

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 11 August 1994

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 10 August. Page 178.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I compliment Her Excellency on the way that she presented the Address at the opening of Parliament. I have said before, and I say again, that Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell is doing an excellent job as Governor of this State. The way that she is getting around and meeting the people and seeing what is going on in the State is a real credit to her. She has set herself a timetable and commitment that many people at a younger age than Her Excellency would not be able to maintain. That is a real credit to Dame Roma.

I should like to express my deepest sympathy to the family of the late Keith Plunkett. I was present at Keith's funeral service. I served in this House during some of the years that Keith was a member, and there is no doubt that he represented his electorate in a very strong way and had a great knowledge of the issues that particularly concerned him. It was very interesting to hear at the funeral service the many comments of his friends about what he had done in the union movement, in particular, over many years. I was very sad when Keith passed away. What was emphasised very clearly at the funeral service was one message that Keith wanted to pass on to those of us who are still here, namely, 'Don't smoke.' I hope many people will take note of what Keith said in that respect.

Her Excellency's speech covered a whole range of topics. It is always interesting to reflect on some, and I note particularly the seasonal conditions referred to in Her Excellency's speech. She said:

On top of the existing financial problems of many farmers, a poor season would force more families to leave their farms. Our thoughts and prayers are with those families.

Her Excellency then went on to say:

My Government has made representations to the Federal Government seeking an urgent review of criteria for determining an area eligible for special rural assistance.

At that stage, as Her Excellency had indicated earlier, it looked as though this State was heading towards a serious drought. As members will appreciate, the rains came two or three days before Her Excellency made her speech, and thankfully there had been a respite from what looked to be a disastrous situation. In fact, I had trouble throughout my electorate over the preceding fortnight. I was extremely worried about the area north of Maitland/Arthurton, and also about the areas around Moonta, Kadina, Wallaroo, Bute, Blyth and Brinkworth. Things were only just holding on and I know that many farmers were worried; yet I expressed my admiration to those farmers who said to me, 'Oh, there is no need to panic yet, John, we still have time.'

Mr Venning: It is very good country.

Mr MEIER: Yes, and they know their country very well.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The member for Custance says that he'd love some of that back. The heartening thing is that at least a minimum of 1 inch and up to 3 inches went through that whole area about two weeks ago and it changed things overnight. I want to emphasise that in this State we must recognise the fact that agriculture will be one of the key determinants that will or will not turn our economy around. The reason I say that is that, if we look at the 1992-93 financial year, the gross value of agricultural commodities produced by South Australia increased by \$38.7 million, to \$2.2 billion. That represents over half the gross value of the product earnings of this State. Therefore, I have to look with dismay at figures provided by the economists—and often they are Government economists—when they indicate that this country is coming out of recession. Many of them say that we are out of the recession and on the way to full recovery.

It is great to hear those figures; however, those figures can simply be a blip on the horizon. They will disappear as fast as they came if the rural sector does not also come out of the recession. It is quite clear that despite an increase in the 1992-93 period—and it will not be long before we have the figures for 1993-94—things were far from good. In fact, in my area, barley actually decreased in value by \$18.5 million or 7 per cent during that period. My farmers had a 7 per cent decrease in their income. Since then, we have had the next harvest. Whilst it was a very good harvest, prices dropped even further. So, the rural recovery has not occurred as we would have liked it to. The one year we had a boom season the prices were disastrous and it is causing us real problems. At the end of last year and the beginning of this year I spoke to some of the farmers whom I would regard as well to do and they said, 'John, we will have to tighten our belts. We will be spending virtually nothing for the next 12 months.' These are the farmers who are relatively well to do. I told them that I understood.

Of course, the reasoning is that they have not had any boom years. The farmers who have been there for so many years realise that if they want to keep going they cannot spend: they cannot buy new headers, new tractors or new tillage machinery. They have to watch very carefully what they outlay on seed, chemicals, fertilisers, etc. It is a real problem. It has a spin-off effect into the general economy because that money does not flow through. It has a spin-off effect in relation to the purchase of motor cars and white goods, and even everyday purchases of food and clothing. Farmers will tighten up their belts and it will not flow through to the rest of the economy.

Whilst I applaud everything that this Government has done since it came to office, we must continue to work hard, attract new industries and give confidence to the small and large business sectors. This State will have major problems if we do not have a rejuvenated rural sector. I thank the Minister for Primary Industries for having done all that he could do to implement reforms in the rural sector as early as possible. We saw many of those reforms come through in the previous session of Parliament. Many farmers in my area have thanked us for what we have done to date, particularly as it relates to the exemption of stamp duty on the transfer of farms within the family, and for the young farmers incentive scheme where there has been a 50 per cent reduction in interest rates.

At the recent South Australian Farmers Federation conference it was very heartening to hear the Minister announce that the young farmers incentive scheme was to be backdated to the beginning of our term in office—back to last

December. I know that many young farmers are making application and are hopeful that they will be able to benefit from it. There are other areas in which we have assisted the rural sector and many other areas at which we will look further, namely, the review of rural finance as detailed in Her Excellency's speech.

We have also put out a strategic plan for 1994-98. Members should be aware of that and, if they are not, they should obtain a copy. The aim of the strategic plan is to ensure that primary industries in South Australia, first, achieve real growth; secondly, increase their contribution to the State's economy (and I have talked about the reasons for the importance of that); and, thirdly, that they be market-driven and internationally competitive. I guess of all industries in this State the rural sector would be the most market driven and the most internationally competitive. It is a shame that a great many of our overseas trading partners do not go down the same track as our farmers rather than, in the case of the United States and Europe, offering massive subsidies to the rural sector. The fourth aim of the strategic plan for primary industries in this State is to sustain our natural resources for the future. The strategic plan covers many details.

I will reflect for a moment on the current state of the political situation in South Australia. It is now some eight months since my Party took office and, whilst the result in the House of Assembly was clear cut with a distribution of 36 members on the Government side to 11 on the Opposition side with no question of what the people in this State wanted, we do not have a similar situation in the other place. The situation that applies in the other place should not be as it is because we have one usurper there, namely, the Hon. Michael Elliott. In June last year the Hon. Mr Elliott decided to run for the House of Assembly seat of Davenport. When he made his announcement he said that there would be no going back. A newspaper article at the time quoted Mr Elliott as saying, 'I can't go back'. He said that his term was expiring in the Upper House, and he told the electorate of Davenport that it was not possible for him to go back.

Another Democrat in the other place, Mr Ian Gilfillan, made similar comments and said that he would not go back to the Upper House. I never had much time for Mr Gilfillan when he was around this place. He made some very unwise statements and did not give due thought to what he said. I wanted to see the day when he left this place. However, my opinion of the Hon. Ian Gilfillan, a former member of the other place, increased enormously overnight when, after being soundly defeated in Norwood—in fact, he hardly got any votes—he decided to not seek to return to the Upper House.

My opinion of Mr Gilfillan increased enormously as a result of his decision. He is, after all, an honourable man, and I never thought that while he was in this institution. I have respect for him as a result of what he did when he was defeated in Norwood. I guess now is probably an appropriate time to congratulate the current member for Norwood on his excellent result. He won the seat outright with 51.1 per cent of the vote compared to Mr Gilfillan's 12.4 per cent. It was rather a joke that Mr Gilfillan even thought he could win the seat. The Liberal Party candidate certainly showed how he could fare against Mr Gilfillan. Let us look at the usurper in the other place who is still there today.

The person who said, 'There's no going back to the Upper House. I can't go back' was Mr Mike Elliott. Mr Mike Elliott contested Davenport and was soundly defeated. In fact, on the

first preference votes he received 26.5 per cent—an abysmal result compared to the Liberal Party candidate's 58 per cent of the vote. Again, it was hardly a contest. Admittedly, he doubled Mr Gilfillan's vote, but it was a hopeless result.

Mr Venning: We had a good candidate.

Mr MEIER: We had an excellent candidate, and I must congratulate the member for Davenport on the excellent campaign he ran. The people of the electorate of Davenport had the opportunity to ask, 'Do we want Mr Elliott, or don't we? Do we want the Democrats, or don't we?' They said overwhelmingly 'No'. In fact, it occurred twice, because the Norwood electorate also rejected Mr Gilfillan. The result was clear beyond any shadow of a doubt. Mr Elliott said he would not be returning to the Upper House. In fact, he said, 'I can't go back', but what has happened?

I saw that man on television a night or two ago. There he was, trying to obstruct the policies of this Government again. I well remember at the end of last session that Mr Elliott was one of two who caused us to sit here so late because they did not agree with all the legislation we introduced and for which we had a mandate. The people gave us a 37-10 (which is now 36-11) mandate to govern this State. However, Mr Elliott, who said he would never go back to the other place, has decided that he is the conscience of South Australia; he will determine what this Government does or does not get through. It is an outrageous situation and should not be occurring.

I suppose our system is such that we have not been able to prevent that happening. We also have another Democrat in the other place—Ms Sandra Kanck. I have not heard many of her contributions in the other place. In fact, I am not terribly interested to hear them, because the Democrats are simply an obstructionist Party—they promise the world but they will never be held to account for their promises. I remember well the protest at the Nurrungar tracking base in April 1993.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: That's in my electorate.

Mr MEIER: As the member for Giles says, it is now in his electorate. I am sure the member for Giles would not have wanted those people there if he had been the member for that area at that time. But this was 1993, and those activists wilfully damaged property. They were vandals, to put it literally. Normally they should be locked up for a while. They broke down fences and drew graffiti on many of the items. They cost this State a small fortune. As a newspaper article at the time indicated:

The wages component—

and this was about halfway through the protest—

was more than \$175 000; accommodation and food for the police officers there is likely to add another \$40 000; and transport and fuel costs, at least \$10 000.

So, in round figures, we were talking about \$250 000, and it would have increased from that. It would be interesting to ask the Minister for Emergency Services just what the Nurrungar protest finally cost this State. It was an enormous cost. Who was there with the protesters? None other than the now Democrat in another place, Ms Sandra Kanck. I heard her on 5AN's talk-back program trying to defend these protesters. I remember seeing on television all these protesters baring their bottoms to the cameras. Is this the type of thing that we want in this State? Absolutely not. Are these the type of people we want in this State? No. By the way, many of them came from interstate: I heard that they had hired a bus from New South Wales.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Well, this is the person from another place who is an Australian Democrat.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr MEIER: No, I'm not saying that this honourable member necessarily bared her bottom. I have no indication whether or not she did. However, a whole group did, and she was part of that establishment that was seeking to bring disrespect on this State, completely defying the norms which we have come to know and which this Parliament seeks to promote, namely, respecting other people's property, not wilfully damaging other people's property, respecting the law and not seeking to cause this State to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to try to protect other people's property. Ms Sandra Kanck is now a member of another place and is holding up and is an obstructionist to this Government's policies.

It is completely outrageous that the people of this State have had to put up with two Democrats who seem to believe that they are the conscience of this State and that it is their democratic right to hold up and even overturn legislation. First, Mr Mike Elliott should not be there, because he has gone back on a clear promise: he said that he would not go back and now he is there. Secondly, we have a member who, by her past actions, has indicated that she does not have much respect for much of South Australia. At the time of the protest, I was interested in a comment from you, Mr Speaker. It was reported in the *Advertiser* as follows:

The member for Eyre, Mr Graham Gunn, whose electorate covers the Far North, described the protest as irresponsible and a waste of money.

It further stated:

Mr Gunn said he was sickened by the cost of the protest. He said the Nurrungar base was an asset to the country and he was proud to have it in his electorate.

I would like to compliment you, Mr Speaker, on those comments against these irresponsible protesters, one of whom is now a member of the Australian Democrats in another place. I would hope that anyone who has ever thought of supporting the Democrats would seriously weigh up their options at the next election, because they are simply causing a big hindrance to us in our getting this State under way—in completing the recovery as we would like it.

I also refer to the protection of the environment, an issue that was covered in Her Excellency's speech. Earlier this week, it was disturbing to see a newspaper article which indicated that many of the metropolitan beaches are suffering severe erosion. That article contained a classic photograph, which showed one of the houses at Seacliff literally sitting on a precipice, and if much more erosion occurs that house might well drop into the sea. A number of things concern me in relation to erosion, the first being that the situation has got to this stage. This reflects badly on the former Government, because something should have been done much earlier. I cannot believe that so little money has been spent over such a long period to try to give these houses adequate protection.

These catastrophes are occurring not only in the metropolitan area but also in my own electorate. In fact, the *Advertiser* identified Warooka, but I remind the *Advertiser* that Warooka is actually inland and there is no sea adjoining it. However, not far from Warooka is a place called The Pines, where there has been much erosion over recent years. In fact, I first took up this issue about 18 months to two years ago.

In the most recent storms, The Pines suffered rather dramatically and a massive amount of coastal material was removed. I have taken up this matter with the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources asking him to address this situation urgently. The Minister has responded by indicating that this matter must be considered urgently, and I am hopeful that money will be allocated in the forthcoming budget so that The Pines residents will get some sort of protective barrier to stop further erosion. I would hope that that funding could continue in the coming years, as I recognise that it is probably difficult to undertake that project all at once. I have received several letters from residents in the past few days, because obviously they are concerned about this matter. One letter states:

Dear John,

Re storm protection

As owners of land in The Pines since the early 70s and full-time resident for the last seven years, we were pleased with your prompt visit after the last storm. From your inspection and the history of erosion, we understand you have made representations for a rock embankment wall (proved effective by trial 30 metres) to be built. The previous Government ignored the problem after the earlier bad storm, so we urge you as our member and voice in Government to try and secure the necessary finance from your fellow members to have the work completed ASAP so that it does not become a much larger expense.

I have received similar letters from other residents who identify various aspects of The Pines area, and I would like to thank them for their concerns and also for seeking to do everything they can as a community. Often a member is literally called in cold before anything else has been done, but these residents have been lobbying in their own way for quite some time, and certainly they have included me in this lobbying. I can assure my constituents that the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources and I are doing everything possible to get some protection for them as soon as possible, and I hope that I will have the opportunity to report good news after the budget. Of course, we realise that, with the \$3.15 billion State Bank debt and other debts that have occurred, cuts must be made, but I would say to the Minister that this is one area that cannot be cut.

It is also of great concern at present that Troubridge Island is suffering enormous problems with erosion. One of my constituents, Mr Chris Johnson, runs a tourist shuttle service from Edithburgh to Troubridge Island, and he has expressed great concern at the erosion that is occurring not only to the island as a whole but to the two heritage listed houses and the lighthouse on the island. It is another matter that I am taking up. I realise that none of us can intercede if nature has decided that the island has to go, but I do not believe that it has reached that stage. Although I have already done so, I emphasise to the Minister that the tourist potential for southern Yorke Peninsula is great and that this is one area of tourism which I hope we can ensure continues. It will help not only to make this business viable but also to attract many people to southern Yorke Peninsula to enjoy the beauties of Troubridge Island and the fishing in that area.

Finally, I would like to congratulate the Government on what it is doing and Her Excellency for her address to the Parliament. I look forward to responsible and appropriate debate in this House in this coming session, and I trust that this Government will be given a mandate in the Upper House to get through those things for which it clearly has a mandate.

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I—

Mr Brindal: Well, I'm glad I came in.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am very glad you came in now, because you are on my list of honourable mentions—the member for Unley. I am very pleased to see you here also. I, too, support the motion and congratulate Her Excellency on the way in which the speech was delivered and the way in which she conducts herself in the office in general. I think Her Excellency was an absolutely inspired choice by the previous Government. As I said, she deserves all our congratulations.

Of course, there has been some sadness since the last time we had this debate, and I refer to the loss of three members: Keith Plunkett, Lloyd Hughes and Reg Groth. I spoke on the occasion when the House recognised the death of Reg Groth, and I will not repeat my comments. I did not know Lloyd Hughes, but I think he represented Wallaroo in the days when country electorates were very small in terms of the number of electors compared to the House of Assembly electorates in the good old days of Liberal Party gerrymanders. Lloyd Hughes was one of those who assisted in gradually building up the numbers here in the House of Assembly so that democracy could finally come to South Australia. I join with others in expressing my condolences to the relatives of Lloyd Hughes.

I worked in this place with Keith Plunkett for four years. Keith was, as other members have said, a great character. He was not particularly tall, but he was as broad as he was tall in stature. He was an extremely vigorous member of Parliament who did not suffer fools gladly, to use a cliché. I think it is fair to say that his hatred of the philosophy of members opposite was intense. I am sure that he did not hate individual members across the Chamber—not on a continuing basis, anyway—but he certainly hated their philosophy. He was a dyed-in-the-wool—again to use a cliché—Labor man, a product of his era and a very effective representative of the working class. I am sorry that he died in considerable distress, which occurred over a number of years. All those who were in the House with him know how much Keith was suffering. Again I would like to join with the Leader, the member for Price and other members who recognise—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member. I know that he is a very gifted speaker, but I do not see why the clock should stand still for him—it stands still for no other person in this House.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Keith Plunkett would have appreciated the interjection from the member for Unley. To conclude, he was a very good member of Parliament, a friend to all of us, and we are very sorry to see him go.

I have not spoken before on the death of Joe Tiernan. Obviously, I did not know Joe all that well, although he did claim to know me over the years as I moved around the State. In fact, he said he drove me up north one day in a TAFE vehicle, but again I have no particular memory of that. Joe was an engaging type of character in the short time he was in this House. He was very engaging on the Economic and Finance Committee; we also had a bit of fun. I would like to join members who have mentioned Joe, a former member for Torrens, and express my regret as other members have. Life does go on, and the untimely and unfortunate death of Joe Tiernan made necessary a by-election for the seat of Torrens.

It was a surprise, not to the present member for Torrens but to a number of people who claimed some expertise in

forecasting elections, that the Liberal Party was so comprehensively beaten in Torrens. It was a conjunction of things; we certainly had the best candidate, and anybody who heard the member for Torrens delivering her maiden speech yesterday would agree that that has been proved conclusively, if any more proof was required. It was an absolutely outstanding debut.

The by-election came after the Audit Commission. Everybody would agree that the Audit Commission would have had some influence on the by-election, because what the Audit Commission spelt out was something for which no person in their right mind would vote. It was a tired old dogma, which will affect every person in South Australia, most of them—not all—to their detriment and, depending on how it is handled by members opposite, it will be to the detriment particularly of those members opposite in marginal seats. There is no question about that.

It will not affect people in the eastern suburbs. They can afford to buy their health care, hospital cover and private security. It does not affect people in the eastern suburbs at all. In fact, if one analysed it, one could say that in one respect they could gain from it, but at whose expense? Certainly it would be at the expense of my electorate and the electorates of members opposite. This has been spelt out very clearly by the member for Unley, whom I congratulate on this newly developed independent streak which is blossoming on the back bench. I will return to the member for Unley in a moment.

I want to be fairly parochial in my Address in Reply debate contribution. I will not be ranging too far and wide. My responsibility as a backbencher now is principally to take care of my electorate, and there is no doubt that the Audit Commission report and the way in which this Government is slavishly—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker: I believe that the honourable member opposite has reflected on me. He has asserted in this place that I have some sort of streak that is newly developed. I find that to be a reflection on me, and I ask that the honourable member withdraw the remark.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): I do not accept the point of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was going to be kind, this morning, to the member for Unley. I said to my colleagues, 'Watch this—it won't be a pretty sight; I'm going to try to be kind to the member for Unley.' However, after that rather silly point of order he makes it difficult for me.

Mr Caudell: Have you changed your mind?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, I'll see how I feel in 20 minutes. My electorate will be very heavily affected by the way in which this Government will pretty well slavishly follow the Audit Commission's recommendations. Before I start on its effect on the electorate of Giles, I ask: who and what was the Audit Commission? In the main, the Audit Commission consisted of a group of ideologues whose ideology was fairly rooted in Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher: a failed and tired, right wing ideology that has nothing relevant to say in the 1990s. In the absence of a philosophy of their own, Liberal members opposite, particularly Ministers of the Government, have grabbed the Audit Commission report and used it for their own purposes as a blueprint for the way in which they want this State to operate.

There were a couple of interesting people on the Audit Commission, such as Cliff Walsh, the former adviser to a failed Liberal Prime Minister. Cliff Walsh is an old war

horse: he has never had an original thought since he came out of university. The only thing that ever went through his head was during the first year of his economics course when it was pointed out to him: 'The market is all. It doesn't matter what the market wants, that's what you'll get and you should work towards that anyway; it's a highly desirable end,' according to the textbook that Cliff Walsh committed to memory in his first year in university. He has not noted that the world has moved on considerably since then. Don Nicholls was another member of the Audit Commission. He was a member of similar commissions in New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania. So, the same people are trotting out the same old recipes for disaster for a large section of the South Australian population.

The impact of the actions of this Government in picking up the Audit Commission's recommendations and running with them will, as I said, be very severe. Some of the impacts will be quite dramatic, and I think we will see that in the budget. In my electorate, if many of these recommendations are implemented, the impact will be very dramatic indeed. They will all be spelt out and the reaction will come. Even more than that, there will be an insidious effect on the whole of South Australia. When you go for this market as the be-all and end-all of economic policy, you must accept the downside; and the downside of that is a continually increasing group of people who will fall between the cracks, because the cracks are widening and the safety net is being taken away.

If you take out a significant proportion of those people who are delivering services and then say, 'We haven't stopped the service,' because half the people are there to deliver it, the quality of that service will decline, not to mention the effect on the employees who deliver that service. It may not be instant in many cases, but as I said it will be insidious and it will happen. This State will go from having a better than average level of public service to a below average level of public service, and that will not be something that any of us ought to be proud of.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will come to the level of debt now—thank you for the prompt. The rationale for all this is that South Australia is in an incredible financial mess. That is what the Cliff Walshes of the world tell us. They say that we have to do something dramatic to change that. What utter nonsense! The level of debt in South Australia is only slightly above what we inherited in 1983, and I did not hear anyone opposite in the then Liberal Government saying that this State was bankrupt. That was in 1983 before the election. I have never heard a word about South Australia being bankrupt, that we had to sack thousands of public servants, whether they be nurses, teachers or social workers who would have to go because the level of debt was crippling.

I have never heard one word of that. I remember that election distinctly, with the then Liberal Government telling us how wonderful everything was in South Australia and how it was going to get better, yet the level of debt was only marginally less than it is today. So when your Cabinet colleagues—the ideologues—those who do not understand and the rest of them who do not even know what day it is tell you that you have to make sacrifices in your electorates because of the level of debt, do not let them con you. They have not convinced the member for Unley or the member for Elder, but they have conned a few others. Do not let them con you.

A recent *Advertiser* article put the question of debt into some kind of perspective. It involves comment by Malcolm

Newell, who is no supporter or friend of the Labor Party. In his column he says:

Public sector debt in South Australia is less than half that of the 1950s and 1960s.

The golden era of Playford! The debt in those days was double what it is now. We did not hear from members opposite—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have quite a good memory. We heard nothing from members opposite that the debt was too high. The debt was double what it is now. Malcolm Newell continues:

Though there are real concerns about what debt levels are supportable today, South Australia's debt is now only slightly higher than in the early 1980s and should fall as a percentage of State product by the turn of the century. And debt incurred by Government businesses is invested to earn revenues in the future and to service the borrowings.

This quote from the column by Malcolm Newell continues:

The most relevant measure of South Australia's interest burden is net interest as a percentage of State revenue—and this, the economists say, is the third lowest in Australia. Our debt is low by international standards, around half the average of the industrial nations.

If we are bankrupt and in dire straits, then the rest of the world obviously is going under; the major world economies are all going under, because on average they have twice the debt that we have. What a load of nonsense was talked by the Audit Commission. Ideology—that is all it was—and it had nothing whatsoever to do with reality. However, we have examples overseas of the kind of philosophy of members opposite, the philosophy they have adopted from Cliff Walsh and company, instead of standing up and developing their own philosophy. We have the Reagan and Thatcher examples. Why did the Government not learn from those mistakes? When one goes to America, as I did briefly last year, and to the UK, on an even briefer visit, one sees the disparity of wealth and the huge burgeoning under-class that no-one cares about. To see that and then come back to South Australia and see the Government implementing identical policies is incredible.

It is countries such as Japan that say, 'We're not interested in Reaganism; we're not interested in Thatcherism; we're not interested in deadheads like Cliff Walsh. We believe in a decent standard of living for our people, and we intervene in the economy to see it occurs.' The Japanese economy is almost totally dominated by control from the governing centre. They are not interested in failed theories of Reaganism, Thatcherism and—I am flattering him to put him in the same category, but members know what I mean—Cliff Walsh. Germany, Sweden and those countries are not interested in this kind of rubbish, this first year economics garbage. They have identified what they want their country to achieve and they have taken whatever measures are necessary to do that. That is what being in government is all about. I have never understood why people want to be in government and then say, 'Leave it to the market.' It is a nonsense philosophy. If the market determines that South Australia's level of unemployment will be 25 per cent, do you still say, 'Leave it to the market'? Of course you do not.

I have been cheated by this clock, Sir: cheated out of four minutes. Nevertheless, I want to mention a couple of things about my electorate. The Audit Commission—and all members opposite ought to be aware of this—has particularly targeted country areas, because some of the principal

'savings' it wants to make, some of the principal changes in the methods of raising revenue, of charging for services, are directed straight at the quality of life of country people.

Mr Brindal: Which ones?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am about to tell you. The Audit Commission says this as regards the EWS:

The Government and the EWS should review the current cross-subsidy between metropolitan and country water users. As a matter of principle, tariffs should reflect the full cost of service to each group. This implies that there is a case for introducing a differential pricing system for metropolitan and country customers reflecting the higher cost of service provisions in country areas.

The implications of that for country people are horrific, and this Government—and we will see it in the budget—believes that, by sleight of hand, it can introduce some of these concepts and none of us will notice. They are wrong: we will notice all right. In relation to ETSA similar things are said, because there is a significant cross-subsidy to country people from the metropolitan area—and that is how it should be. We are one State. These silly, right wing theories ought to be dismissed out of hand, and I give notice to the Government that any attempt to introduce this kind of nonsense through the back door we will notice and react accordingly, as will country people.

The Department of Agriculture is being annihilated on the Eyre Peninsula. We have several MPs from the Eyre Peninsula, and members opposite need not believe me: they can ask them. Services to primary producers in this State are being reduced in a way that I would not have believed possible. In some areas there are not just 10 or 20 per cent but 50 and 60 per cent reductions in the services delivered by the Department of Agriculture to country areas.

I hope members opposite will have an opportunity from time to time to show just how much they care about country people, not just on a matter such as daylight saving but on a few other issues as well. But it is happening—in the Department of Primary Industries it is happening: fish processors in my electorate now pay \$2 000, whereas previously they paid a couple of hundred dollars; \$2 000 in one hit.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: You're going to put small processors—

Mr Caudell: Bring in a private member's Bill on it.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If the member for Mitchell knew something about the parliamentary process and was aware of what was going on, he would see that we have moved to have those regulations disallowed in the Upper House. So, the debate is on.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In this place country members, with the exception of the member for Giles, will not support their constituents. I now want to speak on just two other matters: health and the Whyalla Hospital. I fear that what this Government is doing regarding the Whyalla Hospital will significantly detract from the quality of life and health care of the people in Whyalla. Some of the restructuring in the Whyalla Hospital I support. The hospital has probably a third to a half of the number of patients for which it was built. Sensible restructuring receives no argument from me: you cannot continue to keep empty beds open—no question. In the space of eight months, however, this Government has introduced waiting lists for surgery in the Whyalla Hospital. That has never occurred previously in the hospital's history, and this Government has done that. Rather than reducing waiting lists, it has created waiting lists where

no waiting lists existed, and that is quite an achievement. The Government will be hearing some more about that matter.

They say they have to close the outpatients service, that it is too expensive—find your GP in the middle of the night. Have you ever tried to find a GP in the middle of the night or on weekends? With absolutely no disrespect to GPs whatsoever, they are difficult to find at certain times. We have a system at the hospital, the same as at the major metropolitan hospitals, but it will be cut out. That will also be resisted very strongly.

There are matters concerning education and the Housing Trust that I could go on and detail at great length, and I will do so at a later stage. Another thing that I want country members opposite to examine is the question of petrol prices in country areas. In Roxby Downs, the price of petrol this week is 82.9¢ per litre; in Pimba, in my electorate, it is 85.9¢ per litre. The very maximum freight cost for a litre of petrol up to Pimba from the metropolitan area is about 4¢ a litre. The previous Government and Treasurer—God bless him—ensured that the State tax on petrol in country areas was half that levied in the metropolitan area. There is about 4.5¢ less State tax on petrol supplied in country areas than that applying in the metropolitan area. So, for the oil companies to charge those kinds of prices in country areas just demonstrates what thieves they are. We should not be surprised at that; they always have been. Members opposite ought to join with me in looking at ways we can get them.

On another matter, the member for Florey invited members on this side to join him and the Liberals in some notion of bipartisanship. I have news for the member for Florey, if he needs it: I will not join with members opposite—the member for Florey or other members—in reducing superannuation for police officers, in reducing the amount of money spent on community safety in this community, or in reducing workers' compensation benefits for police officers and other workers. The member for Florey and other members opposite will answer to all those employees at the next election, and I believe they will do it at their peril.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): It is with pleasure that I rise to speak in the debate on the Address in Reply and join other members in congratulating Her Excellency on the fine job that she does. I remind members that Her Excellency was appointed by the Queen upon the recommendation of the previous Government. For members opposite, who never seem to give the previous Government any credit at all, it might be noted that we nominated her for that position.

I hope that the Government has not attempted to put Her Excellency in the invidious position of saying things to this Parliament that the Government does not intend to honour. I make that comment because there have been so many occasions when, by its own words, it has said things which it has then totally gone back upon. I will detail a number of examples of statements made by the Premier and other members of the Government both before and after the election in which they have said one thing—often very nice sounding phrases, phrases of commitment, phrases that sounded like positive achievement—and then gone back on their own words. I hope that we have not seen the same happen in terms of the Governor's speech.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There is a word for that which I am not allowed to use in this place, but it is the

appropriate word for what has happened on so many occasions. We all know the tradition is that the—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I would like you to consider Standing Order 121 in the light of the Leader of the Opposition's remarks in relation to the Governor's speech.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): I do not accept the point of order. I will listen carefully to the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I was fascinated that this morning the member for Unley should have taken exception to some of the comments that were made by the member for Giles, because in my office yesterday listening to the loud speaker I heard him commend the fact that he has the right stature for grovelling. I want to go through various aspects in the Governor's speech. Her Excellency said:

My Government recognises community concerns to ensure that key services are maintained at adequate levels. . .

I will detail in just how many ways the Government has not maintained and does not intend to maintain key services at adequate levels. Despite all the promises that were made to the contrary before the election, in the forthcoming budget we are about to see major cuts to services in this State. More than 11 000 Public Service positions will have gone by the next election, taking people out of key service areas. In education, health, law and order and many other areas there will be a loss of service to the community. The Governor goes on to say:

My Government believes that with a careful and creative approach. . .

This is from a Government which has followed the creative use of words. The most recent example is the Government's attempt to say that a tax increase does not have to take place, a rate increase does not have to take place and new taxes do not have to be introduced, yet we can still have a significant increase in the revenue that will come to the Government.

I believe that what is about to happen is that the budget will show that the Treasurer was correct in his assertion that the Government is considering other tax revenue options to increase the tax take of the Government by increasing the net that goes over South Australians, dragging more South Australians into the tax paying net. The Government will say that that is not a tax increase, that it is not a new tax. Yet for those who did not pay the tax previously it will be a new tax, because it will be a new tax to them. That is the kind of creative approach that we see from this Government. It uses words to have people believe it intends one thing and yet in fact it quite clearly intends to do something different from that.

For example, I refer to the Government's commitment on maintaining payroll deductions of union dues. It indicated before the last election that it was going to do that but following the election it has effectively taken away that maintenance of payroll deductions for union dues. It has introduced a fee that unions have to pay on that matter. It has also introduced the requirement that employees have to annually certify that process to take place. It has done everything possible to undermine that system. Why? It is because it does not believe in it. It did not believe in it before the election when it promised it would maintain it and it does not believe in it now; but by creative use of words it hopes to cover itself. I warn the Government that it will not be covered. The Governor's speech also said:

The response of public sector employees and their desire to contribute to the recovery process is acknowledged.

As I go around parts of South Australia meeting many people in different places on different occasions I get constant feedback that the morale in the public sector is low. The morale in the public sector has been battered by the actions of this Government and that is why so many people rushed to take separation packages, because they simply cannot not wait to get out of a system that they feel is no longer supported by the elected Government of the day, a system in which they feel they are somehow the victims of the Government's actions. I suggest that members in this place start listening to some of the public servants in their own electorates and find out how true the statement I made actually is. To suggest that the public sector is pleased at what is going on and is working to contribute to the undermining of its own system is quite clearly a misrepresentation of the truth.

The next section of the Governor's speech relates to the Commission of Audit. I might say that the Government clearly wanted the document produced by the Audit Commission to be a damning indictment of the previous Government and what had happened over the years. I think it was somewhat taken unawares when that document failed to deliver that damning indictment. On a number of occasions that document acknowledges the work the previous Government did to face a number of the financial problems we have in this State. Clearly, the member for Giles is quite correct in terms of the stance which the authors of that commission took. They come from a particular view of economics and a particular view of what the solutions to financial problems should be.

The Labor Party does not agree with many of those solutions that they support. But in terms of their analysis of where we are and where we had been and actions that had taken place, they did not provide the condemnation which members opposite actually wanted the commission to provide. They have indicated that they will be providing a number of responses to this between April and October. We have already seen a number of the responses. One of the areas which is being dealt with is the area of superannuation. I might say that in the area of superannuation we have yet another example of promises that are being broken without any regard at all to the people who will be affected by them. Before the last election we had the response given by the Liberal Party to the Public Service Association, in which it said:

A Liberal Government will support the current level of benefits in the pension and lump sum schemes. A Liberal Government will maintain its relative contribution to pension and lump sum schemes.

Then, in this place on 19 April this year, the Treasurer said:

There are no plans to change the current arrangements.

We know how different that situation has turned out to be. Mr Acting Speaker, I know that you yourself must quietly be very concerned about just how different the outcome has been from what was originally promised by this Government. That is one of the responses to the Audit Commission, and imagine how many more we will see. We have already seen, for example, the statements made about the cuts to education and health: cuts to both those areas of \$105 million in total.

What is the purpose of this? The purpose is to achieve a significant reduction in the real level of State debt over the next four years. Certainly it is correct that the debt situation in this State has had to be faced. I faced it when I was Premier, as did my Treasurer the member for Giles, and our

Meeting the Challenge statement and related documents were clearly facing up to the financial issues that needed to be addressed in this State. In fact it was acknowledged at the time that we were so doing, so I do not dispute the need to face up to those issues.

However, I point out that, in just the two key areas of education and health, this Government will be taking away \$105 million. Last year in our Meeting the Challenge statement we announced that public sector employment would be reduced by 3 000, yet this Government will take it to in excess of 11 000 jobs, and it is also making large expenditure cuts despite its pre-election promises. Notwithstanding those things, we will not see the major reductions in debt about which members opposite talk. I do not make that statement as a wild accusation, ignoring the facts provided by the Government, because I will refer to the Government's own facts.

I refer honourable members to pages 33 and 34 of the financial statement delivered by the Treasurer on 31 May this year. I interpose that it was delivered by the Treasurer because the Premier skulked away and did not want to face up to public statements on how he was breaking his own promises; he let others do that for him. Pages 34 and 35 detail what would have happened had the basic principles of debt reduction of the Meeting the Challenge approach been put in place and continued until 1998, as opposed to what will happen as a result of the Government's approach. We find, remarkably, that, in terms of the net debt of the State, by 1997 the difference between the figure that would have been the outcome of the Meeting the Challenge approach and the financial statement of the Government's approach is nil—absolutely no difference. South Australians will have paid for \$105 million in cuts in health and education and a reduction in the number of public servants by 11 000 or more, yet it will make no difference. There are many other areas that I will detail in a moment and will continue to detail in the months ahead.

I guess that it would be appropriate to at least identify that in 1998 we see a minor improvement proposed in this document over that proposed as the outcome for the Meeting the Challenge approach. It is fairly minor because the figure about which we are talking is a variation of a bit under 2 per cent in 1998. What a joke! Why should that be? It must perplex people as to how you can take so much out of the system and supposedly therefore save expenditure, yet it does not deliver a better outcome. The simple reason is that the Government proposes to stall the economy, and it is doing it rather well. It proposes to reduce the rate of growth in the economy, which makes sense if you think about it. If we are to have 11 000 or more fewer public servants in the public sector part of the mixed economy of the public and private sectors, and if you are to have less money going out into the important departmental areas, which will often have a multiplier effect in the private sector, naturally, there will be less economic activity as a result of the Government's own actions.

I do not assert this without foundation, and my foundation is the Government's document itself. I refer members to page 17 of the financial statement. I remind members that the growth outcomes for South Australia in 1993 were slightly better than for the nation at large. Our growth figure was about 3.1 per cent, while the nation's growth figure was 3 per cent. We were better than the national average in terms of economic growth in this State before December last year. Since that time we know that figures are coming in day after

day showing just how much the economy is now recovering. That is a wonderful thing about which I am very pleased indeed.

The economy is powering ahead right around the country. It appears that the growth figure for the economy will reach an annual rate of 5 per cent, and that is excellent news. It would just be nice if we could share in that excellent news. But by the Government's own predictions it acknowledges that where the 1993-94 forecast would be 3¼ per cent—and I can tell you that the figure beyond that was going to move its way up to 4 per cent—in 1994-95 it will have to scale back the growth to 2.75 per cent. Why is that so? Well, its own document again tells us the answer: because, if you exclude the public consumption effect on the economy, the growth would have been 3.75 per cent.

The Government has acknowledged that it added a 1 per cent dampener. It may not sound much, but a 1 per cent dampener has a major effect on how many jobs are not being created for young people in this State, and how many business opportunities will not be there for people in this State. That is the outcome that gives us the debt figures being no different than the Government acknowledges would have been the outcome of the Meeting the Challenge approach. That is the sorry picture that we see from this Government.

Let us return to the Governor's speech for a moment and look at the area of public sector reform. It might be noted that the Government talks about wage restraint in the public sector and, of course, it has the sword of Damocles hanging over the public sector. It is saying, 'If you do not keep wage restraint, if you do not have no wage increases at all for two years, extra jobs will go. We will take hostages from the Public Service and add them to the list of those who are to go from the public sector.' In the naive approach that this Government has to industrial relations—and it surely is the most naive of approaches—we have it saying, 'Well, notwithstanding the fact that we are taking this big stick approach that says, "If you have any wage increase at all then, bang, more positions will go", we also expect you to sit down and enterprise bargain.'

We warned at the time that enterprise bargaining would not work under that sort of system. There has to be something in it for everybody. The approach that we took in Government was: sure, we have to have reductions in the cost of Government; and, sure, we have to see not only departmental budgets as efficient as possible but also the overall Government figures returning the budget to a recurrent balance and surplus. However, we acknowledged that there ought to be the opportunity for those who would be participating in productivity improvements to get some dividends from that.

We said that the savings that were achieved should not only go to wage increases—they should not, at all—they should go to the budget at large and to the departments themselves, and a dividend for some wage increase for those participating in the productivity improvements. That is what enterprise bargaining is supposed to be all about. But this Government says, 'No, we want enterprise bargaining where you will offer up savings in your own work areas, and it may even be your own job you propose to get rid of. You offer up that, and we will give you a reward. The reward will be some vague sense of satisfaction that you are doing a nice thing; some vague sense of goodwill of, "Don't I feel so pleased that I have given up things. I have made life tougher, I have reduced the quality of services I am delivering, and I feel happy about that", and that will be the sum total of what you get'.

We warned that that approach would not work; that the IRC would not accept that kind of approach. We were told we were being silly, that that would not be the case, and that it would work. I just remind members that last week the IRC said, 'It is not going to work.' It chastised the Government for its approach to enterprise bargaining and said that it must enter into enterprise bargaining with genuine goodwill.

Mr Clarke: They were ordered to bargain in good faith.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, that is right: the Government was ordered to bargain in good faith. If nothing was wrong before, why did it require that sort of reaction? Why did it require that ordering?

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Because, as the member for Giles says, the Government does not know what good faith is. So the Government has been put on the right track, and I believe it will continue to find that others will have to guide it in that direction. We on this side were always willing to guide the Government in the direction of a sound approach to industrial relations, and our track record is excellent. The level of industrial disputation in this State has always been at record lows under Labor Governments in South Australia, but when there have been periods of Liberal interregnum, such as 1979 to 1982, the figures have blown out. I fear that they will blow out again.

We then see that they talk about reforming legislation to streamline and refocus the operations of the Electricity Trust. I would just remind them of what was being proposed before the last election and of the work that was being undertaken regarding the amalgamation of the Electricity Trust and the EWS—the Southern and Power Water example. That was to generate large savings. There was some query yesterday in Question Time about how the Meeting the Challenge figures were to be met. At the time I was questioned about that, and I said that it would stack up with the announcements we had made, and things like Southern Power and Water were to generate large amounts of financial benefit, precluding the need to do the sorts of things that this Government is doing to important human service areas.

The Governor's speech goes on to refer briefly to the Economic Development Advisory Board. In a fetish to oppose anything that the former Government has ever done, of course they had to gut the Economic Development Board. They could not leave it alone. This board had only just been established, was finding its feet and getting out there doing things. The Economic Development Authority was also making new initiatives—a joint enterprise between the private and public sectors, where the private sector had the opportunity to own the programs of Government for private sector development, and they could not leave that alone: they had to gut that.

I am very concerned that, for a Government that proclaims it wants economic growth, the speech given to this House opening this session has remarkably little information about that. It has remarkably few statements about how they are actually going to achieve the economic growth. In fact, beyond this one brief reference to the Economic Development Advisory Board working with the public sector to develop opportunities, there are no other references in the speech as to how the Government is going to do this. I know one of the reasons why: they have found that some of the things that they have already had the opportunity to announce so far were, in fact, started by us as a Government, and they would rather choke than give any credit for that. So they will not be mentioned. Then we have other issues where a lot of the

support has come from the Federal Government, and again they would certainly rather choke than give credit for that. But then there are some things that are entirely their own work. I remind members what the now Premier said on 28 November 1993:

Already private industry has agreed to invest \$150 million in a computer technology centre to create more than 2 000 direct and indirect jobs.

We were given an undertaking by the Liberals that they had done a deal with IBM and that this deal was to deliver enormous economic benefit to the State. Well, at least they had the good grace not to put that in the draft submitted to the Governor for the speech, because that would have been asking too much for what has happened since on that episode to be detailed to this House. They have squirmed ever since the election over this whole issue, and they deserve to squirm over this whole issue because, in fact, so many large question marks sit over the top of this particular promise made on 28 November. We are looking forward to hearing more from Government members as to how they propose to stimulate the economy, but I would suggest to them that they would do much better to change the kind of approach which they followed in that IBM example.

I said the word 'fetish' previously, and we again see reference to another fetish of the Government, namely, the sale of assets—and I say this as somebody who has been a Premier and a Minister in a Government supporting the sale of assets previously. I acknowledge that, and I will not resile from it. But we always had an important principle, one very important test, against which all these things should have been considered, namely, what would be the net benefit to the Government of a disposal or a retaining of a particular asset? What is the good of selling something when you are going to get less back for it than you would get from the income stream if that asset were kept over the years?

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Giles acknowledges that was exactly the approach of the Labor Party. The Pipelines Authority of South Australia is a good case in point. We can see that the Pipelines Authority of South Australia is in the gun now, yet the financial analysis shows that the taxpayers of this State will be worse off if it is sold rather than if it is maintained. I can assure members opposite that we will have a very good look at proposals in relation to the authority and also to other areas.

References were made also to legislation that the Government proposes to introduce, the first piece of legislation being that affecting the regulation of shop trading hours. We have had some discussion about that matter this week and, while we have had some lively discussion in this Chamber at the expense of the Government where it has looked very chagrined indeed, I venture to suggest that the heat of the debate in this place did not rise to the level of that reached in a certain room on the second floor of this building. The Liberal Party has its meetings on the second floor, the floor on which House of Assembly Opposition members' offices are situated, and on Tuesday of this week one of the Premier's staffers was standing outside the Party room door.

Members of the Opposition are not about trying to sneak along and listen outside the Government's Party room doors to what is happening because, frankly, we are not interested, and that is not the way we operate. That may be the way Government members want to operate, but it is not our style. They were so worried that the furore and noise resulting from the anger in that room would be heard by others in the

corridor outside that they had to have a guard keeping watch to ensure no-one loitered around outside for too long. Well, we know what the outcome was; there will not be legislation.

When the matter was raised yesterday in Question Time, we had a very good, somewhat amusing example of the Government's creative approach, which was referred to earlier. When asked about the issue of this legislation's coming before the Parliament, the Government suddenly decided that it no longer actually meant regulation of shop trading hours as the general issue: it said, 'Oh no, all we ever meant was the trading of red meat.' What a sham!

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is right: members of the Government did not want to be dead meat so they have gone into legislation for the trading of red meat. *Hansard* can record only the spoken word: it cannot record the non-verbal cues. I have to say that it was a delightful picture to watch the Minister for Industrial Affairs as he answered this question in a deadpan fashion, but then as he sat down the smile was erupting on his face, because he knew that he was caught out; he knew that he had just committed a sham; and he knew that, by any reasonable analysis, no member of the public, having heard that phrase 'legislation affecting regulation of shop trading hours', could have believed it referred only to the sale of red meat.

Mr Quirke: And he tried to dud his own backbench.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: He has attempted to dud his own backbench, but members of the Opposition will not let him do that. We do not want to be a party to the nobbling of the members of the backbench who wanted to rebel on this issue. We do not want to see them lose their opportunities. Their own side was prepared to whip the rug from under them, but we want to give them the opportunity to express the vote that the Premier reaffirmed they will have the right to express, and that is why we will be bringing this matter back to this place.

The Government has proposed other legislation, one piece of which relates to the sale of secondhand motor vehicles. The Opposition gives notice that it will look very carefully at any legislation, but it will look particularly carefully at this piece of legislation, because it knows that there is something here that is described in *Hamlet* as being 'very fishy indeed'.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Then we come to the matter of the real estate industry. There are all sorts of rumours that things such as the cooling-off period and other important protections for home-buyers will be at risk. That is the word—that the cooling-off period will be in the gun. I hope that they will have another back bench revolt in their own ranks before they start bringing such odious propositions into this Chamber.

The speech then goes on to refer to seasonal conditions. I have certainly been pleased to see the better rains we have had lately, and I hope that they are being felt right across the State. My worry is that that is not necessarily the case and that there will be a reduction in the agricultural output of this State this year. That will have a flow-on effect for the rest of the economy. I have always acknowledged that there is a relationship between the level of economic activity and the level of agricultural output. However, I do notice that the speech says:

On top of the existing financial problems of many farmers—

I must say that I was interested to note some months ago that the Minister for Primary Industries said that all was well in

Glocca Morra; he said there was not a financial problem for farmers in this State. He is the key Minister in Cabinet responsible for these matters and yet now apparently things are different. Either he did not know what he was talking about then or the Government is attempting to put across something which may not be the case. I would be interested to hear the Minister's rationalisation of his earlier words.

The speech then goes on to deal with education, and we are told that the Government recognises that improving the quality of education in State schools is vital for our long-term future. I certainly agree with that; I have no argument with that particular statement. I remind members of what the Premier said, again in his policy speech on 28 November last year:

There will be no cuts to this year's budget and education spending will increase in 1994-95.

Members would well remember that. That is what he said, yet the Government is now proposing to cut the education budget by \$40 million. What a scandal it is that the Government can stand up in front of the public and say that there will be an increase in 1994-95 yet now it will be \$40 million less. I am not sure whether members heard it, but I was certainly entertained listening to the Murray Nicoll program one night. I am often entertained by it; it is a good program.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Mawson attacks Murray Nicoll and says that his ratings are going down. I know one member who is probably not listening any more, and that is the Minister for Industry. He probably does not want to listen to the show any more after Murray Nicoll did him like a dinner on one program. He had returned from swanning around South-East Asia on a trade promotion mission and said that the Government was selling the good quality education services of South Australia and that the Indonesians were very impressed. They have every right to be impressed because it is a good quality system; it is one that Labor Governments have built up to be a good quality system. However, Murray Nicoll is no fool, and he said, 'Hang on John Olsen, how come you are saying what a great quality system this is, yet your Government wants to undermine it, tear it down and take funds away from it?' The Minister for Industry resorted to the worst category of political speak: he went on for some minutes without answering the statement, hoping that Murray Nicoll would forget his question.

Mr Quirke: He did a Brown, did he?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, he did a Brown, and that brings discredit on him, because he is normally much better than that. However, Murray Nicoll is not one to forget the question he asked, and he is also not one to be fobbed off with a lot of rhetoric that does not answer the question. So, he came back with the question and then came back a third time because Olsen tried yet again not to answer it.

In the end the Minister had to fall back to the stale old excuses that it will not affect the quality of education or the system when they take \$40 million out of the budget. Well, he was shown up for the sham that he is and the Government was shown up for the sham that it is.

We hear in relation to education that the Government will also introduce a fair discipline code in 1995. I would be interested to know exactly who will be on the Government committee dealing with this. I would like to make some suggestions that for the well-being—

Mr CAUDELL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I understand that it is normal procedure that the speaker address all comments through the Chair.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): I do not accept that point of order, and I consider it rather frivolous.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. When the Government is putting together its committee of members of Parliament to deal with the new fair discipline code, could it please do South Australians a favour and leave some people off the list? I know why the member for Mitchell rose a moment ago to try to interrupt.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The members for Playford and Mitchell do not help the Leader's speech at all. Would they please refrain from speaking?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Mitchell tried to interrupt the flow of my speech because he knew that he was one of the members whom I was going to name, because he is the one who wants people charged for loitering around the place. He is the one who wants to use a heavy handed approach with young people so that, if they happen to loiter too long in any area, bang, they will be charged. I know that even the Hon. Trevor Griffin in another place, who is pretty conservative in some of his views, was appalled at such things. I merely ask that the Government not put the member for Mitchell on this committee, because we could see that hapless kids who happen just to rest in the corridor for a minute while going from one class to another might be had for loitering.

Mr CAUDELL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker: the Opposition Leader is totally misrepresenting the facts with regard to what I have put forward.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can make a personal explanation later.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Then there is another member who I hope does not get a guernsey on this committee, and that is the member for Lee. I do not want to comment too much on his outrageous statements with respect to single women, but I want now to remind members about the statements made by the member for Lee about fingerprinting. He believes that people who have not yet been found guilty of something should be fingerprinted. We can see him on this committee dealing with the fair discipline code in schools that will come forward in 1995; maybe kids will have to be fingerprinted when they enrol in a particular school.

We then turn to a more responsive health system. The Government tells us that it will continue with plans to provide a health system that is more responsive to community needs. It will have to be done more by the community; that is what it means, because, with \$65 million taken out of the health care system, people will have to look after themselves a lot more. This approach of getting rid of people sooner, while they are still ill, from the health care system will certainly have a big community involvement. So, there will be a lot more community involvement, because you will be doing it yourself—the DIY approach to health care. I point out, however, that representatives from community health centres (a very important area of health) have complained to me about the approach of this Government to community health issues.

In fact, I met recently with representatives of the Port Adelaide health centre and I maintain frequent contact with other health centres, which are expressing grave concern about what is happening. Indeed, the Port Adelaide health centre told me that it is very worried about what is going to

happen. It finds that the head of the Health Commission, Mr Ray Blight, has passed on some information about the impact on community health centres as a result of this budget, but he could not wear it himself; he said he could only pass on information and that the decisions were those of the Minister.

One important area which has come under the gun left the Minister for Health very uncomfortable indeed last Saturday, namely, women's health centres. Quite frankly, I think that what the Government is proposing to do is outrageous, as it will remove the independence of women's health centres. Also outrageous is the way in which the Minister has attempted to play games with what he has been told by those in the women's health sector. The fact that he has attempted to misuse what they have said and then tried to rationalise his way out of it when he has been uncovered is a disgrace. The way in which the Minister has answered questions in this place from the members for Elizabeth and Napier is a disgrace; when he was talking about the northern area he suddenly thought that, no, the northern area would have to expand to cover the north-eastern area as well.

People in the women's health centre sector are appalled at what the Government is doing. If the Government faces up to that, no longer tries to hide behind excuses and other rationalisations and actually addresses the fact that what it is doing is not supported at least it will be given marks for integrity and honesty, if not for compassion.

The speech makes further reference to the Commissioner for the Ageing. It refers to the Commissioner for the Ageing in cooperation with the Ethnic Communities Council producing a series of information packages in 21 languages for use by the ethnic media. I think that sounds like a good idea. I ask, however, whether the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs will be involved in that, because surely they should be. I was concerned to find that they were excluded from reference in this speech. I hope that is an oversight—I hope that is all it is—but I have a subtle suspicion or fear that the Government is wanting to undermine the capacity of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs. This may be the start of the beginning of the end, so to speak, for that commission and for that office.

I refer to a matter that was not raised in this speech but was raised yesterday in this place by the member for Norwood with respect to aged care positions. I acknowledge the fact that the Minister, who is presently in this Chamber, has continued funding until 31 December this year. The member for Norwood yesterday was cynical about my Government's decision before the last election to continue funding for these programs until June this year. I believe that was an important thing for us to do, because I happen to support strongly these positions, and I have said so publicly on many occasions.

I was present at the Ballo di Comitati of the Italian coordinating committee last year—as I was this year and in many other years—when the then Leader of the Opposition, now Premier, stood in front of the audience and said that a Liberal Government would continue these programs. He did not put a time limit on it; he did not say that he would continue them just until December 1994—before the election, he stood up before all those people, and said, 'I assure you who have raised this issue with me, because you are genuinely concerned about it, that we will continue the funding for this program.' Again, we see the creative approach of the Government. The election has passed, and what does it do?

It meets the letter of the law by continuing funding until December 1994.

Everyone in that room last year would have had the right to interpret the then Leader of the Opposition's speech to mean that, if the Liberals won Government, this funding program would continue, and that it would continue as long as the Liberals were in Government. Their creative use of the truth shows that they were trying to pull another fraud. I hope that, by my raising this matter here, I have shown the Government up for what it is, and that when December comes the Government will be embarrassed into continuing this program into 1995 and beyond. I will applaud that decision if it happens. I will take some personal pride as being responsible for it, but I will applaud the fact that the Government realises it cannot get away with another swifitie in this important area. I have some correspondence from some of the groups who have received this funding telling me that they are happy with the extension until December but that they want the Opposition to keep a very close watching brief on this matter because they smell a rat. They have every right to be so concerned.

I want to deal with a number of other areas. Various aspects of legislation are to be looked at. We are going to monitor closely again the Native Vegetation Act. I am very proud to be a member of the Government which introduced this very important piece of environmental legislation. Many on the other side of politics have hated that particular initiative and done their best to undermine it over the years. Now we see that it is to be reviewed and amended. I am worried about what might be the outcome of that. I hope that this pioneering piece of environmental legislation of the 1980s will not, effectively, be gutted.

With respect to the matter of dryland salinity in the Upper South-East, I endorse the comments made in that regard and hope that something is done. When I was the Minister of Agriculture and later the Premier, I was concerned about the size of that problem. It was a problem on which we had people working actively to look at how it could best be addressed. We will support work done in this area to see that problem addressed, because it affects the general quality of the environment in this State as well as having a particular impact on that region. Regarding that matter, on this occasion I want to give a little bit of praise to the Government. Yesterday, the Premier released the report by the Australian Centenary Federation Advisory Committee. He indicated that he had received a letter from Joan Kirner that said he had given an excellent submission. I have a letter from Joan Kirner saying that I have made an excellent submission, too.

However, I have read most of the report and I want to give some credit to the Government because it appears as if its submission was well thought out and well put together. It appears as if the submission has had considerable influence on the deliberations of the Kirner committee, which has picked up many of the recommendations made by the South Australian Government. I give credit to the Government for that, because that kind of approach will be very positive. While there are so many things about this Government that are worthy of the strongest criticism, this appears to be one issue where, subject to advice from officers of the Government, it has put together something that has been well received and I believe it is a good document.

I now want to raise a couple of other issues in relation to the Governor's speech. A moment ago I referred to the failure of the document to contain much on the economy at all. I think it was last week that the Premier quoted the survey of

business confidence, but I want to quote another survey of the state of business in South Australia that comes from the engineering employers in South Australia who survey their members monthly on business trends. The latest figures are for the survey of June. There are two tables on the level of production activity and the order book situation where people are asked to cite whether things are very good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. I seek leave to have these tables inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them because they are purely statistical.

Leave granted.

	Engineering Business Trends Order Book Current Situation % of Respondents		
	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
As at			
Jul-93	4	44	52
Aug-93	0	43	57
Sep-93	4	66	30
Oct-93	4	61	35
Nov-93	13	58	29
Dec-93	21	54	25
Jan-94	20	64	16
Feb-94	24	56	20
Mar-94	17	62	21
Apr-94	8	63	29
May-94	8	63	29
Jun-94	8	60	32
	Trend % of Respondents		
	Improving	No Change	Deteriorating
Jun-93	26	44	30
Jul-93	30	48	22
Aug-93	35	48	17
Sep-93	35	52	13
Oct-93	22	61	17
Dec-93	42	58	0
Jan-94	60	32	8
Feb-94	40	56	4
Mar-94	33	54	13
Apr-94	21	62	17
May-94	29	54	17
Jun-94	32	56	12

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I appreciate that members do not have these figures before them, so they will have to read my speech later, which I know they will do with great interest, to see these figures. Members will have to take my comments as being a true reflection of the figures in the tables, but I assure them that is the case. Last year when these same engineering firms were asked whether they felt more or less confident about the future, there was progressively an increase in the number who felt that the order book situation was very good, matched by a corresponding decrease in those who felt it was unsatisfactory. That was trending up month by month until December. Come December there was a slight retreat, but in February it went up again.

However, since February the good figures have gone down and down until they plateaued from April through to June. The percentage of those claiming that the situation was very good in December 1993 was 21 per cent. By June this year the figure was 8 per cent who believed the situation was very good. The unsatisfactory figure for June this year is 32 per cent. That just shows how much the economy is stalling in this State, a fact about which I am very sad indeed.

Let me look at retail sales. Around the country retail sales have been buoyant, as the figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics just over a week ago show. We find that most Australian States have actually shown growth in retail sales or, in the case of Western Australia, have shown no change at all. However, the South Australian figures have

shown a decline over the last four quarters. That is of concern. We see that the rest of Australia is powering ahead in terms of improved retail sales, but that is not the situation that we face in South Australia.

I remind members of my earlier comments about the financial statement and the stalling effect that is having on the economy. I hope we will not be in the situation of the doctor in the short story *The Third Resignation* by Gabriel Garcia Marquez where a mother brings a sick child to the doctor. It is a bit like the South Australian economy under this Government at the moment. The doctor gives his prognosis and says, 'Madam, your child has a grave illness. He is dead.' He went on, 'Nevertheless, we shall do everything possible to keep him alive beyond death.' The retail sales figures and the engineering employers' figures show that the situation is not healthy. I sincerely hope it is capable of being resolved, but it will take a much better approach from the Government than we presently see. I have been asked time and again by reporters what the Government should do, and basically I say the Government should change its strategic direction.

Their strategic direction is wrong. The direction that was established in Meeting the Challenge was the right way to go because it would have maintained the quality of services in this State and would have given us debt reduction, a balanced budget and economic growth: things that the approach of this Government will fail to do.

In the few moments that I have left, the last comment I want to make with respect to the Governor's speech is, on behalf of the Opposition, to concur with her in hoping that the South Australian participants in the Commonwealth Games in Victoria, British Columbia, perform very well and achieve the rewards they deserve to achieve. It would be exciting to be with them, but I know that we will be watching on the television news. As a former resident of Victoria, British Columbia, for some four and a half years, I might say it will be a wonderful place for the games to be held—nearly as nice as Adelaide would have been for the Commonwealth Games. They will have a wonderful time and I hope they perform especially well.

One other issue I now want to deal with is the question of multiculturalism. It is fair to say that I am concerned that the Governor's speech does not make reference to that, and also concerned that beyond the one oblique reference to ethnic community matters, in terms of the aged care issue—where, as I remind members, the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission is totally ignored—there are no other references in the speech to this very important issue. It is something that has held a great deal of interest for me because I think it is so important. I am reminded of what in 1989 Miklos Nemeth, then Prime Minister of Hungary, said about Australia and our approach to multiculturalism in this country. He said on that occasion:

We regard Australia's (ethnic) minorities policy as exemplary. It helps to maintain the continuity of tradition and ethnic bonding and guarantees the conservation of ethnotypic characteristics. It is a policy which aims to integrate newcomers, not to assimilate them. I believe that in this country we have done some very impressive things in this area, and I am very proud to have been part of the Government that led the nation in so many areas with respect to multiculturalism. However, it is something that we cannot allow to founder. We must keep on pursuing the issue and not be diverted by those who have a monocultural type of approach; by those who are opposed to multiculturalism on the grounds that they claim it is divisive. They are, quite frankly, wrong. It is interesting to note that

those who claim that multiculturalism is divisive and say we should have one culture ignore the fact that, in any country that is even one culture, people are different. In any monocultural situation people have different ways of expressing themselves, different things that they enjoy. We are not all the same. We are not all homogeneous. Why should everyone in a monoculture all operate in the same way?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Apparently, that is diversity: that can be allowed. What cannot be allowed is for that monocultural diversity within its members to spread over into multicultural diversity, because somehow that is threatening. I suggest that those who hold those views should actually talk to those Australians who come from non-English speaking backgrounds, for example, either by birth or by dissent, and ascertain their views. Recently a study was undertaken on Vietnamese in South Australia by My Van Tran.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: An excellent work, too.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is an excellent work, as my Deputy interjects. One statement she makes, referring to the Vietnamese, for example, is as follows:

For those of the group that are former veterans, a major opportunity to feel pride and a sense of worth is provided not by the work environment but by participating alongside other veterans in the Anzac Day parades.

I have my own very strong views on the Vietnam War: I opposed it, and I do not resile from my opposition to that war. Here, they actually used a situation of their own cultural tradition, of their own history, which enables them more firmly to express their Australianness in this country. I am reminded of Dr Antonio Cocchiari, of the South Australian Coordinating Italian Committee, who sums up his and the organisation's philosophy on Italo-Australians as follows:

Italo-Australians regard themselves as Australians first and Italians second; not as monoculturalists would want to have it—Australians first and nothing else at all.

I am also reminded of a Spaniard, who has lived in South Australia since the early 1960s and who sums it up as follows:

Spain was my mother, Australia is my wife.

As a point of clarification, I have to say he is happily married, but he makes the point that he cannot be expected to deny his past—he cannot be expected to walk away from it—but, on the other hand, he accepts the reality of being in this country. It is from things like that, I think, that we can quite clearly build up the principle that it is possible to love two countries—the one of one's birth and the other of one's residence—and that it does not have to be a matter of divided loyalties. I think one of the great sadnesses in this country was the suffering that was inflicted upon Australians of German descent, when the record clearly shows just how much they participated in this country, including the period during the wars, when their loyalties were overwhelmingly here; and there were no more expressions of counter-patriotic views among the German-Australian community than there were among the general Australian community. So, the concept of being able to love the country of one's origin and the country of one's residence is an entirely possible proposition.

I was very concerned to hear on a talk-back program some weeks ago a journalist speaking against multiculturalism, saying that it would not be possible to have a united country. I hope that such people will, as I say, look closely at what the actual record is in this matter.

In the remaining time I have left, I want to deal with some issues within my own electorate, the electorate of Taylor, which is now quite a large and unusual electorate. It runs from the centre of Port Adelaide to the outskirts of Dublin, in the Lower Mid North. It is a very interesting electorate that covers the western side of the City of Salisbury, the heart of Port Adelaide and the country areas around Virginia and Two Wells, up to Port Parham. The electorate experiences a number of different issues that I believe will see a lot of people concerned about what this Government has been doing. For example, there are lots of Housing Trust residents in Salisbury who, I want to assure members opposite, are very concerned. I know that a number of members opposite have indicated that they have been receiving approaches from concerned Housing Trust residents in their area. That is certainly coming through to me, as people are very angry at what the Government is doing.

In terms of other services, those in the many schools in my electorate, both urban and country schools, are also very worried indeed. Important issues such as that involving the South Australian Film and Video Centre have concerned large numbers of people, and there are also other areas. People are wondering whether or not they will receive proper support for students in special programs in the schools. I have already taken up a number of issues with the Education Minister, and I will be watching most closely what the budget brings in those particular areas.

My area is one that relies heavily upon a good public transport service, and I am very concerned about what will happen to the quality of that service. Most of my electorate is the outer urban area and people do rely on having a good public transport system, a system that I take pride in, having played a significant part in its improvement as the local member.

Mr CONDOUS secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

SOUTHERN STATE SUPERANNUATION BILL

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

WILLUNGA BASIN

A petition signed by 25 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide one full time Horticultural Officer for assisting the agriculturalists in the Willunga Basin was presented by Mr Brokenshire.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Police Superannuation Scheme—Actuarial Report, 1992-93

By the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

Highways Act—Lease of Road Transport Agency Properties

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

Primary Industries South Australia Forestry, Management Review of—Report to the Minister for Primary Industries, 1993-94.

ASBESTOS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I wish to respond to a question raised in this House last Wednesday 3 August by the member for Ross Smith in regard to the awarding of a contract by ETSA to the Bells Thermalag company, which is part of the Bains Harding Group. The honourable member has contended that the contract was awarded without the company in question possessing a valid licence to permit the removal of asbestos. I have made urgent inquiries in relation to this serious allegation and have ascertained that the member for Ross Smith does not have a good understanding of all the circumstances of this matter. I wish to set the record straight.

Recently, ETSA awarded a contract for thermal insulation maintenance and asbestos removal from its power stations to Bells Thermalag and Industrial Services Pty Ltd, a member of the Bains Harding Group. At the time the contract was awarded the contractor submitted a copy of its asbestos removal licence, which was issued on 24 December 1992 and is valid for two years, and consequently expires on 24 December 1994. The asbestos removal licence authorises specific persons, who meet stringent asbestos licensing standards, to undertake asbestos removal work for the company that is licensed.

A condition of the continuing validity of the asbestos removal licence is that a company must notify the Department of Industrial Affairs of any variation to the conditions of the licence. In this case the company nominee responsible for obtaining the licence and carrying out the work had left the employment of the company during 1993. Bells Thermalag failed to notify this variation of condition, and at this point the licence ceased to be valid. ETSA at the time of awarding the contract was unaware that this variation to the condition had not been notified and was of the view that the licence was valid.

Subsequent to the contract being awarded by ETSA, Bells Thermalag approached my department to discuss requirements in relation to the work and obtaining a new nominee's qualification for asbestos removal. It was pointed out to the company that its licence was invalid because it had failed to notify the department of the licensed nominee employee leaving the company. The company at this point has stated categorically that it was not aware of a breach of a condition of its licence. Immediately Bells Thermalag took steps to nominate a further person who could be suitably qualified for the purposes of revalidating the licence, and that employee subsequently submitted but failed to meet the required standards necessary for the licence. Immediately thereafter, on Friday 5 August 1994, two further employees were tested and successfully met the stringent requirements for the licence. These conditions apply to all current licence holders and to any other company which wishes to obtain an asbestos removal licence.

I point out to the member for Ross Smith that, since both nominees are from interstate and are not resident in South

Australia, it is a standard condition that for all asbestos removal work carried out in South Australia at least one nominee must be on site for the duration of the asbestos removal program. It is quite clear that Bells Thermalag and ETSA have both acted in good faith in relation to this situation and that the member for Ross Smith is making suggestions in relation to this matter that are totally without foundation. I would like to point out some further facts—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Let me finish.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: That is an interesting point about the involvement of Trades Hall. First, Bells Thermalag has operated in South Australia on thermal insulation and maintenance work for approximately 60 years and on asbestos removal work from 1978 to 1983, and again from 1990 when it obtained its first copy of its licence. The licence was again reissued in December 1992, and it was operative until the current contracts at the time were concluded in 1993.

The contract in question, which has been awarded by ETSA to the company, covers work which is substantially greater than asbestos removal and is primarily in relation to thermal insulation and maintenance. No work has commenced in relation to this contract at this point in time, and therefore there can be no suggestion that asbestos removal work has occurred in an unlawful way. In fact, it is clear that, as a condition of the tender, the contractor is required to comply with all statutory requirements of this State. The contractor has employed South Australian labour from the staff of the previous contractor to ETSA.

Finally, my Chief Executive Officer and senior personnel from my department met this week with senior representatives of the Baines Harding group. They were totally satisfied that the company has acted in good faith and that there is no suggestion of impropriety in this matter.

I believe that this question, which has been raised by the member for Ross Smith, has made an unjustifiable imputation against the contractor, and it is clear from my statement that the work will be undertaken in a lawful and proper manner to the benefit of the State of South Australia and in accordance with a valid licence. As the member for Ross Smith should also be aware, State preference in contracting is not permitted under the Government procurement agreement. I suspect that the cartel involved in this area is concerned about some competition. The approach taken by my department and ETSA in the handling of this matter is quite proper and in line with the views of this Government, namely, that a consistent approach in the regulation of occupational health and safety matters is exercised and, wherever possible, reflects the direction taken by other States.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: Last session, I undertook to keep the House up to date regarding developments in the State Government's investigation of a possible bid by Adelaide to host the 2002 Commonwealth Games. A significant development since then is that on 25 June 1994 the Australian Commonwealth Games Association agreed to my request to endorse a conditional bid by Adelaide to host the

2002 Commonwealth Games. This agreement is unprecedented and enables the Government to take further steps to decide whether a bid would have a good chance of success.

I should note that the cost of progressing the bid to the stage of endorsement has been negligible, with Perth and Brisbane having withdrawn from the race in view of the strength of Adelaide's position. By way of comparison, expenditure of about \$600 000 was incurred in winning the first stage of the bid for the 1998 games. The conditions accepted by the ACGA for endorsement were: that an assurance be obtained from the Federal Government as to the provision of an appropriate level of funding to stage the games; and that, before a final decision is taken, an objective conclusion be reached as to the likelihood of success of an Adelaide bid.

I will be leaving tomorrow to attend the Commonwealth Games Federation General Assembly in Victoria, Canada, prior to the Commonwealth Games. I will also be meeting with Commonwealth Games Federation officials and delegates from as many countries as possible as a basis for making an informed decision about the prospects of success of an Adelaide bid. I will be seeking to assess the disposition of voting delegates towards the likely success of an Adelaide bid in relation to: the existing goodwill and sympathy towards Adelaide from the previous bid; the strength of Manchester's position, in light of its Olympic bidding experience; the timing of an Adelaide bid in relation to the Sydney Olympics in 2000; and the possible emergence of another bidding city, particularly from within the African region, such as South Africa.

With regard to financial commitment, if the assessment of our chances is positive, I have indicated to my Federal counterpart, Senator Faulkner, that we will require a clear and unequivocal commitment from the Australian Government that it will make an appropriate contribution, in the event that the bid is successful, and that such a commitment will be required within a short time frame following the Victoria Commonwealth Games. We will also update the projected budget that was prepared for the 1998 bid in light of the financial analysis of the Victoria Commonwealth Games. I expect the Government will make a decision as to whether to proceed with a bid for the 2002 Commonwealth Games by late September.

FORESTRY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: One of this Government's important undertakings was to make a financial assessment of our State's forests to ensure management operates along commercial lines based on sound economic projections. Our policy promised an assessment of the long-term requirements of forest products and to streamline administration and operations, in short, to ensure that the community's investment in our forests earns an acceptable return on assets, produces a quality product to satisfy future industry requirements while at the same time making sure that the overall investment is managed on a sustainable basis—to apply commercial standards of excellence required for this important South Australian asset.

Earlier this year, therefore, I commissioned a management review of Primary Industries South Australia, Forestry. This comprehensive report, prepared by Australian Agribusiness

Services, has taken several months to complete. It has involved extensive discussions with a number of key players in the forestry industry and I would like to place on record the Government's appreciation of their valuable input. The key recommendations in this report are about change: change in culture; change in structure; and a change in the relationship with the market place. Many detailed recommendations are made throughout the report and are designed to ensure:

That South Australia sustains a vibrant and relevant forest products industry well into the twenty-first century.

PISA Forestry is aware of the need for change. Indeed, the consultant's view is that 'the organisation should be managed less by technical foresters and more by commercial and market-driven managers'. This change in culture is linked to a change in skills—the consultant's view being that 'the skills basis is narrow and is in need of greater breadth and depth of general management skill'.

The technical competence of forestry plantations management is not in question here. In fact, this aspect of the whole operation is highly regarded. Indeed, I compliment the forestry staff for the way in which they are prepared to accept the challenge before them. But changing the culture and skills mix will not be enough and, therefore, the review discusses structural change. The consultant recommends that all functions that can be identified as having a commercial basis and interaction with industry should be restructured, with the reporting mechanism through a commercial board. The review also suggests that the traditional and important roles of policy advice, community service obligations and economic development would still be retained within the departmental structure.

Turning now to marketing factors, members would know that the softwood product industry is increasingly becoming world competitive, like so much of manufacturing generally. Obtaining increased investment in timber processing in South Australia requires access to the primary resource forest logs and the harsh commercial reality is that new forests in the Eastern States will sharpen up the competition for value-added operations within South Australia.

Attracting timber processing capital requires a greater flexibility in approach to resource management. The review therefore recommends a marketing role within the organisation. Specifically, the reviewer comments:

It is essential that PISA Forestry has an effective and strategically focused marketing function if it is to sustain its competitiveness, meet some customer needs and anticipate both global and local future market trends.

There is some good news for South Australia in the review. PISA Forestry can now release more log to the industry without harming its long-term ability to supply into the future, and this will mean additional jobs for South Australia and additional investment. This extra timber from our forest estate will come from a number of actions, including an increase in the fertilisation program, lowering the rotation age from 47 to about 37 years, and extending plantations. The key point will be greater flexibility in managing the level of cut from the forests supported by a strategic market analysis. The consultant stated:

Additional logs should be offered to the industry on a competitive basis. This strategy would assist competitive pricing and identify market trends.

The Government will now consider the recommendations of this review, which encompass a wide range of operational, marketing and structural matters. Very clearly, the plain message from this study is that there is an exciting future for

our forest operations in South Australia, but only if we can become more commercially focused. I commend the report to the House.

PATAWALONGA

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I seek leave to make a brief ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Government's pre-election policy on the environment and natural resources states that a Liberal Government will commit up to \$4 million to ensure a permanent solution to pollution in the Patawalonga boat haven at Glenelg. In order to achieve that solution, work is required both within the Patawalonga Basin itself, which is being addressed by my colleague the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, and throughout the whole of the Patawalonga catchment, which I, as Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, have been advancing since coming into office.

I met with the 11 councils of the Patawalonga catchment on 20 January this year to outline to them the State Government's position and to request them to get together to form a Patawalonga Catchment Authority. I also outlined to the councils the approach of the State Government to the clean-up of the Patawalonga, which is one of an active and cooperative partnership between State and local government in conjunction with the community. Since that meeting I have agreed to meet half the cost of a project officer for the soon to be formed Patawalonga Catchment Authority.

In addition, the State Government funded the very successful Patawalonga Catchment Water Quality Forum, which was held on 22 May this year, and three community service announcements on catchment care prepared in partnership with KESAB and local government. There is no doubt that education is vital to cleaning up the Patawalonga catchment. However, an education campaign alone will not be sufficient to clean up the water quality in the Patawalonga: there is also a need for works to be undertaken upstream to catch pollutants that make their way into the stormwater system before they reach the Patawalonga Basin.

I am delighted to release publicly today the final report of the Patawalonga Water Quality Committee, a committee comprising State Government, local government and community representatives, which has been prepared by the project group of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This excellent report recommends the major works that the committee considers are required within the Patawalonga catchment, including 14 major trash collection structures and three major silt removal traps. I commend the staff of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, many of whom have now been transferred into the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, for their efforts in preparing this report, and extend my thanks to all the members of the committee for their efforts.

I will now take this report to the Patawalonga catchment councils and will work in close partnership with them to determine priorities for works to be undertaken this financial year. With the continuing strong political will of this Government to ensure that the Patawalonga is cleaned up, coupled with the support of local government and the community, South Australians will, in the not too distant

future, be able once again to enjoy the recreational qualities of the Patawalonga.

QUESTION TIME

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): How will the Minister for Health guarantee that the Women's and Children's Hospital will maintain the present level and quality of Down's Syndrome screening and craniofacial surgery following cuts of over \$4 million to the hospital's budget confirmed by the Minister? In an internal memo, the CEO of the Women's and Children's Hospital warned the Minister, as follows:

It is clear that some very difficult and unpopular decisions will need to be made in order to achieve the budget target. There is absolutely no doubt that a budget target of about \$5 million will necessitate a considerable reduction in services. Whilst it is highly undesirable to transfer screening programs like Down's Syndrome screening to the private sector, if funding is not available, it may be necessary to do so. There are some areas of high costs that will need to be rationed including craniofacial surgery.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Under the casemix funding system we are identifying hospitals that perform services as efficiently and effectively as possible, and also identifying hospitals which, on a benchmark price around South Australia, clearly are able to make some alterations to the provision of their general services, which will see some efficiencies made. I should remind the Leader of the Opposition that when the casemix funding model was first proposed it was the Women's and Children's Hospital that specifically asked to be included in the system, so that it could be judged with its peers. Secondly, this mythological figure of \$5 million, the budget cut—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I have read it: of course I have. In relation to this mythological cut of \$5 million, the fact is that, on casemix based funding, the Women's and Children's Hospital is expected to make an efficiency saving of \$4.03 million and—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Spence says that's what I say. If the member for Spence wishes to contact the Chief Executive Officer of the Women's and Children's Hospital—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Wait for it—he will identify that there is another potential million dollars in savings that will need to be made because of things such as wage increases. I would make an appeal to every person working in the system that, if they make a wage claim—and we are having to bring financial rectitude into South Australia—those wage claims will directly affect the service provision. I would be only too happy for the member for Spence to go straight out now and telephone the Chief Executive Officer of the Women's and Children's Hospital.

An honourable member: Answer the question.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am answering the question. What I am pointing out is that a dividend will be expected of the hospitals for wage claims within the system. So, it is completely within the power of the people working in the system either to be responsible and help the patients or not. That is the first thing. The second thing is—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Picking on kids: that's what you're doing.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Let us be quite clear: the reason why efficiencies are being generated is solely that we are putting right the disasters caused by the 11 people sitting on that side of the Chamber. It is also quite clear that, as has been typical of all Governments, there will be a global budget given to the hospitals. I am absolutely confident that the managers of the hospitals will determine priorities within those global budgets—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence yesterday complained about displays in the House. Now he is doing exactly the same thing.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: If the administrators and the people working within the hospital system, who are dedicated, highly trained professional people who want to see the best possible services for their patients, wish to take advantage of all the policies that we have brought down into the public arena, which will allow them to make efficiencies—and I specifically seek the backing of the Opposition for policies such as contestability, which will allow private sector benchmarks to be brought into the public sector—obviously, the Women's and Children's Hospital will easily be able to meet its budget targets on system wide benchmarks.

EMPLOYMENT

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): As I have been contacted by a member of my electorate who is among the long-term unemployed, and recognising his concern, will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education inform the House about today's employment statistics?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Kaurna for her question.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: It will upset some of you people, I know. We have some very good news. The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in South Australia fell in July from 11.2 per cent to 10.4 per cent. The fall in unemployment occurred despite a rise in the seasonally adjusted participation rate of 1.4 percentage points, the largest rise for over three years. Therefore, the fall in unemployment was due entirely to job growth. The full-time youth unemployment rate in South Australia fell by 3.6 per cent to 34.6 per cent. For the benefit of members opposite, there are now 17 500 more people in jobs in South Australia than in January this year. The Bureau of Statistics's figures show that the labour market participation rate, at 62.6 per cent, is the highest since May 1991. The strong growth has been in retailing, manufacturing and hospitality, representing over 60 per cent of private sector employment in South Australia.

The good news has been the result of a team effort by the Government and the community working together, and we expect further job growth in the months ahead. We still have a long way to go: unemployment is still far too high and the monthly figures, as we know, can jump around quite a bit. However, we had the Premier overseas recently, attracting business investment to South Australia; and the Minister for Infrastructure is also working hard to attract investment in South Australia. We have had recent announcements by companies such as Motorola and Gerard Industries. I should

indicate by way of caution that we could expect the TSPs to have a negative impact in the months ahead, as some of those people seek employment in the job market. However, overall the figures are very encouraging. All the indications from advertisements and studies of business confidence are positive, and I believe South Australia is on the road to recovery. However, a lot of work is still to be done by the Government and the community.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Does the Minister for Health accept the views of senior hospital administrators that few savings can be made by cutting blue collar areas, and that further funding cuts to hospitals can only mean reduced patient services? In his internal memorandum, the Chief Executive Officer of the Women's and Children's Hospital said:

It is my perception that little is to be gained from further reductions in the blue collar area as available benchmarks already indicate a high degree of efficiency.

The CEO also stated that, while ancillary services would be subject to contestability, 'it is not expected that significant (if any) savings will be possible from cleaning and engineering'.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: In any system one looks for efficiencies, and not only in the blue collar area. I am quite confident that the managers can make those efficiencies.

ROLLS ROYCE

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Can the Treasurer please advise the House of the current status of the white Rolls Royce owned by SGIC through its subsidiary company, Bouvet Pty Ltd, the company which owned the Terrace Hotel? I believe this matter was last canvassed by the Economic and Finance Committee under the then chairmanship of the member for Playford. However, it appears that at that time the white roller was submerged under a controversy which then arose as to the residential status of the penthouse pussycat.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Rolls Royce—which I think was more than indicative of the way the last Government ran its affairs—was purchased by SGIC with the complete agreement of the then Government, the then Treasurer and the then Premier for the princely sum of \$275 000, with a further \$10 952 in stamp duty. The all-up cost was \$286 000 for one motor car for the benefit of the then Government and its friends. We will not go back in history about Mr Kean and all his friends who were propped up, supported and encouraged by members of the then Government. Members opposite drank with them at the Terrace Hotel. I would not be surprised if they had a ride in the Rolls Royce at the Terrace. It is another sad saga; it is like seeing the flag on the flag pole.

This Rolls Royce was indicative of the largesse and absolute stupidity in the management of the previous Government. That era has come to an end, even though for the next decade we will pay for the damage that the Labor Party has wrought upon this State. At least we are getting rid of some of the vestiges. The Rolls Royce has gone, but we did not do particularly well out of the deal. Although the previous Government paid \$286 000 in 1989, after canvassing many establishments around Australia we were able to attract an offer of only \$125 000.

The Hon. D.S. Baker: It will go to Victoria like the Grand Prix!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Yes, it went to Victoria, like the Grand Prix. The Minister for Primary Industries is quite a superb guesser. He did not have to look far to guess which way it went. It is another chapter in South Australia's history that we should remember only for the lesson it provides—we should not remember it with great pride. We no longer have a Rolls Royce at the Terrace.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister for Health guarantee that paediatric wards will not close and the number of senior nursing staff within the nursing and mid-wifery sections will not be reduced at the Women's and Children's hospital? In a minute to the Minister, the Chief Executive Officer of the Women's and Children's Hospital warned that budget cuts will make it necessary to close at least one and maybe two paediatric wards, and that the number of senior nursing positions within the division will be reduced.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I will not guarantee that, because patient loads change. The member for Spence would not keep wards with no patients open if the surgical procedures change. I have already detailed to the member for Spence on several occasions that medicine is changing. He should open his eyes and realise that the length of stay is decreasing dramatically and, if that means that there are unused wards and beds, we will obviously make every efficiency possible.

TORRENS BY-ELECTION

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Deputy Premier, representing the Attorney-General, inform the House whether he is aware of allegations of vote rigging at the recent Torrens by-election?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Even if half the allegations that were made on the *Times* program on Channel 7 last night are correct, those people in the House who watched it would be appalled. I know that on this side of the House we would be appalled. I am not sure whether members opposite would be appalled because, if the allegations that were made on that program are true, it would be of great concern to all South Australians that the political process and the electoral system were being corrupted. The lengths that appear to have been taken to have the member for Torrens elected reflect badly on the process of assisting more women to seek election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Members would be aware that the successful candidate, the now member for Torrens, was an employee of Peter Duncan, the Federal Labor member for Makin. The *Times* program last night detailed how another employee, Mr Rowan Holtzberger, organised for a number of candidates to stand as so-called independents to manipulate the vote by controlling the flow of preferences.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Mr Dave Sag, the Independent Hemp candidate at the election, explained how he rang a telephone number attributed to the Smokers' Rights candidate for the by-election only to have it answered by Mr Rowan Holtzberger. Holtzberger also took telephone calls directed to the so-called Independent Grey Power candidate. The Smokers' Rights candidate happens to live in Marree. The

program showed how this candidate's nomination form was signed by two people approached by Mr Holtzberger whilst shopping at Woolworths. It also showed how Mr Holtzberger arranged for nomination forms to be signed by shoppers at Woolworths for another candidate whose campaign theme was Christian values. It was a clean sweep.

The Independent Grey Power candidate was interviewed during the program, and he said:

What happened with this is that after I made my nomination my wife was sick and I just didn't worry about it.

This did not stop Labor Party members handing out Independent Grey Power pamphlets at the booths. The program interviewed Mr David Pemberthy, who is a political journalist for the *Advertiser*. He said that Mr Holtzberger impersonated him so that the ALP could obtain information on the Liberal campaign. Mr Duncan, the man responsible for all this—the Kingmaker or the Queenmaker—was interviewed at the end of last night's program. He confirmed that he fired Holtzberger as a result of his involvement; however, Mr Holtzberger is now back on staff. In my living memory, this represents the greatest abuse of the electoral system that this State has ever seen. I have asked the Attorney-General to obtain a report from the Electoral Commissioner.

HOSPITAL SERVICES

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Has the Minister for Health advised the merged Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Lyell McEwin Hospital that they face a cut in their combined budget of \$10 million within three years? Will he now admit that his promises of improved health services in the western suburbs are as false as his promises—

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn. The honourable member is commenting, and he knows that is contrary to Standing Orders. I will rule the question out of order if he continues in that manner.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: In an effort to preserve services in the teaching hospital in the western area—and I know the member for Spence is delighted that we have managed to do that, despite the State Bank financial problems that have beset the State—and increase services in the northern area (and I know the members for Elizabeth, Ramsay and Briggs and all those other electorates are equally delighted) we looked at a number of options.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I did refer to all those other electorates in the northern area. Where are you now?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Taylor.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am sure the member for Taylor is delighted with the teaching hospital and the extension of services in the northern area. At last someone has grasped the stinging nettle and has improved services in the north-western area instead of just historically funding it, keeping the fingers crossed and hoping for the best. In the process we looked at a number of options, including the removal of the teaching hospital status from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and that would have caused many problems—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am coming to that. That would have caused many problems for the people in the western area of Adelaide which, according to the social atlas, would not have been valid. In an attempt to look at these things, a company that has run hospitals around Australia

indicated that it would be happy to give us a figure on where it believed savings might be made. A figure of \$10 million is not the final figure given to us. It is of that order, I am prepared to say, but is an indicative figure as to the types of savings that this hospital company, which runs hospitals around Australia, believes can be made.

Because we have a huge debt to cover, we have to look at these sorts of things. If we are told that we can continue to provide services adequately, effectively and with high quality whilst making those sorts of savings, I make no bones about it: they are the sorts of things we will look at. The final figure will be a matter for the steering committee to decide with regard to how the figures are allocated between the Health Commission, as part of our budget task, and the large percentage of savings that will be returned to those two hospital campuses to improve the services to the people in the north-western area.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mr KERIN (Frome): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development advise the House of progress being made with major MFP projects, in particular the Virginia pipeline, the Gillman wetlands and urban development of the greater Levels?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Since the State Government was able to have the MFP refocussed on to some key, core objectives, we have seen significant progress. In relation to the Virginia pipeline—a project which will develop export orientation for our horticultural industry, which is currently subjected to an unsustainable draw down of the aquifer in the Virginia triangle and therefore requires alternative water resources—that project has been signed off by the MFP board and currently is being rigorously assessed by the EWS which will, in a timely manner, respond to the MFP board's request for that project to go ahead.

Should it do so, the capital required will be about \$40 million, of which \$10 million has been signed off under the Better Cities program. If that project goes ahead, that is, if it is deemed to be a commercially viable project after rigorous assessment by the EWS, some 500 jobs would be created in the construction phase.

At this stage it is intended that construction will start in June 1995 and be completed in September 1996. In addition, the model of Australian technology for international markets will flow from that project. There is collaborative effort and research involving not only CSIRO but Japan's Miti agency.

If we can get that project right, it will not only assist us with our export market potential, the creation of jobs and the sustainability of agricultural production in the Virginia triangle but also stop the discharge of some 50 million megalitres of sewage into Gulf St Vincent, resulting in seagrass dieback, which is impacting on fish breeding grounds and export in the fishing industry. It is more than a 'win, win' position if we can get the technicalities of the project right and if we can undertake private sector involvement in provision of part of the infrastructure.

Another component that I refer to the House is the wetlands clean-up and urban development stage 1, to which the honourable member referred. We have been most encouraged by the response to registration of interest both nationally and internationally for the now expanded core site, which has given it the capacity to attract that national and international interest as a result of the refocussing. That will

be given consideration by the board and the Government over the next 12 months.

Parallel with stage 1 is the clean-up of the wetlands. It is worth noting that that is the last stand of cool temperate mangroves in the world and the most southerly in the world, and its survival is vital for the South Australian fishing industry, Gulf St Vincent, and export market potential from fish products out of Gulf St Vincent. The Gillman-Dry Creek area is rated as a significant bird sanctuary—even more significant than the Coorong. It is interesting to note that migratory species from as far away as Siberia utilise the mangroves in that area. In the first step clean-up of 172 hectares, testing started in February 1994 and construction will continue until about May 1995 at a cost of some \$6 million. Tenders will be let shortly with the creation of between 150 and 200 jobs in that component of the scheme.

The last area was the Australian-Asia Business Centre. That will be owned by a consortium of some 50 companies—20 from Australia, 20 from the Asia-Pacific region and 10 from other parts of the world. It will be operated by the private sector to assist executives to cope with the challenges of doing business in the Asia-Pacific region. Whilst seed funding will be required in the initial phases—the first one or two years—it is proposed on the business plan adopted by the MFP board that it will be self funding and be able to repay that seed funding in its second and third years. The first intake of 50 executives is expected early in 1996, and it will be fully functional by the end of 1996.

In terms of those four projects, with the refocussing, the clear orientation of those projects, and the support of the South Australian Government and a range of agencies within the South Australian Government, I am sure that at the end of the day they will be successful and significant projects for the State and create jobs in South Australia for South Australians.

PATHOLOGY SERVICES

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Minister for Health agree with the Vice President of the Australian Medical Association, Dr David Weedon, that 'corruption in Australia's private pathology industry is alive and well', and is the Minister aware of any over-servicing induced by secret commissions from the South Australian pathology industry? A front page story in Melbourne's *Sunday Age*—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, will you invite the member for Hart to make himself more orderly?

The SPEAKER: Order! It is the obligation of all members to conduct themselves in accordance with Standing Orders. If the honourable member would like me to apply them rigorously, I am happy to do so, but he may also be the victim of it.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: A front page story in Melbourne's *Sunday Age* of 31 July reports a dramatic rise in the use of pathology services, and that has sparked renewed allegations from the AMA and elsewhere of widespread over-servicing and corrupt practices in Australia's \$1 billion private pathology industry. Kickbacks and inducements allegedly offered to doctors by unethical laboratories include company paid nursing sisters in doctors' surgeries and the payment of 'broom closet leases' for space in surgeries for rents of more than \$20 000 per year. Other inducements reported to be offered include computers,

software, fax machines, televisions and, in some cases, cars, holidays and cash payments.

The President of the Australian Medical Association, Dr Brendan Nelson, is reported as saying he has been told of pathology companies 'renting the bottom drawer of a desk in a doctor's surgery for \$2 000 a month'.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Spence. Was the honourable member inferring improper conduct across the Chamber?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is having some difficulty but, if the member for Spence was inferring any improper conduct, I will name him on the spot.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I require from the member for Spence whether he inferred that the Minister was involved in any improper conduct.

Mr ATKINSON: I did not imply anything of the Minister, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I would like to answer the Deputy Leader of the Opposition by saying that I have absolutely no evidence of commissions being paid in South Australia. Indeed, there are appropriate bodies to investigate such matters and, as the honourable member has indicated, bodies such as the AMA abhor such practices. There are obviously rumours. There always are. I have seen them in a number of Australia-wide papers, medical papers and so on. I repeat: I have absolutely no evidence of it, and I ask any member of the House or any member of the public in South Australia who has any evidence of behaviour that is reprehensible and ought not occur to provide it to me, and action will be taken forthwith.

OPERATION PENDULUM

Mr BASS (Florey): Has the Minister for Emergency Services seen the article in today's *Advertiser* which refers to Task Force Pendulum and, if so, can he advise the House of the success of the task force so far?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the member for Florey for his question and for his ongoing interest in policing matters in this State. The member for Florey, as have many members in this Chamber, has been concerned for some time about reports of rising crime in South Australia, particularly in the area of house breaking and robbery. The front page of the *Advertiser* this morning referred to a \$132 million crime wave, and that story related to those very crimes—house breaking and robbery. That *Advertiser* story follows the release of the 1993 national crime statistics, which show that the level of those crimes in South Australia exceeded the national average.

Task Force Pendulum was formed to combat such crimes. It was launched on 28 July this year for an initial three month trial period to combat crimes of house breaking and robbery, which are causing such concern in our community. This task force is unique as it is the first occasion on which a metropolitan operation has been combined by police with Neighbourhood Watch to target specific offences.

The task force has been extensively planned by the police through its commanders, crime analysts and the Neighbourhood Watch groups. In all, 90 task force members have been drawn by the Police Force from uniform and traffic patrols, intelligence analysts, command response groups, detectives

and support staff. In particular, I would like to highlight the fact that the task force also comprises police officers who have been drawn from non-operational duties and put back to work at the crime front. The officers involved have been hand-picked because of their ability and because of their knowledge of policing and the matters under investigation.

The task force is concentrating on individual criminals in geographic areas, and attention is being paid to receivers of stolen property and those who support criminal enterprise. I am pleased to be able to advise the House that, after its first week of operation, Task Force Pendulum has, indeed, achieved significant results. The task force has three operational areas: metro north, which is based on the Holden Hill complex; metro south, which is based in police headquarters; and the city of Adelaide, which is based in the Adelaide Police Station. In just one week of operation, in the northern region there have been 10 arrests and 11 reports; in the Adelaide region, 25 arrests and 14 reports; and in the southern region, 19 arrests and 23 reports. That is a total of 102 arrests and reports by this new police task force, working with Neighbourhood Watch groups, in just one week.

So, in its early stages, the Liberal Government's attempts through the Police Force properly to combat these crimes is starting to work. I advise members that, if people in their electorates contact them wanting to know how they should communicate information to Task Force Pendulum, the telephone numbers are: for the northern region, 207 6173; for the southern region, 204 2300; and also the city of Adelaide Police Station number. I trust that all members of this House will acknowledge the spectacular success of this initiative and support police and Neighbourhood Watch leaders in their endeavours.

SEXUALLY TRANSMITTABLE DISEASES

Ms HURLEY (Napier): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. What is the Government's position on the proposal to record the names of people who are HIV positive or who have sexually transmittable diseases? It has been revealed that the Victorian Health Department proposes to record the names of people who are HIV positive. This move was backed on Monday night by Victoria's Director of Public Health, Dr Chris Brook, at a meeting of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on AIDS.

At present, in Victoria a special non-identifiable code is used to store data on people with infectious diseases such as AIDS, syphilis and gonorrhoea. However, Dr Brook said that there was no reason why people with STDs or HIV/AIDS should be treated differently from others with identifiable diseases, such as hepatitis C, who are listed by name. This proposal has been attacked by AIDS organisations and the Australian Medical Association's national and Victorian branches, which are concerned that the move might inhibit people from volunteering to be tested for AIDS.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: In matters that are as sensitive as this, clearly privacy is paramount. We have not had any discussions about recording or releasing, or anything like that. I will certainly discuss the Victorian experience with people who are involved in what is an essential public health measure. Obviously, I recognise that a number of people in the HIV/AIDS positive community have said, for the reasons to which the honourable member alluded, that identification may well preclude them from having perhaps even the first blood test which might identify that the risk factors in which they have engaged have turned them into an HIV positive

status. Of course, if they do not know that, they are then unable to take precautionary measures in their daily living. So it is an important feature of a public health problem.

PORT ADELAIDE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr BECKER (Peake): I direct my question to the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. In light of the newspaper report this morning regarding plans for the redevelopment of the Port Adelaide waterfront, can the Minister provide further details of the project and indicate the level of Government funding committed to it?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed, this development will be one of many that we hope to be able to recount to the House, now that South Australia has reopened for business. The development that was featured in the paper this morning, which was the result of the Woods Bagot report, is a program of development for the Port area over some five or 10 years. It covers an area of some 50 hectares, from No. 1 dock to the West Lakes development.

The area has the capacity for construction of 800-odd houses or units. There are also plans for restaurants, shops and other accommodation in the form of hotels. It will be built on the State heritage precinct of Port Adelaide. From that point of view alone, it will provide tremendous opportunities for the area, as those of us who have been fortunate enough to visit such places as Salamanca Place in Hobart, Tasmania—which is where tourists go if they visit Hobart—will know. People also go to Fremantle and around the docks in Sydney.

It is interesting to note that, all around the world, after the ships have left, docks that have seen busy years are now being rejuvenated in urban development, and Port Adelaide is no exception. This Saturday I will be tendering for a \$20 million housing development, which will involve some 100 residential houses on the 5.8 hectare site which we have called Harborside Quays East. This is a marvellous opportunity for development. In the course of the advertising process we hope that we will also get a response from developers interested in other parts of the area.

The Government has already been approached by two developers who have shown genuine interest in the development of that site. Indeed, since the Woods Bagot report was put together we have also had developers coming from other States and looking at general areas along the waterfront, which augurs well for the future of the area. As far as funding of the project is concerned, some Government money will be used on the Harborside Quay development for decontamination of the site. Other than that, all the developers involved are coming in on the basis that the private sector will be basically funding the projects.

Anyone who visits the area in Port Adelaide will see its huge potential in terms of urban renewal. The services are already there; it is a matter of clearing the land on either side of the docks, and the great plus for the area is the fact that it will bring people back to Port Adelaide. If we do not bring people back to the Port the project will not be a success.

There is already commercial development there and, whilst investments have been made in the Port Adelaide area, development is fairly static. There are areas around the Black Diamond Corner that we all have to agree are tired. We have an opportunity to have something very special for South Australia, and I hope that this project will receive bipartisan

support. Whilst this development will be built more on the Fremantle than the Darling Harbor style, the heritage aspect of the area will make it a very special project that local residents will be proud to show to visitors from around the world.

TRADING HOURS

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs accept an invitation to speak at a rally to be held on Sunday 21 August 1994 organised by the Small Retailers' Association and the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association to explain the Government's breach of faith concerning extended shopping hours, and will he also bring a copy of the speech he made on 8 December 1993 to the same people when he promised there would be no extended shopping hours whilst he was Minister?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The member for Ross Smith likes to play games with the union movement and to set up anyone he possibly can. Perhaps I had better put on the record once and for all what the Liberal Party actually said in a formal document. This document was signed by me as shadow Minister, so I will tell the honourable member exactly what was said. The document states:

Immediately on coming to Government [we will] set up an inquiry into the retail industry to advise on—

and the honourable member should listen very carefully to this—

whether shop trading hours should be extended and, if so, to what extent and how this should be implemented.

Thousands of copies of that document were sent out to every community in South Australia. Clearly, it went out to—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Ross Smith.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: —a very large number of small, medium and large businesses in South Australia. I would be prepared to go to any rally that was not set up and driven by the union movement.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Ross Smith to order for the second time.

HEPATITIS C

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Minister for Health advise this House what action he proposes to take to address the need for services for those South Australians who are infected by hepatitis C?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This is a very important question, because hepatitis C is an insidious disease that is allegedly taking a greater profile. As members would be aware, it is a blood-borne disease caused by a virus, historically being transmitted from person to person by needle sharing, drug use or, indeed, by transfusion involving contaminated blood products. That is a particular dilemma that I will deal with in a minute.

Referring to the transfusion risks, I am pleased to say that the tests done on blood samples for transfusion have become much more specific in relation to hepatitis C. Indeed, as recently as 1991, the test for hepatitis C in blood products was about 85 per cent specific. In other words, 85 per cent of the contaminated positive HIC clients were identified. As of June 1994, that specificity has risen to 99 per cent. It is

clearly much greater and hence the risks of transfusion are decreased.

However, of course, in talking about transfusion, many people are suffering from haemophilia who have been subjected to risks over and above those of the actual disease, which, of course, can be debilitating in itself. In fact, about 70 per cent of haemophilia sufferers in South Australia have contracted hepatitis C from factor 8 transfusion. As we have about 150 haemophilia carriers, roughly 100 of them are hepatitis C positive. I have to emphasise that that is as a result of blood transfusions prior to the great increase in specificity of the blood testing. Nevertheless, it is an absolute tragedy. I think it is fair to say that it is a tragedy with which everyone has a great deal of empathy.

The Health Commission has established a technical advisory committee comprising representatives from the Health Commission, the Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service, IMVS, which is obviously involved in testing, and so on. Of course, the dilemma with the spread of hepatitis C is that, because it has a spectre, if you like, of progressing to a chronic disease—and I believe that about 20 per cent of sufferers who have chronic hepatitis C end up with liver failure—there is obviously a demand for counselling, for further investigation and for therapy as we know it at the moment.

As part of the recognition of that need, the Health Commission is to appoint a full-time senior project officer to plan a coordinated State response to the risks and demands imposed by hepatitis C. That office will work with the Communicable Diseases Control Unit, the Drug and Alcohol Services Council, Red Cross, IMVS and, obviously, the Haemophilia Association itself. It is a terrible entity in itself, but obviously for sufferers of haemophilia (as a disease process) and their families, to have such a sword of Damocles hanging over them is, quite frankly, unacceptable, and hence the action the Health Commission is to take.

PUBLIC SECTOR WAGE FREEZE

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): I direct my question to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Does the Government now accept that its State public sector wage freeze is now dead thanks to an order from the Australian Industrial Relations Commission that the Government must negotiate in good faith, and does he accept that he was delaying enterprise bargaining in breach of the Government's stated position?

Last week the South Australian Government became the first employer in Australia to be ordered to negotiate in good faith by the Federal commission after it was found it had prevented SACON management from pursuing enterprise bargaining negotiations. Such good faith bargaining cannot take place with an arbitrary wage freeze imposed by the Brown Government. The Minister has continually portrayed himself as a champion of—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The honourable—

Mr CLARKE: —enterprise bargaining yet he is ordering managers—

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule the question out of order. The honourable member continued to speak whilst the Chair was calling order.

WASTE TRANSFER STATIONS

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Can the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources advise the House whether anything is being done by his department to establish policies containing recommended buffer distances between residential properties and waste transfer stations?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I know of the concerns of the member for Lee and a number of his constituents regarding the proposed waste transfer station at Royal Park. As that matter is *sub judice*, at present being before the Environment, Resources and Development Court, I am not in a position to comment. However, I am aware that the broader issue involving the recommending of buffer distances between residential properties and industry, including waste transfer stations, is a matter of concern throughout South Australia.

It is important that, in opening up South Australia for business and encouraging development in our State, we do so in an ecologically sustainable way, which will require us always to consider not only the economic but also the environmental and social consequences of these decisions. It is important that the quality of life of existing residents is not unreasonably interfered with by industrial development being placed too close. There are many examples of where, as a result of poor planning in the past, that is a problem. Equally, it is important that the ability of industries to operate effectively and efficiently is not unreasonably interfered with by allowing residential properties to be placed too close to them.

My department is actively involved in encouraging and facilitating development within our State that is ecologically sustainable. As part of that process, the Office of the Environment Protection Authority is developing a number of environment protection policies under the Environment Protection Act 1993 to provide clear direction on appropriate environmental standards. One such policy that has been developed will include recommended buffer distances for a number of activities of environmental significance, including waste depots. Those policies when finalised will be brought into effect following the proclamation of the Environment Protection Act. I understand the concerns of the member for Lee, and I thank him for his question, which I am sure is of interest not only to him and his constituents but to everyone in this Parliament.

SUPERANNUATION

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Treasurer give a guarantee that no changes will be made to the benefits or contribution rates currently applying to existing members of the old State and police lump sum and pension superannuation schemes?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: That issue was raised within the Audit Commission. The Audit Commission suggested that there should be some realignment of the contribution rates for the old pension schemes, and that matter is being examined.

ADELAIDE CROWS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Is the Premier aware of what economic and other benefits the Adelaide Crows generate for South Australia?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I realise that the member for Mawson is a keen follower of the Crows, as are many thousands of other South Australians.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: If the honourable member opposite is a traitor to the Crows, be that on his head, but there are many thousands of supporters of the Crows. The Crows have been good for South Australia; they have brought a lot of new economic activity to the State, and they have attracted a large number of people for AFL football matches. When AFL matches are played in Adelaide it is amazing to see so many interstate visitors, particularly from Victoria. Of course, the Crows have also put South Australian football on the Australian map. I think they have performed superbly to lift the morale of South Australians at various times during this season, and last season in particular.

Crows outfits have become a major retail item available through a large number of retail outlets. So, the Crows have been good for this State. Graham Cornes, as their coach and as a former player, has become for many small boys an idol. With the Crows experiencing a down period at present, it is unfortunate that many South Australians want to knock them. It is a bit like members opposite who knock anything that moves—they have even tried to knock the Crows this afternoon—when what South Australians should be doing is getting behind them despite their current down period. The public should be backing the Crows and making sure that they win against the Brisbane Bears this weekend.

PORT ADELAIDE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: The bags are packed. Can the Minister—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Custance to order.

Mr FOLEY:—say when the Government intends to start construction of the proposed new Port River crossing and light rail service to Port Adelaide as outlined today by him in his \$450 million 'Port revamp plan'? In a report released today by the Minister to the *Advertiser*, it is stated that a third river crossing at the Port River is necessary to enable the \$450 million redevelopment of Port Adelaide. However, in a letter I have received from the Minister for Transport regarding this matter, she states:

The allocation of funds for such an expensive project is not expected to be possible for some time.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: As I announced earlier today, the report published in the *Advertiser* this morning is the Woods Bagot Report into the Revitalisation of the Port Adelaide Area. The Government has a particular interest in this report and I, as the Minister for Urban Development, have a particular interest in the urban renewal of the port as far as it involves housing, bringing people back to the district, commercial development, development associated with the heritage precinct, and the like.

As members opposite know, when you ask consultants to devise a total conceptual plan for a district you accept the reports they give you and evaluate them as a total concept. That is what has happened in this case: the Government has received the Woods Bagot report and is evaluating it. It should be borne in mind that such reports are written by people who are supposed to have vision. While members opposite may not have vision, when we go through the

Woods Bagot report and examine its proposals—it may be down the track; bear in mind they are proposing a 10 year time frame—we may find some value in some of them. We are looking at the matter from an urban development point of view. There are some marvellous opportunities for this State, and members who represent that district would appreciate that the Woods Bagot report contains some tremendous opportunities which we do not want to lose.

I will evaluate the whole of the report from cover to cover. We have had the report for only a couple of days, but if there is any value in any of the proposals we will look at them in great detail. It is a five to 10 year report which will be initiated this Saturday when I put out tenders for the first project, the Harborside Quay development, which I hope will become the catalyst for the redevelopment of the whole of the Port Adelaide district. Members opposite have homed in on the bridge in question and the transport facilities proposed by Woods Bagot. While those proposals have been put forward by Woods Bagot, they do not, as yet, have any status whatsoever other than as part of the total proposal, which we are evaluating.

If members opposite are knocking the report at this stage—and no doubt in Question Time in a fortnight's time they will have gone through the report and will continue to knock it—then I say they are out of kilter with the vast majority of South Australians, who are asking people to come forward with ideas that will help us go forward in the future. This volume is full of ideas, and I think everyone should evaluate it carefully to see what we can get out of it for the benefit of Port Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson is out of order.

CRIME PREVENTION

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I table the ministerial statement on crime prevention made by the Attorney-General in another place.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I wish to draw to the attention of the House the lack of information for new truck licence holders. I was recently approached by Mr David Norton, a driving instructor at Gawler, who made me aware of how little information is given out to new truck licence holders. The road traffic code booklet is given to people when they receive their licence from the Motor Vehicle Registration Department, but when you look through that booklet there are only two references to trucks: the gross vehicle weight of trucks and what particular trucks can carry; and the speed at which trucks are allowed to travel on the open road and within a built up area. It gives very little information to new licence holders on the operation of their truck or articulated motor vehicle.

The Australian Truck Drivers Manual is available to new licence holders for their information, albeit at a cost of

\$13.50, and this covers all aspects of truck operations. It is a good publication, and was first proposed by Mr Ken Briggs of the South Australian Road Transport Industry and Training Committee. By comparison, immediately on their obtaining a truck driver's licence, VicRoad supplies to every new licence holder a copy of the VicRoad bus and truck drivers handbook. It is an exceptionally good book, provided free of charge to new licence holders. It covers such things as: the law relating to truck drivers; driver health and safety; vehicle inspection for truck drivers; controlling the vehicle on the road; communications and safe speed; vehicle emergencies; crashes; and heavy vehicle signs, as well as coupling and uncoupling of trailers.

The book is extremely good because it gives tips to drivers, especially new drivers, on the way they should operate their rig, and also gives them the dimensions for loading. It sets any new driver up to know the dangers involved in loading a truck and trailers, and the weights that apply over both axles, both in Victoria and in other States of Australia. It also goes into the communication and safe speed of truck drivers' operation and gives them hints on overtaking at different times and on different road conditions; on parking on the side of the road and the dangers aligned with that; on the use of hazard lights for truck drivers; and guidelines as to what drivers should do when a truck becomes disabled either during the day or at night. I will be passing a copy of this booklet to the Minister for Transport. I believe it is an extremely good booklet that should be delivered free of charge to all licence holders of trucks, as it gives them very good information on the operation and safety of operation of their truck.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): In a question this afternoon from the member for Newland to the Deputy Premier, representing the Attorney-General, some material that was apparently on a television program last night, which I had the pleasure of seeing, was circulated in here and some allegations made. The Deputy Premier, in his usual oafish way, suggested that a letter would be sent with these allegations to the Electoral Commissioner. I have no problem with that. I would like to put a few other things under his arm as well, so that he is balanced when he goes up there. In a moment I shall return to the story of one candidate in Playford and, if some members opposite would like, I will mention a few other people around here as well. It is sufficient to say at this stage that we will dollop this out in small doses as we go along. I received from my good friend the member for Hart a note that reads as follows:

Dear John,

Please remember Roger Hayes, Liberal Party candidate for Albert Park in 1989. Three weeks before the last State election he appeared in Hart as an Independent candidate directing preferences straight to the Liberal candidate.

That is fair enough, but the next bit is even more interesting. It reads:

He even used his 1989 Liberal Party posters with an Independent sticker plastered over the word 'Liberal'.

We are used to some people in here who start out as Liberals and eventually get in here as Independents or, more precisely, people who start out as Independents and get in here as Liberals. The member for Hanson started his political career with the Call to Australia Party, as I understand, and the member for Lee ran for the Majority Wishes Party. But the majority did not wish—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr ROSSI: I object to the honourable member in regard to his statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot object. He can raise a point of order but he cannot object.

Mr QUIRKE: I have finished with him for now: maybe next week. Out in Playford a fellow ran at the last election on an Independent platform and, when we went for the rolling of the marbles and took out the names and the position on the ballot paper, I saw the name of Lionel Owen. I had met him before. He was a constituent and I had had to speak to him about a constituency matter that afternoon, but I had done it on the telephone and did not know him personally. When I spoke to him that afternoon he said that he was running in the election, he was very keen, and he wanted to put the issue of gun ownership and all that stuff on the agenda. That was fine: I had no problem.

Then he went on to say that he would discuss preferences with me at some stage, and I said 'That's interesting.' Of course, that was the end of it. He came back two days after the election and told me he had signed a secrecy provision with Graham Morris of the Liberal Party who funded his election material all the way through, and he said he could not tell me any more because he had signed a secrecy agreement.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr QUIRKE: He did that within earshot of two other persons. He said that Graham Morris had signed a secrecy agreement with him for the production of his electoral material.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mawson.

Mr QUIRKE: That is why he gave his preferences to the Liberal Party of Australia: because it paid for his campaign. But he did not want to talk about it any further. I have never raised the issue but, if the Deputy Premier wants to go to the Electoral Commissioner, we will make the trip worth his while.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I wish to speak about something that has much more substance, that is, the issue of the—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know whether you heard it, but the honourable member opposite imputed improper motives to me across the Chamber, and that is quite wrong. If he has something to say in this Chamber about Unley or any other seat, let him say it according to the rules.

The SPEAKER: To which member is the honourable member referring?

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Playford, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Can the member for Unley advise the Chair of the words that he believes are unparliamentary?

Mr BRINDAL: He imputed improper motives with respect to the electoral process for the electorate of Unley. He said, 'We have Unley on our list, and that will come next', or words to that effect.

The SPEAKER: Order! Unless the member for Unley can be precise in relation to the alleged impropriety, the Chair cannot ask for a withdrawal.

Mr BRINDAL: He said, 'Unley will be next on the list'.

The SPEAKER: The Chair cannot uphold that point of order, because it is the view of the Chair that those words are not unparliamentary.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that the member for Mitchell did not receive a fair go and, in any event, I did not hear you call him. I ask that a full five minutes be allocated to him.

The SPEAKER: Unfortunately, the honourable member had commenced his remarks, so the time must proceed despite the fact that points of order were taken and considered.

Mr CAUDELL: I wish to speak on the subject of the Industry Assistance Commission Draft Report into Petroleum Products. Today I approached the Premier in relation to the recommendations of the Industry Assistance Commission Draft Report on Petroleum Products. The report recommended total deregulation of the industry with no controls over pricing of products. History lessons of oil companies ignored, lessons from years of manipulation of markets have been disregarded. The final report was presented to Mr Gear, acting for and on behalf of the Federal Treasurer, for release on 6 July. To date it has not been released. I have asked the Premier to call on the Commonwealth to ensure that, with deregulation, effective controls are put in place.

Should the Commonwealth ignore the call to discuss the issue and proceed with the report recommendations, I will ask the Premier to call a conference of all State Governments to ensure the following: first, transparency of petrol pricing; secondly, implementation of terminal gate pricing in Australia (and in South Australia we would have terminal gate pricing in Adelaide, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Whyalla and Mount Gambier) and, thirdly, the ability of service stations to contract a legally qualified vehicle to pick up the product, which would effectively reduce petrol costs to all consumers immediately.

The oil companies now decide what street and what town benefits from discount fuel. Whilst Marion Road sells fuel at 66¢ a litre, Noarlunga sells it at 72¢, Port Augusta at 74¢ and Ceduna as high as 80¢. This pricing disparity is due to selective marketing by oil companies, and this would not improve under the IAC's recommendations. Under a transparent terminal gate price, prices in South Australia could be effectively up to 10¢ a litre cheaper.

The IAC report ignores certain facts. Due to oil industry selective pricing policies the following apply:

- most consumers are paying 15-20¢ per litre more than others in the discount cycle.
- based on a Victorian Government report, only 30 per cent of consumers now receive the benefit of cheaper fuel. Based on experience it can be reasonable to assume that a similar percentage is applicable to South Australia.

The IAC's report believes that its recommendations will reduce costs and bring benefits to consumers. Unfortunately, its conclusions do not allow for the lessons of the past. I once again confirm that I have requested the Premier to speak to the Commonwealth and ask that in conjunction with deregulation the Commonwealth implement an Australia-wide policy which includes, first, transparency of petrol pricing; and, secondly, one category pricing availability for all service stations so that all consumers can benefit from cheaper petrol.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): My contribution today relates to the support for our excellent universities in South Australia: Adelaide, Flinders and the University of South Australia, indeed all our educational institutions. In my Address in

Reply contribution on 3 August, I talked about having a vision for the future for South Australia. I talked about the analogy of our aiming to become the Switzerland of the south, about emphasising our diversity and using it as our strength. I compared our excellence in education and medicine, and the fact that we are a multicultural country, having the benefits of multiculturalism at work. Channel 10 reported the comparison in a light hearted way, and I thank them for it.

I believe that we are underselling ourselves as a State. The future does not look very bright if the universities, on which we depend for providing that future, are not supported. The recent report provided to the Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training (Simon Crean) proposes a reduction in the number of university places in South Australia. This is of great concern to me. I asked the following question in the House last Tuesday:

Has the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education seen a report provided to his Federal counterpart. . . ?

As the Minister outlined in his reply, there is much concern about that sort of proposal, because it would damage our excellent institutions in South Australia. As I said, the future really depends on the support that we give these excellent institutions in South Australia. The universities have done a lot in promoting excellence. I example the School of Manufacturing and Mechanical Engineering at the Levels campus of the University of South Australia. The links with other educational institutions and other countries afford valuable platforms for the State to bounce back and provide a future not only for us but for our children and grandchildren. We cannot be treated by the Federal Government as plain numbers, with suggestions that there be no further support for placements but that there be a shift to other States. We cannot afford to do that.

South Australia needs the continuing support of the Federal Government to promote our excellent tertiary institutions. I know that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who is on the council of the University of South Australia with me, would agree. I can see that members opposite—

An honourable member: The member.

Mr SCALZI: The member for Hart (which is very close to Hartley) agrees with me that we must have a bipartisan approach, support our tertiary institutions and protest at any moves by the Federal Government to reduce funding that will decrease the number of places in tertiary institutions in South Australia. If we are to have a future, we must have a trampoline: we must have a bouncing platform to promote South Australia. We have done a lot of good work and we are heading in the right direction. I urge all members of this House, regardless of the Party they represent, to have that bipartisan approach and to protest strongly to Federal members of Parliament to ensure that that takes place.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I refer to a very important issue that affects not only my electorate but the economic development of the State. Before doing so, I will briefly touch on a comment made by the Premier during Question Time: he deeply offended me when he referred to me as being treacherous because I am not a supporter of the Crows. I must admit to not being a wholehearted supporter of the Crows: I am a one-eyed supporter and Vice-President of the Port Adelaide Football Club. The member for Mackillop and I are bound not to support the Crows but we support Port Adelaide's bid for the second AFL licence. I want it on the record that it is

offensive to refer to me as being treacherous. I am only being loyal to my constituents and to the club that I have supported all my life—Port Adelaide.

I now refer to other major issues concerning Port Adelaide, first, the release today by the Government of the Woods Bagot report into the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. I want it on the record that I support the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. I welcome the report and I will be a constructive player in all the works that the Government does to bring this project to fruition. However, I need to make a few observations. There has been much written and said about the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. Much has been put into the public arena about what Port Adelaide needs and how the Port Adelaide area should be redeveloped. The time now is the time of action. No longer is the tabling of reports or the release of inquiries sufficient. What we need in Port Adelaide is some action, and I can only hope that the Government backs up its commitment to this report not just with words but with dollars, physical support and a supportive approach.

There are many points associated with the redevelopment of Port Adelaide, but the most significant is the third river crossing. I alluded to that in a question in the House today. The need for a third river crossing is paramount. It is important for the redevelopment of Port Adelaide and also for the constituents of my electorate. As this Government follows through with the former Government's plans for the transport hub proposal, we are seeing a rapidly expanding number of vehicles and heavy trains using the Le Fevre Peninsula. In doing so, they are causing intolerable transport flows through my electorate and the City of Port Adelaide. What we need is a commitment from the Government to build a third river crossing. I am realistic. I do not expect the Treasurer to commit to this project tomorrow or, for that matter, in the next 12 months.

I call on the Government to put forward a capital works program that clearly identifies the third river crossing for Port Adelaide. If we are to have an efficient flow of transport through our expanded container terminal at Port Adelaide, we must have a more rapid mode of transport and improved infrastructure. That can be delivered only by a third river crossing. I am talking about a very important piece of economic infrastructure. What do I get from members opposite? I get the continued, ridiculous and ill-informed abuse that we have become accustomed to.

Members opposite are incapable of debating an economic issue. They do not have a grasp of economics and the need for economic development. If I have to come into this Chamber and preach to members opposite about what is necessary for economic development, I will take on that burden. There are many ill-informed members opposite—many of whom are sitting on the backbench and most of whom are in the Chamber now. I call on them to stand with me in supporting the redevelopment of Port Adelaide and the improvement of the economic infrastructure within Port Adelaide, and in committing this Government. I call on the member for Unley—he is so influential within this Cabinet—to say to the Deputy Premier—

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I will take the point of order.

Mr BRINDAL: I believe that the honourable member opposite alleged that I was a member of Cabinet. He said I was 'so influential within this Cabinet'. I remind the honourable member that I am not a member of the Cabinet.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member's point of order was frivolous and ill-befitting a Crows supporter. The member for Hanson.

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Today I want to focus on a minority splinter Party holding South Australia to ransom. You may think that it is the Labor Party: that is not so, even though it has 11 members in the House of Assembly. Perhaps its time as a minority Party will come later. I am referring to another bunch called the Australian Democrats. For over 40 years this nation has had minor Parties and Independents in Parliament including some Independents who have given outstanding service. We can go back to 1954 when, through a massive split in the ALP, we had the formation of the Democratic Labor Party, the DLP. It became an upper House minority Party—a coalition Party—until it was wiped out in the 1975 general election of Mr Fraser versus Mr Whitlam.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEGGETT: They were officially gone in 1975. The Australian Democrats emerged in the late 1970s: I am sure the member for Spence will know the date. It was called 'Chipp's Party'—a promise by Mr Chipp to keep the major Parties honest. Honest my foot! Here in South Australia we have a State controlled by two members of the Australian Democrats in the other place. Effectively the whole of this Parliament comes under their spell. Their policies are as weak as their membership—insipid and empty both economically and certainly socially. One could say that about the Labor Party also.

A classic example was Cheryl Kernot, the Leader of the Australian Democrats in the Senate, stating, according to the *Advertiser* of 8 August, that she wants to see gay relationships recognised in an ACTU family leave test case. I will leave it at that. The Australian Democrats should be called the 'two bob each way' Party. At the State election they won less than 8 per cent of the State vote. That was not much less than the vote some of the Labor Party members got in some of their seats. It was 73 051 votes that they obtained.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEGGETT: You went to preferences. It was .96 of a quota. In city and rural seats in the House of Assembly the average vote for the Democrats was around 7.7 per cent or thereabouts. This proves beyond all doubt, even to the most politically naive, that this insipid bunch (not this one over here, although they are insipid), the Australian Democrats, is not the voice of the people of South Australia. The people overwhelmingly indicated who they wanted their voice to be in the South Australian Parliament. It was not the Labor Party or the Australian Democrats but the Liberal Party of South Australia. That was proven with 37 to 10 members in the House of Assembly and, tragically, through the death of Joe Tiernan, that was reduced to 36 to 11 members.

Where are the Democrats in the Lower House? They are zero and they always will be. Janine Haines proved that the Australian Democrats could not win a Lower House seat after her ill-fated attempt to win the seat of Kingston federally. The people of this State overwhelmingly voted for a Government with a huge mandate—the Liberal Party and its policies. Enter the Australian Democrats—all two of them. On pre-election legislation proposed by the new Brown Government, we saw opposition from the Australian Democrats. They effectively opposed and successfully blocked optional voting legislation. They forced changes to the industrial relations legislation and to WorkCover. They forced the legislation to be watered down and, as a result, changes had to be made. In

the public sector, they continued to threaten the Government's debt reduction strategy and will continue to do so, which also includes their opposition to the superannuation legislation. They blatantly ignore the key policies for which this Government has a huge mandate given to it by the people of South Australia.

The two Australian Democrats got less than 8 per cent of public support. When they finally got in, it was due to some of the hillbilly people supporting them—the small groups who should have been in a home for the bewildered years before. They continue to hold back reform that is so important for the rebuilding of this State.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LIVING RESOURCES

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the resolution from the House of Assembly relating to evidence and documents presented to the committee without amendment.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (PRIVATE MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The operation and infrastructure management of correctional services cost the community approximately \$89 million in 1993-94. The cost of provision of correctional services in South Australia is, per prisoner, the highest in the country, a fact referred to by the Commonwealth Grants Commission and the recent Audit Commission Report.

In order to reduce costs, the Audit Commission recommended the outsourcing of selected services provided by the Correctional Services Department, for example, the operation and management of prisons, prison industries, catering, maintenance of buildings, administration of Community Correction Orders, prisoner transport, hospital watches and the dog squad.

The Audit Commission also recommended that a new prison be constructed and managed by the private sector. The Government is committed to increasing the cost effectiveness of correctional services, and there is much Australian and international evidence to suggest that competition in correctional services stimulates dramatic improvement in the quality and cost effectiveness of service provision. Outsourcing and private management of prisons also provides a benchmark against which to measure the delivery of Government services.

The Government believes that increased competition through the outsourcing of selected correctional services will direct attention to the real costs of providing services through the public sector (including the costs of capital, legal advice, insurance, transport and administration overheads) and expose subsidies and restrictive work practices.

Savings arising out of this competitive system will be applied to accommodating increased prisoner numbers, expanding existing services, creating new Government services and/or returning funds to reduce Government debt.

The Government also believes that increased involvement of the private sector in provision of Government services will lead to the transfer of technology and ideas between the public and private sectors of the economy and will introduce positive changes in public sector management culture.

The prison population is likely to increase by approximately 40 per cent by the Year 2000. The private sector can inject the capital

funds necessary to build new prisons and experience has shown that they can also provide new cells faster than the public sector and provide creditable management in correctional functions.

The outsourcing of correctional services is not a new phenomena. Prison services have been contracted out to the private sector in the Eastern States for a number of years. Currently Queensland has two private prisons, New South Wales has one, and Victoria recently announced the calling of tenders for the financing, design, construction and management of a new private prison. Two other private prisons are also planned in Victoria. Private prisons also operate successfully in the United States and Great Britain.

Prisoner services have also been outsourced in Australia. Victoria has recently awarded contracts for the management of prisoner transport, St Augustine's Security Ward, (St Vincent's Hospital), prisoner security at the Melbourne Supreme and County Courts and prisoner court transport services.

Private sector management has been introduced in Australia by a variety of political parties, including National, Labor and Liberal Governments. Australia's first private prison at Borallon was contracted by the Queensland National Party Government. The second, the Arthur Gorrie Remand Centre, was contracted by the Queensland Labor Government and the third, Junee Prison, by the New South Wales Liberal Government.

This Bill is necessary to give the Government the ability to contract out correctional services in a manner that both protects the Government and Offenders. The Bill details conditions to which contractors must adhere. It enables employees of private management bodies to perform the functions of prison officers within the scope of a contract, makes private managers accountable to the Minister and allows the Minister to supervise the operation of private prisons.

Contracts between the Government and private sector management bodies must deal with the following matters:

- minimum performance standards for management bodies and their employees.
- approval by the Chief Executive Officer of all employees of the management bodies who are to come in contact with prisoners.
- compliance by the management body and employees with directions given by the Chief Executive Officer.
- periodic submission to the Minister of reports and audited accounts.
- indemnity of the Crown by the management body.
- prohibition of devolution of responsibilities by the management body, or of changes to the control of a management body that is a body corporate, without the approval of the Minister.
- immediate access by the Chief Executive Officer to all prison premises and records.

The Bill reserves the right of the Chief Executive Officer to remove a prisoner from a privately managed prison and allows the Minister to enter and staff a private prison should that become necessary.

The Minister has power under the Bill to scrutinise proposed management bodies prior to contracting out services to them. The management body must be able to demonstrate that it is a reputable and credit worthy organisation and can meet the obligations detailed in the management agreement.

The provisions of the Part VII of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* are extended to management bodies and their employees to provide the same disincentives to corruption that apply to public officers. The operation of the *Ombudsman Act 1972* is also extended to administrative actions undertaken in private prisons.

A key feature of the legislation is the appointment of monitors by the Chief Executive Officer to ensure that all aspects of the Act and the management agreement are being complied with by the management body. Particulars of the work undertaken by monitors must be included in the Department's annual report. The function of monitors is similar to that of inspectors who are currently appointed under the Act to ensure that standards and instructions are being complied with in the existing prison system. Monitors will have free and unrestricted access to offender records and premises of institutions.

Another key feature of the Bill is that the Minister will have the power to order a management body out of a prison and provide emergency staff in the event of the management body failing to carry out its responsibilities.

This Bill, while preceding the handing down of the State Budget, is essential to the Budget process as savings through outsourcing and private sector management have been assumed when formulating the 1994/95 Correctional Services Budget.

The Correctional Services (Private Management Agreements) Amendment Bill 1994 makes a significant contribution toward ensuring a high standard of administration of, and cost effective management of, correctional services.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

This clause inserts definitions of "management body", "management agreement" and "monitor".

Proposed section 4(2) provides that certain employees of management bodies (e.g., prison staff) will, for the purposes of the Act, be taken to be employees of the Department for Correctional Services. One effect of this will be to extend to employees of management bodies the right to use reasonable force under section 86 of the Act.

Proposed section 4(3) provides that a reference to an employee of a management body includes an agent of the management body and the employee of an agent when acting within the authority granted by the management body.

Proposed section 4(4) defines which persons are persons in "positions of authority" in relation to a corporation for the purposes of the Act. This is relevant to the extension under proposed section 9C of the operation of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* and to proposed sections 9A and 9B which provide for scrutiny of persons in positions of authority in a management body prior to the execution of a management agreement.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 7—Delegation by Minister and Chief Executive Officer

This clause amends the delegation clause to provide that the Chief Executive Officer may, with the approval of the Minister, delegate his or her powers to an employee of a management body employed in a position of a prescribed class. Such delegations may be conditional.

Clause 4: Insertion of s. 7A—Commercial ventures

This clause gives the Minister the power to enter into commercial arrangements in relation to prison industries and products.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 9—Annual report of Chief Executive Officer

This clause provides that the annual report of the Department must include particulars of the monitoring of management agreements.

Clause 6: Insertion of Divisions 1A and 1B of Part 2

Proposed section 9A(1) provides that the Minister may enter into agreements for the management of prisons and for the carrying out of any other of the Department's functions.

Subsection (2) sets out the matters that must be dealt with in a management agreement.

Subsection (4) provides that the Minister must be satisfied that a proposed management body or its directors are fit and proper persons to be parties to a management agreement.

Proposed section 9B provides powers by which the Minister, Chief Executive Officer or Commissioner of Police may investigate proposed management bodies and their employees for the purpose of deciding if they are fit and proper persons, or whether to approve of them as employees.

Proposed section 9C provides that the offences relating to public officers in the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* (for example the offence of bribery or corruption of public officers) will apply to employees of management bodies as if they were public employees. The section also provides for the provisions of the *Ombudsman Act 1972* to apply to management bodies. Were it not for this section, prisoners in privately managed prisons would not be able to complain to the Ombudsman whereas their counterparts in public prisons could. Currently, prisoners may complain to the Ombudsman in relation to any administrative (as opposed to judicial) act.

Proposed section 9D provides ensures that the Chief Executive Officer retains the right to remove a prisoner from the custody of a management body at any time.

Proposed section 9E provides that, in a situation where a management body has, in the Minister's opinion, failed or is likely to fail to carry out its responsibilities, the Minister may order the management body's employees to leave the prison and may staff the prison with employees of the Department (including employees of another private management body). The Minister may also send in supplementary staff in the event of other emergencies, e.g. a riot, if of the opinion that the management body is not handling the situation properly. The Department's costs in taking action under this section may be recovered from the management body.

Proposed section 9F provides for the appointment and duties of Departmental monitors. Monitors will directly supervise the undertaking of management agreements and must report to the Chief Executive Officer. Particulars of the monitoring of management agreements must be included in the Department's annual report. Monitors have unfettered access to prison premises and documents, and may question prisoners and staff.

Proposed section 9G sets out the powers of monitors and authorised employees in exercising their functions or powers. A person hindering the activities of, or falsely representing themselves to be, an authorised employee or monitor is guilty of an offence and liable to a division 5 fine (\$8 000)

Clause 7: Substitution of section 85b

This clause provides that all persons operating under the Act (current clause 85B applies only to officers of the Department) must not disclose information relating to prisoners or their families or to victims of offences. The clause also increases the penalty for the offence of disclosure of information from a Division 7 fine (\$2 000) to a Division 5 fine (\$8 000).

Clause 8: Substitution of s. 86a

This clause provides that employees of the Department and of management bodies are to be indemnified from civil liability for their actions and that their employer is liable in their stead.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 88B—Evidentiary provision

This clause makes provision for evidentiary matters arising out of these amendments.

Clause 10: Statutes revision amendments

This clause allows for the schedule which makes several statute revision amendments of a non-substantive nature to the Act.

Mr FOLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

(Continued from page 196.)

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I have pleasure in supporting the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply to the speech by Her Excellency, Dame Roma Mitchell, on the opening Parliament on Tuesday 2 August in which she put forward proposed developments of the State Government for this coming session. I am very proud to be part of that Government which has, in such a short period, achieved so much. One of the greatest achievements has been the 7 200 full-time jobs created in South Australia between January and June 1994. We must applaud the Minister in being able to further boost jobs through encouraging such major companies as Motorola and Australis and with the advent of the Worrina tourism development and information technology.

One must not forget that the two major car manufacturers in South Australia, GMH and Mitsubishi, are now working overtime during the week and all day Saturday to try to meet export demand for their products. The quality of the Australian motor vehicle has come such an enormous way in the past 10 years that we are now able to compete on the world market. In the first five months of 1994, more than 3 500 inquiries were received about the Government's new rebuilding South Australia job creation program. It has led to the creation of 900 new jobs under the WorkCover subsidy program alone—one of six programs now available under this Government.

It has also led to: the creation of the Economic Development Advisory Board, under the chairmanship of Mr Ian Webber, which was set up to advise the Government on economic development (that has been a breath of fresh air, and I know that the next 3½ years will realise some enormous goals for this Government); the restructuring of the Economic Development Authority to bring it all under the one umbrella,

with the major agencies having the responsibilities for facilitating the business development; a new General Manager of Regional Development being appointed within the Economic Development Authority to oversee the stimulation of development in regional areas; the new exporters' challenge scheme to assist new exports entering overseas markets which, for the first time, has supported 27 small businesses in its first year; and the Government deregulation initiatives upgraded through the establishment of a Business Regulation Review Committee in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the appointment of a Director.

While driving to Parliament House on Wednesday, I heard that the Tuna Boat Fishermen's Association has now signed a contract to supply Japan with \$30 million worth of tuna over the next three years, and that is a great initiative. I was also impressed by the comments of the members of the Japanese business consortium visiting Adelaide who said that the thing that impressed them about this new export tuna industry was the cleanliness of preparation of the product, the immaculate way in which it was packed for export and the efficiency of the industry. This can only create new markets and further expansion of such enterprises for the State.

We have seen the wine industry encouraged by the Premier, who has been so supportive of that industry. Also into the next century we will see expansions within this industry that will bring enormous wealth to South Australia. Our products are now being recognised overseas. On recent trips, I have compared our products to French, German and American products, and I must say that I am very proud to think that I live in a State that produces such a premium quality product for all to enjoy but, more importantly, at an affordable price.

Of course, there have been developments in the area of tourism, and the Tourism Commission has been restructured. It is now much better placed to capitalise on future opportunities. The Government has initiated a vigorous program of marketing and infrastructure support to create a positive environment for the industry. A network of tourism marketing boards is being established to take over primary responsibilities for the promotion of regional tourism destinations.

The Council for International Trade and Commerce—and I was delighted to be invited by the Premier to attend this meeting—was launched on 28 July and now plays a very important and focal part in relation to Greenhill Road in that it carries the 20 international flags of all the representative Chambers of Commerce. Also I am of the strong belief that that business council and those chambers will promote bilateral trade relations with many nations from which migrants to South Australia have come. It is very important when we, as probably one of the greatest multicultural mixes of anywhere in the world, having something like 120 different countries represented in our State, let those people play a role in exporting our product from South Australia back to their country of origin. Of course, this initiative by the Premier is a national first, with 20 country and region specific Chambers of Commerce and business councils collocating in this new facility.

During the election campaign, I recall many people asking me, 'Why would you want to win Government at the next election when the State is in such financial difficulty?' I sat down to think about that, because I knew that the task ahead would not be an easy one. I reflected back some two years earlier when I was in Singapore and, as I was checking in to fly back to Adelaide, a person called Joh Bjelke-Petersen,

whom I had met on a number of occasions in my capacity as Lord Mayor, greeted me and told me that he was flying back to Adelaide and then on to Tasmania. Some 20 minutes later, when I was sitting in the lounge waiting for the departure of the aircraft, a Minister of the Government, Bob Gregory, also happened to be there waiting for the same flight to return to Adelaide. While waiting for our plane, we had a conversation for some 20 minutes.

It is ironic that, in a jumbo aircraft that had some 380 passengers on board, in business class who should be seated next to each other but Joh Bjelke-Petersen and Bob Gregory, who are the two most unlikely characters that one could ever hope to see sitting next to each other! After breakfast in the morning, Bob came to inform me that he thought that the old fellow sitting next to him had gone around the bend and was half silly. When I thought of that in the context of our winning the next election, I thought, 'Well, it wouldn't have been a bad idea if, in the Labor ranks, we had a few silly people like that running around,' because Joh left Wayne Goss with a surplus amount in the Treasury, and many other things on which Goss has now been able to capitalise. I read in the *Advertiser* the other day that, in fact—

Mr Brindal: Was it the *Advertiser* or the *Sunday Mail*?

Mr CONDOUS: No, the *Advertiser*—Wayne Goss this year was actually going to deliver a surplus budget. He can thank one person, and one person only, because Bjelke-Petersen left Queensland with the greatest tourism infrastructure in this country, and Goss has been able to capitalise on that. What I am trying to get at is this: here we are inheriting a debt of some \$8.4 billion, and we have been left with a State whose finances have been absolutely decimated. Members opposite are happy that we have won the election because they know that they did not have the gumption to carry out the required reforms to get South Australia up and running, and they wanted us to do the work that they were incapable of doing.

In the area of tourism, I ask members to look at the disasters, one after the other, of that period. In relation to Jubilee Point at Glenelg, I cannot say how disappointed I was not to see that development go ahead involving what I believe would have been one of the greatest marina developments in this country. Labor Government members lost it because of their incompetence. They lost the Wilpena Pound development. They could not do anything about negotiating a sensible deal for the Mount Lofty Ranges cable car. Kangaroo Island was another disaster. They lost the marina at Sellicks Beach, as well as the Worrina project, for which they are now criticising us, yet they could not do anything about it.

What happened to Zhen Yun and the Marineland development at West Beach? We had people carrying placards down there for over 12 months complaining that we could not put the porpoises anywhere else because they would die. In the end, we finished up shipping them to Marineland in Queensland. Not only did they survive but they bred and they are now playing an integral part in that State's tourism infrastructure. We lost the development. Zhen Yun then took the South Australian Government to court. However, they never got to court; they settled out of court. The former Government never told the people of South Australia what that mistake was worth in dollars, but I heard somewhere between \$8 million and \$13 million was the figure for their incompetence in trying to get a tourism project off the ground.

Where has the tramcar restaurant gone? That was another great initiative. The Minister in the other House at the time went along and cut the ribbon. They did not cooperate with

the developers of that project. When I asked the developers what was going on they told me that the Government was charging them some horrific amount of money for rental to get the tramcar on the line. The service has now been running successfully in Victoria for five or six years and we, who had a better tram and facility, have been embarrassed by not being able to operate one single tramcar restaurant on the line. It is sitting down at Morphettville doing absolutely nothing when it could be playing a very important role in our tourism industry.

Let us look at the Adelaide Airport upgrade. We have been told, but I think it bears repeating, that the Adelaide runway is 2 528 metres long, that Adelaide is the only gateway airport in Australia with a runway shorter than 3 200 metres, and that it cannot operate efficiently as an international gateway until the runway is extended.

I went to a meeting the other night, and thankfully the Minister for Tourism was there giving us great support, because those present all believed that the extension of the runway is the single most important project for the well-being of this State. I must say that the member for Hart came along to give us bipartisan support in objecting to the residents' stand and saying, in effect, 'I'm not going to play politics here tonight; I won't score points; I will support the Government because the extension of the runway is a very integral part of the development of this State.' And it is. The one thing that this State does very well is grow top quality, first-class produce such as our fruit, vegetables, flour and aquaculture products including oysters, abalone and tuna.

I was delighted to hear on Radio 1323 the other morning Keith Martin saying that a Cathay Pacific flight leaving Adelaide Airport *en route* to Hong Kong was carrying 22 500 kilos of premium quality tuna worth \$1.5 million. That is the sort of activity that this Government must support in the future, because our produce is in world demand. However, it is no good making our producers pay \$200 extra to have the freight transported to Melbourne and then to be sent to South-East Asian ports when we should really be competitive.

It is well known that some existing flights suffer payload penalties which commonly result in their leaving freight behind. Freight flights cannot operate viably to any destination from the present runway, and we stand no chance of achieving passenger flights into new destinations such as Tokyo, Taipei and Seoul until the runway is lengthened. The fact that no airline is presently planning flights from Adelaide to North Asian destinations is tragic. Those markets are the fastest growing in the world and we must plan the infrastructure required to serve them now. We have the product, it is the very best; and, of course, the extension must be built.

What amazes me is that at the weekend the Federal Treasurer, Mr Willis, told the Labor Party Convention in very clear terms that there was no way that the FAC had the finance to extend the runway. The only way that additional changes would be made at Adelaide Airport was if it were sold off and privatised. Yet, I saw the Leader of the Opposition on Sunday evening bumbling away and trying to substantiate the decisions that the left wing had made at that convention, when he honestly believes that privatising and selling the airport is the only chance that Adelaide has of achieving this extension. Members of the left are now going to Tasmania for the big national convention where they will flex their muscles to try to stop any privatisation of Australian airports. Nothing will happen to the airports until they are privatised.

I do not have any problems with privatising anything. In fact, in many instances Governments have become involved in businesses they should never have dipped their toes into and lost a lot of money, whereas private enterprise has the expertise and hands-on ability to make instant decisions to bring those projects to fruition.

Let us consider what happened last Monday, 8 August. A Qantas aircraft with 150 passengers arrived at 5 a.m. and because there was a wind of greater than 15 kilometres per hour it could not land because of the backward thrust necessary, causing greater noise than the curfew allowed. I do not have any problems with that, because I totally support the curfew and the constituents, who I believe deserve to know that between the hours of 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. they will not be disturbed. When the flight landed at 6 a.m. it took up the only telescopic walkway into the airport. A Singapore Airlines jumbo jet with 380 passengers arrived 20 minutes later, which meant that there were more than 500 incoming passengers. With a Garuda flight also landing only 20 or 30 minutes later, those passengers from the Singapore Airlines and Garuda flights were walking across the tarmac in a temperature of 3° and in constant rain to enter an international airport terminal.

We talk about wanting to promote tourism in this State and we have the lifeline—the airport—unable to provide a decent service. No other major airport in Australia has the disadvantages of Adelaide Airport. Members of the left wing will still argue that it should remain under the auspices of the Federal Government when they know that it is not even providing a decent facility for one of the greatest growth industries in this country.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: That's right. Even the Treasurer said that Adelaide Airport looks a little on the down side compared with most of the other capital city airports. All Federal Airports Corporation money is currently going into Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane, but the argument still goes on.

The environment is a very important issue in my electorate. In fact, after employment, the environment is one of the major issues in Colton. I was delighted to hear the Minister say today that we are starting to control the Patawalonga situation. The water that comes out of the Torrens flows naturally north and, therefore, the beaches at West Beach and Henley and Grange are the recipients of whatever flows into that area. I believe that something can be done.

I have looked at the situation involving the treatment of sewage at the Glenelg treatment works and I know that it currently serves a few reserves after the water has been treated and released to the sea. However, I believe that there is an opening now for the Glenelg treatment works, once the water is treated, to service all the major parks, reserves and the ovals in the Brighton, Glenelg, West Torrens, Henley and Grange and Woodville council areas.

This has a twofold effect. First, it reduces the amount of treated water going into the sea. However, in addition, instead of the councils having to pay 88¢ a kilolitre for fresh water—and, remember, this is the driest State on the driest continent—there is the possibility of paying half that amount to use that quantity of water. That is a very important factor.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: There are enormous possibilities to reduce the cost. Not enough councils have created wetlands adjacent to the Torrens River. We have 12 councils abutting the Torrens. The Henley and Grange council has done this in one particular area. I think it should be done in all areas

because, when you take an overall look at the whole area in conjunction with the Stormwater Catchment Authority, being able to create the wetlands will do three things. First, it will mitigate flash flooding of the area during a heavy downpour. Instead of pouring all the water out to sea, it can be caught in those wetlands. It will also improve water quality because after the rains rubbish and debris will be able to be removed before it is pumped into the Torrens. Then, if there is no necessity to pump it out because it can be held, the amount of water that is pumped into the Torrens will be reduced by allowing the water to soak through the surface and re-enter the watertable below. These are issues which the Minister is looking at and which will be addressed.

I would like to conclude by referring to two matters. The first concerns poker machines. I am very anti poker machines. When I was Lord Mayor I wrote to every member of Parliament urging them before they made any decision to go to Sydney and visit the Reverend Ted Noffs at the Wayside Chapel so that he could tell them of the consequences of poker machines on the fabric of the community. Obviously, the majority of members of the Labor Party who helped the legislation to go through were not concerned. Their main concern involved the \$50 million-odd that they believed they could make in a year.

From talking to traders in the Central Market area, my own little traders at West Beach and others, we have found that in the past two weeks there has been an enormous downturn in retail sales. You cannot pump a further \$13 million into poker machines and not expect people to take it from somewhere, because there is only a certain amount of disposable income. Of course, they cut down on food and clothing and put it into gambling and entertainment. It is a tragedy that our State has come to this. I, for one, would find it absolutely boring to sit in front of a poker machine for hours on end plying a few coins in an attempt to win money which, of course, the machine finishes up winning.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: That's right. Finally, I would like publicly to object to an editorial that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* last Sunday entitled 'Brown's backbenchers must stop rocking the boat.' I took exception to words such as 'a growing group of State Liberal backbenchers... emerging as a major embarrassment to South Australians'; 'They are becoming a serious hindrance to [the Premier]'; and '... badly behaved backbenchers who do not know their place in political life.' My commitment to the Premier is 100 per cent. I would never question his reforms to try to put South Australia back on track. I believe that what he is doing is the only way, and even though some of our decisions are harsh the community supports us, because it knows that unless we institute these measures we will be in trouble and our children may never have a future or a role to play in the development of our community. The article in the *Sunday Mail* states further:

Today, the *Sunday Mail* speaks out on behalf of the electorate to condemn [the members].

Who gave the *Sunday Mail* the mandate to speak on behalf of the people of South Australia? The final sentence of this article tells me that I should not act in self-interest or for personal promotion but in the best interests of the Party, the Government and my constituents. My constituents should come first. The Premier made quite clear last week when asked by the member for Ross Smith whether he would

discipline his backbench—he was referring to me especially for putting my point of view regarding shopping hours—that in this Party, the Liberal Party, we have a basic philosophy, and that is that individuals have a fundamental right to vote according to how they believe they should vote.

I take exception to the fact that this editorial—I do not know who wrote it; it may have been the Editor himself—has attempted to interfere with my responsibilities and prerogative rights as a member of Parliament. That is the first point I would like to make. Secondly, the writer uses the words 'crude threat to cross the floor'. The deliberate use of the prerogative objective 'crude' is defamatory and designed to inflame public opinion against me. I presented to this House a petition on behalf of 55 111 South Australians. They were relying on me to put across their objection to Sunday trading. I would have been seen in the eyes of those people as having let them down if I had not followed the democratic process and pushed their point of view.

When I feel strongly about an issue, when I know the people of South Australia are concerned and they ask me to act on their behalf, I know the Premier will give me the right to stand up and have my say on what I think is right for those people. I did not come into this House to earn a salary; I came here because I wanted to achieve. I am not going to lose my dignity and self-esteem by capitulating to rubbish that is printed in the *Sunday Mail*. I would rather be able to go out of here with my dignity, as Steve Condous, a respected member of the community. I will not succumb to the rubbish that is printed in the *Sunday Mail*, which does not even deserve to be bought for \$1.10.

Mrs HALL (Coles): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Before I proceed with my address in reply today and refer to some specific issues, I would like to refer specifically to the accusations made earlier today by the member for Playford. He asserted that Mr Graham Morris, the then Director of the Liberal Party, was involved in funding a gun lobby candidate for the seat of Playford at the last election. I understand that Mr Morris has been contacted and says he wishes it to be recorded in this House that it is absolute rubbish and a shoddy attempt by the honourable member to divert attention from the corrupt practices of the ALP and Mr Duncan. Mr Morris challenges the member for Playford to repeat such accusations outside the House where he does not enjoy the protection of the House. These are quite serious allegations, and Mr Morris obviously has a good reputation to protect.

Today, I would like to talk about the issue of change: changes that are already taking place in South Australia and some changes I would like to see in the future. Many of my colleagues have already referred to significant gains that have been made in terms of investment decisions of this Government, such as the wonderful Gerard Industries \$20 million-odd expansion; the most exciting Wirrina tourist project, which the ALP is continually criticising; investments by Motorola and Australis; the exciting project for Port Adelaide announced by the Minister today; and the \$30 million tuna industry contract.

One investment decision that is of great interest to my electorate of Coles is the exciting \$10 million-odd redevelopment of the historic Penfolds Magill Estate. This project, which is to be completed by the end of next year, will provide impressive tourist facilities for visitors who are attracted to our State, which we all know is the home of our world acclaimed Grange Hermitage. We all acknowledge that these

are important achievements of the new Liberal Government. In addition to these and the ever growing list of investments that we are going to see in South Australia, the Government has moved on industrial relations reforms. It has abolished compulsory unionism, and we have now moved into the era of workplace agreements and enterprise bargaining.

Following the theme of change and, I hope, a new culture of confidence in South Australia, I refer to comments made by the Premier recently when he launched the Council for International Trade and Commerce in South Australia. I quote in part, as follows:

The flags of 18 participating chambers and the South Australian flag now fluttering out there on Greenhill Road are a most potent symbol that the focus of South Australia is changing. It is globally orientated, it is world competitive, it has a strong role to play in world markets. The flags are also a compelling symbol of the strength of our multicultural community and a recognition of the importance of language and culture skills in developing international business networks. There are currently 32 country and region specific chambers of commerce and business councils operating in South Australia.

All these changes are signs of how we are drawn inexorably into the world scene. There is no greater example of this than the daily assessment of our economy by the world market. Australia, as we know, is now moving out of recession and running headlong into the problems associated with growth. It seems strange that world financial markets turn so quickly from the problems of recession to those of prospective inflation. Why should share markets rise so rapidly at the prospect of growth and then retreat when growth is achieved? It seems extraordinary. Despite being at the whims of international speculators, we in South Australia must ensure that we are part of the growth of the Australian economy, that business activity increases and that the dividend is an increase in jobs.

Of course, our path to prosperity in South Australia is littered with the economic corpses of the previous Labor Government. I have no doubt that we will be well aware of the failings of the previous Administration when we consider the budget to be brought down on 25 August. That document must lay out the plan for South Australia's future, and we all know we must move forward. My thinking about prosperity and success and how to achieve both have been inspired by a recent visit to Roxby Downs. The Minister for Mines and Energy and the Government's backbench Mines and Energy Committee had the opportunity recently to view first-hand the Olympic Dam operation.

Olympic Dam has grown into an enormous leading international mining and processing operation, producing 66 000 tonnes of refined copper per year, 1 400 tonnes of uranium ore concentrate, 20 000 ounces of gold and 400 000 ounces of silver. The 850 strong work force lives in a model community of about 2 500. These figures are impressive, and they will look better still in about 10 years. It is probable, in fact, that they will double. The world of Roxby Downs and Olympic Dam is dominated by growth, expectation, development, pride and success. It provides a stark contrast to what has previously been the norm in greater metropolitan Adelaide. In Roxby Downs the prevailing attitude is positive. These are definitely not people who see the future merely as a series of obstacles to be overcome: they see a future full of opportunity and achievement.

The town and community are built on pride and performance that has been so often missing in the rest of South Australia. South Australians might take Roxby for granted, but it has been a theme, an issue and a project since the

Tonkin Government had to overcome Labor's opposition to its establishment in 1981. However, if the spirit and culture of confidence that runs Roxby can prevail in the boardrooms of Adelaide, South Australia will swing out of those problems left by Labor in record breaking time.

A week or so before my visit to Roxby I was lucky enough to spend some days in Colorado in the United States. Despite the many problems in America, no visitor can fail to be impressed by the positive attitude of Americans, whether running large enterprises or clearing tables in restaurants. American people look immediately at the positives of most proposals. It is a real 'can do' approach that contrasts much too often with Australians, who look at the negatives and kill off projects of merit before they have even begun.

The purpose of my trip to America was to visit the as yet unopened new Denver International Airport. This is a colossal and impressive \$3.1 billion project. It is a green field site on a large area of land, designed to handle ultimately 1.2 million aircraft operations annually. The main terminal is 1.4 million square feet in area, covered by a huge atrium roof of stressed plastic fabric 126 feet high. There are 15 000 parking spaces. The total area of the airport is 53 square miles, and there are five 12 000 foot runways ready for the opening, while others will be built to bring the number to 12 for early next century when the airport will be completed.

The Americans are not shy about self promotion. This airport project is really about the twenty-first century. I could go on describing this project, which clearly has impressed me, and members might think that it has little to do with air transport in South Australia, when Adelaide Airport does not even have a full sized runway, as we have heard so many times during this debate. If members think that, they are wrong. Denver's new airport is a local project. It was inspired and promoted by the people and leaders of Denver. Its mayor has said:

I am enormously proud of our collective achievements and I look forward to working together to make this airport the finest in the world.

Why cannot we in Adelaide set our goals to make our international airport the best in the world? The construction of the new Denver airport was made possible with the support of many local people, local companies and organisations along with Government agencies, who came together to make it happen. The cooperative effort of all these groups, through the mayor's office to the many construction contractors, has enabled the vision to come to life. While there is Federal money as part of the funding of the Denver airport, it is a local concept with a great deal of local money invested. Let us contrast this with how South Australians have been served thus far. Our airports are owned by the Federal Airports Corporation, which believes that the extension of the runway here is not economically viable.

How do you like that, Mr Deputy Speaker? There speaks the voice of the Eastern States. They have not asked us for an opinion about the airport's viability: the decision was made by the powers-that-be in the east. It is ludicrous that local industries that depend on our airport for tourists or the export of our produce should have the decisions made about air transport by people in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. It is also ludicrous that in 1994 Adelaide is the only capital city in this country not to have aerobridges at our domestic terminal and to have just one aerobridge at the international facility. So many speakers on our side have raised that in the past week or so.

It is just not acceptable. The first impression of our visitors must not be that of a city that somehow lacks sophistication, because our city and our State do have an elegant sophistication—but, unfortunately, once we leave the air terminal. A personal view, while still on the subject of our airport, is that we should be adventurous and futuristic in our upgrade. The domestic and international terminals should be under one roof. Together such a terminal would be welcoming to both interstate and international visitors.

It would facilitate easy transfers and enable the designers of such a project to look more than a few years ahead. Denver is geographically central to America, not dissimilar to our own position here. By American standards it is not a huge city, but it is vibrant and it is growing, and it does not take its orders from the old cities back east. While recognising it is part of the greater Colorado and American landscape, it is fearlessly independent. Denver largely does as Denver wants and as Denver does because it dares to dream. Decisions on our airport should be made by South Australians, in the same way as the monumental United States project was conceived, by people who live in the local city.

I support completely the work done so far by my friend and colleague the member for Hanson. He has said on public record that, if possible, our airports should be owned by investors in South Australia. Of course it should be. Our Government should give a lead to South Australian corporations, businesses and investors to buy this airport from the Federal Airports Corporation and get on with the business of developing it. It is a number one priority, as acknowledged by this Government and so many of my colleagues in this place and, as we have noted on many occasions, the member for Hart supports the sorts of things I am saying. It will bring us further along the road to prosperity and it will provide jobs, and lots of them.

If the people on the Opposition benches are serious about their new slogan, 'Labor Listens', if they are serious about really listening to what the voters in this State are saying, they will have to clear the old, ideological wax out of their ears, because not only is it preventing them from hearing but it is clogging up their brains. Even the Federal Treasurer, Mr Willis—normally a mild mannered bloke—had to shout to get it through to them last weekend. The economic reality is that there will be no changes at the Adelaide Airport unless there is some form of private ownership. Instead of regurgitating the tired, old rhetoric about no privatisation, why not go out and listen and support some of the alternatives? As the member for Hart said last week, unless we can get Adelaide Airport re-established on a truly international footing, we might as well forget the future of our tourism industry in particular.

We hear and read a great deal about tourism as the newest and most successful Australian industry. Unfortunately, unlike the rest of Australia, South Australia has been going backwards in this area. The Federal member for Fadden, Mr David Jull, one of the great tourism experts in Australia, noted recently that, by the year 2010, 114 million Asians will travel outside their own country annually. Clearly, we should attract a significant share of that vast movement of tourists, but we will have to be ready for it. Australians travelling overseas are often reminded of how the majority of foreigners view Australia—as a rather vague idea. Everybody has heard of the kangaroos and the koalas. Many can name Sydney, perhaps recognise Melbourne, and some can even mispronounce Cairns. They can, perhaps, even cite several of Australia's major attractions, but they do not have the

knowledge to discern differences between the States. They will ask, 'Where is South Australia? What is that? Is it anywhere near Sydney?'

We could all list many of our tourist strengths: the best wine, the best food, the best cafes and restaurants, the best beaches, the best outback, the best animals, the stunningly beautiful and best opals in the world and the magnificent wonder of the whales that have recently returned to South Australia. But how do we go about building South Australia's aggregate share? We must start to think positively. Like the people in Denver and Roxby Downs, we have to generate this energy, this positive attitude ourselves, this culture of confidence.

If you came to Australia for a spot of fishing, you might go to the Barrier Reef out of Cairns for marlin. You might even want to even try your luck off Broome. You would also want to chase a tuna out from Port Lincoln and catch a whiting out from Kangaroo Island. We Australians must promote themes to benefit each part of our various industries rather than concentrating on State borders that promote only part of an industry and part of an attraction. I have no doubt that commercial tourist operators see the benefit in this and are taking advantage of it. Government is a significant party to the promotion of tourism. We must continue to get together with other States to work out amicable, sensible and creative arrangements so that we can together promote Australian themes that will benefit us all. Already this is happening with the Northern Territory and Victorian tourist industry. Our Tourist Commission should be congratulated, under the leadership of its Minister, for pursuing this form of promotion.

This need to see ourselves as getting our tourist share was brought home to me from another experience in the United States when I was talking to a woman who is rapidly developing ecotourism out of Asia. The themes she described were very difficult for us to promote to potential overseas visitors on a State basis alone. For instance, if you were to come to Australia to explore the opal industry, you would probably want to see the pre-eminent Coober Pedy and Andamooka fields. As well, you probably ought to visit White Cliffs and Lightning Ridge in New South Wales. You might even want to venture up to Queensland for the Cunnamulla-Eulo festival of opals and take in the lizard racing and the safari at the Yowah opal fields. Already we are promoting such creative itineraries in the brochure outlining Authentic Australia: two that come to the mind are the Opal

Discovery Tour and the Opals, Outback and the Ghan. As a person who is proud and quite passionate about opal, its beauty and its value and not just to South Australia, I strongly support additional tourist promotion in this way.

If you came to Australia to get a taste of Aussie wine, you would visit the Barossa because it produces more wine than anywhere else in the nation. While you were up that way you would be most remiss not to take in Clare and Eden Valley. You could then drive south from Adelaide to the Southern Vales, then to the Riverland, Coonawarra and Keppoch—and that is only in South Australia. Maybe I would get adventurous and want to taste it all. That would include the lovely shiraz of the Yarra Valley, the big cabernets of the Margaret River and the toasty whites of the Hunter. Then there is Mudgee, Tassie and even Queensland. Let us not forget Chateau Hornsby in the Territory. Again, our Tourist Commission has just announced its own 'wine trail' promoting the wonders of wine in South Australia in a cooperative venture with Victoria. I applaud these initiatives, especially as South Australia has such great opportunities to increase its market share with both interstate and international visitors after so many years of Labor neglect.

In closing, I refer again to the way Americans do business. As I was departing Denver airport, the gentleman who had shown me through the project apologised that he had run out of brochures. He promised to mail them to me. Ten thousand miles and just 10 days later I received the folders. That sort of rapid response should be the objective of enterprises in both the private and public sectors and of any organisation responding to clients. As politicians, we have as our clients the people of South Australia who elected us. We are there to take new initiatives and to drive this State. I believe that they too want a rapid response to our problems. There is no time to waste. There is no more time for arguments that rehash old ideological battles. There is no time for negativity. The real questions to be asked whenever new ideas are proposed are: will this benefit South Australia; will this give us a sense of pride and achievement and self worth; and will it provide jobs for the future? Together I believe we must make all this happen and we must seize the opportunities that are there for us to grab.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.49 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 23 August at 2 p.m.