is the way to go; I dips me lid to the people who are doing it', and in South Australia we are.

MBf

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): During the Premier's discussions with MBf in Malaysia in response to their inquiries about the opportunity to develop a casino at Wirrina, and in his response to its being a conscience issue for Parliament to decide, did he also point out to Tan Sri Loy his strong personal opposition to casinos and his fears that they could be used in South Australia to launder money? If not, why did he sell out his own previously stated beliefs on this matter? The Premier has strongly opposed the development of casinos in South Australia on each occasion the matter has been debated in this place, namely, in 1973, 1982 and 1983. In the debate—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It's a fact.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. As I understand Standing Orders, questions must be on matters for which people are responsible to this House, and I ask whether the Premier is responsible to this House for his personal beliefs.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order because, as I recall it, the question asked the Premier whether he had indicated his personal views on casinos. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to draw his explanation to a conclusion.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In debate the now Premier said at that time, 'I am opposed to the establishment of a casino.' He further stated:

I do not believe that it will be of enormous benefit. . . I am concerned that we could be approving a means of washing large amounts of untaxed money, particularly at a time when we know that the issue of dodging taxation has come to the fore in Australia. . . yet we are proposing to set up more facilities to make it easier and more attractive to launder this money.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is up to the Premier as to how he answers questions.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have never kept it a secret that I am personally opposed to casinos.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes I did, and I have told everyone else who has approached me. I have made it clear to everybody who has approached me, even on a private basis, that they are dealing with a Premier who does not like casinos.

The Hon. S.J. Baker: Or poker machines.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, or poker machines. I have made that clear around the place also. Parliament decided to allow people to play poker machines. I will not be playing the poker machines. I have never played one, but it is a personal belief. Therefore, the answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question is 'Yes'. I will continue to point out to people my personal beliefs as well as the general position they face; that is, that this Parliament is the only body that can decide or give commitments on a casino.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I find it astounding that we have an Opposition in this State that has nothing else to do. It cannot exercise its mind with respect to the real issues confronting South Australians. Do members opposite ever think about what they can do to help South Australians with those issues? Do members opposite think about what they can do to obtain from the Government crucial information that might help the people of this State? No, wherever there might be a development in South Australia we have this shabby campaign whereby the Labor Party knocks it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: One of my colleagues sent me a suggested new pledge for the Labor Party, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, to sign. It states:

I, Lynn Arnold, a member of the ALP parliamentary Party, hereby pledge not to knock South Australia or potential developments from now on. Signed, Lynn Arnold.

I would be only too happy to send this pledge across to the Leader of the Opposition to see whether he is willing to sign it. There is a challenge for him. Are you willing to sign the pledge?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is not allowed to use displays in the Chamber.

Mr Atkinson: Two out of three good rulings.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Spence will not reflect on the Chair. I ask him to withdraw.

Mr ATKINSON: I withdraw, Sir.

RECREATION AND SPORTS MINISTERS COUNCIL

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing outline the major points of discussion and resolutions of the recent Recreation and Sports Ministers Council meeting that was held in Sydney?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I went through the minutes the other evening and I thought that five issues would be of intense interest to the House. The first issue relates to the question of junior sports, particularly sport in schools. It was the view of the Commonwealth, the Federation of Australian Sport and all sports Ministers that throughout all States there had been a continuous decline in the availability of sporting opportunities and the range of sports being offered; and that a culture had crept into the various Education Departments

which argued the case that, because of the crowded curriculum, sport would be displaced.

I do not think that there is a sports Minister in the Commonwealth who would not take the alternate point of view—that sport should be encouraged. Indeed, many Ministers were of the view that it should be a compulsory part of the curriculum. The South Australian Government holds a very strong view in relation to the question of sport in schools. When we launched the Australian Junior Sports Policy last week the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. Rob Lucas) intimated that this Government is now moving to a three year plan to reintroduce physical education and sport back into the curriculum. As time goes on, this Government hopes to make further announcements which demonstrate that it is committed to the reintroduction of sport and physical education back into the curriculum.

Another item which would be of interest is the Olympic Athlete Program, which members will remember as the gold medal plan. It is designed to prepare Australia for the Sydney Olympics and the Para Olympics. It will be a partnership between the national sporting organisations, the State Government, the Australian Olympic Committee and the Australian Sports Commission. This program has at its heart a national network of intensive centres for elite athletes. In South Australia we hope to see women's soccer and archery introduced as programs, bringing the total number of programs in this State to 22.

The other matter of interest is the issue of complementary drugs in sport legislation, which will ensure a coordinated national approach to drug testing and its enforcement in each State. The establishment of a national sports charter as a basis for creating an Australian framework for sports development was also discussed. Clarification of the implications of Pay TV on sport is another matter that was addressed. This concerns the issue of Pay TV channels having access to sport which is normally available over the free to air service. I believe that that matter has now been largely resolved by the Federal Government, but it was of great concern to us at the time.

MBf

Ms HURLEY (Napier): In the Premier's discussions with Tan Sri Loy about the possibility of developing a casino at Worrina did he tell Tan Sri Loy that he thought such a proposal would not attract many tourists, was unlikely to create jobs and was illogical? In debating a proposal in this place to establish a casino 80 kilometres from Adelaide, the same distance as Worrina, the current Premier (then the member for Davenport) said:

The main argument advanced in favour of a casino in South Australia has been that it will attract tourists to this State. If the casino is more than 80 kilometres from Adelaide, it will not attract the largest possible number of tourists. . . . How many tourists would fly to Adelaide and then rent a car and drive 80 kilometres to a casino when they can fly direct to Hobart? It is totally illogical.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that she is not permitted to comment when giving an explanation.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I sometimes wonder who sets up members opposite to be fools in this House on issues like this. The casino we were debating in the Parliament at the time I made those comments was the casino at the railway station, and I would be the first to argue that I do not think it has been a major tourist attraction for South Australia. I do

not see that it is a huge focus for tourists to come to Adelaide, particularly as there are casinos all around Australia. Therefore, I do not think my comments are highly relevant.

I point out that the objective of Worrina is to put in high-class golfing and recreational facilities and to attract international tourists to those facilities. It includes accommodation, condominiums, an upgrade of the hotel and the building of a marina. These are significant recreation facilities, which is part of an overall plan to invest up to \$200 million. They are the crucial issues. That is what will attract international tourists. I would ask members opposite to stop trying to create something out of nothing, to stop being so bereft of ideas and to get back on track because they are an embarrassment to South Australia.

TUNA INDUSTRY

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Is the Premier aware of any developments in the South Australian tuna industry? There appear continually in the paper exciting and innovative reports of developments in the tuna industry in this State, especially in relation to the Japanese market. I am sure the House would be interested in a more complete explanation than can generally be given in the media.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There is further good news for South Australia—if for one moment the Leader of the Opposition might listen so that he can decide whether he is going to knock this as well. He is on to his advisers again! I am delighted to announce to the House that at about 3 o'clock this morning a very substantial contract was signed between the South Australian and Japanese tuna industries. That contract has a value of over \$30 million. It is very important because it links the Japanese tuna industry into South Australia.

Earlier this morning, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, together with my ministerial colleague, Dr Such, I opened the new TAFE college at Port Adelaide. A key part of the Port Adelaide campus of the Regency Institute is a fishing industry and maritime training facility. In fact, it would be the best such facility in Australia. The South Australian Fishing Industry Training Council is actually represented on the campus; it has its office there. Mr Hagen Stehr, who is the President of that training council, was there. I understand that he was part of the signing at 3 o'clock this morning. It is good news for South Australia because, as I said, it locks the Japanese tuna industry very much into South Australia. It is a contract worth about \$30 million over a three year period. It is another sign that things are starting to move again in South Australia.

As Hagen Stehr said to me this morning, it is on top of the very exciting developments already achieved with the tuna farms at Port Lincoln, because they have gone from exporting \$2 million worth of produce to an expected \$55 million this year. Almost all the 1 600 tonnes of tuna is to go to Japan. It was this Government, the Liberal Party, that sat down with that industry and signed a memorandum of understanding last year. By the way, it was knocked at the time by members of the Labor Party; they came out criticising that memorandum of understanding. But that industry has expanded very substantially, and it is now prepared, through a subsequent memorandum of understanding, to start investing substantial money to establish a feed industry in Port Lincoln. This is all part of the Government's working very closely with industry, developing long-term plans, and I am delighted to say that it

is further good news for South Australians today, despite the Leader of the Opposition and his bunch of cronies.

MBf

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. I refer to the Minister's statement in this place regarding various allegations against MBf and Tan Sri Loy.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: I am just about to give it to you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth.

Ms STEVENS: Will the Minister advise the House when the police investigations into Tan Sri Loy were concluded, and did the Minister and the Premier seek the advice of the Malaysian police during the course of their own investigations? A police report was compiled against Tan Sri Loy on 7 February 1993. The Minister for Tourism stated in this place last week:

Police investigated the claims made and nothing was proven.

However, sources in Malaysia have confirmed that there has been no announcement by the Police Force or the Malaysian Minister of Home Affairs or other authorities stating that nothing was proven, as claimed by the Minister for Tourism. In fact, in answer to a recent question in the Malaysian Parliament, it was revealed that the police are still investigating the matter.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I can bring the honourable member right up to date and put the situation in perspective in South Australia. All individual board members of the company which owns Wirrina Cove Resort Pty Ltd, which is the MBf group in South Australia, were required under the gaming machines licensing provisions not only to be approved but also they were fingerprinted and checked by the South Australian police. They were also checked by police in Kuala Lumpur. Every single board member has been approved. As a matter of fact, we would even go so far as to say that gaming machine licence No. 51103411/60 was approved on 14 June 1994. I would like to point out to the House that Tan Sri Loy is a member of that board.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

RAPE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for Health inform the House of any Government initiatives to enhance the delivery of health services to victims of rape and sexual assault, and will the Minister identify whether there is any evidence that these services are well accepted in the community?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Newland for her question about a matter that interests everybody in the Parliament, because I am sure that we all believe that rape and sexual assault are unacceptable. Indeed, they are health problems with a peculiar focus in that, in essence, one can assume that they are fully preventable in the truest sense. Overwhelmingly, they have a social rather than a medical basis, and the consequences usually have a profound impact on people's psyche rather than on their physical well-being. The main health report receiving agency reported an increase from 426 to 590 in the number of rapes reported last year, and it is thought that that is because the community has realised it is important that these ghastly

occurrences be reported and treated in better facilities. Also, reports of child abuse in this area increased from 164 to 193 from 1992-93 to 1993-94.

The Rape and Sexual Assault Service is a vital cog in the battle for women to cope with the consequences of sexual aggression and violence which, as I said before, is quite frankly unacceptable. Last week, the service reached a new milestone when it moved its base from a hospital campus—from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital—to a community base at the Norwich Centre, and that indicates that the Government cares very much about these services. It has created a more accessible community oriented service. It is now a 24-hour service with a 1800 telephone number for country access, and I am confident that the new complex, which I was delighted to open, will provide a world class service.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES BUDGET

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister for Family and Community Services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: Have you been to the Modbury Hospital lately? Will the Minister rule out any cuts to the global budget of the Department for Family and Community Services or to social services generally in this year's State budget? The highly regarded Anglican Community Services is on record as saying that such cuts would show the Government's lack of commitment to children and to South Australia's future and that children would be put at risk because of increased violence, increased child abuse and the reduction of the welfare system to respond to those challenges.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can I say how delighted I am to receive a question on family and community services from the spokesperson on the other side. I did not even know that he was the spokesman until I heard him quoted on the radio the day before yesterday.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I don't think he did, either. The audacity of the honourable member opposite to ask that question! The only reason we are considering the need to make budget cuts is the previous Government's mismanagement—the honourable member's Government's mismanagement—of the finances of this State. Despite financial mismanagement by the previous Government—by the Government of the honourable member who asked the question—this Government will ensure that direct service delivery to families and children at risk will not be reduced. That is no thanks to the honourable member's Government.

Years of Labor has put enormous numbers of South Australians on the unemployment queue. Unemployment is a major factor in child abuse and domestic violence. Everybody knows that, and I would have thought that, if the honourable member opposite was the spokesperson on family and community services, he would have known it as well. The Brown Government has made a commitment to provide more jobs and to improve employment opportunities for South Australians. That is something we see as our first priority. Let me repeat for members opposite, particularly for the honourable member who asked the question: despite Labor's financial mismanagement, this Government will ensure that direct service delivery to families and children in need will not be reduced. I am delighted that the honourable member has had the guts to ask the question at last, given that he has been talking about it on radio and through the media

for so long, so that I am able to clarify that situation for the people of South Australia.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I direct my question to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Given the importance of the Murray-Darling basin to us and, in particular, the South Australian section of it as a multi-user resource—that is, irrigators, households and tourists, among others—what information can the Minister give the House about the use of the South Australian state-of-the-art, leading-edge technology which is held by the Lands Mapping Division and which is computerised, enabling access through digitised search and reproduction; can he say whether this technology can be sold elsewhere and, further, whether it will be used in the production of our tourist maps for the Murraylands and the Coorong?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The ongoing management of the Murray River is an extremely important and very topical issue, as was referred to in the Premier's statement made earlier in this House. The matter that the honourable member has raised is an important issue, which was brought to my attention recently. It is certainly an issue that I believe should be followed up, and that is exactly what I have done. A number of matters need to be addressed in this area.

The Murray-Darling Basin Commission expressed a concern some time ago about the lack of an accurate, consistent and complete mapping base for planning and management within the Murray-Darling flood plain. As a result, it decided to commission the preparation of a series based on aerial photography that would ultimately lead to the creation of a geographical information system, otherwise known as GIS. I am delighted to be able to advise the House that the Resource Information Group of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources was awarded the contract to produce the order for the photographic series, primarily because it was able to demonstrate that it had the professional and technological skills unmatched elsewhere in Australia.

After production of the series, it was decided to release it on CD ROM in order to make the complete digital data more accessible to users. As a result, a convenient pack of three CD ROMs holding approximately 250 scenes covering the length of the Murray River was produced. I had the great pleasure of formally launching the product on 28 July.

The Murray-Darling Basin Commission has given my department the right to sell the digital maps and their hard copy on these CD ROMs. There is no doubt that the market for these products extends well beyond our borders into New South Wales and Victoria as well as the Commonwealth. I am delighted to know that there is significant interest in this initiative overseas as well.

The product will be of significant value to planners and managers of the Murray River system, and I believe that we can feel proud of the efforts of my department—the Department of Environment and Natural Resources—in, first, winning the contract and, secondly, producing such an excellent product. This is a significant initiative in this State, one that is being watched very closely by my colleagues in other States and one that I commend to this House and to the people of South Australia.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES BUDGET

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I direct my question to the Minister for Family and Community Services. In the light of his answer to my previous question, will the Minister now rule out any cuts to community-based providers of social services in this year's budget?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Perhaps I should point out to the honourable member that the first priority of the Department for Family and Community Services is to care for families and children who are at risk. I have already given an assurance that there will be no cuts to services in that area. As far as the rest of the budget details are concerned, he will have to be patient until the budget is brought down.

TAXATION RELIEF

Mr BECKER (Peake): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources inform the House whether he has raised with his Federal counterpart the issue of some form of taxation relief being given to land-holders who do not have primary producer status but who want to undertake revegetation on their land?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Again, this is an important issue that has been raised with me, and I have taken action in regard to this matter. The land-holder who wrote to me and who has been referred to by the member for Peake was keen to re-establish original vegetation on his property on which long-term grazing was unsustainable. I thought that that request made a lot of sense, so I followed it up on 29 July.

I wrote to my Federal counterpart, Senator Faulkner, to raise the question whether taxation relief should be available to this land-holder and others who are not primary producers so that they can undertake vegetation work on land to mitigate land degradation, and that is something that I would imagine all members of the House would support. I have advised Senator Faulkner that I believe there is a good argument that some form of taxation relief should be provided for land-holders who do not have primary producer status and for those who therefore fall outside the ambit of section 75(d) of the Income Tax Assessment Act.

I also advised the Federal Minister that it was my intention, under the auspices of ANZELL, to raise this issue with other conservation agencies and my ministerial colleagues to see what support exists for a comprehensive review of this issue and to make a formal approach to the Commonwealth to recommend changes to the Income Tax Assessment Act to allow for certain taxation relief to be available to land-holders in the circumstances I have described.

Having made that representation, I am now awaiting a reply from the Minister. I believe it to be an important issue. It is a move that will help land-holders if we are able to gain these concessions. I hope that my Federal counterpart, the Federal Minister for the Environment, will look at this matter very sympathetically.

CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I rise to make a personal explanation and at the same time, under Standing Order 108, to

address a matter of privilege. I do so after having given serious thought as to whether I would—

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member make his personal explanation.

Mr LEWIS: I seek leave to do so.

Leave granted.

Mr LEWIS: Last night, during my Address in Reply contribution, I provided to the House evidence of where funding cuts had been made to the amounts of money appropriated for research into primary industry, and I referred to a number of sensitive documents that I had in my possession by way of background information.

Those documents were returned with my other papers to my room on the second floor and when I went home I left that room locked with the light off. I returned this morning, at the usual time of 7.30 a.m., to find my door ajar and the light switched off, but not in the fashion in which I had left it. Someone had been in my room and those papers had been removed. I would be grateful if they were returned, because there is no whistleblower's protection for the people who provided them. I believe that they are a vital part of the ongoing debate about the way in which that kind of research in this country has been debilitated over the past 10 years, and the people who provided them could find themselves in an awful predicament. I said I would only ever use them anonymously and under the privilege of Parliament.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member indicated that he was raising a matter of privilege. Has he raised this issue as a matter of privilege or to inform the House?

Mr LEWIS: I have, the matter of privilege being that, as any other member, I too feel affronted that someone in this Parliament has stolen documents that were secure and provided to me on the basis that I would only ever use them under the privilege of Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will examine what the honourable member has said about the matter of privilege and give him a considered response as soon as possible.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I, like the member for Ridley, am concerned today about the issue of funding for rural research. I was prompted to speak on this matter by the mention yesterday of the role of the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) regarding prawn fisheries in this State. That discussion confirmed once again that SARDI is able to provide all that is required for this State, given the resources available to it. It impelled me, again, to support the role of research in this State and the need to provide adequate support and services to organisations such as SARDI. My comments today apply to rural research and research in other areas generally, but I would like to concentrate particularly on SARDI.

I think it is important that in this State we are able to have rapid reporting, as in the case of the prawn fisheries, and local knowledge made available to us via our own State based rural research program. Scientists in this State are able to respond accurately to the specific needs of our State. I understand there has been a move to make research in this area a more nationally based concern, but I want to talk today about the need to maintain a decent level of funding and research facilities in this State.

Much of the funding support for SARDI already comes from industry. A great deal of its income is derived from this source, and SARDI actively seeks this sort of income. That is a very good thing: it ensures that SARDI's activities are relevant to industry demands and that it is in touch with industry. However, the sort of funding that that raises is inevitably specific to what the funding body requires, and it needs to be held tightly within the parameters set by that funding body. That is an important service, but it is only part of the picture of rural funding in this State.

South Australia has a unique environment: I suppose that every area is unique, but we have a dry inland area and extensive coastal areas which need to have specific and general research done on them. There are many fragile areas in our State that are under great pressure from farming or aquaculture. Aquaculture, in particular, is already important in this State, but there is a lot of pressure to increase the amount undertaken here. This will put all our waters under a great deal of pressure. Even today, the Premier spoke about tuna fishing in this State. We all support tuna farming and that sort of aquaculture—it must be the way of the future—but we need to have a great deal of information about what effect that sort of farming has on the environment and what sort of environment is required for sustainable, successful and profitable farming.

Some of this research will be provided by the industry itself, but some of our more fragile coastal environments may well be affected by the sort of farming undertaken on the shore. That will require more general research on how seagrasses are coping and how other animals and sea creatures in the vicinity are being affected. I think everyone understands the need for that sort of rural research, but I want to speak a little about the people who are conducting it. Our academic institutions in South Australia—

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

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I rise this afternoon on a matter of concern to my electorate involving tourism signage for the Riverland area. Unfortunately, I and many people in my electorate believe that the Riverland is not getting fair, due and reasonable recognition in an advertising sense in terms of how people should be or currently are being directed to the Riverland. This particular issue arises as a matter of coincidence, because I had jotted it down as an issue of importance and a significant matter that should be raised, but then the issue was raised with me specifically last week by Renmark tourist operators and the Renmark Corporation.

The matter relates specifically to major tourist signs that have been erected on Main North Road between Gepps Cross and the Sturt Highway where it continues through to the Gawler bypass. In that stretch of 30-odd kilometres, four major tourist signs have been erected. Those signs, in bold print, mention specific tourist areas—the Barossa Valley, the Clare Valley and the Burra area—and measure, I would estimate, about 3 square metres. Each of those signs refers to 'tourist areas'.

As a proud member of the Riverland area, I find it somewhat surprising—and, I would have to say, somewhat offensive—that the Riverland does not rate a mention on these major tourist signs as one leaves the extremities of the metropolitan area and heads north along the Main North Road and the Sturt Highway. I would like to dispel any opinion that perhaps the Riverland has been missed off these major signs because of distance. The second sign north from Gepps Cross

notes the distance in kilometres with respect to each of the areas mentioned: the Barossa Valley, 58 kilometres; the Clare Valley, 124 kilometres; and the Burra area, 146 kilometres.

In terms of general tourist recognition of the designated area of the Riverland tourist area, at the western extremity it is marked by either Morgan or Blanchetown. According to my measurements, Blanchetown, in particular, would be very close to the same distance designated on the Clare Valley sign, namely, 124 kilometres. While there may be some historic perception that from the top of the Truro hills, looking down over the 40 kilometre stretch of mallee station country, that is not necessarily an attraction, I nevertheless restate the Riverland as a tourist attraction and assure members and constituents in my electorate that I investigated the matter earlier in the week. Although I gather that the responsibility falls under somewhat of a grey area between the Tourism Commission and the Department of Transport, I understand that the Tourism Commission is the senior body in this matter.

For this reason, I am in the process of writing to the Chief Executive Officer of the South Australian Tourism Commission to ask him whether he and the commission fully support the Riverland's case for a fair and reasonable deal in regard to this matter. Far be it from me to compare directly the Riverland with the other places mentioned on those signs, but I readily justify and defend and, more importantly, proudly promote the Riverland as having, in many ways, a greater diversity and quality of tourist offerings than all the other areas of South Australia.

Time does not permit me to go through the myriad offerings and options the Riverland provides in terms of tourist opportunities, but for clarity I will mention some. There is the Murray River, with its water sports, fishing and houseboating; the provision of national parks associated with the river; and the opportunity represented by its being the fruit bowl of South Australia.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Quite often, particularly on this side of the House, we get hold of a Minister and say, 'This person is not doing the right thing; he (or she) should be doing this (or that) for our constituents.' But today I want to congratulate the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations on a very speedy execution of his duty in a matter involving my electorate. I hand out brickbats to a number of people, including that Minister, and no doubt I will be doing that when the budget comes down if it contains the sorts of things that we hear of. However, on this occasion, without identifying it too closely, there was a problem in my electorate involving a Housing Trust property. It sometimes takes a while for a resolution of such an issue. All members who have been here long enough have had these sorts of problems in their electorate.

Some of us probably have had more than others, because some have more public housing in their electorates. Something of the order of only about 10 to 11 per cent of my electorate is Housing Trust. It is an unusual Labor electorate in that sense and, as a consequence, the large Housing Trust concentrations that are present in the northern suburbs, such as in Elizabeth, Salisbury, Salisbury North in particular and, to a lesser extent, the newer areas to the north of Elizabeth, are not present in my electorate. Most of the people in my electorate own their own homes or share the ownership of their homes with the relevant two or three banks and struggle

hard to pay the mortgage. That makes them particularly sensitive when there is a problem, particularly when some Housing Trust tenants in the area are not doing the right thing.

I think most members take, to quote the words of today, a sort of unofficial pledge to ensure that the life of their constituents is no worse at the time of the next election than it was at the time of the previous one when that member offered himself or herself up for public service. I took to the Minister a serious matter which has dragged on for some time and which his department, largely unsuccessfully, had tried to grapple with, although it had not in my view given the due diligence necessary to the problem. The Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations intervened and, within a matter of a day or two, the problem was resolved along the lines that I put to the Minister. In all fairness it should be recorded here in the House that I as a member, albeit of the Opposition, was very satisfied with the role that the Minister played in this exercise.

I commend him to the House for this, so he cannot say I am not a fair individual. When it comes to other matters, I am sure I will have other things to say, and you can probably put money on it, as I think the member for Florey indicated. But in this matter urgent action was required. I am afraid to say that the department concerned, involving the Aboriginal Housing Unit, was somewhat remiss in its actions. In my view it took an unsatisfactory length of time to deal with the problem. The Minister sorted out the matter very quickly, and I wanted these remarks on the public record here today.

All members understand the difficulties experienced in many of these areas. Some of these issues are things that dominate the lives of our constituents, and it is very good to see quick action, as in this case. I commend the Minister on that basis.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): The comments of the member for Playford give me reason to hope that there might be light in that fog that swirls around the primal bog in which Opposition members are currently recuperating from their recent election loss. At least we have seen a glimmer of the light that might one day be on the hill again. However, I would like to record the fact that on this side the Government is deeply concerned. There are things as important as politics, and some of them are the social fabric of our community. For generations the joke that goes 'Knock, knock: who's there?' has been a source of humour to adults and children alike, and I caution members of the Opposition: they are in danger of destroying that valuable tradition, because currently there is only one answer to that in South Australia.

When you hear the question: 'Knock, knock:' and someone asks, 'Who's there?' the only answer at present is, 'The Opposition'—the ALP in this State—because that is all they seem capable of doing. They knock, knock, knock, and are capable of very little else. On that theme, I well remember—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: At least my build is such that I am still capable of grovelling, and I suggest that the member opposite should not throw stones. I well remember that before the last election I suggested to the then Premier that an activity this State could look at for the celebration of the centenary of our Federation, and also to coincide with the Sydney Olympic Games, was an Expo. The Premier was very quick at coming out and knocking the idea: it was a dreadful idea; the member for Hayward (as I then was) had not thought about it careful-

ly, he had not consulted anyone. But the then Premier did not bother to say that things such as International Expos are handled on a Government to Government basis. He did not bother to do any homework himself; he was just busy knocking. It is interesting that the Premier of Victoria took up the idea, and I believe Victoria is looking at an Expo for that time frame. So, there is an idea lost to South Australia because of the myopic vision of those people who purported to be a Government at that time.

I would like to suggest to this House that a project we could look at for that same time is a millennial exhibition of the development of mankind. It is almost trite to say that the change of a millennium happens only once in a thousand years, and at that point in our history it is reasonable to look at the developments that we as a species have undergone. I would like to suggest to the Government that one of the things we in this State could do to attract tourists during the Olympic year, to focus on our celebrations of our 100 years of Federation and to emphasise to the world at large that we are custodians of one of the most ancient cultures on earth, the culture of our indigenous people, would be to invite other significant contributors to the history of the development of our species—and I am talking about the Chinese, the Greeks, the Egyptians and more contemporary world Governments, such as perhaps the United States of America and also Britain, for its development of democracy—to contribute to an exhibition of the development of mankind.

Then, in that important year for the history of this State and this nation; in that year when so many international tourists will be here; this State would be host to a display that I hope would be a world display of major significance and major interest to all the nations on earth. As we go into the next millennium one thing is certain: the concept of a global village is so developed and the fabric and cultures are becoming so intertwined on this globe that the future, wherever we go and however we make it, can no longer be little, isolated Europe marching to one drum, Asia marching to another drum and the Americas marching to a third drum. Everyone must march to the same beat.

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): I refer to the answers given by the Minister for Industrial Affairs and the Premier with respect to shopping hours. Three very important things have emerged. First, the Minister's answer proves quite conclusively that the Government, up until last week, had always intended to introduce legislation to deal with shopping hours or any extension thereto. I refer to the speech of Her Excellency the Governor—and, of course, we all appreciate that the Governor's speech is written by the Government—at point 13, page 5. Her Excellency says:

During this session, you will be asked to consider legislation affecting regulation of shop trading hours, the real estate industry, the sale of second hand motor vehicles and residential tenancies.

It was very clear that the Government was going to introduce legislation and would allow both Houses of Parliament to cast a vote on which side it favoured with respect to the extension of shopping hours. A funny thing happened on the way to yesterday's announcement by the Minister for Industrial Affairs: the Minister and the Government got cold feet because 14 Liberal Party backbenchers were prepared to vote in accordance with their conscience and the wishes of their constituents against extended shopping hours. Hence, the Government decided to use the exemptions device under section 5 of the Act.

That is a very novel approach because that provision does not require reference to either House of Parliament. Even if that is not unlawful by the strict letter of the law, by the spirit of the law the fact that a Minister through subordinate legislation can do something which the legislation itself does not empower the Government to do is beyond the principles. Indeed, when he was the member for Davenport in 1977, the Premier said the same thing, and it is recorded in *Hansard*. He said that it infringed the principle of exemptions, and for this action to be granted indefinitely without any oversight of either House of Parliament was an infringement of this principle.

The other point with respect to the Premier's answer is that, as far as the Liberal Party is concerned, all members of Parliament will have a free vote. There are absolutely no problems. Therefore, every member in this House will have the opportunity to vote on my Private Member's Bill which will be introduced tomorrow. It will provide two things: any exemptions granted after Monday-

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I believe it is out of order to anticipate debate. The member for Ross Smith is clearly referring to a Bill that he is to introduce in this House and he is canvassing that Bill. I believe that is clearly out of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): I accept the point of order.

Mr CLARKE: I will move on very quickly. My next point while the Minister is here, and all you backbenchers opposite should carefully consider-

Mr BRINDAL: I again rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I believe it is customary to address remarks through the Chair and the member for Ross Smith just referred to members on this side as 'You'.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I remind the member for Ross Smith—

Mr CLARKE: I appreciate that they are trying to gag me, Sir. I will quickly try to make this point: when I—

Mr CAUDEL: Mr Acting Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Every time you are making a ruling and I am trying to listen to what you have to say I cannot hear you.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Come to the point of order. The member for Ross Smith.

Mr CLARKE: When I asked the Minister whether he would rule out any further extension to shopping hours for the life of this Parliament, the Minister delivered a tirade and never answered the question.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member's time has expired. The member for Mawson.

Members interjecting:

Mr Clarke: You didn't repeat him today.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): I refer the House to a well written article by Philip White in last Saturday's *Advertiser*. Philip White, who is a great supporter of the McLaren Vale wine region, is an articulate, intelligent and astute gentleman. I will quote what he said to clarify my points. The article headed 'Too many chiefs', states:

Failed parliamentary hopeful and Teachers' Institute boss Clare McCarty is beginning to show her underdown. Sackings and early retirements among the teaching force have severely eroded the institute's income, so some trimming became necessary there as well. But the full-salaried, full-time, elected President and her two full-salaried, full-time vice-presidents stay put, as does their full-time secretary. And out go the media officer and the occupational health and safety officer.

Clearly, this is another typical example of the Labor Party and the UTLC with their nose in the gravy train. They disregard what they should be doing, which is leading by example (as do those of us on this side of the House) and addressing the financial circumstances or cutting the cloth to fit the situation. We often hear people like Clare McCarty screaming about cuts, etc. Where did she stand prior to the last election? We know that she supported the Labor Party because she paid about \$150 000 of teachers' money to SAIT so that she could run a mock campaign and transfer all her preferences straight through to the Labor Party. She never consulted the teachers to find out whether they were happy to have their money spent that way.

Once again that confirms that the Opposition and the UTLC do not care about the grassroots people and the battlers of this State. It is the Liberal Party who cares about those people. When we bring up these matters it hurts because we hit a raw nerve. Clare McCarty is clearly on the gravy train like many of those on the other side of the House. I call them capitalistic socialists. They are not true socialists who want a fair go for everyone. It is like George Orwell wrote in *Animal Farm* in 1984. They want to be superior and capitalise on and rip off the grassroots people who they purport to look after. Here is a classic case of people like Clare McCarty not looking after the people that she should be looking after because, if she was, she would be doing what all good leaders do, and that is leading by example. Clearly, they are off the planet.

I appeal to Clare McCarty to lead by example and spend this money to support teachers rather than wasting it. She should be helping to put proper information forward and not propaganda as we go through the exercise of getting South Australia back in order. I guess it is a bit difficult for them when they have always been in that cocoon, clearly cushioned and wrapped up in cotton wool. I can assure you, Mr Acting Speaker, that the constituents in my electorate who are working their butts off on a 38 to 45 hour week, depending on their job these days, would not be very happy at all to read that once again we have another example of the unions and the Labor Party clearly neglecting all those people who they should be representing. They are spending all their time ripping off people and making sure that they have all this unnecessary support staff.

When will the Labor Party and the UTLC realise that it is about time they practiced what they preached and, like the rest of us in South Australia, got on with the job of getting this State going again? I support Philip White in his comments. I hope that many people read that article and do not forget that the Labor Party and the UTLC are clearly not interested in the majority of people in South Australia but are only interested in continuing to feather their own nests. Feathering their own nests is what they do very well. One has only to look at the score percentage of their body shapes to see that they are certainly looking after themselves, but it would be a lot better if they looked after the rest of this State.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LIVING RESOURCES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I move:

That the committee be authorised to disclose or publish, as it thinks fit, any evidence and documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence and documents being reported to the Parliament; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting its concurrence thereto.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CLOSURE OF SUPER-ANNUATION SCHEMES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Statutes Amendment (Closure of Superannuation Schemes) Act 1994. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: 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 seeks to permanently close to new entrants the lump sum schemes established under the *Superannuation Act 1988* and the *Police Superannuation Act 1990*.

At the present time these superannuation schemes are only temporarily closed.

As I stated in the Parliament earlier this year, a considerable saving will be made for the taxpayers of this State by the closure of the present lump sum schemes for government employees and the establishment of a new scheme.

I shall also be introducing into the Parliament today a Bill seeking to establish a new contributory superannuation scheme for public servants, teachers, health sector employees and police officers.

This Bill also provides that employees who are unable to currently join a contributory scheme will be able to join the closed lump sum schemes on an interim basis. When the new scheme commences on 1 July 1995 those members covered on an interim basis by the existing lump sum schemes will be transferred to the new scheme.

It is on the basis of the details of the proposed new scheme being announced and legislation actually being introduced into the Parliament that this Bill seeks to confirm the closure of the main State lump sum scheme and the police lump sum scheme.

The Audit Commission recommended the action being taken under this Bill.

Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

Clause 2 brings the Act into operation on 30 September 1994. This is the last day before the existing Part 4 of the principal Act comes into operation and re-opens the State scheme and Police Superannuation Scheme.

Clause 3: Substitution of Part 4

Clause 3 repeals Part 4 of the principal Act and replaces it with a new Part that amends both the *Superannuation Act 1988* and the *Police Superannuation Act 1990*. The amendment of the *Superannuation Act 1988* will enable an employee who could not otherwise join the State scheme to apply for acceptance on the basis that he or she will change over to the Southern State Superannuation Scheme when that scheme commences on 1 July 1995. This will enable employees to make contributions from October 1994 onwards. The clause also amends the *Police Superannuation Act 1990* in a similar manner. It also adds (see new subsection (1)(d) of section 16) a new category of persons who will become members of the Police Superannuation Scheme, namely former State Transport Authority transit officers who have trained as police officers and entered the police force before 1 April 1995.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTHERN STATE SUPERANNUATION BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide a contributory

superannuation scheme for persons employed in the public sector; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: 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 seeks to establish a new contributory superannuation scheme for government employees.

The scheme will have a cost to the Government based on the level of employer support required under the Commonwealth's Superannuation Guarantee (Administration) Act 1992. This means the employer cost of the scheme as at 1 July 1995 will be 6 per cent of members' salaries, and will rise to 9 per cent of members' salaries as the Superannuation Guarantee Charge rises in steps to 9 per cent of salaries on 1 July 2002. This scheme has a cost parameter in line with that recommended by the Audit Commission.

The scheme is to commence on 1 July 1995. It will be the contributory scheme available for public servants, health sector employees, teachers and police officers who are not already members of an employer supported contributory scheme. An existing member of the main State schemes which are closed to new entrants will, however, have a right to move over to this new scheme.

In order to establish this scheme, the Government also accepted an Audit Commission recommendation and closed the existing main State lump sum scheme and the police lump sum scheme. Another Bill which is being introduced by the Government, seeks to confirm the closure of those other schemes on the basis that the Government is now moving to establish a new scheme for government employees.

The proposed scheme is an accumulation style of scheme and will provide retirement benefits on a par with those provided for employees in the private sector. By contributing 6 per cent of salary to this scheme, an employee can expect to receive a benefit on retirement after 35 years membership, of at least 7 times final salary. In general to be a member of the scheme employees must contribute at a chosen full percentage point of salary between 1 per cent and 10 per cent. Obviously the more an employee contributes the greater will be the end benefit. The level of employer support is not dependent however on the level of employee contribution. Membership of the scheme will be compulsory for police officers who will be required to contribute at least 5 per cent of salary. The Police Association support the concept of the scheme being compulsory for future police officers.

The scheme will also be available for casual employees. Casual employees were not eligible to join the main State lump sum scheme which has recently been closed.

A basic level of death and invalidity insurance is provided in the proposed scheme with an option for employees to purchase higher levels of insurance. Essentially members of the scheme will be able to buy up to 7 times salary cover for death and invalidity. The insurance is planned to be provided from within the scheme itself in order to obtain the most attractive rates. This means that an employee will be able to buy \$55 000 death and invalidity cover for around 75 cents per week. This makes the scheme quite attractive for employees.

In recognition of the special nature of police work a minimum level of benefit is to be payable under the scheme in those unfortunate situations where an officer dies or becomes an invalid as a result of an incident in the course of duty.

In line with another recommendation of the Audit Commission the Government intends to fully fund for the employer liability as the liability accrues. The Bill contains specific requirements for the employer contributions being paid in satisfaction of the Superannuation Guarantee requirements, to be paid into an established employer fund.

Members' contributions will be invested with the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust and the Bill provides that members will be guaranteed a rate of return of 4 per cent above inflation. This aspect of the scheme's design provides another attraction to employees considering joining.

As an interim measure, employees who wish to join a contributory scheme before the new scheme commences on 1 July 1995, will be able to join the closed lump sum schemes as though the schemes had not been closed. On 1 July 1995, these employees will be transferred to the new scheme being established under this Bill. These interim arrangements are being dealt with under another Bill being introduced as part of the package of revised superannuation arrangements.

Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act on 1 July 1995.

Clause 3: Interpretation

Clause 3 provides for the interpretation of terms used in the Bill. The definition of "charge percentage" allows employers to provide salary packages which include an additional superannuation payment on behalf of an employee. The term "retrenchment" is defined as termination of employment by the employer for any reason that cannot be attributed to the employee. Subclause (3) provides that the employer will be taken to have terminated the employment of an employee whose limited term of employment expires and who is not re-employed in his or her former position or is not offered some other position carrying a salary of at least 80 per cent of the employee's previous salary. Subclause (5) provides for the circumstances in which the employment of a casual employee will be taken to have terminated.

PART 2

ADMINISTRATION

DIVISION 1—THE FUND

Clause 4: The Fund

Clause 5: Investment of the Fund

Clause 6: Accounts and audit

These clauses make provision for the Southern State Superannuation Fund. This Fund is similar to the South Australian Superannuation Fund continued in existence by Part 2 Division 3 of the *Superannuation Act 1988*.

DIVISION 2—MEMBERS' ACCOUNTS

Clause 7: Members' accounts

This clause provides for members' accounts. Contributions made by members will be credited to these accounts.

Clause 8: Other accounts to be kept by Board

Clause 8 provides for other accounts to be kept by the Board and for the auditing of accounts kept by the Board.

DIVISION 3—THE SOUTHERN STATE SUPERANNUATION (EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS) FUND

Clause 9: The Southern State Superannuation (Employers) Fund

Clause 10: Accounts and audit

Clause 11: Determination of rate of return

Clauses 9, 10 and 11 provide for a new fund to be called the Southern State Superannuation (Employer Contributions) Fund. The scheme is to be fully funded. Contributions will have to be made by employers within seven days of the payment of salary to a member (see clause 26). The amount of each contribution will be the charge percentage of the salary paid and will be paid into the fund established by clause 9.

DIVISION 4—PAYMENT OF BENEFITS

Clause 12: Payment of benefits

Clause 12 provides for the payment of benefits. Benefits are paid from the Consolidated Account which will be reimbursed by charging the Southern State Superannuation Fund with the employee component of benefits (subclause (2)) and the Southern State Superannuation (Employers) Fund with the employer components of the benefits (subclause (3)).

DIVISION 5—REPORTS

Clause 13: Reports

Clause 13 provides for reports to be made to the Minister by the Board and the Trust. The Minister must have copies of the report laid before both Houses of Parliament.

PART 3

MEMBERSHIP AND CONTRIBUTIONS

DIVISION 1—MEMBERSHIP OF THE SCHEME

Clause 14: Interpretation

Clause 15: Election by new employees

Clause 16: Election by member of the Benefit Scheme

Clause 17: Election by contributor to the State Scheme

Clauses 14, 15, 16 and 17 enable certain persons to make an election to become a member of the Southern State Superannuation Scheme. An application to the Board is not appropriate as the persons in these categories are to have a right to be a member of the scheme. However, if a member wishes to receive supplementary future service benefits he or she will have to apply to the Board which may refuse the application or grant conditional acceptance based on the applicant's state of health or lifestyle.

Clause 18: Commencement of membership

Clause 18 provides for the time at which membership of the scheme commences. Where an employee is joining the Southern State Superannuation Scheme from another scheme it is important that these clauses provide for an exact meshing so that the employee is not credited under both schemes for the same period or does not miss out on any employer contribution during any period.

Clause 19: Members of the police force

Clause 19 provides that all members of the police force will be members of the scheme established by the Bill unless they are members of the Police Superannuation Scheme.

Clause 20: Elections

Clause 20 makes general provisions in relation to elections.

Clause 21: Duration of membership

Clause 21 provides for the duration of membership of the scheme.

DIVISION 2—SUPPLEMENTARY FUTURE SERVICE
BENEFIT MEMBERS

Clause 22: Acceptance as a supplementary future service benefit member

Clause 22 enables members to apply to the Board for acceptance as a supplementary future service benefit member. A future service benefit is provided under clauses 34 (invalidity) and 35 (death) and is an insurance against monetary loss due to loss of future earnings on invalidity or death. A basic future service benefit is provided to all members and is paid for by a reduction in the annual employer contributions—see clause 28 (N is the relevant factor in the formula in that clause). This will be supplemented in the case of members who are accepted as supplementary future service benefit members. The value of N will be increased in accordance with the regulations and the annual employer component will consequently be less for those members. Their future service benefit will be increased however by the factor A (see clauses 34 and 35) also to be fixed by regulations.

Clause 23: Variation of benefits

This clause provides for variation of a supplementary future service benefit.

Clause 24: Election to terminate status as a supplementary future service benefit member

Clause 24 enables a member to terminate his or her status as a supplementary future service benefit member.

DIVISION 3—CONTRIBUTIONS BY MEMBERS

Clause 25: Contributions

Clause 25 provides for contributions to be made by members of the scheme.

DIVISION 4—EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS

Clause 26: Employer contributions

Clause 26 provides for contributions to be made by employers.

PART 4

THE EMPLOYER COMPONENT OF BENEFITS

Clause 27: Employer contribution accounts

Clause 27 provides for the employer component of benefits to be credited to accounts maintained by the Board in the names of all members.

Clause 28: Annual employer contribution

Clause 28 sets out a formula for determining the employer component of benefits under the Bill.

Clause 29: Administration charge

Clause 29 provides for an administration charge which is to be deducted from the employer component of benefits.

PART 5

SUPERANNUATION BENEFITS

Clause 30: Interpretation

Clause 30 defines "the employee component" and "the employer component" of benefits for the purposes of Part 5 of the Bill. There is a guaranteed minimum for each component.

Clause 31: Retirement

Clause 31 provides a benefit on retirement.

Clause 32: Resignation

Clause 32 provides the resignation benefit. Subclause (7) allows a member who has preserved a benefit to change his or her mind (if the benefit has not been paid) and carry it over to another superannuation fund or scheme.

Clause 33: Retrenchment

Clause 33 provides a benefit on retrenchment. A member who is retrenched can choose to preserve the benefit or carry it over to another fund or scheme as though he or she had resigned.

Clause 34: Termination of employment on invalidity

Clause 34 provides for a benefit on invalidity. Subclause (6) provides for a minimum benefit in the case of members who are members of

the police force. Subclause (8) provides that termination of employment in circumstances that would otherwise amount to retrenchment will be regarded as invalidity if the member was incapacitated for work when his or her employment was terminated and satisfies the Board that the incapacity is likely to be permanent.

Clause 35: Death of member

Clause 35 provides for benefits on the death of a member. As with invalidity members of the police force are guaranteed a minimum benefit by subclause (7).

PART 6

MISCELLANEOUS

Clause 36: Employees to be informed of their rights to membership of the scheme

This clause requires the Board to ensure that persons who are entitled to elect to be members of the scheme are informed of their rights.

Clause 37: Employer benefits and contributions where member on leave without pay

Where a member is on leave without pay employer contributions will normally cease. If, however, the member has been seconded to employment outside the public sector it may be more convenient for all concerned if employer contributions continue to be credited on the member's behalf under the scheme. This would only occur of course if the second employer had agreed to reimburse the first employer. The clause operates through Ministerial direction and therefore its use in a particular case requires the agreement of the Minister.

Clause 38: Exclusion of benefits under awards, etc.

Clause 38 prevents the accrual of superannuation entitlements under awards and under this Bill. Similar provisions are included in the *Superannuation Act 1988* and the *Superannuation (Benefit Scheme) Act 1992*.

Clause 39: Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme

Clause 39 provides that a member of the scheme is not entitled to benefits under the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme.

Clause 40: Review of the Board's decision

Clause 40 provides for the review of decisions of the Board by the Supreme Court or by the Board itself.

Clause 41: Power to obtain information

Clause 41 gives the Board power to obtain information from a member or an employing authority.

Clause 42: Delegation by Board

Clause 42 is a delegation provision.

Clause 43: Division of benefit where deceased member is survived by lawful and putative spouses

Clause 43 provides for division of benefits on the death of a member who is survived by a lawful spouse and a putative spouse.

Clause 44: Payment in case of death

Clause 44 provides for payment of benefits where the recipient has died.

Clause 45: Payments in foreign currency

Clause 45 provides for the payment of benefits in foreign currency in certain circumstances.

Clause 46: Rounding off of benefits

Clause 46 provides for the rounding off of benefits.

Clause 47: Liabilities may be set off against benefits

Clause 47 allows the setting off of a liability of a member under the Bill against a benefit payable to, on behalf of, or in respect of the member.

Clause 48: Resolution of doubts or difficulties

Clause 48 provides for the resolution of doubts or difficulties by the Board.

Clause 49: Regulations

Clause 49 provides a regulation making power.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 9 August. Page 141.)

Mr BECKER (Peake): I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the address in reply to the speech on opening day, Tuesday 2 August 1994, by Her Excellency the Governor, Dame Roma. Once again, Her Excellency carried out her duties in a most exemplary manner and I place on record what a delight it is to have a person of her stature

representing Her Majesty in this State. I hope that she can continue for many years to come.

It was with regret that I noted reference had to be made to the passing of several former members. The most recent was the former member for Peake, Keith Plunkett. Keith was Chairman of the Public Works Committee but, more importantly, he was the representative of the electorate of Peake from 1979 to 1989. I knew Keith well not only through his involvement in State Parliament but also through the parliamentary lawn bowls. Some people might think that that is one of those perks where everybody enjoys themselves and does little work, but the contrary situation is the case. It is an opportunity to get together, to fraternise with members of all political persuasions and not only enjoy a hobby but also share experiences.

Keith came to enjoy his lawn bowls and shared with us many a tale of his early experiences. It gave me the opportunity to understand and appreciate that, although life has been difficult for some, they can overcome those difficulties. One of the greatest things in this country is that anyone can be elected to State or Federal Parliament, and relate their experiences and do whatever they can to ensure that future generations do not have to tolerate and/or experience the difficulties that they had to overcome. So, Keith did make a special contribution to the State Parliament, and it is a pleasure to have known him. It is with sadness that we have to recognise, such a short time after his retirement, his passing. To his wife and family we extend our sympathies, as we do also to the family of Reg Groth.

Reg was the member for Salisbury and Chairman of the Public Works Committee. I got to know him through the workings of the parliamentary system. Probably the saddest occasion was the sudden passing of Joe Tiernan, the former member for Torrens. The night before his death, Joe and I were showing people through the Parliament and, at about 9.30 that evening, I said, 'Ok, Joe, it's all yours'. I was going home and he was in the lounge with some of his friends. He said, 'See you later, Heini' and that was the last I saw of Joe. He was a member of the Economic and Finance Committee of which I am Chairman. He showed a style and ability that would have made him a very good and valuable member of that committee, as he was as a member of this Parliament. Unfortunately, he was denied that opportunity to continue to serve any longer on that committee. I thank Joe's family for lending him to the State, to the Parliament and to the people of South Australia. He will be sorely missed.

The electorate of Peake has now been represented by four members of Parliament since it was formed in 1970. The first member was the late Don Simmons from 1970 to 1979. Don was chairman of the Public Accounts Committee as it was known in those days, and he went on to become a Minister. Don never enjoyed extremely good health, particularly in later years, and was denied a long retirement. The late Keith Plunkett was the member from 1979 to 1989, followed by Vic Heron from 1989 to the 1993 election. I became the first Liberal member of Parliament to hold the seat in the name of Peake, albeit with slightly different electoral boundaries from the former electorate. That demonstrates the vulnerability of electorates today in State politics.

I have had to battle with marginal seats since May 1970 when I was first elected with a majority of 135 votes. In fact, I have always said that every electorate should be made marginal with a majority of no more than 2 or 3 per cent. If it was possible to do that, we would get a much better and fairer system of political representation. I believe that that is

what the Electoral Commission is now trying to achieve; so many members at the last State election were elected on a very small majority. The Governor's speech outlined many things that the Government proposes to introduce for the future benefit of South Australians—to create an opportunity for them and to give them a brighter and better future.

The Audit Commission is one of the great achievements of the first eight months of this Government. It undertook a tremendous job in virtually auditing the whole of the financial affairs of this State. That is something I have been advocating and supporting ever since I have been in this place. I do not think that anyone knew, understood or appreciated the complex financial position that had developed under Labor Governments since the early 1960s right through to the 1970s, occasionally interrupted by a Liberal Government. The Audit Commission came down with 336 recommendations. Each one of those recommendations will be carefully assessed and evaluated by the current Government, and they must be evaluated if we are to do anything beneficial for this State.

If anything has been proved, it is that under socialism you get a very sympathetic, easy-going style of Government—a Government that cannot say 'No.' During the two decades of socialism in this State, the people of South Australia did not realise what was occurring. Nobody appreciated that for the first time in this State—and in this country, to a large degree—a political experiment was occurring based on the age-old theory of socialism, which had never worked. It was development and growth at all costs; and it was social justice, social welfare—it was everything. But, in the end, there had to be a day of reckoning. Tragically, that day of reckoning will deny future generations of South Australians the lifestyle they should be enjoying.

One of the biggest faults under the socialist system of government was over-staffing. This State's public sector was over-staffed by many thousands of employees. A chart of South Australian State public sector employment shows that, at the end of December 1983, there were 102 700 wage and salary earners; in 1985, when there was a State election, there were 106 200 employees; in 1989, when there was another State election, the public sector had grown to 109 900 employees; and in 1990 that growth had climbed to 113 700 employees. So, we had a huge, bloated public sector, and something had to be done. The economic situation had turned sour in South Australia and cutbacks had to be introduced. There had to be changes. By the end of 1991, there were 107 200 Government employees—in other words, a cutback of some 6 500 employees; by December 1992, the number of employees had dropped to 106 800; and, by December 1993, there were 106 100 public employees.

This afternoon the impact of the financial situation of the State—of how the former socialist Government's forward estimates for 1992-93 to 1995-96 would impact on South Australia—was explained. As the Treasurer said, in 1993 it was suggested that at least 3 700 public servants would have to be axed; in 1994-95, it was said 4 200 would have to go; and, by 1995-96, another 2 600 had to go—in all 10 500 public servants would have to go. It is not as though the new Liberal Government of this State is doing something that has never been seen or heard of before. What it is doing is rationalising the Public Service and culling the over-staffing. In doing so, many hundreds of millions of dollars will be saved.

I realise that this is not easy on those who have been asked to take separation packages. It is not easy to say to people,

'Your job is redundant', when their hopes were built up and when they were told that everything was going well and that the State was in good shape when it really was not. It was almost as though we, in South Australia, were living the big lie. That is really what it was all about. It was about public relations; and it was about perceptions within the community of what was happening in South Australia. All along, ever since the Liberal Government of 1979-82, we recognised the warning signs of over-staffing and we knew that something had to be done. But, under the Bannon Government, nothing ever happened. The public sector was built up and more people were taken on. People were given jobs because they knew somebody who knew somebody. A job was found for people if they bumped into a Minister and pitched a sympathetic story.

The tragedy is that somebody has had to assess what is going on. The job specifications of the Public Service will change. I work as hard as anybody else does for the schools in my electorate. Is it any wonder that I get extremely upset when I see on the front page of the *SAIT Journal* (Wednesday, 3 August 1994)—a magazine which is representative of the voice of South Australian teachers who are members of that institute—an article which, under the subheading 'Industrial Action', states:

Unfortunately words alone will not stop the Government from attacking members' working conditions and students' learning conditions. Executive has put a motion to annual conference that will allow planning for a protracted campaign of stoppages and bans. If passed, industrial action will commence as soon as attempts are made to implement budgetary reductions which seriously threaten jobs, employment conditions or the quality of education. All decisions on workplace industrial action will be made at the branch level.

So far we have successfully discredited the Audit Commission, gained overwhelming public support for maintaining class sizes and drastically altered the Government's original intentions regarding education spending. The budget is another stage in the long battle to save public education. A strong, united union can win the battle.

This is the warning that the Teachers' Institute will sabotage the budget whenever or wherever it can. This is the warning that the Teachers' Institute is recommending that its members sabotage the actions of the Government in the name of better education. Members should look at the schools. I inherited an electorate that has run down schools. A class at one school has had six teachers this year. We are trying to rectify this chaos which was created in previous years, and certainly within the past 12 months. Schools have not been painted and have not had substantial maintenance work for 17 years. They have peeling paintwork and wood rot. Damage is occurring to the property because of the lack of maintenance by the previous Labor Government over the past 17 years.

Is it any wonder that the present Government is facing tremendous maintenance problems? It will either have to obtain funds by borrowing, thereby increasing State debt, and that is simply not on, or it will have to cut services to try to replace the buildings that are starting to rot. It is a terrible situation for any incoming Government to face, but at least these issues have been highlighted by the Audit Commission. It is a disgrace to think that the Teachers' Institute is advocating sabotage of a Government that is trying to do something for the future generations of this State when Government buildings that house our students and teachers have been allowed to run down over the years.

There was no screaming or jumping up and down by the Teachers' Institute that I can recall. Certainly, I do not recall that the institute's candidate, during the State election, claimed that our schools and our classrooms had been run

down to such an appalling state. We will have to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in my electorate alone—which was formerly a Labor electorate—to try to rectify the neglect.

That overstaffing, which was created by the previous Government for popularity purposes, would be about 10 per cent. Certainly, a large number of those public servants have gone and more will go, and the numbers will take a dramatic drop in an attempt to ease the budgetary situation, but it has been a very expensive exercise. The Treasurer should be commended, and he must hold firm his resolve to solve the problems if we are to have any future in this State. As a matter of fact, I noted today in an August 1994 report, *Australian Economic Trends*, written Emeritus Prof. A.H. Pollard and put out by Lumley Insurance, the following:

Australian Government utilities as a whole in the five years to 1992-93 have reduced real debt by \$12 billion, employment by 24 per cent, prices to customers by 10 per cent, and increased labour productivity by 102 per cent and dividends to Government by \$1.4 billion.

That clearly indicates, given the opportunity and with determination and a bit of foresight, what can be achieved. A huge saving was made by reducing public debt. Employment went down by 24 per cent but productivity went up 102 per cent. There is the key to the whole thing. What was going on? What were those people doing when the work force can be reduced by 24 per cent but productivity can go up 102 per cent? Somebody must have been swinging easy within the public sector—taking it very easy indeed.

I just hope that the Teachers' Institute's threats of intimidation and its attitude of wanting to sabotage the budget will fall on deaf ears. I hope that the new Government will be given the opportunity to get on with the job that the parents and the teachers expect us to do, so that we can provide quality education. There are many good teachers who can teach in virtually anything—including a cowshed—and who are quite capable of managing the affairs of our schools. If we are given the time and the opportunity, we will repair those schools and bring them back to a satisfactory standard.

During the growth of those lovely years of the 1980s, under socialism in the State, we also saw a huge growth in other areas, along with the various perks and lurks that are associated with the growth of a huge bureaucracy. When the Government recently announced that it had let out a contract to Optus for interstate and overseas phone calls, and there was to be a saving of about \$1 million, I was quite curious. I calculated that there would be a saving of about 20 per cent, so we were spending about \$5 million in that area. I telephoned the Treasurer and asked him, 'What is our annual phone bill?' I was advised by the Treasurer:

The total annual cost to Government for all telecommunications services is currently estimated to be around \$50 million p.a. taking into account statutory authorities and instrumentalities but excluding local councils and universities. The estimate of \$50 million p.a. is based on Telecom annual billings. The set of agencies targeted relates to those agencies which now form the basis for Government's carrier service discount schemes.

Within the estimated \$50 million p.a. telecommunications spend, around \$30.4 million p.a. is associated with telephone services and is comprised of: access charges, \$6 million; local and metered calls, \$16.3 million; long distance calls, \$7.3 million; and international calls, \$800 000.

So we can see that the Government does have a substantial telephone bill. There was the opportunity to achieve savings, and \$1.5 million would be nearer the figure. That is a figure one could not resist if one had the terrible task of cutting back and bringing back to reality the financial affairs of the State.

So, there is no doubt that Optus knew what it was doing. The letter continues:

In regard to mobile telephones, there are currently around 3 000 units in service comprising both portable and in-vehicle systems. Of the total, around 2 950 have Telecom as their service provider, the remainder are connected to Optus. Government's annualised mobile telephone costs are currently estimated to be \$2 million p.a. and are comprised of: access charges, \$400 000; and call charges, \$1.6 million.

On the surface, when you say it very quickly, 3 000 mobile phones is a frightening figure, but we must not forget that the Public Service employed more than 106 000 people as at the end of December 1993. So 3 per cent of public servants still have access to a mobile phone.

Some years ago, I can remember putting a question on notice asking how much rent the Government paid for the telephone connections in Public Service buildings. I know that the Government was horrified to think that anybody would ask such a question. However, somebody did do the exercise, and it led to an improved telecommunications system within the Public Service and a tremendous saving of about \$6 million a year. There are phone outlets all over Government buildings—and in this House, as well—that are not used. Who knows how much we are paying in rent because, every time we install a telephone outlet, we are supposed to pay rent on it. Who knows how many work and how many do not work, and who knows for how many we are paying rent. Certainly, right throughout the whole of the Public Service there was a need to upgrade the telephone system. Huge savings were to be made. Perhaps the time is ripe to undertake another review of the whole of our telecommunications system.

I am disappointed that the member for Hart is not here, and he has not called for my resignation in the past two

weeks: he is obviously not well. Generally, every week he seems to call for someone to resign or be sacked—and the *Advertiser* editorials have not been too bad, either. I will continue to raise the issue, on behalf of the taxpayers and of the public servants of South Australia, of the allocation and use of Government motor vehicles. Sure, as the member for Hart said the other day, a chauffeur driven car is allocated to the Economic and Finance Committee. I do make use of that, and I find it very beneficial if I am working long days, starting in the early hours of the morning, and if I have to read documents and prepare for appointments while going from place to place. It is not always easy to get parking.

Of all the questions that I have put on the Notice Paper, 50 per cent have come from within the Public Service. I have never said that before, but that is where they are coming from, because there are people in the Public Service who believe, as I do, that the allocation of motor vehicles by chief executive officers is not being carried out according to the true spirit of the regulations. Be that as it may, that is something that the Treasurer has had the courage to look at; there has been a clear statement that there will be a reduction of 25 per cent in the number of motor vehicles in this State. There are about 10 500, and certainly there would be room to reduce that number considerably, although I am not able to say by how many.

However, there could be a better use of Government taxes and alternative methods of public transport utilised. Given that the issue comes up from time to time, I asked the Treasurer just how much we pay in fringe benefits tax on the use of Government motor vehicles. The figure is \$957 596—a considerable amount of money—for the year 1993-94. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* material of a purely statistical nature.

Leave granted.

Fringe Benefits Tax Payable on Private Usage of Government Vehicles 1993-94

Departments	No. of Benefits	Taxable Value \$	Tax Payable \$
Arts & Cultural Development	7	27 663	13 347
Attorney Generals—PACA	22	60 342	29 115
Attorney-Generals	1	4 937	2 382
Auditor-Generals	6	22 575	10 892
Correctional Services	30	99 129	47 830
Courts Administration Authority	131	365 101	176 161
Deputy Premiers	1	5 200	2 509
Economic Development Authority	13	41 416	19 983
Education & Children's Services—CSO	9	32 795	15 824
Education & Children's Services—Education	170	99 252	47 889
Employment, Training & Further Education	11	27 931	13 477
Engineering & Water Supply	116	161 386	77 869
Environment & Natural Resources	48	87 810	42 368
Family & Community Services	261	202 823	97 862
Housing & Urban Development	16	10 757	5 190
Industrial Affairs	27	85 822	41 409
Legislature	5	15 134	7 302
Mines and Energy	14	34 892	16 835
Multicultural & Ethnic Affairs	2	1 457	703
Plain Central Service	1	1 885	910
Police	95	104 793	50 563
Premier & Cabinet	17	85 838	41 417
Primary Industries—Agricultural		15 994	7 717
Primary Industries—Fisheries	1	293	141

Fringe Benefits Tax Payable on Private Usage of Government Vehicles 1993-94

Departments	No. of Benefits	Taxable Value \$	Tax Payable \$
Primary Industry—Forestry	16	19 703	9 507
Public Trustees Office	1	6 222	3 002
Recreation, Sport Racing	14	63 490	30 634
SA Tourism Commission	11	26 960	13 008
SACON	6	23 591	11 383
State Aboriginal Affairs	1	3 467	1 673
State Electoral Office	2	2 381	1 149
State Services	10	25 625	12 364
Transport—Marine	40	68 948	33 267
Transport—Road	98	59 628	28 771
Treasury & Finance	18	39 135	18 883
Total Departments	1221	1 934 375	933 336
Authorities			
Adelaide Convention Centre	4	22 823	11 012
Bookmakers Licensing Board	1	3 519	1 698
HomeStart Finance	1	922	445
Manufacturing Advisory Council	1	3 138	1 514
OPSR	3	4 904	2 366
SARDI	2	4 639	2 238
State Governor's Establishment		0	0
SAFA	6	5 650	2 726
SASFIT	1	4 685	2 261
Total Authorities	19	50 280	24 260
Grand Total	1 240	1 984 655	957 596

Mr BECKER: In terms of each department and the various sections, the amounts are not all that great. One of the highest figures is the \$176 000 paid by the Courts Administration Authority, which has 131 motor vehicles. However, there are other departments that one would expect to have a number of cars, such as the Department for Family and Community Services. Given its role, I would expect it to have motor vehicles available to transport families in distress or relatives of families in distress from point A to point B, and that can happen seven days a week.

I have always said that the number plates on Government vehicles should be coded. I appeal to Government that when it is considering the matter of Government motor vehicle number plates they be coded in such a way that one character on the number plate identifies that department. So, if someone reports that the number plate of the car in question is, say, 'VOF', the car will be recognised as belonging to the Department for Family and Community Services, for instance, and there would be a quite legitimate reason for that vehicle being used on a weekend.

It is interesting to note that even the Legislature has five motor vehicles, which attract a fringe benefits tax of \$7 302. The figure that surprised me was that paid by the Department of Mines and Energy, which has 14 vehicles. I would have thought there would be many more vehicles involved in that department's operations.

This information does not include all the statutory authorities. However, the moneys paid by the various departments reflect the impact of what the Treasurer is trying to do. With a reduction of at least 10 per cent in the number of public servants, one could well expect that there would be approximately a similar saving in the number of Government

motor vehicles and the corresponding cost in the fringe benefits tax as well.

That is part of the impact of the Audit Commission. Not everyone will be happy with it, but unfortunately when you have a Government that has a philosophy of growth and expansion at all costs and a vested interest in expansion and growth, as did the previous Government under the philosophy of socialism, then, of course, when you have a change of Government and a focus on a private enterprise system you will see what some people perceive as a radical change. It is not a radical change: it is coming back to reality; it is coming back to accepting that every so often there is a day of reckoning. That day of reckoning has arrived in South Australia.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): Before calling the member for Torrens, I remind members that this is her maiden speech and I request that she be offered the normal courtesy.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and I wish to acknowledge the sad passing of Keith Plunkett and convey my condolences to his wife Betty. I also extend my condolences to the family of Reg Groth. I have particularly fond memories of Reg, as I am sure do others in this House.

I take this opportunity to convey my deep and sincere sympathy along with, I am sure, that of my colleagues in this House to the family and friends of the miners lost in the Moura mining accident. My father worked in the pits in New South Wales and I recall running home from school when we heard the sound of the sirens, waiting for news that no-one

ever wishes to hear. The memory of those sirens still sends a shudder through my soul.

It is a great honour as the newest member in this House to have the opportunity to put on record some of my hopes and aspirations for the electorate of Torrens. However, let me say to all members in this House that I recognise that the by-election for the seat of Torrens occurred due to very sad circumstances, and I would like to extend my sympathy to the family and friends of Joe Tiernan and to those on the other side who worked closely with the former member.

I am very honoured to be able to follow those members before me in the very special duty of representing the electorate of Torrens. From the day the by-election was called until this time I feel that I have not stopped running, learning, meeting people, attending to issues and getting results. I explained to the electors of Torrens during my campaign that I was seeking their endorsement for three reasons: first, because of my long-standing commitment to the people of the north-eastern suburbs; secondly, because of my belief in South Australia; and, thirdly, my hope that through my ideas, energy and skills I can contribute to this Parliament in building a better future for workers and their families and, indeed, all South Australians.

I am determined to bring the Torrens community voice into this Parliament. I am deeply committed to the cause of social justice and share with my colleagues on this side of the House a solemn duty to ensure the fundamental rights of people to a decent standard of living, safe and fulfilling employment in good conditions and the opportunity to participate fully in the political, social, economic and industrial future of this State, irrespective of their gender, class, race, sexuality or where they live.

It is these values that have formed my politics from an early age. As the daughter of a coal miner who struggled to bring up his family after my mother died when I was a child, I can share with members today the satisfaction and determination I feel at being able to represent my community's concerns in this House. My father taught me much about the realities of work and what it means to families. I can assure members that I can never and will never forget where I came from.

I am conscious that I am entering this Parliament during a very important period of our history: at the end of one century and the beginning of another. It was in the 1890s that the Labor movement in this country, besieged by the struggles on all fronts, the shocking exploitation of workers in key pastoral, transport, waterfront, mining and manufacturing industries, the great strikes and, indeed, the riots of the time, turned to the parliamentary arena for assistance and support. A little over 100 years ago, the Australian Labor Party, which I am honoured to represent in this House, was formed to champion the rights and concerns of the ordinary men, women and children of this nation. The Labor movement in this country is the backbone of our economy and the cornerstone of our society. All the major reforms that have brought us the standards of living and the industrial stability that we often take for granted today have been sponsored and underpinned by the working men and women of this State and this nation.

I believe that we are all born with potential and the fundamental right to enjoy our lives to the maximum, regardless of that accident of fate that locates us in a particular economic circumstance. The notions of privilege and greater rights being vested in some by virtue of inherited

wealth or the accumulation of profits at the expense of others must be repugnant to all in a modern society.

Our society has been built on the Labor movement and the commitment of ordinary citizens who often struggle to make ends meet, to educate families, to own a home and to enjoy a fair standard of community life. It is to these South Australians that I pledge my support—the women and the men of the Torrens electorate, the majority of whom saw the contrast between the policies of Labor and the broken promises of those opposite, which will be my focus in the years ahead.

Like many of the people whom I represent, my background lies with the traditions and values of the working families of this community—the family values and the community concerns that place social responsibility before the pursuit of profit and individual gains. The values that characterise the struggles of the Labor movement over a century ago are what drive my politics today.

I believe deeply in the trade union movement, which for so long has been the collective voice of these values, a vehicle for change and, indeed, restraint which is so integral to the fabric of our life. I am saddened that, a century after our Party was formed to take the struggles of organised labour to the parliamentary sphere and after all the gains that have flowed as a result, we find ourselves at the close of this century still debating the basic tenets of workers' rights with some conservatives opposite who seek to turn back the clock on industrial relations and unleash discord and conflict on the community.

I was shocked to hear the comments in this House by members opposite earlier this month when they spoke of muscles and bones thinning and wearing out and of the possibility of using sickness benefits for older, worn out workers at the end of their life so that they are not a burden on employers through the WorkCover system. In my view, people deserve dignity and respect, and the community has a clear responsibility to ensure that employers provide workers with comprehensive rehabilitation and compensation for work related disabilities. This is clearly best met by a single insurer established by Government and managed on the basis of representation of worker and employer interests focused on complete rehabilitation and full compensation. We must not undermine the coverage and effectiveness of our workers' compensation system in this State. To do so is to let down those in our community in the very areas where they look to their parliamentarians for policies of support and compassion, fairness and justice.

I enter this House at perhaps a time of the greatest assault seen to date on our industrial relations system, with awards and conditions under steady attack, WorkCover being undermined, and our occupational health and safety standards and principles being challenged. My base is firmly in the Labor movement, and I wish to make clear that I will defend standards of decency and fairness on all occasions. I strongly support the community's right to stand up to any attempts to promote division and suffering in this State. Attacks on workers, the unemployed, the elderly and single mothers alike must be met with strong and principled debate. We have come too far to allow the bigotry or self-interest of a few to take away from the well-being and community standards of the majority.

I am also aware that I enter this House during the centenary of women's suffrage in South Australia, another historic marker of our social progress to a mature and inclusive society which recognises and supports the citizen-

ship and rights of all people. This year of celebration for women enables us to re-examine and reinforce our awareness of the continuing battle to promote and preserve equality and rights to justice of women, indigenous people, people of non-English speaking background, people with disabilities and people who are disadvantaged because of poverty, unemployment or any other factors.

The struggle for the enfranchisement of women in South Australia provides us with an important lesson in how change can advance community standards. South Australia's place as the first colony to grant women the right to vote on the same terms as men and as the first democracy anywhere to enable women to run for Parliament has been well highlighted this year. What have not perhaps been as well attended to are some of the other issues which were tackled as part of the suffrage struggle at the time. Among the suffragettes of the time who helped organise the vote to be given to women were women such as Mary Lee and Augusta Zadow, who were committed to the cause of the Labor movement as well as their concerns for women.

Mary Lee was the founder of the Working Women's Trade Union and a delegate to the United Trades and Labor Council. Augusta Zadow was a tailoress, and as a tradeswoman she was sensitive to the issues and concerns of working people. The Women's Suffrage League was founded in 1883, and it took some six years to organise the support required to win the vote, but what is perhaps less well known is that, at the same time as the fight for suffrage was under way, these women were also organising women clothing, boot and laundry workers and campaigning against appalling conditions operating in these then sweated trades.

Women were excluded at the time from membership of the Tailors' and Bootmakers' Union and were forced to organise on their own, albeit with some support from the UTLC at the time. Mary Lee and Augusta Zadow joined with women such as Agnes Milne, a shirtmaker from Brompton, and campaigned for a public inquiry into wages and conditions for clothing workers and those in related jobs. At the time, the Masters and Servants Act reigned supreme, and there was no regulation of wages and working conditions. Eventually, a Shops and Factories Commission was established in 1892. It took extensive evidence from women workers as well as those from the Zadow Tailors' Union, the UTLC and employers.

The picture of working life in Adelaide in the early 1890s is sobering indeed, and makes us appreciate how important the industrial gains of the past century have been for our way of life in this State and nation. Workshops were located in basements in Hindley and Rundle Streets without natural light, lit only by gas lamps which used up the available oxygen so that women frequently passed out with fatigue. This was quite common. Workshops were so packed full with sewing machines that a 6 inch pipe to be used for heating could not be installed in one workshop. Some women were forced to work in tin sheds which heated to well over 100 degrees and were paid by the piece, so they were forced to slog away for long hours. The evidence of one young girl who had a severe back deformity indicated that her deformity had occurred through working long hours bent over her sewing machine whilst she was still growing. Witnesses argued at the time that the conditions here were comparable to those of the day in Britain, if not worse.

The necessity for some regulation of employment could no longer be ignored, and in 1894 not only did we pass the Bill for women's suffrage in Adelaide but also our first

factory Act. Augusta Zadow became our first factory inspector, followed by Agnes Milne. So, today, we can remember these women for their double victories of a century ago. We can also be impressed by the extent of such achievement when we consider that this was done while women worked for a living for long hours and were expected to do the double job of wife and mother as well. All this happened 100 years ago; yet, if we, each and every one of us, are not vigilant, responsible and compassionate, we can lose such hard won gains.

It is pleasing to note that in this centenary year of women's suffrage the UTLC has an assistant secretary with specific responsibilities for women. This provides a focus for the employment concerns of women, and I wish Jude Elton all the best in this important position. I am also very pleased indeed that on Saturday the Australian Labor Party elected unopposed Ms Deirdre Tedmanson as President of the South Australian Branch. Deirdre is a great friend and colleague of mine who has great ability and vision. I am sure that she will help to guide the Party as we unite around the task of rebuilding.

I believe that we must build on past achievements, and I strongly support the principle that all people are entitled to terms and conditions of employment which recognise and facilitate their involvement in family life and support their ability to discharge their family responsibilities. I enter this House during the Year of the Family, yet we continue to see that the gap between working patterns and the reality of family life is still wide. Our desire to support family life in the community must be matched by a preparedness to ensure that people are not disadvantaged in the workplace by their family responsibilities and that we promote policies for family well-being in tandem with our economic strategies. A compassionate and fair society is a civilised and mature society. Family and community life is critical to each of us, and our children will gain their self-esteem and learn about their rights and responsibilities as citizens if they are provided with the resources and support to develop their potential.

The best education services, the best health standards, the best environment and the best employment opportunities are the basic rights of each and every South Australian. Our task is to defend those rights and to ensure that every policy and every program aims to further the community interests for the maximum good, not to promote the interests of a select few or pander to the disparate vagaries of political whim. History will judge us badly if we do so. I will not let the people of Torrens be taken for granted. The people of Torrens elected me as a new face to voice community concerns, and I will honour that trust. Others will no doubt attack the result of the by-election in Torrens and seek to explain away the community's vote. But I know from the hundreds of hours spent doorknocking and the energy and enthusiasm of the hundreds of volunteers, to whom I owe great thanks, that there was a vitality and excitement about the way in which the community embraced the opportunity for a fresh start. People want politicians to take up local issues and not to let Parliament take them for granted.

It is the message that we have heard in the Labor Party. We are listening and we are learning. We are rebuilding, and I am enthusiastic to have the opportunity to play a part in that process. As a mother of two sons who grew up and went to school in the north-eastern suburbs, and now as the proud grandmother to Mitchell, I know how important a good education is to our children. People have been telling me on the telephone and at the door that they want good education

for their families and that they are concerned about what is happening to our public schools. I will be taking up these concerns in this House. I know that personal security is an issue of concern today, but we must recognise the complexity of issues relating to law and order and not just look for simplistic, populist solutions that merely paper over questions of cause and serve only to reinforce fear and prejudice.

We must find constructive things for our young people to do. We need hope in the future and, above all, we need jobs. Our community needs to see leadership and policies that put people first. We need action to protect our elderly from abuse and we need good recreational facilities and more children's services. We need to support our young people with skills, with trades, with jobs and with self-discipline. These are the issues which people raised during my campaign and to which I responded with sincerity and my pledge to bring these issues into this House. My skills lie in knowing what it is like for families, having lived through tough and difficult times myself. I believe that compassion and hard work are the things that make one's politics rewarding, and I owe much of my interest in and knowledge of politics to my family, to Peter Duncan and, perhaps above all, to my deep admiration for Don Dunstan, our great former Labor Premier.

Don Dunstan stands out in my lifetime as the kind of politician worth striving to be like. He is forthright and has passion and beliefs, and he has never lost the common touch. What we need in South Australia is a renewal of those values of commitment and concern, of compassion and common-sense. Don Dunstan fought for this State to be the centre of artistic and cultural endeavour, and our reputation built under his leadership was world class. Now, sadly, our top actors and artists are having to leave the State to find employment. I am committed to proper funding and Government support for the arts, given its importance as an industry to our regional economy as well as the essential role that the arts play in the development and integrity of any community. For South Australia to let slide the magnificent reputation and focus we have had on the arts is nothing short of shameful.

Our record has been second to none on the national and world stage, yet now there are some in this House who would see this unique aspect of South Australian excellence slip away through negligence and lack of vision. I support the strong campaigns currently being run by the Arts Industry Council on arts funding and the Media Alliance, where the performers are demanding performance. I urge all members to consider carefully the arguments and issues raised by those in the industry, because this industry, fostered in the Dunstan years, has been until now one of our great success stories. It is to Don Dunstan that we all owe our thanks for such foresight and vision, and I have learned from Don Dunstan that politics and being in Parliament is about representing people's hopes and aspirations; it is about leadership and vision; and that Governments are elected to lead and to govern with integrity, not simply to react to the pressures of the moment.

My Party has a great opportunity to build back through representing the needs and hopes of ordinary South Australians. The conservative focus is narrow, whereas the Australian Labor Party has centuries of tradition and policy to see it through the tough times. Peter Duncan is a person who has this ability to work towards long-term goals, and I owe a great deal of my fortitude to his guidance and vision. Peter Duncan will always place the community he serves first, and has a long and proud record of electoral successes which outpace even the particular Party swings of successive

elections. He has never been afraid to stand up and fight for his beliefs. He has rebelled against his Party and others when he has genuinely believed an issue required debate. Such courage is rare in this area of economic rationalism and conservative, bland politics.

I have always admired Peter's tenacity, and the attempts of those opposite—and I am sorry the member is not here—to use scurrilous parliamentary tactics to besmirch his reputation deserve prompt repudiation. Sour grapes and name calling has never convinced the community, and it is not an honourable way to cope with defeat. I would also like to thank our Leader (Hon. Lynn Arnold) for his support of me and his strong shoulders to lean on. Anyone who doubts his integrity need only read the speech he delivered on election night: they were the words of a true statesman. The community wants its voice, its concerns and its needs to be heard in this place. I accept with pride the support that has been given to me by the electors of Torrens and I know what message they entrusted to me to bring to this House.

It was a message of belief that we can emerge a stronger State despite our recent setbacks; it was a message of hope that they will never be taken for granted; and it was a message of concern at possible cuts to services and a reminder to this current Government that people will not be played around with nor have their standards of living slashed. Since marrying Bob in 1968 I have lived and worked in the north-eastern suburbs, and I love the opportunities in those suburbs that form the electorate of Torrens for families to grow, to work, to shop and to play sport in a community of ordinary, decent people, making ends meet and planning for our kids' futures.

I have worked as a factory worker at Bundy's, at a nursing home caring for the aged, delivering goods throughout the area and, in recent years, as an electorate officer, helping, caring and sorting out people's problems. Some of them have been simple and some complex but all important and all deserving of prompt and efficient assistance. My early life taught me much about people and much about life. My recent years have taught me much about bureaucracy and how to get things done. My friends and family know that I am a doer and not just a talker and, if the House will allow me as a very new member to say this without rancour, that is what I think we need more of in politics today: less talk and more action. I believe that people have a right to have their problems dealt with immediately and with care.

We have come a long way in the past 100 years, and the advances in our ability to deal with technological change in complex health and scientific problems is staggering. But it is the basic human values that continue to hold our communities and families together. Sometimes I think now is the time that we got back to basics. It is time we got back in touch with what people want to see in South Australia for the future. We need to focus on the kind of community we want to build for a better future, for a better tomorrow.

The kind of aggressive politics of the past, the divisions in the community and, indeed, the acrimony that I understand can sometimes invade this House must be replaced by a greater sensitivity to the diversity of our community and an appreciation of how to develop accord in the community we seek to serve rather than division and alarm. My family and friends have played a very important part in my move from electorate officer to a member of Parliament. Their support and encouragement was without bounds. My husband Bob has always encouraged me to be active in all issues. He has shared the responsibility of child rearing and home duties,

giving me the opportunity to participate in community and working interests. Mostly, though, our activities and interests are shared, which has made our lives much more enjoyable. Our two sons, Anthony and Jason, give me much pride, and their support during the campaign was very important to me. There were so many who gave their time freely and tirelessly during the by-election, and I appreciate their support and their efforts.

I am also a very strong supporter of responsible dog ownership and am a member of the South Australian Canine Association. I thank all of those in that organisation who supported me during the by-election and, from time to time, no doubt I will raise some of those issues in the House. I particularly wish to thank a very special lady, my mother-in-law, Ila Geraghty. For all the jokes about mother-in-laws, my mother-in-law is really one in a million. She is a very special lady. I met her when I was 16-years old, and she has been my special friend ever since. When our family needed someone to lend a hand, someone to be there, Mum was the one. I am truly grateful to my mother-in-law and to my family and feel unashamed in putting on the record how proud and fortunate I feel to be part of such a loving family environment.

These are my politics: family values, commitment to the Labor movement and a deep belief in social justice. These are the forces that will animate my contributions inside and outside this House. I believe that we must learn to give out of a sense of justice what until now has been given only as charity. I entered this House, as I mentioned earlier, during a time of great change. We watch in awe as South Africa transforms itself before our eyes. We honour and celebrate this inspirational change towards equality, democracy and peace. We stand by as the continued oppression of the East Timorese blights our near doorstep. We raise money and aid for the grief-inducing tragedy that is Rwanda. We embrace a process of reconciliation with Aboriginal Australia and strive to remedy the decades of ignorance that have inflicted great pain and brought great shame to our race relations in this country. We celebrate our State achievement as a world pacesetter in extending the franchise to women. I am honoured to join this House as the representative of the Torrens community. I look forward with great enthusiasm to the work ahead. I thank members for their indulgence.

Mr KERIN (Frome): It is with pleasure that I support the Address in Reply. I also congratulate the member for Torrens on her maiden speech and wish her well in her efforts for her electorate. In her speech the Governor outlined much of the continuing program of reform that this Government will approach over the coming months. I add my congratulations to those of other members of the House with respect to Her Excellency. Since our initial Address in Reply speeches in the First Session of this Parliament we have all had further opportunities to be guests of Her Excellency and to witness closely and understand her fantastic contribution to the State. My electorate of Frome and its surrounding areas are about to be honoured by a visit from the Governor. It is great to see that she has such commitment to those who live in the country areas, and I am certain that the people of Frome look forward to the visit of Her Excellency. Her presence will act as great encouragement and a boost for morale in the region.

Her Excellency will spend virtually a full week in the Mid North area of the State, and I wish to sincerely thank her for such a significant visit to the area. I know that members of the Italian community of Port Pirie are absolutely thrilled that Her Excellency has seen fit to be their guest at the annual

blessing of the fleet celebrations and are greatly honoured by her acceptance of the invitation.

Country people have experienced quite a few difficult years. Many factors have been beyond their control, not the least being unsympathetic State and Federal Governments. These things have combined to place enormous pressures on regional and rural communities, and they often feel as though they have been forgotten. Hence that often used phrase that Governments have been unable to see past Gepps Cross. For me and the constituents of Frome, much encouragement has been given by the attitude of the current Cabinet to our electorate.

In country areas we are used to seeing Ministers only when elections are imminent. The commitment of the current Cabinet has been the source of much comment and praise within the electorate. I suggest that in the eight months of Liberal Government we have had a far greater visitation rate from Ministers than ever before. It is absolutely essential for Ministers to get out of Adelaide and meet with country people and listen to and understand their problems. I congratulate the Premier and his Ministers on doing just that, and I would like to highlight some of the activities of Ministers in my electorate of Frome. I feel that I can be of far greater service to my constituents by speaking of these activities than by engaging in the personal attacks which have played such a large part in this debate.

The commitment of the Premier to country areas is well known. He recently visited Port Pirie on the final day of a three day trip to the west and the north of this State. The feedback from the West Coast was excellent. The people over there have often felt forgotten, and the acknowledgment of the Premier, who spent a couple of days over there, made them feel a lot better. The Premier's day in Port Pirie was an opportunity for both him and the community. The Premier inspected the Port Pirie High School site. We are currently in the process of amalgamating the two local high schools, Port Pirie High and Risdon Park High, to form a new John Pirie High School. The Premier met with members of the planning group, staff, students and parents and discussed the process and the community feeling towards the restructuring. The amalgamation process has been thorough, with thousands of hours of voluntary input. The resulting high school will increase curriculum choice and essentially lead to greater educational opportunities for the students of Port Pirie and surrounding areas. The new school will commence operations at the start of next year.

The Premier also visited the neighbouring TAFE college. This excellent facility is now the headquarters for the Spencer Institute of TAFE which covers all the north and west of the State. Here, the Premier had the opportunity to speak with both staff and students and inspect some of the programs which the institute is delivering. The Premier's talks with the Port Pirie Regional Development Board gave it the opportunity to provide updates on the projects which it is working on. A couple of projects are most exciting for the area, and the board welcomed the opportunity to discuss them with the Premier and appreciated his interest.

Similarly, the Corporation of the City of Port Pirie briefed the Premier on several matters of concern, and it was an excellent opportunity for all involved to discuss the problems which face the various levels of government. As always, the Mayor and his council in Port Pirie were excellent hosts and invited people from various sectors of the community to a reception: once again a wonderful opportunity for both the community and the Premier to mix.

We also visited two of the newest developments in Port Pirie: the pivot fertiliser facility and the Tourism and Arts Centre. The people of Port Pirie are extremely proud of their new Tourism and Arts Centre, which was previously an abandoned railway station. The transformation is amazing and the thought and creativity which has gone into the development is an absolute credit to those in the community who were involved. The Premier was most impressed with the often subtle but creative manner in which so much of the rich history of Port Pirie and the region has been included in the design and decoration of this wonderful centre. I was most gratified by the consistent and, may I say, bipartisan appreciation expressed that the Premier gave so much time to this visit and his extended trip throughout regional South Australia.

Many of the Ministers have also visited the Frome electorate. The Minister for Youth, Training and Further Education visited Peterborough where he inspected the TAFE college and had a look at the resource sharing between the high school, the community and the TAFE college, which includes a new library and offices and equipment. We also visited some of the projects around the town. There is a solar house which some of the groups in the town are working on. We also saw the Peterborough Liliums. We later visited Jamestown where we met with the people at the TAFE college and also with the district council. In the evening the Minister attended the dedication of murals in the main street, which is a Kickstart program.

At the lunch at Peterborough I was most impressed with the Minister's empathy with youth and his dedication to the training of youth. The Minister for Education and Children's Services had two visits to the electorate, the first being to Peterborough, which was a very timely visit. We had had Opposition statements the day before that we would close 23 of the 28 schools in the electorate and Peterborough High was one named in the media. As it had 197 students, and fewer than 300 students was the criterion used, it gave the Minister the opportunity personally to reassure the community that that was very far from the truth. While he was there we visited not only the high school but also the primary school and the kindergarten. We met with the working committee for the restructure of education in Peterborough, which is looking at a new structuring of the three schools.

From there we went on to Port Pirie where we held discussions with the working group for the amalgamation of the high schools and with students. While there, the Minister made the announcement of the new Principal of the John Pirie High, Mr Ken Whalley, who is an excellent choice and who no doubt will do a great job in heading up the new school.

The Minister made a second visit to Jamestown, where he witnessed the very poor education facilities that have been run down over many years. The quality of education in Jamestown has had everything to do with the people and nothing to do with the facilities. We are looking at the restructuring of education in the town and, whilst there, the Minister visited the high school, the primary school, St James Convent and the kindergarten. We met with the working party looking into the restructure.

The Minister for Transport visited the area to look at the shocking state of some of our arterial roads, which have suffered from decades of neglect. We had a bumpy ride on the Booleroo to Jamestown road, and we met with the Mount Remarkable and Jamestown councils to discuss their concerns regarding the state of the roads and what can be done about it. We also looked at the Burra to Morgan road and talked to

the Burra council about the sealing of that major road. The non-sealing of that road over the years has been a handicap to the development of the Mid North of the State and, hopefully, we will see something done about that in the near future.

Given the importance of that road, I was amazed, after talking to council, when several people made the point that the Minister was the first Transport Minister to visit Burra in more than 20 years: that is disgraceful when one considers the significance of that road.

The Attorney-General visited the three centres of the Upper Spencer Gulf. In Port Pirie he inspected the court house and had talks with the relevant people. The court house is an example of years of neglect of country areas. Whilst in Port Pirie, he also met with people involved with crime prevention, the court companion service and counselling services, as well as lawyers and other community groups. No doubt he gained a lot of useful feedback.

The Minister for Health has made two visits to the electorate and is visiting again next week to look at the hospital at Port Pirie. On his first trip, we went to the Gladstone Health Service where he gained an insight into the broad range of services offered by the excellent group of professionals who work there. The Gladstone Health Service is an excellent example of how a small community can provide a quality health service to its people without having a hospital. The second trip by the Minister was for the accreditation of the Port Broughton Hospital, where the Minister could not help but be impressed by the dedication of that community to the hospital. It is an excellent example of how hard country people are prepared to work to give themselves the facilities that people in cities tend to expect.

The Minister for Primary Industries came to Port Pirie to open the new PIVOT rural service centre, which is an excellent innovation. It results in savings to farmers in that part of the north of \$6 to \$8 per tonne, and that adds up to quite a bit over a year and provides greater flexibility to farmers in terms of how they pick up their fertiliser. To the town of Port Pirie it means more employment, more boats coming through the port and more business in the town. It is a credit to everyone involved in that it has been put up so quickly and has been running effectively. The Port Pirie Regional Development Board as a facilitator deserved much of the credit. It is a truly regional development that will benefit both Port Pirie and the region. We had a good turnout to hear the Minister speak.

The Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations and for Recreation, Sport and Racing, a former resident of Port Pirie, understands what a wonderful part of the world I represent. He came up and we met with the Housing Trust, had a tour of the town and looked at the housing needs of the city. We met with the Central Mission people who provide emergency housing, amongst their many great services. The Minister met with council to discuss local government planning and the housing problems. Again, the Mayor most generously hosted a reception to welcome back a former resident and now Minister of the Government. The Minister also met with representatives of the racing, trotting and greyhound industries, all of whom gave a similar tale of what happens to country areas continually and how country clubs have found it increasingly hard to contend with bigger clubs trying to dominate the codes.

The Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development came to Port Pirie to speak at a regional development seminar. He met with the industry and

the development board. I acknowledge the Minister's understanding of the local projects on which the development board is working. It is a help to them to have a Minister who understands what they are trying to do.

The Minister for Tourism visited and opened yet another highly successful Laura Folk Fair. It is an important cultural and tourist event for the region. It is a credit to the people of the reasonably small town of Laura, whose hard work sees the town and the area around it receive a significant financial boost once a year. The Minister for Tourism also visited Port Pirie for a South Australian National Football League game between North Adelaide and his beloved Central Districts. Whilst most of the Ministers have fond memories of their visit to the Frome electorate, not so the Minister for Tourism: Centrals got an absolute hiding and his son was reported for striking on that day. Anthony is obviously not as mild mannered as his father.

Both the frequency of the visits and the manner in which the Ministers have been willing to listen have sent a very important message to the Frome electorate, namely, that this Government does care and that its vision extends far beyond Gepps Cross. The people of South Australia are now starting to see an impact of the change of Government and are starting to enjoy the benefits. Some Government reforms have already been implemented and there have been important achievements. The creation of 7 200 full-time jobs in the first six months of 1994 represents a massive turnaround and signals greater job opportunities to come. Announcements such as those involving Motorola, Australis, Mitsubishi and the Wirrina development are testimony to the fact that this Government is active. The success of our economic development programs and the general lift in business confidence are giving business in South Australia the confidence to invest. This in turn looks good for job seekers.

Another area of ongoing concern is the Adelaide Airport. This Government is desperate to achieve what the previous Government did not achieve, and the upgrading of the airport is vital to the prospects of this State. The decision of the State ALP to oppose privatisation of the airport is a betrayal of the people of South Australia, and it is hoped that more common-sense will prevail at the ALP national conference.

An essential platform in the rebuilding of this State is public sector reform. The Audit Commission report was brought down in the first session of the Brown Government. The Government's response to the recommendations of the Audit Commission has been assisted by the many hundreds of submissions from public sector employees and the public. The desire to contribute to the process by public sector employees is greatly appreciated by the Government.

I was particularly pleased with the response to the Audit Commission of the teachers and school communities in Frome; we had about 100 submissions, which allowed us in turn to make up a detailed submission to the Minister, for which I know he was grateful. It was good to see that the locals had decided to be constructive and get on with the job. The bottom line of this process is that the absolute mess caused by the previous Government is more than just a book debt. It is a very real position of jeopardy and requires a community response, along with Government action, to rectify it. The Opposition and unions have been very quick to blame the Audit Commission for cuts. The Audit Commission's report refers to the damage done to this State's economy and infrastructure by the previous Administration. The blame does not lie with the Audit Commission: it lies squarely with the former Government.

A major task for this Government will be to rebuild the agencies which make up the public sector into far more efficient entities than they were in the past. The reforms to ETSA, the E&WS Department, the former SACON and the Housing Trust, amongst others, will see South Australians receive far greater value from Government services than they have received in the past. It is important that we, as a Government, ensure that a career in the Public Service is a rewarding and satisfying option and that the contributions of public servants are recognised and appreciated by all South Australians. The Government's primary objective in implementing major public sector reform is to create a South Australian economy which is competitive and growing and which has the capacity to capitalise on the opportunities that are emerging in Asian countries to the north.

Through the early years of education strategy, extra funds will be allocated to education to develop a sound base of skills and knowledge in junior primary years. A major area of neglect in the previous Government's education strategy was the lack of guidance officers and speech pathologists in country areas. This has been a constant concern to my constituents and something that I know the Minister is committed to rectifying. Earlier this afternoon the member for Peake spoke of the terrible condition of school buildings in his electorate. Likewise, the Frome electorate has a lot of problems with school buildings. Many schools are extremely run down and appear to need a lot of money spent on them. Reasonable amounts of money have been spent on some schools in the past couple of years. Considering the amount of work that has been done for that money, it is a major worry. Private enterprise could just about replace those buildings for the same money that has been spent on just propping them up.

In terms of health, casemix funding has been widely applauded. The hospitals in the Frome electorate seem to be impressed with the new system. Whilst they have some questions, which is always the case with a new system, they look forward to being able to provide a far more efficient health service. The soon to be introduced second mobile x-ray screening unit should be applauded, as it will increase the number of country women who can access that service.

In the area of primary industries, I welcome the extension of the Young Farmer Incentive Scheme, the date of which has been put back to the date of the election. The Government's stamp duty relief on inter-generational farm land transfers has been greatly appreciated. This measure is of real assistance. I have been particularly pleased to witness the number of constituents who have taken advantage of the exemption. This has been a Government measure with an enormous social justice outcome, and it has gone some way to offsetting the inequities and injustices which country people seem to suffer at the hands of the Federal Government's welfare system. We also saw the release of the rural debt audit. This is very much an analytical document and, as such, hopefully will be of great use in making decisions which will assist rural communities.

Regarding law and order, we have seen reforms aimed at putting more police back on the beat. This is to be applauded. I hope that country areas can share in this, as they suffer from low numbers of police, particularly when resident officers are on leave. The communities have done a great job of becoming more involved, and Rural Watch and Community Watch schemes are thriving. We also have School Watch and Hospital Watch. The move to more community involvement in law and order is welcome.

Whilst the change of Government which was brought about by the landslide vote in December has given the State renewed hope, the job of rebuilding South Australia will not be easy. The sheer magnitude of the financial losses over recent years is staggering. Last week we were given the latest figures on the Myer Centre and 333 Collins Street. When one considers the schools, hospitals and roads which could be built with those losses—and we certainly need them—it brings home the importance of decisions of Government and the absolute necessity for accountability. It also reaffirms the necessity for change. This Government has a mandate and an agenda for change. In this session we will continue with that program. I look to being part of the recovery in this State.

Mr BASS (Florey): I support the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech opening this the Second Session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament. Mine will be a short contribution to the Address in Reply, as I am eager to begin debate on more legislation that will be introduced by the Brown Government—legislation that will continue to raise the hopes of all South Australians for a better future. I congratulate the member for Torrens on her maiden speech: it was wonderful ideology. If only her Party, when in office, had not mismanaged the State so badly, some of her ideas could be implemented without bankrupting the State. There is no doubt that that was where South Australia was heading under Labor.

The First Session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament was indeed the beginning of a long and hard task for the Brown Liberal Government, but it was a task that the Premier and his Ministers approached with enthusiasm and compassion. In reviewing the First Session of this Parliament, one can see that the Government was not only able but willing to make the hard decisions, notwithstanding that these hard decisions would cause some pain—pain that has to be felt if South Australia is to return to a viable State and is able to provide a future for our children and our children's children.

Many of my colleagues have detailed the positive reforms that have taken place. I reiterate some of the more positive economic developments which have been implemented by the Government and which created an additional 7 200 full-time jobs between January and June 1994. No doubt many more jobs will be created when major investment initiatives by companies such as Motorola, Australis, Mitsubishi, Wirrina and so on begin operations in South Australia.

There has been criticism of the number of committees that have been set up by the Government to review possible initiatives before they are implemented. This Government, unlike the previous Government, is implementing initiatives after consultation and review in order to give all South Australians an opportunity to have input into their own future and to ensure that decisions are made for the betterment of South Australia. The Government will not make *ad hoc*, shoot-from-the-hip decisions that leave South Australians with huge debts, as did the previous Labor Administration. Public sector reform initiatives, which began immediately the Brown Government took office, will be continued during this session of Parliament, as they are a vital part of the process of rebuilding the South Australian economy.

With casemix funding to be introduced from 1 July, it will not be long before the unacceptable hospital waiting lists are reduced—without, I might add, a reduction in the quality of service and care. The centre of health care in my electorate—the Modbury Hospital—continues to deliver an excellent service. All concerned in terms of this hospital should be congratulated, and that includes personnel in the administra-

tion offices, the medical personnel and the ancillary staff. Much has been written about the Modbury Hospital, especially recently when the Nurses Federation called a public meeting to discuss the three options that the Brown Liberal Government was considering in an attempt to reduce the unacceptable waiting list while still improving efficiency and quality of service.

At this meeting my colleague the member for Wright clearly detailed the options that the Government was considering but, in his usual inept style, the Federal Labor member for Makin, Mr Peter Duncan, in an attempt to score political points, said *inter alia* that the Federal Government would not allow the State Government to take away the Modbury Hospital and that the Federal Government would become involved. If Mr Duncan wants to get involved in State matters such as health, I suggest he resign from Federal politics and come back to South Australia and maybe give members opposite some sort of leadership. But, before he does anything, I suggest he talk to his Labor colleagues in Canberra and obtain tax relief for those people with private hospital coverage so that more people will enter the private health system and get out of the public system. This would shorten the waiting list for public beds.

The member for Spence, as the shadow Minister for Health, also spoke at the recent public meeting at the Modbury Hospital and informed the meeting that the Labor Government had considered the issue of privatising the hospital in 1983 but had rejected the idea. At that stage of the evening, the effort of riding his bicycle to the meeting—or if he did not ride his bicycle, he must have travelled on a bus—must have cut off the oxygen to his brain, as he had a memory lapse and forgot to tell the meeting that in 1989 the then Labor Government had called for expressions of interest for a new or expanded hospital service. Only last year, 1993, the Government, of which the member for Spence was a member, asked the Modbury Hospital board of management to look again at the option of an integrated private hospital development at the Modbury Hospital site. Last Wednesday, in Question Time, the Minister for Health detailed the part that Labor played with the Modbury Hospital, so I will not repeat all of what was said. However, one part is most relevant, and I think it needs repeating. The Minister said:

A public advertisement calling for expressions of interest was placed in the local and national media on 4 December 1993.

That is one week before the election. Further, he said, referring to the advertisement:

It invited proposals regarding the provision of a private hospital on the Modbury Hospital site, private sector funding for public patient facilities and proposals for mutually beneficial cross servicing arrangements between the public and private sectors.

I believe that all of this is completely contrary to the statement of the health spokesman, the member for Spence, as follows:

The Opposition is totally opposed to any form of private involvement in Modbury Hospital.

I remind the shadow Minister for Health that, if he wants to wander into my electorate on his bicycle—and that is if it has been recovered—by all means do so, but he should try telling all the facts on an issue and not twist them around or conveniently forget pertinent facts so as to create undue concern to the constituents in the north-eastern suburbs.

During the first three months of this Government, there have been initiatives in such areas as ageing, the environment, natural resources, arts, recreation and sport, and there

will be further initiatives in the near future in many areas sadly neglected by Labor. Of course, the other areas of great interest to me are the police, correctional services and industrial relations. May I say that both Ministers responsible for these areas, Ministers Ingerson and Matthew, have attacked with vigour and enthusiasm the problems left by the previous Labor Government. The new industrial laws will no doubt see a revival of industry in South Australia without reducing the workers' rights.

The only people who will suffer from the new industrial laws will be those unionists who have survived by having compulsory unionism to maintain their numbers, and there is no doubt that the freedom of association laws were well received by the majority of workers in South Australia. The initiatives of the Brown Government to get more people on the road—or, as we in the industry would put it, at the coalface—are definitely the way to go. As a police officer, over the years I witnessed the Labor Government use Police Department personnel to implement initiatives that should and could be done by non-police personnel. The promise made by the Brown Government to have 200 additional police on the road in its first term of office is well under way, and it can only benefit all South Australians—with the exception of the criminal element.

With regard to correctional services, the Government has again attacked the problems head on and has implemented initiatives that will reduce by between 20 and 45 per cent the cost of keeping a prisoner in custody. The Mount Gambier gaol, which is just another Labor white elephant, is now being expanded so that it will hold a total of 110 prisoners—an increase of 54. So at least it will be financially viable. One wonders who the Minister for Correctional Services was when the original decision was made to rebuild the Mount Gambier prison without increasing its capacity from its original size. One would have to query the person's ability to run the correctional services within a reasonable budget. The introduction of partnerships between Government and the private sector will allow the establishment of industry within our prisons, thereby assisting in generating meaningful work and, more importantly, rehabilitation opportunities.

The Government's new truth in sentencing legislation removes the uncertainty for all concerned and is a marked improvement on the ridiculous system implemented under a Labor Government. Prisoners will know exactly when they are due for parole or, where they have long sentences and the parole involves a period of more than five years, when they can first apply for parole and the standard of behaviour which will enable them to obtain parole.

I conclude my Address in Reply contribution by quoting to the House the result of a July poll taken by the *Bulletin*, printed in its August edition. Notwithstanding the hard decisions made by the Brown Government, the approval rating of the Government has increased since first being elected. In December 1993, Liberal Government support was 52.8, with Labor at 30.4 per cent. Yet, in July 1994, Liberal support was at 54 per cent—and I repeat 54 per cent—an increase of 1.2 per cent. In fairness, Labor support had .6 per cent at the expense of the Democrats. I believe that this is a message for the two Democrats in the other place: the South Australian public are comfortable with what this Government is doing. They realised they were duped by the Bannon/Arnold Government, showed their disgust at the December 1993 election and now seven months later accept what is happening in South Australia as they realise that,

without this reform, South Australia has only one direction, that is, downhill.

In closing, I congratulate the Governor on her opening address and urge the Opposition to take a bipartisan approach with the Brown Government to continue South Australia's recovery, and maybe—just maybe—Labor may well be remembered as an Opposition that assisted the Government of the day in restoring South Australia to the great State it once was rather than being remembered as a former Labor Government that sent the State to the brink of bankruptcy. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply delivered by Her Excellency the Governor on the opening of the second session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament. Again, I pay tribute to the wonderful ongoing job done by the Governor of South Australia, Dame Roma Mitchell. She does a terrific job and always looks and acts the part. As has been mentioned since the last Address in Reply debate, there has been the death of one member and three former members of this House. Joe Tiernan, the former member for Torrens, was in this place for only 3½ months. His sudden death shocked all members of this House, and brought a timely reminder of our own tenuous hold on life. Reg Groth was the member for Salisbury for nine years; Keith Plunkett, the member for Peake for 10 years; and Lloyd Hughes, the member for Wallaroo for 13 years. Collectively, these members made a significant contribution to the Parliament of this State, and I extend my condolences to their families.

In her speech opening this session, Her Excellency mentioned various matters, one of which I would like to dwell on at some length referring to the Commission of Audit. The Government seems to think that this report has scripture status. To go down the path of many of the 336 recommendations of the report—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Florey not talk over the balustrade.

Mr De LAINE: For the Government to go down the path of many of the 336 recommendations of the Audit Commission report would be absolutely disastrous for the State and the people. Without casting any aspersions on or questioning the integrity of the members of the Audit Commission, I just do not think there was enough time for them to conduct an adequately in-depth study and assessment of all the Public Service activities being carried on in our State. Nor did the membership of the committee have a broad enough base of expertise to make a genuinely objective assessment of the public sector.

Before coming into this place I was in the private sector and I remember very well back in the late 1970s and the early 1980s when assessments of this type were carried out, resulting in the massive loss of many skilled workers and people with expertise in various parts of industry. Those companies involved almost went bankrupt and it was only through a concerted effort, with the massive injection of foreign funds, massive restructuring and, above all, massive injection of high tech equipment, which cost more jobs, that those companies were able to get out of trouble and are now performing quite well. However, I fear that the same sort of thing will happen here in the public sector if we continue on the path we are following at the moment.

The proponents of these assessments always seem to pick academics who have plenty of paper qualifications but who are very thin on practical experience in the fields they are

investigating and assessing. Most seem to be accountants or people from a financial background who seem to look at and recognise dollars and cents only, rather than what is required for people to run an organisation and to provide the required services. These assessments need to be done by people who not only know about dollars and cents but who also know thoroughly the areas of operations of whatever organisation they are assessing so that they can recognise and assess all the implications of cuts made to the organisation in question. That is very important and it seems to be something that is almost always overlooked.

The public sector reform program that was put in place by the former Labor Government before the 11 December election was a realistic program in that it offered targeted separation packages only to those people whose jobs were assessed as redundant. There was some flexibility in this scheme in that some people who were in positions that were considered to be redundant were able to exchange with other people who wanted to take the separation packages. There was also sufficient flexibility to provide some of these other people with the retraining necessary to give them the skills required to enable them to exchange with the people who wanted to take the package but who were not in a job that was considered to be redundant. The system worked very well; the Public Service shed quite a few people. In fact, it was working quite well until the disastrous policies of this present Government were introduced, and all that seems to have gone down the drain.

The constant emphasis of the previous Government was, within particular departments, the retention of people with the necessary skills and expertise to allow the department to function properly for the benefit of the people of South Australia. At the moment, with the number of people who are taking separation packages, anyone who wants to put up their hand and take a package is allowed to go, with scant regard for the loss of expertise, experience or skills that that person has in relation to that department.

Having spoken to people who work in a variety of positions in some of these Government departments, I know that things are getting very difficult and that departments are not able to function adequately. I mentioned only yesterday in Question Time a typical example of where Government departments are not able to respond to the problems of people in the community as they should and as they were intended to respond.

The Tonkin Liberal Government did similar things from 1979 to 1982. The word 'outsourcing' was not used then—that seems to be the current buzz word—but functions were outsourced by that Government. Much maintenance work was done by the private sector, but not in an approved or appropriate manner. However, the bills were paid to the private sector, even though Government workers from EWS, or other departments, had to redo the work to the required standard in order to continue the services. This policy cost the taxpayers a lot of money; it farmed the work off to the private sector and I can see the same thing happening again under this Government.

Maintenance was not performed on a lot of plant and equipment. In fact, some of the machinery, plant and equipment in Government departments was so abused and neglected that by the time the Bannon Labor Government came into office some of it had to be replaced at great cost. So much for the saving of money on a short-term basis. Much equipment was sold during this period. You, Mr Deputy

Speaker, as a Minister in that Government would no doubt know that what I am saying is true.

Because at that stage the Liberal Party was in power for only three years it did not learn from its mistakes. Just as its mismanagement was starting to bite it was kicked out of office and it was left to the Bannon Labor Government, which was elected in 1982, to pick up the pieces, rebuild the public sector and get the State back on the rails. As I said, many maintenance programs and other infrastructure facilities had to be brought up to date and replaced, and that made life very difficult for the incoming Government.

I have listened carefully in this place to members of the then Opposition (who are now in Government) over the past few years and I am absolutely appalled at the lack of understanding of many members—not all; there are some very capable members—in terms of what has been happening in the real world in the mid to late 1980s and the 1990s. Like most conservatives, they live in the past and continually quote the good old days. There were good times in years gone by. They were not very good for workers but they were good in respect of our geographical isolation, our full employment situation, our protectionism and our subsidisation of almost all human services.

The Liberal Party in South Australia seems to have been in Opposition for so long that it has lost touch with the real world. I wish members opposite well; I sincerely hope they can solve the problems of the State, but I have my doubts. They will find that running the State is a lot different from being in Opposition: in Opposition you can criticise and complain but you do not have to deliver, whereas in Government they will have to deliver. As I said, I wish them well; I hope they can do it for the sake of the people of South Australia and our great State.

The problems of today lead to expenditure that Governments did not have to bear in years gone by, including the Liberal Party's term in office from 1979 to 1982. There is now a very high and unacceptable level of unemployment. The State has a quite narrow revenue base and we have been squeezed in recent years by the Federal Government. I know that it is a Federal Labor Government and I have been very vocal to my local Federal member in relation to the squeeze that the Federal Government has put on South Australia and, indeed, on the other States. South Australia, in particular, has lost hundreds of millions of dollars in recent years because of the cutbacks in funding by the Federal Government. No doubt the State Liberal Government will now find the same sort of problems when it comes to the money allocated by the Federal Government.

Because of the difficult times we are now experiencing with the high level of unemployment and other problems, we need to sustain a myriad of services to support people and families in difficulty. Back in the 1930s, 1940s and early 1950s, the sort of support for families that is available today did not exist. Much of this support was not even needed. Local communities were close knit, and many families lived together in the same locality: there was a lot of individual family support. The vast majority of wives and mothers did not work. If they did, the grandparents lived quite close and provided free and effective child care.

Since that time, we have seen many migrants arrive without this extended family support. As a community, we became more affluent during the late 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. This has enabled young people to marry, buy land and move into areas far removed from the established community, thus producing the suburban sprawl. This has destroyed the

extended family unit which provided support in the early days of the State and has stretched the Government's resources to provide public transport, public housing, roads and other infrastructure, schools and hospitals, etc.

Another problem with which other Governments have not had to contend in the past is the major problem of drugs and increased crime. In recent years much has been said in this place about crime. It is true that the crime rate has increased sharply, but in my view that is not the fault of the Government, because I cannot see that the new Government is making any inroads in that regard. The crime rate is obviously high, and I attribute that to three main reasons: unemployment, drugs and the attitude and expectations of people. I blame improved communications, particularly television, for this. People become dissatisfied when they see the way in which more affluent people in the world live, and they want a slice of that action. I cannot blame them for that. They become dissatisfied and disenchant. They are unemployed, they get on to drugs, and they break, enter and steal to sustain their unfortunate habits. These are the reasons why the crime rate has risen, and they are taking enormous resources from Governments. I sympathise with the existing Government in this regard. Members opposite have these problems to deal with, as we did. I hope they can overcome them, but it will be a very hard task.

There is also the increased demand for jobs. Most women are working now. They need to work to maintain a standard of living and to raise their family in this modern day and age, and they need to have their own career. So, there is an increased demand for jobs. However, at the present time, despite the unacceptably high level of unemployment in this State, the fact is that running parallel with that is record employment in this State—that is, the number of people who are working.

The impact of technology is another area that has cost the community very dearly in terms of jobs and caused increased expenditure for the Government as well. The high cost of health has been caused by our ageing population and the greater life expectancy that we have imparted to people. It is great that people are living longer, but it is at a cost to society. There has been an explosion of knowledge and methods of treatment. One of our colleagues, the member for Hanson, has just had a hip replacement. That is the sort of operation that is being done in large numbers in this State, and they cost an enormous amount of money.

Hospitals require expensive equipment. Gone are the days when the major piece of equipment in a hospital was an X-ray machine. We now have high-tech computerised equipment. For instance, the last CAT scanner that was installed in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital cost over \$7 million. Because of the rate at which this sort of equipment is improved, it becomes obsolete very quickly and needs to be replaced in five to 10 years at an enormous cost. Governments, especially former Labor Governments, have been criticised for not spending enough on health, but in fact that expenditure has quadrupled in recent years. These are the factors that impact on the amount of money that is spent. The present Government will find when it starts to work out a budget that the extraordinary cost of services will teach it a thing or two about health.

The same situation applies to education. Higher standards in teaching facilities and equipment are needed to prepare young people for employment. Tertiary education used to be for rich people only, but Labor Governments have given the opportunity to working class people to participate.

Mr Venning: That's not right.

Mr De LAINE: Of course it is. They have opened up the system to allow ordinary working class people to participate in tertiary education. That, of course, has cost a lot more taxpayers' money to sustain. Vocational education (TAFE) has been expanded rapidly. I attended the opening today of the Port Adelaide campus of the Regency College of TAFE, which is an excellent institution. This is the sort of thing that costs Governments a lot of money, but it is well worth the expenditure and the investment in young people, in particular, to give them the skills they need to lead a productive life and take up skilled employment opportunities that no doubt will come along in time.

Another area that costs Governments dearly, particularly in this State, is the provision of recreation and sporting facilities. In this State we have many world-class sporting facilities. In the past, Governments did not have to bother about such facilities. At first, facilities were provided by clubs with some assistance from local government. Clubs were given a piece of land, usually an old rubbish dump or an unused piece of land, and the people who joined the clubs often went out with picks and shovels and hewed sporting facilities out of virgin land.

I remember the Port Adelaide Cycling Club did this. It made a bike track down at Port Adelaide by hand, although it was a dirt track and pretty rough. The Riverside Golf Club, which is now a very good golf club, originally was hewn out of the mangroves and swamplands near Port Adelaide by ordinary working-class people using picks and shovels. There were plenty of open spaces for kids to play in, but now all that has gone and it has fallen to Governments to provide these facilities. People demand world-class facilities, as I say, and they certainly have them here with the velodrome, hockey stadiums, Football Park and some of these other excellent venues.

Mr Venning: We need more hockey pitches, particularly in the country.

Mr De LAINE: Yes, more hockey pitches and more sporting facilities. I agree with the honourable member. But this is something that Governments have to provide these days, and it puts a greater load on taxpayers and State Governments. Roads are better than they ever were before. South Australia, although maybe many members do not know—

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr De LAINE: I am talking about sealed roads. I know there are some pretty rough roads in the honourable member's area, and that needs to be addressed. Now that the Liberal Government is in place, the honourable member will have superhighways going through his farmland, so that will be great. I look forward to that, and I hope the honourable member gets that. However, I am talking about main roads and metropolitan roads. I know there are plenty of dirt roads left and they, hopefully, will be addressed, but our roads in general are by international standards some of the best in the world in the way they are constructed and the way they are surfaced. So, we are very well off in this respect. But once again, it costs the Government a lot of money. The other problem is the size of the State and the very small population, which means that all taxpayers have a great amount of infrastructure to support, unlike many other countries with small geographical areas and large populations. That is another problem that this State, particularly, has to live with. No doubt Government members will find this out as they go on.

In the past, the South Australian Government, whether Liberal or Labor, has done a magnificent job in the way it has done things. I remember Sir Thomas Playford, that record breaking conservative Premier who was in office for 32 years, was quite often quoted as saying that some things are best done by the Government. He was referring to areas such as roads, bridges and the sorts of structures where public safety was of prime concern. To hand this sort of stuff over to the private sector would be inviting disaster, because it is human nature that people in the private sector will cut corners in an effort to make more profit. Where public safety is concerned, I agree with Sir Thomas Playford that those things are best done by Government, where profit is not a criterion. The Government will do the jobs properly and will spend the money it must spend without any risk of cutting corners.

Another area which costs the Government dearly now but which never used to be the management of our fisheries. The fisheries are managed very well in world terms, albeit with some problem areas. There was a need to come in and manage these fisheries because they were being fished out not only by the many thousands of amateur fishermen but by the professional fishermen with their increased technology, triple rigs and all that sort of equipment on boats. They were fishing much more tonnage than was previously anticipated, and there was a real need to manage our fisheries. These are just a few examples of what is needed in these times to run our State. It is vastly different from what was needed in the Playford era and also different from the last time the Liberals were in power from 1979 to 1982. I dare say the Government will find out these things as it goes along. I wish it well and hope that it can put these things in place for the benefit of the people of this State.

One other matter I refer to is the Film and Video Centre at Hendon, which was recently closed down. I am surprised that the member for Lee has not jumped up and down in this place to protest about this closure. I know that if my friend and former colleague the member for Albert Park (Kevin Hamilton) were in this place at this time he would be making all sorts of noises about the closure of this marvellous centre. The centre has been built up over the years and is a great loss to the State. I have in my possession a couple of letters from organisations in my electorate protesting against the closure.

One is from the Naval Association of Australia, Port Adelaide division, and its affiliated associations: the Submarine Association, the Australian Vietnam Logistic Support and Forces Association and the Royal Australian Naval Reserve Senior Sailors Association, with a total membership of almost 1 000 without including their families. This organisation was very vocal and sent me a letter in protest against the closure of this excellent centre because of the excellent job the Film and Video Centre did and the amount this organisation and its subsidiaries used it. They used the resources a great deal, and to them it is a massive blow to have the centre disbanded.

The other letter that I received was from the Pennington Primary School, which is in the middle of my electorate. It was also a very large user of this facility at Hendon and was protesting against its closure. This school is fairly consistent with other schools in my electorate, where approximately 90 per cent of students are Government assisted and on school-card. Ninety per cent is a terrific percentage, and other schools in the area are between 85 and 90 per cent. They were very big users of films and videos from the centre and have also complained bitterly and put up some very good arguments as to why the centre should not be closed—but to no

avail. I deplore the actions of the Government, particularly the Minister for the Arts, for closing this much used resource in Hendon.

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

Mr De LAINE: Before the dinner break I was referring to the disgraceful closure of the South Australian Film and Video Centre by the Minister for the Arts. I mentioned the uses that the Naval Association had of its facilities. I also referred to a letter that the Pennington Primary School had sent to me. That school is fairly typical of schools in my electorate; 90 per cent of students receive Government assistance in the form of the school card. In the few minutes I have left in this debate, I will quote a couple of passages from the letter sent to me by the Pennington Primary School. It states:

Families cannot afford to send their children to cinemas at approximately \$5 a head. The Film and Video Centre provides a socially just service by charging only \$1 a film, the cost of which is met by the school. Its very existence allows our school community to access quality media at a price that is affordable. It addresses the needs of people in poverty. Pennington Primary School has 70 per cent of students from a non-English speaking background. In the New Arrivals program there are currently 78 students who have been in Australia less than two years. With such a high proportion of students who have minimal or no English (and who may also be preliterate in their first language), it is absolutely essential that a rich and varied visual environment is created to support students in learning English. The use of visual arts enables children to make connections and see relationships. . . . Over the years, the SA Film and Video Centre has provided students at Pennington Primary School with the motivation to produce their own award-winning films.

Over the past few years, because of this motivation, Pennington Primary School has won several awards—gold medal awards at State and national level in film making. That is excellent, and it is predominantly the Asian and overseas students who have done this. The letter continues:

Please consider alternative ways of funding this community resource so that it continues to grow. We will gladly pay increased hiring fees, if this means the South Australian Film and Video Centre can stay open.

Unfortunately, that fell on the deaf ears of the Minister and the Government: the facility has been closed.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I support the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply in the Second Session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament. I congratulate Her Excellency the Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell, on her speech. Like my colleague the member for Napier, I believe Her Excellency delivered it with grace and dignity. I have to say that I found the speech itself disappointing. I found the content disappointing. I thought that it lacked vision, cohesiveness, a real direction for our community and our State, depth, and any real analysis of the issues and challenges that we now face.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: No, it is not. Over the past four months since I was elected to Parliament, I have spent a lot of time thinking about Government, the role of Government, the role of MPs and the role that the Government has in relation to change and moving a society towards certain goals and objectives. All these factors come together to make our society one in which we can not only restore economic prosperity but also enable the State to maintain its high standard of living and its enviable lifestyle: those things must balance. In coming to and reflecting on this view, I thought about what I have learnt as a senior manager within the public sector regarding the achievement of change.

I did a lot of reading and undertook much discussion with a wide range of people. These are the things that I discovered and learnt about. The first thing that needs to happen is the establishment of a climate in which we can work and which will give us the results we are after. Establishing the climate is a very important first start. The key players need to be on side because, unless that occurs, the changes will not work in the way that they need to. The key players need to have a chance to participate, share their views and have their concerns dealt with. It means that we need to listen, there needs to be open communication, we should encourage discussion of ideas and encourage a range of views, we should not be doctrinaire or judgmental and we need to build a degree of trust. We need to gain the confidence of the key players and the community. If we do not, we cannot succeed.

Members interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: Members opposite probably need to listen to this, because I do not think it has happened. The model we need to look at in the 1990s is one of teamwork, collaboration and consensus. It is important not to rush into quick decisions when you are taking over something, unless you are very clear about it. There can be a lot of pressure to quickly come in and start doing things, but you need to be careful because you can easily take the wrong path and set in motion a train of events that you did not anticipate.

Secondly, you need to assess the situation and understand the parameters in which you work. Things look different when you are in charge, when you have access to the information and know that the buck stops with you. It is important to assess things carefully before you start. You should never forget the big picture in which we now work. The world has changed dramatically. We are no longer a city State within a State, a State within a country, a country within a region, a region within the world—we are all of these. The world is now truly our oyster, and we need to frame all our strategies and planning in those terms.

Technological change has meant that information transfer and the ability to communicate speeds up everything everywhere. New conditions call for new approaches like creative thinking, problem solving and strategic planning. We have to balance all the factors: economic development on the one hand with social cohesion, environmental preservation, cultural diversity and so on on the other. Getting the balance right is the key. We need to communicate the vision. We need to do it often, and we need to do it with hope. We need to provide hope for people that we are going somewhere, and that we are getting somewhere. We need to give people something in which to believe, something to strive for and, most important, something to be a part of. After that, it is setting in place the structures and mechanisms to achieve the outcomes.

I will look for a moment at the achievements on the national scene and relate them to what I see has happened here. Over the weekend the Treasurer, Ralph Willis, addressed the Labor Party convention and stated:

The nation is enjoying a strong economic recovery, a recovery that is delivering jobs and raising living standards, but it is not just a normal turn of the cycle recovery or a short-term boom and bust recovery, as the Opposition would have the nation believe, but rather it is a very well based recovery that gives Australia the real prospect of achieving a strong economic performance for the rest of this century. It is based on the strongest set of economic fundamentals that Australia has experienced for 30 years.

He went on to mention low inflation, low interest rates (the lowest in 20 years), high levels of business and consumer

confidence, productivity growing strongly, and international competitiveness greatly improved. He also mentioned that time lost in industrial disputes is very low; export performance, especially in non-traditional areas, has improved; and, despite strong growth, our balance of payments and current account deficit are stable. He further stated:

Such favourable circumstances have not happened by accident. They are the product of a decade of restructuring the economy. The economy is much more open, competitive, efficient, productive and job creating than the highly protected, over-regulated, antiquated economy we inherited.

He mentioned that manufacturing exports have increased two and a half times in real terms in just eight years. He also mentioned the wine industry and Mitsubishi in South Australia. He talks about substantial growth in our trade-in services—they have doubled in real terms since the mid-1980s. Our largest service export, tourism, now provides more export income than wool and wheat. He talked about education as another service export success story. International education now rates only marginally behind wheat as an export earner. He went on to speak about achievements in employment and the plans and strategies for the future. Let us briefly look at what has happened and how that came about. In 1983 the Federal Labor Government won Government, having been in Opposition since 1975—eight years in Opposition. In the early stages of its first term the Labor Government set the climate under which it would work.

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable member resume her seat.

Mr BRINDAL: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member, but I ask about relevance, whether the political history of the Australian Labor Party is relevant to an Address in Reply debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will realise that the Address in Reply is a pretty broad ranging debate but in general it is customary to refer to the content of the Governor's speech. I will allow the member to continue.

Ms STEVENS: I want to talk about the process by which those things were done and then relate it to what I have seen here, Mr Deputy Speaker. There were wide ranging debates between unions, academics, big and small business, social services and ordinary people. The result of that was the accord: an agreement to work in a consensus model, an agreement to work together to produce the goals that the country needed. There were amazing achievements in that time. Who would have thought that a Labor Party would change a centrally fixed wage system and come up with enterprise bargaining, which we now accept as the way to go? It was not easy. We had great traditional allegiances but it was done.

Let us now look at what has happened here in South Australia. The Brown Government came to power last December after 10 years in Opposition. Essentially, it had been more than 10 years because it was out of Government throughout most of the 70s and 80s. It came to Government with a very large majority, and a real opportunity to take the community forward. It had a real opportunity to set the foundations for the future, to set the climate, to assess the situation and then to move on towards the end of the century. Let us look at what has happened.

Within a few days of the opening of Parliament this year the Audit Commission was set up. The Audit Commission report was released and 30 days were allowed for comment and consultation. But what about the community input? The

Audit Commission report became the only source document for ideas, discussion and setting of parameters for the future. What about other things? What about the A.D. Little report, the 2020 Vision planning report, the Federal Government reports and research, other information services and the people doing the job in our State who had ideas, suggestions, concerns and issues for the future?

There was no invitation to all parts of the society to debate freely any of these issues. The accountants knew it all. Those who dared to venture a view that varied were belittled and shunned. Academics, social agencies, public sector workers and ordinary people were ignored and devalued. Even the one daily newspaper that we have decided to support the Government's approach. But an enormous opportunity was lost—an opportunity to set a climate that said, 'Okay, we are in Government. This is the situation: what are your ideas? These are the facts: what do you think? Have you got any other suggestions? Let's go forward together.' Where was the debate? Where was the cross-fertilisation of ideas? Where was the big picture? Where was the focusing of all sections of the community towards the future and what needed to be done? Were Government members too scared to open up the issue? Why? They had a large majority which should have given them confidence really to take the risk and do that. Did they not believe that the community could come up with any suggestions?

They lacked the vision and the understanding that leaders draw people together, gather the facts, encourage debate, focus issues and then drive forward towards goals that they articulate. Here was an opportunity to provide direction and hope and to galvanise the community, and it was lost. What happened, and it now continues, is that there was a huge telescoping down of the issues so that they looked at things only in terms of accounting: dollars and cents, profit and loss. Their attitude was, if it saves money, it must be good; if we spend more than other States we must be doing it wrong.

We are left with no vision, no excitement, no picture of what our society will look like in four years and no tackling of the big issues. What we are left with is hard times, cuts to services, with no real hope of a light at the end of the tunnel—except that it might be another train. We need more hope in this State than the Crows and, as we know, this year even they have taken on the general feeling. What we have is a whole lot of blaming and finger pointing, just as I am getting from members opposite now.

Make no mistake: we are all angry about what happened with the State Bank. We are all appalled at the total mismanagement that was revealed of private sector, experienced managers. What we find is a whole lot of blaming and finger pointing. The public sector and public employees as a group have copped the whole lot. The Government's attitude is, 'Anything private is better than anything public; get rid of them; cut the numbers. It won't matter if we cut the numbers, we can still do the same services, and we will do it better without them.' In all of that, we have forgotten that the public enterprises that let us down were those operating freely in the open market. It was bail-out by SAFA, which was not freely operating in the marketplace, on which we had to rely. While there is blaming and finger pointing, we do not move on; we block our ability to think constructively about the future. We concentrate on point scoring, and we get sucked into a negative thought pattern. A good leader realises this and knows that we have to move on, that we have to pull the team and the community around to a future vision and positive action.

Above all, we see meanness in the approach of this Government. This meanness has never been more exemplified than the Treasurer's refusal to honour a commitment to allocate some of the profits of gaming machines to the social welfare sector. We will need this funding to deal with the problems that some people will have. You are as mean as that.

An honourable member: You are.

Ms STEVENS: We also see a return to dogma, and this is what this small-town telescopic tunnel vision thinking does: it brings about a return to dogma and to the solutions of the past. We think about full privatisation as the way to go. We pick up on doctrinaire approaches that we know have been discredited elsewhere in the world, such as in England, the United States and Western Europe, but we say, 'No, this is the way we have to go, because we just do not have the ability to think more creatively.' We also show that we do not understand the big picture. I wish to cite some reflections given by senior public sector managers, which I read yesterday in an article in the *Adelaide Review*. That article refers to:

... the Government's view of Government, which is that, to the extent that we have to have it [the Government] at all, it should be run as if it is a corner store, a local work shop, a proverbial bootery. The lowest common denominator—efficiency—should be the mechanism by which its success is judged.

None of us has confidence that the Government will meet the challenges in any way other than an economic rationalistic approach. In an article in the *City Messenger*, Michael Lennon, who is the departing CEO of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, said:

The biggest danger we face is a loss of confidence in ourselves. People need to remember that Adelaide has always lived on its wits from the time it was a germ in (SA founding father, Edward Gibbon) Wakefield's mind.

It is the Government's job to keep confidence high, to give hope, to paint the big picture and to involve people in making it come to pass. In an article in the *Adelaide Review*, Peter Ward said:

The Audit Commission came and measured for the coffin and the Asset Management Task Force is selling off the estate even before the body has been buried.

It is an overwhelming situation when this Government's decisions are made in a total policy vacuum. They do not link and the Government cuts off noses to spite faces. So, this is the way the Government approached its first term in office after 11 years in Opposition. And this attitude, this climate setting, put the stamp on how Ministers have approached their tasks: with rigidity, shallowness and a lack of policy organisation, lack of vision and lack of strategic planning. It has been purely a numbers game and a cost cutting exercise without a framework within which to do it. We have already seen it in legislation that has been passed involving industrial relations, occupational health and safety and WorkCover, where sections of our community have been set against each other and basic fairness is not there. Members of the Government have been ideologically driven, confronting and not collaborative.

I mention also the debacle that occurred in relation to the South Australian Film and Video Centre. Here we had a ridiculous cost cutting exercise, a prime example of cutting off the nose to spite the face. We had a report that proved the worth of the organisation, but it did not meet the bottom line in the accountant's book and so it went. We lose a collection which has been brought together over many years and which

has provided information and support to many organisations in our community. The videos have been spread around libraries in the State. We do not know what has happened to the films. I believe they are still sitting there while the Government thinks about what it is going to do. This Government is penny wise and pound foolish.

The content of the 'Recovery Through Reform' speech was thin on vision and thin on policy—just thin. Although I could talk for a long time, I will mention only briefly a couple of issues raised in the document. The document contains a reference to the health system under the heading 'A More Responsive Health System'. Members should remember, of course, that we already know that we are facing \$65 million in cuts and that health is a tradeable service. The A.D. Little report mentioned health services as something we could build on and export. So, in view of that, we have this reference to 'a more responsive health system'. The Government stated that it would continue with its plans to provide a health system more responsive to community needs; it would restructure the provision of health services and devolve functions more appropriately carried out at regional level; and local input would be strongly encouraged. Is that more responsive?

Already today I have seen a high level departmental document saying that the extent of the cuts to the Adelaide Women's and Children's Hospital will mean serious cuts in the services. In terms of women's health, the Government is providing two breast X-ray services, but it is possibly taking away four women's health centres that have worked successfully for 16 years. Community health involves working with people at the grassroots level—cut that. The amalgamation of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital is good news on the face of it, but how will it be achieved when we are facing \$65 million worth of cuts?

Whose needs are being responded to in deciding to privatise the Modbury Hospital? All of this is happening in a policy vacuum. We have people not knowing what is going on; health workers have one set of instructions and one set of information from bureaucrats one day and it changes the next. Again, we have to think about education, remembering that it faces \$40 million in cuts. It is also an export earner. The first thing that has happened is that—

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have been listening to something like 15 minutes of constant interjections, including those from the member who as recently as 10 seconds ago has gone back to his seat. Would you please extend the courtesy of the House to the speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The conversation from the Government benches is more than audible. Members are rightly corrected for interjecting out of their seat. I must admit that I missed that. I would appreciate it if members would extend the courtesy of listening to the speaker who has the call.

Ms STEVENS: Thank you, Sir. So, there will be \$40 million worth of cuts to education—an export earner—and 46 principals have taken targeted separation packages. That represents a leadership loss to the system of about 900 years of accumulated experience. This is happening in an export earnings area. Is that really the way to go?

I noticed, and I was pleased to notice, that early intervention was mentioned. I am pleased to see that the Government is carrying on from the start that the Labor Government made in its last term. I noticed that the reporting of student

achievements with national profiles will commence. South Australia has been a leader in that field over recent years. In fact, this State developed the attainment levels and worked with other States to produce the national statements and profiles, which really focus on understanding the learning process and provide a way for individual students to have accurate information about where they are in terms of their learning.

I am pleased to see that that is being extended, but I am not pleased to see that basic skills tests have been introduced. I notice that the member for Lee supported this, but I wonder whether he has any idea of what he is really supporting. When senior leaders from the Education Department went to New South Wales to get the good news on basic skills testing they were asked why they had come over there and what they had come to learn. They came back saying, 'It will not do any harm; it will not do any harm, but it will not do any good either. It involves standard tests marked by a computer, with every child in the State doing the same test at the same time. This will not help our literacy issues, and literacy is an important issue in schools.'

How do we measure creativity? I wonder how the computer would go with that—or is that not a basic skill, even though creativity is one of the things that we know we need for our workplace of the future? So, we have a situation where the Government should be explaining to the community about basic skills, not falling for the three card trick and testing basic skills because that is what other states do. Tests that will measure something that will not have anything to do with education or learning; that will not help students. In fact, what they will do is use valuable teacher time while they give students practice in doing tests, for no good reason. What we need to do is really tackle literacy, work out how to do it and put in the resources, because it is really important. But there is not a place for basic skills testing in the literacy debate.

I turn now to public infrastructure. I do not have the time to go further into education, on which I could speak for a long while. Public infrastructure; where is the policy, where is the direction?

Mr Brindal: Here.

Ms STEVENS: You could have fooled me. We have TSPs coming out of our ears and all the experience gone, but it is only the public sector. What we need to ask is whether the Government is up to it. Mao Tse Tung was reputed to have said, 'May you live in interesting times.' I would say that we do live in interesting times. We live in more than interesting times; we live in times that require creativity, vision, people working together, determination, good planning and resources, and we will get the outcomes we need. So, is the Government up to it? I have to say 'So far, no,' and when I consider the information in its document. My answer is still 'No'.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I would like to contribute to the grievance debate tonight on the issue of hypocrisy. I have been listening to a considerable amount of hypocrisy in

this House for about eight months, and I thought after reading the local paper yesterday that it had finally come to an end and that I was going to have a say. I am fed up with listening to the other side talk about those members on this side of the House who are here for one term. The one thing that the members on the other side of the House seem to forget is that we are here because we won. We were the ones who were successful. We hear very little from the other side about their failures—all of the failed Labor candidates who did not even make it for the one term. I would like to say quite seriously that if I last only one term I can honestly say that in that one term I will have succeeded in doing many more positive things for my electorate than have some of the past members for my electorate in 23 years.

While we are considering some of the hypocrisies that go on within the electorate of Kaurua, I would like to raise a couple of the issues that came up in the campaign. The first was the issue of the Aldinga police station which another member of the electorate and I raised to draw attention to the need for police presence at Aldinga and Sellicks beaches. We raised that issue because, having lived in the area for 20 years, it was painfully obvious that people simply did not report crime in that area because there was an expectation that the Christies Beach police would not respond. They were overworked and under-resourced and simply were not responding to the outer suburban areas of Aldinga and Sellicks Beach. We raised the issue of the need for police presence basically to make the current Government and Minister at the time recognise that we existed and that we had a need.

Mr Brindal: Who was that fool?

Mrs ROSENBERG: I won't tell you who that fool was. We raised the issue by way of a petition. The failed Labor candidate at that time responded to our raising that petition with his solution for what Aldinga Beach really needed. His solution was to close the Willunga Police Station, which is a country police station with one male police officer in attendance between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., and transfer that police officer to Aldinga Beach. That so-called solution was supposed to suffice for Aldinga Beach.

Mr Brindal: You should name that person; he sounds like a fool.

Mrs ROSENBERG: He was a fool, and he still is a fool. However, the problem is that, once we presented the petition which contained 2 500 signatures to the Parliament and the then Minister for Emergency Services, suddenly the failed Labor candidate realised that about 2 500 votes were involved in this issue and there was an urgent need to have a police station at Aldinga Beach. Not only was he going to build a police station but he was going to build a \$2.5 million police station, and it was to be erected at Aldinga Beach by about the year 1996. However, in the meantime we had to survive with what we had—absolutely nothing! The hypocrisy of this is that this failed Labor candidate, whom the other side would obviously have preferred to see in this House, reacted to the community's needs only when he suddenly realised that there were a couple of votes in it for him. That is not the sort of member that our area decided to choose.

The other issue concerns the Old Noarlunga traffic lights. The member for Heysen, as a past member for Old Noarlunga, worked extremely hard to get the former Government to recognise the need in respect of two key issues in Old Noarlunga: sewerage and traffic lights at the intersection leading into the township. The member for Heysen, as the then member for Old Noarlunga, could not manage to get a

member from the other side of the House, the then Government, even to visit Old Noarlunga. I do not think they knew that Old Noarlunga even existed.

When we raised the issue of the need for traffic lights at Old Noarlunga by having the shadow Minister for Transport come on site with residents—and she agreed that there was a need for lights—suddenly the failed Labor candidate said, 'Oh my goodness, there are probably 700 or 800 votes in this, too.' So he went on site with his heavies from the Department of Road Transport. Unfortunately, his heavies from the Department of Road Transport did not agree with him and said, quite publicly on site, 'There is no way, Jose, that you're going to get lights on this corner.' So what did he do? He stood there shrugging his shoulders and saying, 'What can I do? This is what the department says. I can't change the department's mind.'

So, the failed Labor candidate decided that he had to save face. Mr Deputy Speaker, you might be interested to know that his solution for the residents of Old Noarlunga was to photocopy some maps in the current Gregory's street directory and send them to the residents of Old Noarlunga with lines marked to suggest how they could get out of Old Noarlunga without going across the intersection—very intelligent action from a so-called intelligent candidate for the Labor Party! The Old Noarlunga residents, some of whom have lived there for over 70 years, did not appreciate being told how to get out of their community without the benefit of lights at the intersection. The absolute hypocrisy of this is that, this week, he stated in the local *Messenger* newspaper that we simply are not doing our duty, and we have not delivered our election promise because we have not installed traffic lights immediately. For heaven's sake, he was not going to put lights there at all. In fact, his best suggestion was that the residents should leave the township in a totally different direction so that there would never be the need for lights in that area.

Another issue I would like to raise is the Main Street program for the Aldinga township. During the election campaign there was a wonderful photograph in the newspaper of the failed Labor candidate at the time showing the application form that he had submitted to the local council for a Main Street project. However, I have made an inquiry to the local council and I now have a reply in writing saying, 'We are sorry; we have checked our files and we cannot find that application.' Not only did he not make that application but he suggested to the community that he had done something that he simply had not done.

If we want to carry that slightly further, this failed Labor Party candidate made a promise on-site in the middle of Gawler Street, Port Noarlunga, to a series of older residents who live in Housing Trust flats in the area that, because of speed along that road and around the corner, he was going to ensure that a median strip was put in place. In fact, he even gave residents the date the median strip was going to be put in place. How he was going to achieve that without having applied to the department or his Government for funds I do not know. When I applied to the department to find out when the median strip was to be put in place, I was informed that a submission was never made.

The final hypocrisy that I cannot let go—and I have two minutes left—is the shop trading hours debacle. In my opinion what happened prior to the election, with the introduction of total deregulation of shopping hours, was an absolutely appalling situation. Members opposite now say to us and to our Minister, 'You have no right to introduce the

changes in shop trading hours under the section that you have used.' Whether I agree or disagree with the shop trading hours decision is irrelevant. I am appalled at the hypocrisy of the other side, who argue that the method by which this change has been introduced by the Minister is unacceptable. It is most appropriate that I, as a member who did not support the extension of trading hours, say that the Opposition's hypocrisy is absolutely unacceptable.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): What a curious address. Someone should tell the honourable member that she won the election. I cannot understand why eight months later she wants to come in here and pour out all this bile. I can understand that she has a supportive audience over there. There must have been something in the soup tonight—

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is both customary and courteous to refer to members in this House by their title or by the office they hold.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point is well made. All members are aware of it. The honourable member will refer to other members in that way.

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Deputy Speaker, what was I supposed to have said? I referred to the member over there—

Mr Brindal: You said 'She'.

Mr QUIRKE: All right. I was saying that there must have been something in the soup tonight, or could it be that the Government did not have a good day yesterday? It is interesting that the member who told us a moment ago how she supported all those little storekeepers and all the rest of it was one of those members opposite who had their nose down in this House all day yesterday. We did not hear a peep out of her and, as for some of the other members over there, we will find out what their views are when we debate the Bill introduced by the member for Ross Smith.

In the nine minutes remaining I want to read into the record a couple of letters, including one from me to the Personnel Manager of Arrowcrest in South Australia, as follows:

Dear Mr Gleeson,

I am writing to you on behalf of a constituent of mine, Mrs Margaret Kerr, who is also an employee of yours. When you check the file you will find that this person was injured on her way to work and went through the resultant compensation process. Orders were made by the court, promises by solicitors and an award of over \$9 000 was made for pain and suffering.

A payment of \$5 900 was made to my constituent by way of a section 43 payout, whilst the other \$3 300 approximately is now being contested by your company against my constituent. This money was awarded to my constituent for pain and suffering and your company is now allegedly seeking legal loopholes to claim a very small amount of money. Could you please investigate this urgently and advise me accordingly?

I thought that when that went to Arrowcrest there would be some telephone conversations and we would ascertain a few other pertinent facts, and I will relay those to the House now.

Mr Rossi interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: If the member for Lee wants to interject could he at least have the decency to hobble back to his seat? At the end of the day, my constituent was a person who—

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Deputy Speaker, would you tell the member for Lee not to make disgusting displays in the House? I believe that is against Standing Orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Standing Orders clearly say that material shall not be displayed. I do not think a foot is classified as 'material'.

Mr QUIRKE: It certainly is when it is the member for Lee's foot.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member may have put his foot in it.

Mr QUIRKE: I think some pertinent facts of this case may need to come out in the House. This was an employee who was on a very meagre salary but who did the right thing by the company under the legislation that was in effect at that time. When SGIC made the relevant payment under the award, the moneys that had been advanced to her under WorkCover were refunded to the company, and what this was about was Arrowcrest—which has such a brilliant record of industrial relations and is probably one of the better arguments around this State for unionism—deciding that it would snatch every dollar it could from the very small amount of money for pain and suffering, and this is the letter it wrote back to me. It was almost like a Liberal Party campaign speech. I suspect this fellow had something to do with some of the policies that were not broken. The letter reads:

Dear Mr Quirke,

We refer to your correspondence on the above subject. You correctly state that Mrs Kerr received an award through the courts as a consequence of injuries she received. You should be aware that the legislative framework under which Mrs Kerr's action has been taken places significant responsibilities on our company as her employer at the time of her accident. Specifically, if she should require further treatment as a result of her injury—

that is a matter for SGIC, but still—

we are obliged by law to cover the cost of that treatment.

That is interesting. It continues:

The damages award technically made to Mrs Kerr incorporates payment for future medical difficulties—

this is all signed through SGIC, so I cannot see how that is the case—

It is that component of the award to which we lay legal claim. As you were a member of the Government which introduced the legislation under which Mrs Kerr's claim was made, we are sure that you would not expect us to abrogate our rights—

to a few miserable dollars—

You are no doubt aware that neither companies nor individuals can opt out of their legal obligations. . . Therefore, we have no choice—every other employer around town that I have met has exercised that right—

but to protect our future interests in the best way we can. We resent your suggestion that we are seeking 'legal loopholes' to claim 'a very small amount of money'—

I am sure they will like what I am saying tonight even less—

The law is clear in this area. Mrs Kerr is neither the first nor the last person to find herself in this situation. The legislation that existed at the time of Mrs Kerr's injury stated the employer must take responsibility for people injured when travelling to or from work—a circumstance over which we had no control—

no dispute on that—

If we were required to take responsibility for such injuries then we also have the right to protect our interests in the future.

Of course, SGIC has done that for them. It continues:

It should be noted that new legislation which has recently passed through the Parliament will mean employees who are injured on their way to and from work will be entitled to all damages payments that are awarded. However, they will have to take responsibility for their own rehabilitation—

as indeed, as soon as they signed up with SGIC under the old Act, they had to. It continues:

We also note that your constituent and her lawyers have at all times been advised of the reasons for our action. We are sorry if her lawyers have made promises, as stated by you, that they were not in

a position to keep. That matter, however, is between Mrs Kerr and her legal advisers. It is not something which we can influence.

There are a number of companies in South Australia that have the decency to deal with their employees in a way in which most, if not all, members in this House would applaud. There is an overwhelmingly large number of companies in South Australia that attempt to do the right thing by their employees. This lot have a record from the John Shearer days all the way through, where they are not only miserable in the extreme but where they also use whatever means they can to snatch a few miserable dollars—in this case, I believe, from a cleaner who worked down there.

Arrowcrest has a reputation (and indeed I want to report this to this House tonight) of being one of the worst employers in this State. I am happy to make those remarks, because this is one of the worst instances of an employer taking

advantage of a loyal employee that I know of. I said to Mrs Kerr, 'If I write to this company and if I raise this matter in Parliament, if we do not get anywhere, you realise that this lot could, indeed, victimise you further.' Her answer to me was, 'I feel so cheated by this company, so cheated by the way that they have treated me, that I am happy and I do not care what they do.' I lay that in the House here tonight. We often hear in here about the excesses of unionism; this is the excess of an employer. I have discussed this matter with members opposite who, I believe, generally concur that the trampling on the rights of little people such as this who have been legitimately injured and have gone through the process is a disgraceful abuse of power.

Motion carried.

At 8.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 11 August at 11 a.m.