

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 7 September 1994

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

### EDUCATION FUNDING

A petition signed by 21 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to cut education funding was presented by the Hon. R.B. Such.

Petition received.

### FILM AND VIDEO CENTRE

Petitions signed by 53 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the South Australian Film and Video Centre were presented by Messrs Meier and Such.

Petitions received.

### SPENCER GULF LIGHT BEACONS

A petition signed by 656 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to replace No. 4 and No. 9 light beacons in the Port Augusta channel of the Spencer Gulf was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

### ALEXANDER KELLY DRIVE PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS

A petition signed by 61 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to install pedestrian lights at Alexander Kelly Drive, Noarlunga Centre was presented by Mrs Rosenberg.

Petition received.

### TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 143 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow extended retail trading hours was presented by Mr Rossi.

Petition received.

### SODOMY

A petition signed by 60 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to criminalise sodomy was presented by Mr Rossi.

Petition received.

### GAMING MACHINES

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** On 4 August this year, I informed the House of developments involving the launch of gaming machine operations in hotels and clubs in South Australia. The successful launch of gaming machine operations on 25 July and the continuing installation program has been achieved despite significant problems with the pathetic quality of machines delivered by gaming machine manufac-

turers, as well as ongoing supply problems with one particular manufacturer, namely, Aristocrat.

The quality problems of machines delivered by manufacturers include missing, wrong or faulty parts, delivery of unapproved software, incorrect hoppers and graphic faults. Since raising this situation with the manufacturers the quality of machines has improved. However, the supply problem involving Aristocrat machines remains a problem. Aristocrat, which has actively solicited business in South Australia, has secured a major share of the market but has failed to supply machines for scheduled installation dates. This has caused considerable concern for many hotels and clubs, which have invested large sums of money, and has delayed the installation program for gaming machines around the State.

The installation program for gaming machines provided for 1 490 machines to be installed by 1 August. At that date, 990 machines were installed with the shortfall caused by the late delivery of around 350 Aristocrat machines and numerous time-consuming revisits for partial installations. Partial installations have had to be approved to allow venues, which have taken delivery of other manufacturers' machines, to begin operations while still awaiting delivery of Aristocrat machines.

In view of the ongoing supply problems with Aristocrat, the State Supply Board—the official purchasing agent of machines—has given venues the opportunity to cancel or change their orders. As at 5 September, purchase applications and orders involving a total of 175 Aristocrat machines had been cancelled. Other venues have opted to wait for delivery. Currently, delivery of Aristocrat machines is running about four weeks behind the original scheduled delivery time. This delay involves 353 Aristocrat machines. As at 6 September, 2 705 machines had been installed around the State, and 108 sites were operational. Thirty-one of these sites were operating with less than their full complement of machines because of delays in delivery.

In relation to quality problems, I am advised that of the 399 Aristocrat machines installed during July, more than 14 per cent were faulty. In the week from 30 July to 5 August, 20 per cent of the Aristocrat machines installed were faulty. Overall, of the 675 Aristocrat machines installed up to 26 August, more than one in 10 had faults. Problems with the Aristocrat machines have included incorrect electronic identification for the central monitoring system, wrong programs in the machines (incorrect chip sets) and misaligned coin diverters—problems which reflect poor quality control by the manufacturer.

Aristocrat advised the State Supply Board in July that quality problems identified with its machines were primarily the result of the inexperience of their new South Australian technicians. However, I wish to advise the House that a further problem has surfaced involving Aristocrat machines at the Adelaide Casino and, we have discovered, in New South Wales clubs as well.

A Government inspector and surveillance staff at the Adelaide Casino have uncovered a scam involving the manipulation of Aristocrat model 540 machines installed at the Casino. Investigations have revealed that a defect in these machines has allowed them to be manipulated so that they overpay winnings by up to 50 per cent. The matter came to light at the Casino when a patron was noticed loading credits and then cashing out repeatedly. The patron was questioned by security and police on 17 July and all 119 Aristocrat model 540 machines at the Casino were shut down.

It was found that the patron, who admitted he knew what he was doing, was playing the particular machines until he achieved a winning outcome that allowed either the option of a double-up or some other special feature. He would then load the machine with credits, being careful not to exceed \$100 in value—which would require an attendant—and press the collect button, resulting in the machine paying out between 10 per cent to 50 per cent more than it should. In view of the difficulties in proving that an offence had been committed, the patron was released with a police caution.

Aristocrat was contacted immediately and advised the Casino that the problem could be rectified with the installation of a new hopper plate. All Aristocrat model 540 machines at the Casino have been converted and recommissioned. An inspection of all Aristocrat machines installed in hotels and clubs in South Australia was carried out on 23 July, before live gaming operations commenced. Sixteen hoppers were found to have suspect or faulty blades and were replaced. A new hopper runner plate, which has been tested and certified, has been installed in all Aristocrat model 540 machines in this State.

Mr Speaker, the Adelaide Casino estimates that since February this year it has lost more than \$160 000 in relation to 12 of the defective Aristocrat model 540 machines at the Casino. The Casino Supervisory Authority has launched an inquiry into this matter and has received information that problems with the Aristocrat model 540 machines were discovered in New South Wales as far back as October and November last year.

A number of clubs in New South Wales have reported problems with the Aristocrat 540 machines, including cash-flow irregularities and the overpayment of coins. One particular club in New South Wales was alerted to problems with the machines in February this year when two patrons were observed playing in a regimented manner involving double-up winning combinations. Subsequent testing revealed that the hopper was overpaying.

Several people who were suspected of obtaining money fraudulently from the Aristocrat 540 machines were interviewed over a period of time but the club formed the view there was almost no chance of pursuing the matter with the players as the players claimed that they were not aware they were being overpaid. The club's concern is that Aristocrat was aware of the problems at least in February 1994, and was not prepared to take the action necessary to prevent secondary losses three months after the first experience.

Another New South Wales club discovered a hopper overpayment problem with the model 540 machines in October last year and immediately notified Aristocrat. In response to a request from the South Australian Liquor Licensing Commissioner for details on its knowledge of the problems with the machines, Aristocrat replied on 28 July this year that the 'overpay condition manifested itself in a significant manner in New South Wales towards the end of May this year'. Aristocrat revealed that a State-wide retrofit of machines which appeared to be affected in New South Wales was underway, stretching the resources of its service division to the limit.

Aristocrat claims that it was in the process of beginning to address the problems of other jurisdictions which operated the problem machines when it was alerted to the incident at the Adelaide Casino. Mr Speaker, I advise the House that the Casino Supervisory Authority is continuing its inquiries into this matter and will provide a report when it has completed its investigations.

## RURAL SECTOR

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** Many of South Australia's primary producers are facing a particularly difficult season this year. Our State had the lowest August rainfall in 50 years. In fact, we are on track to equal the driest year ever. This has left our winter cereal crops at a critical stage and our livestock facing feed shortages. I have taken our farmers' concerns to Canberra and the Federal Minister for Primary Industries (Bob Collins) is well aware of the regional problems facing South Australia. Thankfully, while South Australia is not presently affected by the devastating drought now gripping Queensland and 80 per cent of New South Wales, Victoria and areas of South Australia are nevertheless in trouble.

While I recognise that there is a national drought policy in place, which specifically excludes special assistance to regional areas, Senator Collins agreed at a meeting in Canberra last Thursday to consider any application for assistance. One of the difficulties our State currently faces is the lack of a scientific basis for the declaration of drought, severe drought, or unseasonally dry conditions. Officers from the Federal and State departments are therefore now working to ensure that an accurate system of measures is put in place as a matter of urgency so the Government can determine drought conditions in a way as is done in Queensland and New South Wales.

The Northern Eyre Peninsula and the Northern Mallee are currently experiencing one of their driest years on record. On Monday I met farmers and had a look at the conditions in both these regions. Areas such as Wirrulla and Poochera have had less than a quarter of their normal monthly rainfall for August and have already had temperatures up to 28 degrees with strong northerly winds. In the Northern Mallee, below average rainfall has been recorded in all centres during August, and in some areas less than half the average has been measured. Even where recent rain has fallen, subsoil moisture remains dry. Even in areas where there has been more rain, crops are on the edge and in many cases are already showing signs of stress.

The weather conditions in the next two weeks are critical. In the unfortunate situation that drought conditions apply in South Australia I have already put together an advisory group within the Department of Primary Industries to develop a strategy to address the problems that will arise. Critical issues being considered include the need to maintain a nucleus of breeding sheep and cattle to ensure the future viability of those industries, and the importance of avoiding soil degradation and soil loss. We also are looking at ways to minimise the season's impact on farm viability and on the State's overall rural debt position.

The advisory group is planning two complementary approaches. We are looking at options that address the increasing shortage of fodder, which is threatening the State's grazing flocks and increasing the risk of damage to soil as a result of overgrazing. Depending on the rainfall during the next two months, the group is also considering later options that will address the possible shortfall in cereal grain production and the impact of that shortfall on farm viability. The current cost and availability of fodder supplies are of great concern, as is the general lack of agistment available across southern and eastern Australia and the potential for

serious shortfalls in grain production if there are no good spring rains.

I will be discussing these issues with my ministerial colleagues from around Australia at a meeting being convened in Canberra tomorrow by the Coalition's shadow Minister for Primary Industries, John Anderson. There is the need for a coordinated approach to the Federal Government to fund some of these measures, including exceptional circumstances, assistance for stock and perhaps water, and the provision of various support programs for farm families and rural communities.

I also will be lobbying for a joint approach on changes to the Farm Household Support Scheme which is at present a loan, available for only two years through the Department of Social Security. However, it is not widely used because farmers currently believe that the payment is aimed at getting them off their farms. In my view, there is a need for a family farm allowance under certain conditions to enable farm families to access standard welfare payments through the Department of Social Security, and I will seek my colleague's support to lobby for this. The present farm household support could be modified to allow payments to be made so that they are not considered a loan, are available for as long as is necessary under the present circumstances, and remove the current 'must have been refused carry-on finance' criteria.

Then there is the question of relief for fodder transport and the need to continue to press for more appropriate farm management bonds which will also be raised when I meet with representatives of the National Farmers Federation tomorrow. South Australia is heading for a record dry year and our crops and livestock are suffering. The Government will take all steps necessary to ensure that our State is in the forefront when special measures are considered for Australia's farmers. Departmental advisers will be providing detailed briefings on conditions during the next month to ensure that we are prepared in the unfortunate circumstances that South Australia does face a drought. We will then address the need for carry-on finance and the availability of that for the sowing of next year's crop towards the end of this year.

#### LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

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

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

### QUESTION TIME

#### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):** Does the Premier categorically deny that the information technology subcommittee of Cabinet has considered tender proposals from IBM and EDS for the Government's information technology contract, and that it has recommended that negotiations continue with EDS as the preferred supplier?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I indicated yesterday that the Government has a subcommittee of Cabinet looking at this matter. I indicated also that that subcommittee has been meeting on a very regular basis and will continue to do so because this is such an important issue for the whole future of South Australia, not just the outsourcing of the Govern-

ment's own IT work but, very importantly, the new economic development. I highlight to the Leader of the Opposition one of the fundamental reasons why it is so important to do this outsourcing. They are facts that reflect very badly on the way the previous Government managed IT.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I will come to that very shortly. This is right at the heart—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! One question at a time.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** —of why it is so important to bring about outsourcing. A study of 23 Government agencies found the following: ten different payroll systems, 16 accounts payable systems, 17 general ledger systems, 18 asset registers and 29 accounts receivable systems. In fact, if you look at it, there are about 140—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** —Government agencies overall that need to be included in the IT work of Government. So, if 23 have that sort of variation, that sort of mishmash, just imagine what it would be like if you took the whole 140. That is the proud record that Labor left for South Australia. That is the sort of mishmash that this new Government has had to pick up. The Government subcommittee on this has continued to meet and will continue to meet. The Government subcommittee has been briefed by the two companies involved. We have had detailed presentations. No specific recommendation has been put as to who should be the winner of the outsourcing contract. Let me make that quite clear: there has been no specific recommendation. In fact—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Well, no recommendation—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections; there will be one question at a time.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** What the Cabinet subcommittee has decided and directed is that there should be ongoing negotiations, and they are being carried out at present. They are being carried out, might I add, with two of the best lawyers on IT that you would find anywhere in the world; in fact, they have been flown from America. They are quite outstanding people. We hunted the world. If we are to have an outsourcing contract, it is important that we have the best legal advice possible, and that is something that the previous Government did not understand. It could not even write a contract for a \$4 million or \$5 million bridge at Hindmarsh Island, let alone outsource Government information.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Yes, what about the Grand Prix.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** They could not even see when they had lost the Grand Prix. I can assure the honourable member that the Government will apply the best due diligence. In fact, in his report to Parliament yesterday the Auditor-General himself highlighted the extent to which the Government has been very meticulous and has worked closely with the Auditor-General to make sure that the whole process is very prim and proper.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I highlight the extent to which members of the Labor Party in this State, particularly the member for Hart, who is now being joined by the Leader of the Opposition, are deliberately setting out to vandalise the whole tendering process. They are like a pack of kids out there with their spray guns. They are no more than a pack of vandals deliberately trying to vandalise this process, right at a very delicate stage of negotiations. It reflects badly on them when, in fact, they have so little regard for what the outsourcing contract could bring to South Australia. As I said yesterday, they are no more than a bunch of troglodytes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Spence has had a pretty fair go. The member for Chaffey.

### COOPER BASIN GAS

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** Will the Premier advise the House of arrangements that have been finalised with the South Australian Government for the sale of Cooper Basin ethane to New South Wales and the benefits that will flow to South Australia from these current arrangements?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The Government has decided that it will release 160 petajoules of ethane gas to ICI from South Australia's Cooper Basin so that the ICI petrochemical plant can go ahead and derive product from this gas. However, to make sure that the deal is of long term benefit to South Australia, we have been able to access a secure supply of gas for the future well-being of South Australia. In fact, we have been able to secure access to 400 petajoules of gas at a very reasonable price, but on top of that there will be a special purchase agreement, which means that—

**An honourable member:** We did it.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I will come to the Labor Party's performance on this later.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** We have also signed a special purchase agreement, which means that we secure about 53 petajoules of gas for South Australia at the most competitive rate for gas that you would find anywhere in Australia. That will help to secure for South Australia, particularly in the generation of electricity, because 70 per cent of our electricity comes from gas, very reasonable electricity charges in the future and to pass those benefits onto South Australia. Because of this securing of the long-term interests of gas from the year 2004 to the year 2013, we are able to say that South Australia now has secure, long-term gas supplies at a very reasonable price. That is very important in terms of our being able to secure a long-term industrial base and also for securing long-term benefits to South Australian consumers.

It goes further than that. The total benefit of the contracts now signed between the State Government, the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, SANTOS representing the producers, and ICI—the net benefit to South Australia of these agreements now secured—is between \$30 million and \$60 million. That is an enormous benefit to this State.

On top of that we now have a surety of gas supply for South Australia probably to meet all the requirements for ETSA and all the industrial and commercial gas supplies through SAGASCO from now until the year 2013. Therefore, members should recognise the enormous significance of these agreements that have been secured.

I come to the track record of the former Labor Government on this matter. Members opposite sat here for the best part of 20 years hoping that out of the mirage in the distance would suddenly come a petrochemical plant. We can all recall how Don Dunstan, just prior to the 1973 election, slipped out of his pocket on *This Day Tonight* some sort of letter and said, 'Here is a firm letter of intent to build a petrochemical plant.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** More than 20 years later that petrochemical plant at Redcliffe has not come to fruition and it is not likely to do so. So much for the dreams of the Labor Party over the past 20 years. Although we have released 160 petajoules of gas to ICI, it is estimated that the total quantity of ethane gas in the Cooper Basin is probably about 300 petajoules, and it is almost certain that there are between 60 petajoules—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! One can always tell when the Deputy Leader is out of order, too.

**Mr Ashenden:** He's all gas.

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

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It is fair to say that that is about all he does have. I point out that there is still somewhere between 60 and 140 petajoules of ethane in the Cooper Basin that could be used if we were able to secure a smaller petrochemical plant for South Australia in the future, but it is clear that there is no petrochemical plant with any realistic proposal that can go ahead in the near future. There may be in the distant future, but that gas will still be there if such a small plant ever comes to fruition. The important thing is that this Government has been able to secure for South Australia what the Labor Government could not secure over the past three or four years.

### IBM

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Will the Premier table a copy of the recent letter that he has received from IBM critical of the outcome of outsourcing negotiations, or is this information subject to a confidentiality agreement which prohibits IBM from making any public comment on the company's position?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I have not received such a letter, so I cannot release it.

### SHOPPING CENTRE GROUND LEASES

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** Will the Treasurer inform the House of the progress that is being made in selling ground leases at Elizabeth and Noarlunga shopping centres? The former Government, in its Meeting the Challenge statement in April 1993, announced that it would be selling the land on which these two shopping centres are built. Particularly in Noarlunga, the current improvements being made to the shopping centre are ongoing and the community and Noarlunga council are keen to be updated on this issue.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I am pleased to respond to this question. I remember the Meeting the Challenge statement of 22 April last year. In the debt management strategy of the former Government there was an item, 'Sale of shopping centre leases'. When we walked into office after the 11 December election, I assumed that the matter had been progressed—that instructions had been sent to the owners, the

Housing Trust, to progress the sale, because it was on the debt management strategy.

Some months later I asked, 'When will these properties be placed on the market?' and I was told, 'We haven't received any such instruction; we haven't done any work on it.' Perhaps they thought it was just a joke. It is absolutely vital for regional centres such as Elizabeth and Noarlunga to progress, to ensure that their facilities are up to date and that they are meeting the requirements of their consumers. We know of some investment propositions now available which are being held up because those leases had not been sold, as was suggested, and given to the market back in April 1993. The matter was put in the 'too hard basket' by the Housing Trust because it had been given no specific direction by the former Government.

So, when members of the former Government say that their Meeting the Challenge statement was a credible document, once again it is shown to be quite flawed. More importantly, considerable interest in involvement in these shopping centres has been shown by people associated with outside investment. There are some complications involving certain areas of space, in terms of who owns them and how they will operate under different ownership. The Asset Management Task Force has been set the task of reviewing the ground leases and ensuring that those properties are capable of being sold.

The task force reviewed a report on the Noarlunga and Elizabeth City Centres by Hall Chadwick in March this year. The report recommended an asset realisation program of six months for Elizabeth and 12 to 18 months for Noarlunga to address specific issues that enhance the value of the ground lease for sale. The task force supported the recommendations made in the report and recommended that the program commence immediately. Again, we want Elizabeth and Noarlunga to be not only the best of regional centres in this State but also the source of great pride to everyone and competitive with regional centres interstate. We have set that process in train. It will occur, and I believe that Elizabeth and Noarlunga will be enhanced as a result.

#### INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Does the Premier agree with the Auditor-General's comments concerning the need for greater reporting of the financial commitments associated with industry assistance measures, which involve subsidy payments and/or exemption from certain State taxes; and, if so, will he disclose full details of commitments made to companies such as Australis, Optus and Motorola? In his recent report, the Auditor-General stated (section 2.2.10):

In my opinion, to allow for effective management of financial commitments and public accountability there should be coordinated, aggregate reporting of Government financial commitments arising under programs to develop the industrial and commercial base of this State. Without such arrangements in place there is an inadequate basis upon which a matter that has the potential to impact on the public finances of the State can be subject to effective public scrutiny.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** That is an outrageous question from the shadow Treasurer, the Labor Party member of the Industries Development Committee, to which applications by those companies for financial assistance have been referred. It is outrageous to suggest secrecy in this matter when those applications have gone before that very committee on which the honourable member sits. How can the honourable member, who purports to be the shadow Treasur-

er for the alternative Government of South Australia, make that sort of accusation in this House? It is absolutely shabby politics, to say the least.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** He sits on a bipartisan committee, which this Parliament established and has operated for many years—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** —and then comes up with a shabby question like that. Let us make it quite clear—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The question deserves the contempt it is getting in the House this afternoon. I have asked all Ministers and all departments to look at the specific recommendations of the Auditor-General on a whole range of issues in his report—not just this issue. However, I highlight the shabby nature of this particular question when in fact the information the honourable member is seeking has been before the very committee on which he sits.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Playford is out of order. The member for Elder.

#### LAND TAX

**Mr WADE (Elder):** Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development provide details of Government support being provided for small businesses in South Australia? There have been some recent claims that an additional 30 000 small business people will be adversely affected by land tax following the recent State budget.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** One of the very rare occasions when Opposition members sought to challenge any component of the budget last week—they were otherwise deafening in their silence in relation to the budget—was their claim that this was an impact on small business. Let us just analyse—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** They haven't adequately answered the budget yet. I would have thought the honourable member would keep quiet, given his attitude to matters going before the IDC and the way in which he has just been put down. Does he want another serve? Mr Speaker, in relation to the statement—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will put in context the statement that small business is being impacted by the variation to land tax—and this is conveniently ignored by the Deputy Leader. On the lower end of the threshold the actual net effect is \$17.50, ranging to \$52.50 when it reaches the \$65 000 category. The maximum payment to be made by anyone coming within that section involving the broadening of the tax base will be \$105. Let us put that in perspective in terms of what we as a Government have done for small business in South Australia. Let us not forget the 22 per cent cut in electricity tariffs, which will save up to \$1 250 for small to medium businesses in South Australia. That makes the \$17.50 pale into insignificance: a couple of postage stamps compared to the reduction in electricity tariffs.

This Government has given a substantial cut in the cost of electricity and ensured greater retained earnings and greater profitability for small business operators; and, with careful and specific targeting, we have removed the cross-subsidy of small and medium businesses to residential consumers in South Australia. This Government fixed that problem: the previous Government ignored it. Let us look at the former Government's track record: for three consecutive years the former Administration increased the rate and income base of land tax in this State's revenue budget.

Not only has this Government balanced it out with very substantial electricity tariff reductions, but it has put in place a \$12.5 million jobs package to let South Australia get back to work again through WorkCover subsidies for small business enterprises. As at 30 June, 1 289 businesses had successfully applied to participate in that scheme, and some 600 to 800 applications are currently in place. So, all in all, almost 2 000 small businesses have benefited from that scheme.

In addition, this Government has put in place a \$2 million component for the development of a business plan for small businesses, to give them the greater capacity to access the financial institutions, either to restructure their loan or to take out a loan for the purchase of new plant and equipment, so that they can become internationally competitive. Over 300 applications have been received from small business enterprises to access that scheme. The \$2 million allocated in South Australia for that one scheme for 63 000 businesses can be compared to New South Wales's big fanfare earlier this week of \$1.5 million for some 230 000 small businesses. So, by any comparison of what Victoria or New South Wales is doing, this State Government has really put its money where its mouth is in terms of supporting small business in South Australia. And bleat as the Deputy Leader might, he will never be able to stack up an argument that small business is not now getting a fair go from Government.

#### ASSET SALES

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Treasurer release a new list of Government assets proposed for sale following the announcement by the Minister for Tourism to this House yesterday that the Government now has no intention of selling the Entertainment Centre? During the election campaign the current Premier released a so-called South Australian recovery program, which listed a range of assets to be sold as part of its debt reduction strategy. Those assets listed included the Urban Lands Trust properties, Central Linen Service, the Pipelines Authority and the Adelaide Entertainment Centre. As only a page and a half was dedicated to asset sales in the Treasurer's budget, when will he announce a new asset sales list and a new timetable?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The answer is: when I am ready and not when the Opposition asks for it. It is quite clearly stated in the budget, and I recommend that you all read the budget papers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Perhaps members opposite cannot read, and perhaps that is the reason why they have not actually asked any budget questions. There are some excuses, and I can understand that. The issue of what assets the Government sells and when it sells them is the business of Government.

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** What about the taxpayer?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Indeed, it is certainly the business of taxpayers. The Government intends—

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** It was like the IBM deal, was it?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The Government intends to maximise the sale of all assets to the benefit of taxpayers in South Australia. The Government said right at the outset that it had a list of assets, and it was explicit about them before the election. The list has not changed. The time frame for the sale of assets will be subject to the best market conditions prevailing.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I think that the Deputy Leader is continually out of order.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I thought that after the Business Asian Convention the Deputy Leader would crawl down his hole for the next six months and keep his mouth shut.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The assets were as listed. The sale will take place at the most convenient market time.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### TRAUMA SYSTEMS COMMITTEE

**Mrs HALL (Coles):** Will the Minister for Health tell the House what the Government hopes to achieve through the recent establishment of a Trauma Systems Committee?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I am very pleased to tell the House what will eventuate for South Australians following the formation of a new Trauma Systems Committee, and that is primarily a better system for treating patients who have been traumatised. It will finally involve getting the right patient to the right hospital so that the trauma is minimised by the care that is available. As members would realise, people can be traumatised in many ways, primarily I suppose through road accidents but also violence, poisoning, workplace accidents, burns, swimming pools, and so on, can all lead to major sources of trauma. Unfortunately, in some well-publicised cases in the past it has been pointed out that patients have ended up in hospitals perhaps inappropriately, where the hospital has been unable to manage their care in the best way possible or, indeed, where patients have even bypassed appropriate hospitals, hence taking longer to get the care. That will not occur after this Trauma Systems Committee presents its findings.

Trauma is a particularly important issue for South Australians, as cases involving accidents, poisoning and violence cost our hospital system nearly \$100 million a year, and trauma patients occupy over 11 per cent of the beds in our public hospitals. So, this has a major financial effect on the taxpayer; and, if the Government can reduce the time that people take to get to hospital or can place them coincidentally into a hospital that is better able to treat them and rehabilitate them, obviously the effect on the patients will be beneficial and so will the effect on the bottom line.

The Trauma Systems Committee, which is to be chaired by Professor Sir Denis Paterson, has a number of eminent representatives from Adelaide and also has a representative from New South Wales, Professor Steven Deane, who is a

world recognised authority on trauma management and who was part of a similar arrangement in New South Wales. It may well be that, as a result of this review, South Australia ends up with a smaller number of major trauma centres than it has now. In Sydney, of the total number of trauma patients who end up in ambulances, only 6 per cent of all those patients are taken to a different hospital from the one they might have expected to be admitted to previously. It is not as if patients will be dramatically altering the hospitals in which they end up, but it does mean that a system that is focused on providing better trauma care for South Australians will result from the deliberations of the committee.

### GRAND PRIX

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Will the Minister for Tourism advise the House what negotiations have occurred and what guarantees have been given by the Victorian Government and FOCA to ensure that marketing and promotion for the first Formula One Grand Prix in Melbourne in March 1996 will not damage the last race to be held in Adelaide in November 1995? In this morning's press a spokesperson for the Melbourne Grand Prix is quoted as saying that Melbourne could not hold the event in November 1995. She said:

It would be a commercial disaster because there is only four months between our last race and their first.

Given the narrow timeframe between the two events, there will clearly be an overlap in promotion, and they will be competing for sponsorship dollars and for racegoers' interest and attendance.

**The Hon. M.H. Armitage:** That's the Grand Prix you lost.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** As the Minister for Health aptly put it, it is important every now and again to remind members opposite and the public of South Australia that the mess we are in with the Grand Prix is because the contractual arrangements were not properly followed through. The contracts were not only not signed but were airy-fairy and were in fairyland. As has been often said publicly, the Government has agreed to enter into an arrangement to sell assets to the Victorian Government, and that process is almost completed. So far as I am concerned, and for the public, too, it is a very satisfactory arrangement for the Government.

At the same time we have also entered into negotiations, which are almost finalised, for the use of some of our staff from now until the race in Melbourne in 1996. The use of those staff will also be of significant financial benefit to South Australia. As well as that, we have entered into an arrangement with the Victorian Government whereby joint promotion of the race will continue to occur. So, no thanks to the previous Labor Government, to the best of our ability we are able to run this year's and next year's event, and we have made an arrangement that will be made public as soon as it is finalised that will be of significant benefit to the South Australian community.

### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** My question is directed to the Premier. What action is the Government taking to guarantee the privacy and security of outsourced Government information?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The privacy and security of the Government's information system is important, and I

notice that the Auditor-General in his report yesterday once again commented on this matter. It is interesting to note that the Auditor-General also commented on this matter back in 1992 and 1993, and it is interesting that the former Government did absolutely nothing, despite the Auditor-General's warning. In fact, the Auditor-General highlighted the need for the Government to ensure that there are suitable procedures whereby Government departments and authorities clearly understand how they should operate in this area in terms of guidelines.

I am delighted to say that this Government has done much more than the former Government, despite the fact that we have been in office for only a few months, in terms of trying to secure the privacy and security of Government information. The Office of Information Technology recently produced a document 'South Australian Government Information Technology Security Guidelines', which has been sent out to all CEOs. Shortly a more detailed document 'The South Australian Government Information Technology Security Standards in an Outsourced Environment' will be going out to all Government agencies. It is important as part of the outsourcing that we also ensure that we maintain privacy and security. From the recent visit overseas by Government specialists in this area it is clear that, if appropriate guidelines are put down and if there are appropriate contractual obligations on the outsourcer, there is no reason to be overly concerned about privacy and security.

It is also interesting to see which agencies overseas have now been outsourced, such as the internal revenue body of the United Kingdom Government, which handles all tax returns. One could not imagine a more sensitive area than the tax information of individuals, yet it has been successfully outsourced with no difficulties in terms of security and privacy, provided the guidelines handed down are adhered to. Equally, this applies in other key areas, such as social security in the United States of America. I was interested to learn in the past day or so that the Defence Department of Australia is now looking at outsourcing a significant part of its data processing as well. Again, it shows that if it is properly outsourced there is no reason to be concerned about the security and privacy area. The Government has worked diligently to ensure that these standards are applied.

I point out to the honourable member that the Government remains the owner of the information at all times. The outsourcer is the custodian of the information in the computer, but the Government owns the information and retains control over it. The Cabinet subcommittee on outsourcing has looked at this matter and has set down guidelines. I can assure the honourable member that the Government is paying due diligence to ensure that privacy and secrecy is maintained.

### GENTING GROUP

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Treasurer now advise the House of the nature and extent of the Government's investigation into Genting's continuing involvement with the Adelaide Casino? On 24 March last year the current Treasurer told the House:

All the evidence suggests there is a cloud over Gentings as to how it got the licence and how it got the licence for 20 years.

In reply to a question two weeks ago, the Treasurer's position—

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Two weeks ago we had the same question.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** You were going to obtain an answer.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** In answer to a question two weeks ago about the Treasurer's current position as to Genting's integrity, he told the House that the Liberal Opposition had been provided with information which caused some doubts about Genting's associations with the Casino and said the issue of Genting's suitability or otherwise would be subject to a review after he had finished with the budget. Has the Minister received new information about Genting, why is the company being investigated and are there discussions about the legal implications—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now commenting. Leave is withdrawn.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I gave the answer previously. I said that when I finished with the budget I would look at it again.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** He continues to interrupt and does not listen to the answer. I said that I would look at it again when I finished with the budget, but the budget process does not finish until October. We have Estimates Committees for the next two weeks, which I assume members opposite will turn up to. We know that there are no guarantees and they might forget that the Committees are on. I presume that they will be here for the next two weeks when we will have to answer questions. The budget process goes on. I said that when I had time I would look at the issue.

I gave a clear answer to that previously. The Opposition continues to waste the time of the House. There must be some really important issues affecting its constituents that it could be asking questions on in this House. Instead, we put up with this repetition of questions. I have had two today, and it is not the first time. These questions are on issues that are not important to South Australia. I have already answered the question. I have given a clear answer: when I get around to looking at the issues I will inform the Opposition and the whole of South Australia.

### TOM ROBERTS HORSE TRAIL

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing outline the significance of the Tom Roberts horse riding trail in South Australia and how its development is in line with the Government's election commitments?

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** This is another of the good little news stories that come out of my department each week. I commend members of the House to the Tom Roberts Trail. It is a trail which now adds to what is probably some of the most important walking and riding trails in this country.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** If you ask someone who rides a horse you will find that they are not very rich people. In fact, they spend all their money on their horses. A 10 kilometre stretch was opened last Sunday week. That will be enlarged to become a 100 kilometre stretch meandering through the Adelaide Hills. It will add to the network already in existence.

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

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** Indeed! The numbers of riders anticipated to use the trail is in the vicinity of 20 000, which gives some indication of the number of riders out there who will access the trail. We already have other trails: the

walking trails, the Heysen Trail and the allied linking trails. They cater for some 300 000 people. We also have cycling trails which cater for some 200 000 people, and only a matter of weeks ago I opened the Riesling Trail which runs up through the Clare Hills. The Tom Roberts Trail is named after Tom Roberts, a gentleman who had considerable war experience in Palestine, Libya and Egypt. He returned to South Australia and became the chief instructor for the South Australian Mounted Police.

It was a great honour to have his widow, Pat, present for the opening of the trail because this gentleman is respected throughout Australia as one of the most eminent authorities on horse keeping and dealing with difficult horses. I commend all members, if they are at the show, to visit the Department for Recreation and Sport pavilion and look at the various displays on the walking, riding and cycling trials. They certainly are worth having a look at. I reiterate what a pleasure it was to have his widow present when we opened the trail and to see the significance that the horse community has for the trail and that lady and her presence.

### PUBLIC SECTOR SUPERANNUATION

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Will the Premier restate without reservation the undertaking he gave on 5AA on 26 August, as follows:

For those already in a superannuation scheme the Government is not changing the benefits.

Will the Premier confirm that the Treasurer is no longer examining reductions to benefits for members of the old State and police lump sum pension schemes?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I stand by what I said, and the Treasurer gave an answer to that question yesterday.

### OPERATION PENDULUM

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** Will the Minister for Emergency Services advise the House about the continued success of Operation Pendulum? I am personally aware of Operation Pendulum, as my own house was broken into a few weeks ago. As a result of some pretty smart police work, most of my property has been returned and the offender has been apprehended. I am aware, via my insurance company, of big increases in the success rate of solving the crime of house-breaking.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** One of my colleagues asked whether the honourable member's camera was involved in the theft, and I am unsure of that detail. I invite the honourable member to talk to my colleague about that matter. The member for Custance is well aware first hand of the value of Operation Pendulum, and it is fitting that we finally have a question about police matters asked in this Chamber. I point out that the shadow Minister responsible for police matters has not seen fit to raise a question in this Chamber about policing activities in this State since May. Operation Pendulum has been an outstanding success.

I previously advised the House that the operation consists of 90 hand-picked police officers who are tackling, in particular, property crime. The task force commenced its activities after its launch on 28 July this year, and in just over one month it has achieved 285 arrests and reports. That is a significant achievement and an indication to criminals in this State that the Police Force now has a strong body of men and women who are adequately trained and prepared to at last



start tackling in this State the issue of property crime. That has been facilitated by ensuring that the police have the resources to tackle that sort of crime. In the past week the task force made a further 85 arrests and reports.

Operation Pendulum is a joint operation between police and the community working together through Neighbourhood Watch groups to facilitate the arrest rate that they have achieved to date. Individual criminals in geographic areas are targeted each day by the task force, and attention is paid to receivers of stolen property and those who support criminal enterprise. The task force uses specially designed tactics and strategies which are being used to critically evaluate and identify those tactics suitable for long-term use throughout the Police Force. To date, the success of the task force has been far greater than anticipated, and the member for Culance is just one of many South Australians who have been able to get back their property through the vigilant efforts of this group of police officers.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I am sure that all members will acknowledge the excellent work undertaken by the Police Force through this task force, and I look forward to advising the House at a future date of further arrests.

#### GAY AND LESBIAN MARDI GRAS

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** Does the Minister for Tourism support the proposal to boost local tourism at Glenelg by staging an annual Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras? Would he be prepared to meet with the Glenelg Chamber of Commerce and the spokesperson for the Lesbian and Gay Community Action Group, Mr Lwelleyn Jones, to explore the possibility of this type of event? The Sydney Mardi Gras has developed into a major event on the tourism calendar that attracts worldwide attention—

*Mr Andrew interjecting:*

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

**Mrs GERAGHTY:**—and the possibility of staging a similar event in Adelaide has attracted the interest of the Minister's events committee. As the Glenelg Chamber of Commerce is anxious to determine support for its proposal and the Minister was unavailable to comment last night, it would welcome his response.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume his seat. There are too many interjections. I have put the member for Hart at the bottom of the list because he continues to interject. If he wants to ask a question today, I suggest that he be a little more quiet.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** From information given to me this morning I understand that there has been no formal approach to the Department of Tourism, and until there is a formal approach to the department it is not an issue that I need get involved in. I point out to the House that, irrespective of what our views might be, the Mardi Gras in Sydney is a very successful tourism exercise. When and if the group that is supposedly developing the project at Glenelg makes an approach to the Department of Tourism, it will be considered. It is my understanding that the Glenelg council at this stage has not been approached. As it is primarily a local government issue in terms of the sorts of street marches, concerts or Mardi Gras that should occur, I would have thought it was a local government issue and not an issue for the State Government.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL BEST PRACTICE

**Mr EVANS (Davenport):** Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources advise the House of the importance of best environmental practice to industry and what he is doing to promote it?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Certainly, my department and I recognise the importance of best environmental practice and we are working very closely with industry to promote it. There is a growing awareness, both in industry and Governments, of the contribution that environmental performance makes to international competitiveness. In the USA, for example, many of the sectors subject to the most stringent environmental regulations, including chemicals, plastics, synthetics, fabrics and paints, have become the most efficient and have actually improved their international competitiveness. There is always a danger that those firms not addressing environmental performance will find it difficult to sell their products on the international market, particularly in Europe, Japan and the United States, given the introduction of environmental evaluation measures such as the ECO audit.

As Environment Minister, I am particularly keen to ensure that South Australian industry does not face that difficulty and is not put to an economic disadvantage through failing to address environmental performance. I emphasise the importance of that. The office of the EPA has been actively promoting best environmental practice to industry, and with my full support and encouragement will continue to do so.

The Australian Manufacturing Council understands the need for firms to achieve environmental excellence and international competitiveness at the same time. The council also recognises that best practice environmental management by industry must be complemented by what is described as best practice environmental regulation. The Australian Manufacturing Council recognises that such regulation is required in order to provide clear goals for industry in working towards best practice environmental management and to eliminate the deliberate offenders and poor performers, recognising however that overly proscriptive regulation can be counterproductive, and that is what we are trying to move away from. I certainly recognise this and am working with the office of the EPA to ensure that we achieve best practice environmental regulation by using national and international benchmarkings.

Best practice also results in reductions in costs as it promotes conservation of energy and raw materials, the elimination of toxic substances and the reduction of wastes and pollutants. I can assure the honourable member and the House that I am well aware of the importance of best practice environmental management and best practice environmental regulation. I am doing everything I can to promote it and to promote the development of environmental management industries in South Australia, and I will continue to do so.

#### HOUSING TRUST ATTACHED DWELLINGS

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations consider sharing the cost of separation of services when a Housing Trust tenant wishes to purchase their half of a Housing Trust double attached dwelling? At present when a tenant wishes to purchase their half of an attached dwelling, that tenant must bear the full cost of work needed to separate the water and sewerage services. If and when the tenant occupying the other half of the attached dwelling wishes to

purchase their half, that tenant then reimburses the first purchasing tenant half the cost. However, if the second tenant never wishes to purchase, the first tenant is forced permanently to bear the full cost which, at today's values, is approximately \$9 000.

**The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:** That issue does not come up all that frequently, but I agree it should be addressed by the trust. If we are genuine in seeking to encourage tenants to purchase their properties and if an anomaly such as that arises, we must be prepared—I am certainly prepared—to look at it. It is very important in terms of the debt reduction strategy of the Housing Trust that we do everything we can to ensure that, if a tenant wants to enter into home ownership, matters such as this should not arise. It has caused the trust management some problems in the past, but I am certainly prepared to address the issue. If the honourable member can give me further information that can identify the tenants and the addresses at which they reside, I will take up the issue with trust management straight away.

### MEAT HYGIENE

**Mr KERIN (Frome):** My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries. Following the passing of the meat hygiene legislation in the last session of Parliament, will the Minister explain the future role of AQIS in meat hygiene in South Australia?

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** When we came to government, it was quite obvious that there needed to be some deregulation in the meat industry in South Australia. In fact, on many occasions I had expressed concern at the over-regulation of that industry and the fact that the product used for domestic consumption was still inspected by AQIS inspectors, thus adding extra cost ultimately to the consumer in South Australia. I had been to the Leader of the Opposition many times to see whether we could get the system deregulated somewhat.

Under the Meat Hygiene Act which, having been passed by both Houses of Parliament, is now law, we have set up a Meat Hygiene Advisory Council. That council, instead of consisting of bureaucrats, consists of processors of meat who themselves have an interest in the industry. It has not been announced, but an eminent person in rural affairs, Gerald Martin, has been made Chairman of that council. He has had considerable experience in the AMLC and in the Farmers Federation of South Australia. He is there to drive things through. As to what will happen and how things will change, meat for domestic consumption will get onto quality assurance programs and will not have to be inspected by AQIS inspectors. We are moving along a similar line to Queensland and Victoria.

AQIS can be involved, because the quality assurance programs have to be driven by an independent body. If AQIS wants to tender for that—and it is outsourcing, tendering out, if you like—and the tenders are now open, on 1 December it has an opportunity to be involved. However, if the tender is too high or if it does not want to tender, it therefore cannot be involved. It is much the same as is occurring in Victoria. Generally, for domestic consumption, we will be moving down this line of quality assurance programs. In other words, the stamp of the slaughterhouse or meatworks will be the quality assurance that consumers in South Australia will have. It is a move which is long overdue and which will make AQIS accountable to industry generally. If it gets the tender, it gets the job.

### PRAWN FISHERY

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Has the Minister for Primary Industries set a scheduled licence fee for Gulf St Vincent prawn fishers, and does this fee contain a portion for the buy back levy. Interest on the buy back was frozen three years ago. Is that still the current position?

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER:** I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest, which reflects the interest of other members of this House in the Gulf St Vincent prawn saga. I compliment the management of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery in the past 18 months, because it has been a very difficult fishery. The Hon. Ted Chapman, with a group of people, walked through some very difficult times to get this fishery going. For all the criticism of some people outside—and I might say of a member of another place in opposition—more than 230 tonnes of prawns were caught out of that fishery last year. It is correct; because of a problem of the previous Administration, we were not able to collect any fees for last year's catch. That is being addressed; in fact, it is being looked at under the general internal review that the Director of Fisheries is going through at present. I can assure the honourable member that any outstanding fees payable to the department as a result of fishing in that industry will be collected this year.

### DISABLED PERSONS

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on the member for Wright, I point out to him that he has interjected a number of times this afternoon and is fortunate not to have been overlooked also. The member for Wright.

**Mr ASHENDEN (Wright):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I address my question to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will not reflect on the Chair.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** As the disabled are under-represented in TAFE and are more likely to be unemployed, can the Minister indicate what steps TAFE has taken to help people with a disability to gain access to training and employment opportunities?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** This is a very important question, because we have a lot of people in the community with a disability of one kind or another. It has been difficult enough during the recession for people without disabilities, but people with disabilities have suffered greatly. Regarding the statistics, a DEET survey last year showed that people with a disability were twice as likely to leave school before completing year 12 as were those without a disability. Furthermore, those with a disability comprise about 61 per cent of the long-term unemployed. A survey done last year in South Australia indicates that about 4 000 people over the age of 15 with an intellectual disability are not in vocational education and training or employment. It is important that we address that issue, because we cannot afford to waste the talent of those people. TAFE is addressing the matter, and it is worth while that it does, because fewer than 1 per cent of our students have a disability: we have a long way to go to do something positive for people with a disability.

Some positive things are happening within TAFE. We have a horticulture program in the South-East, through which intellectually disabled people are gaining effective training. We have extended the training period. One of them has now

gone on to gain an apprenticeship. At the Norwood Adult Education Centre we have a program to train the intellectually disabled to work in restaurants and hotels, and that has been very successful. Through the Para Institute we have another successful program for people who have a very severe physical disability; they are being trained in computer techniques and associated skills. So, TAFE is already doing a lot, but we need to do much more.

Yesterday I launched FlexAbility, which is a national approach to improving access for people with disabilities to give them greater opportunities in TAFE, because in this day and age the chance of their gaining employment without training is very small. I readily acknowledge that we have a long way to go. TAFE is doing quite a bit, but we need to do more to ensure that all in the community and particularly those with a disability are not denied access to full-time employment.

---

### EMERGENCY SERVICES QUESTIONS

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

Leave granted.

**Mr ATKINSON:** During Question Time today the Minister for Emergency Services claimed that no question had been asked of him by me in his portfolio. I refer him to questions 72 and 73 on the Notice Paper and urge him to reply speedily.

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** Having listened to that personal explanation, I thought it was no wonder the honourable member lost his bike. My attention has been drawn to the unfortunate closure of the Postal Museum. A letter in the *Advertiser* of 25 July this year written by L. Holden of Seaview Downs stated:

With the closure of the Postal Museum in Franklin Street by Australia Post, why cannot some room be found in Adelaide's second post office (Gilles Arcade) to house the material that is left in the GPO before it finds its way to the museum in Melbourne? One piece that comes to mind is Charles Todd's desk. The SA's UPU collection of postage stamps has already gone to Melbourne. The Australia Post regulations tell us that, if the postal authorities have more than one copy of any article or item, what is left will be destroyed. Some records have already gone.

Gilles Arcade probably owes its continuing existence to the fact that the post office was relocated from a tent on the Torrens in 1838 and, along with several Government departments (supreme and local courts and police stations) gave the building enough use and time to be later again used as a theatre, along with the many other enterprises that were housed within it. Surely it is more important to keep Adelaide's history here than allowing it to be sent to Melbourne.

Several members of philatelic clubs in South Australia came to see me to express their concern that once again valuable assets held in South Australia could be shipped to the National Philatelic Museum in Melbourne. In Melbourne, Australia Post has established probably what is one of the best displays and postal museums of Australian postage stamps. In the early days of the establishment of the colonies, each State issued its own postage stamps, and South

Australia's stamps were an outstanding issue. It would be a pity if the collection of postal memorabilia that has been built up over the years by Australia Post and housed in the Postal Museum were to be lost.

The museum was closed in December last year through lack of patronage. I must admit that I had not been there before to look at the display and the memorabilia, and I was pleasantly surprised by what had been developed over the years. I am disappointed that we have not given more prominence to the display and the collection, or assisted Australia Post in bringing to the attention of the people of South Australia part of the early history of this State.

I saw the State Manager, Mr Curd, and he has assured me that an officer of Australia Post, Mr David Hogben, who is well versed in philatelic history and memorabilia, is undertaking a research program over the next six weeks to ascertain the full extent of the material held by Australia Post before any decision is made as to what will happen to it. So, the allegation that some of the material has already been destroyed is not correct. Whether some has been shipped to Melbourne seems to be unclear, except that what will be here and what will be catalogued will be available to remain in South Australia. The challenge to the Government is to make room in either the National History Trust or the State Museum to house this very important material.

Most important, of course, is the memorabilia relating to Charles Todd. Charles Todd's desk, his camp stretcher and much of the equipment he used when he pegged the overland telegraph is held by Australia Post in this museum. It would be an absolute tragedy if we lost that material. So, I appeal to the Government to assist Australia Post and the philatelic societies in South Australia to retain this very valuable collection of memorabilia and to establish it within one of the many Government buildings in the city or in the museum for the benefit of future generations.

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

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** Before I get to my topic, I wish to have recorded in this House the fact that I did not in any way reflect on the integrity of the Chair in a radio interview. Quite the contrary, I commented on the fairness and helpfulness of the Chair in a very difficult situation.

I should like to talk about the southern right whale. South Australia has been presented with an opportunity to contribute in a very significant way to the well-being of our largest annual visitor—the southern right whale. The opportunity to establish a marine park at the head waters of the Great Australian Bight has been before the South Australian Government for some time with the debate appearing to focus on which sector will have access to exploit the resources of the region. The implication of a 'joint proclamation', as proposed by the Department of Mines and Energy, has provoked a degree of concern within the conservation and environment movement, and I am sure that, like me, other members of this House have received lobby material regarding this matter.

My research into the question of a marine park has produced some very disturbing facts; namely, that South Australia has the smallest area of its coastal waters set aside as protected aquatic habitat. This is even more disturbing given the fact that South Australia was the first State in Australia to produce comprehensive legislation to protect marine ecosystems 23 years ago in 1971.

To date we have 14 aquatic reserves encompassing an area of less than 1.5 per cent of our coastal area. This figure is extremely disappointing when compared with other States. For example, Queensland has 24.5 per cent of its coastal waters as marine protected areas. Western Australia has over 20 per cent covered and its State Government has recently announced a complete ban on exploration and production in the Ningaloo Reef off the North West Cape of Western Australia. A report in the *Financial Review* of 1 August this year states:

The Western Australian Government has banned exploration and production on Ningaloo Reef off North West Cape, giving conservationists their most significant victory in WA in more than 10 years.

It goes on to state:

Mr Court told the conference the Government was committed to preserving one of the world's premier nature-based tourist attractions.

A recent proposal by the environment organisation Greenpeace to set aside 700 square kilometres of the proposed 1500 square kilometre Great Australian Bight Marine Park as a marine protected area with full protection status seems to me to be a proposal worthy of consideration. Such an area would go some way towards redressing the embarrassing situation in which we find ourselves: the State which pioneered MPAs now having the smallest protected area.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Well, you are in government now, so we are asking you. This area would offer complete protection to the southern right whales during their mating, birthing and feeding cycles and, I am informed, would offer a marine sanctuary to a very wide range of other marine species.

Adelaide rejoices when the whales arrive. We are treated to stunning visual footage of their obviously delightful play as they frolic off our coast. Their annual arrival offers a tourism aspect which is growing in its importance to our State's economy. I have not had the privilege, but I am informed that the best whale watching in the world is to be had from the cliff tops at the head of the Bight. A significant ecotourism venture is under way and is being organised by the Yalata Aboriginal community, who are developing a land-based whale watching facility. The establishment of a totally protected marine park could only enhance the value of such a venture.

The proposal for a joint declaration will allow mining rights throughout all areas of the proposed park, whereas the proposal for an area of the park to have full protection status would preclude all forms of resource exploitation.

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** It is amazing that all of a sudden the Opposition has discovered the benefits of viewing the whales from Yalata. It is unfortunate that the previous Government never erected a sign there for tourists to see where the whales are. Travelling in the area, one finds about 10 kilometres in off the highway, on top of a rubbish bin, a sign done by a thumbnail dipped in white shoe cleaner showing the premier viewing spot for whales. However, I do not wish to tell a whale story.

There have been a number of articles in the Messenger Press and also recent radio reports relating to local government groups taking over control of Adelaide Airport. Currently there is a push by the Mayor of Unley, including a consortium of Unley, West Torrens and Adelaide City councils, as well as the Glenelg council (soon to be the Holdfast Bay council), to set up a section 200 authority under

the Local Government Act to take over control of the Adelaide Airport when it is privatised.

I have grave concerns about those councils taking over the airport. I feel that it would be nothing more than jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. There is an old adage that businesses should stick to the businesses that they know. Unfortunately, local government does not have experience of running a large international airport.

Some time ago the Bannon Labor Government, under the Local Government Act, unfortunately allowed local councils to get involved in other than what would be considered their normal activities. As a result, a number of councils have created a few problems for themselves, and none more so than my own council, Marion, which in the past has made some decisions that have cost the ratepayers dearly.

I believe that development of the Adelaide Airport would also be affected by councils taking over control. As is well known, these days councils seem to be run by sectional interest groups. I believe that the proposal to which I refer would also have an effect on tourism and ancillary transport facilities servicing the Adelaide Airport.

The Mayor of Unley has made play of the fact that the Adelaide Airport at present has a \$3.2 million operating surplus. However, as regards financing the airport, he fails to take into account the cost to ratepayers of servicing the debt.

I have particular concerns about section 200 authorities if we operate under the Local Government Act. Section 200 authorities, when dealing with some local government activities, have created an air of secrecy and a lack of accountability with local government. I feel that, if the Adelaide Airport were to fall into the hands of local government operations, it would create concern about accountability in that area.

I also have other worries about local government. I believe it should be doing more about deregulation rather than subcontracting its current services. The Local Government Association should be looking at the deregulation of its waste collection and at other matters, including recycling, buildings, roads, parks and gardens. I feel that local government should be more concerned about running other areas than about running Adelaide Airport.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** Earlier this week the Federal Opposition Leader, Alexander Downer, released the Coalition's directional statement, titled 'The things that matter'. Having had the opportunity to look through the package accompanying that statement, I am very pleased with what I see from my Coalition partners in Canberra. It augurs well for Australia, assuming the Coalition wins the next Federal election. 'The things that matter' focuses on those things that matter to the Australian people. It is a statement of basic beliefs and goals that draws strength from the Australian traditions of fairness, freedom and self-confidence.

The statement is relevant, forward looking and contemporary and strongly reflects the values of both the Liberal and National Parties. The statement is not and was never intended to be a detailed collection of specific policy initiatives, nor a financial account of new spending commitments or of how such commitments would be financed. The statement provides a significant amount of detail but essentially sets out the fundamental building blocks on which the Coalition Parties will build their policies for the next election.

It is great to see and to highlight some of those building blocks. First, the statement is pro-jobs and, surely, that reflects the policies of this Liberal Government in South

Australia: our key aim was pro-jobs. We well know that the boom and bust cycle under Labor has undermined both business and national confidence. As an essential first step, a Federal Liberal Government will restore sound economic management. The nation must have a major national road strategy to provide jobs for all who want to work. The Coalition will implement a practical, commonsense approach to labour market reform. Tax and interest rate policies will be aimed at rebuilding national savings and easing pressures on small businesses and farmers. Australians who work hard will be given incentives to enjoy the fruits of their labour.

The efforts of all Australians will be recognised and encouraged by a Coalition Government, ending the Labor era of privileges for some special interest groups. A new national building project called Linking Australia will modernise transport and communications networks. The statement is very much pro-jobs. It is also pro-families, and I am delighted to see that. National confidence, security and stability will be strengthened under the Coalition through support for the family. The Coalition will restore the goal of keeping families together and will attack the causes of family break-down. Urgent steps will be taken to tackle the alarming levels of crime and violence that now afflict communities.

Families and communities will be made stronger to give individual security and support. Tax and family payments will ease financial pressures. Health care, education and child-care and home ownership will be important new priorities. Also, the Coalition will establish the climate for economic prosperity that will deliver a worthy future to our children. The third key building block is that of pro-communities. The Coalition believes that local communities and not centralised Government are the great strengths of our society. Therefore, the Coalition will seek to harness the strengths and skills of individuals and groups in the community to help solve local problems.

The Coalition will build a cooperative partnership involving the Federal and State Governments, local government and community organisations. It will expand opportunities and choice for women in vital areas. Young people, the elderly and ethnic communities will all be included in the new vision to strengthen society. The Coalition will improve standards of housing, health and employment for Aboriginal communities, and it will establish community employment boards to provide local solutions to unemployment. It will be pro-Australia and stop knocking Australia, as the present Prime Minister has been doing. It is a wonderful package.

It highlights the things that matter in this country, and I hope that all Australians will take the opportunity to look through the Coalition's great policy statement 'The things that matter', because at the next election we need a change of Government. Under 'The things that matter' we can get Australia back working.

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** I want to speak briefly about some issues related to the incident that occurred yesterday in the House involving the Minister for Primary Industries and the member for Torrens. I do not want to go into the specifics, but it is important for all of us to think carefully about what happened, why it happened and why it should not happen again. It is important not to think of it as just an isolated incident. It is important to think of the wider issues it raises. Essentially, the remarks were of an offensive nature and made by a man—a man in a powerful position in the Parliament and in the State—about the nature of a relation-

ship involving a woman, also in this House, but in a much less powerful position.

The remarks were made in a series of throw-away lines. I was thinking about this last night and I would like to make a couple of observations. First, I think it is important for people in this place to think about those comments and to think about whether those comments would have been made in the same way to a man. Would there have been a direct reference from one man to another man in this way, and would it have occurred in the same way as it did yesterday in this House?

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Ms STEVENS:** It is important—if you would just listen—for us all to think about that. I believe that that would not have happened. These are the sorts of demeaning comments that often occur in our society towards women and, I have to say, mostly from men. Secondly, the Minister concerned withdrew his remarks, yet went on to make another remark in the same vein. He did not understand, or he chose not to understand, that his remarks were inappropriate and offensive. Again, as happens so often in relation to sexual harassment—and his remarks amount to sexual harassment—those who do it think it is a joke, say they do not mean it personally, then continue to do it.

They see each occasion as an isolated incident and not part of a whole attitude and approach to other people. As I said, comments like this come within the ambit of sexual harassment. They are demeaning and derogatory. They are insensitive. They serve to have a go at someone in a way which belittles and embarrasses them, whether or not the person means it. This was done publicly yesterday in a place where it is very difficult for the victim to respond. The member for Torrens did respond and the Speaker supported her response. Other members might have been so stunned, insulted or angry that they would have said nothing.

Sexual harassment happens to all women at some time during their lives. It is insidious, it disempowers them and it is contrary to democracy. It happens in learning institutions—and we know it is a major impediment for females in that regard—and it happens in the workplace. It causes mental anguish, stress and physical illness, and sometimes it ends in physical attacks. It is well recognised that it is not on. Many organisations have dealt with this matter in terms of awareness raising and grievance procedures, and perhaps that is something that members of this place need to look at.

It also happens in local government. Recently I spoke with members of a local government organisation who said that it happened there, and they spoke about the feelings of women who did not want to take part as a result of sexual harassment. This year we are celebrating women's suffrage and talking about ways of increasing women's representation in Parliament. I would suggest that sexual harassment is a significant impediment to women taking part in Parliament. We need to address the issue as a matter of urgency if we want to redress that situation.

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** We spent the best part of yesterday listening to members on both sides of the House commending or criticising the 1994-95 budget. I heard some good debate and some that left a lot to be desired. The Treasurer wore a lot of criticism over the length of his speech and the cutbacks he announced, but who was that from? It was from the very group that made the mess in the first place, and what right did members opposite have to criticise? Have they

forgotten who made a mess of the State, who jeopardised our future and our children's future?

We, as a Government, are confronting problems we inherited. We did not create them. The people of South Australia know that and they have given us the job of cleaning up the mess. This budget will secure the future for the State and for South Australians. As a Government, we are committed to creating jobs, reducing debt and holding down taxes. This budget is all about giving people the opportunity to find a job and enjoy the financial security only a stable job can provide. Yesterday, members opposite spoke about Housing Trust waiting lists, and they were right. For the past four to five years the waiting lists at Noarlunga have been seven years. However, priority housing has a six month waiting list. An increase in demand for housing has occurred over the past 18 months, and I think we all know why.

This State Government made a promise to the people of South Australia that it would provide sound economic management and not shirk hard decisions which have for so long been put off by the previous Government. Reynell, along with other southern electorates, has many positive gains in this budget. The major initiatives provided for the electorate of Reynell are in the areas of education, health, industry and housing. Major development and refurbishment work will be undertaken at the Christies Beach and Morphett Vale high schools. The sum of \$900 000 will be spent on the first stage development at Christies Beach High School, as well as a further \$70 000 on program maintenance. An amount of \$250 000 has been allocated for the Morphett Vale High School's program maintenance. Woodend Primary School will proceed under a lease-back arrangement. The Government will also commit an extra \$7 million in 1994-95 for minor works and, in addition, schools will share an allocation of \$12 million for maintenance and minor works under the back to school grants scheme.

In the area of health, work will commence on the \$5.8 million upgrade of accident and emergency facilities at the Flinders Medical Centre. The sum of \$2 million will be spent this year. Additions to the Noarlunga Hospital will be completed this year in line with the national mental health policy of providing treatment for patients within their local community. Of particular interest to women in the community is that there will be extra funding of \$11 million for the SA breast X-ray service, and the SA cervix screening program will allocate additional funds in 1994-95 to conduct a campaign in the metropolitan area to encourage women to be screened for the presence of cancer of the cervix.

In the area of industry, \$4 million has been allocated to Sola International Holdings' research and development facility, which is due to begin in September 1994. The Government is assisting Sola International Holdings to establish a new research and development facility at Lonsdale under the terms of the land and factory construction scheme. Sola International has been in Adelaide for over 20 years. Its Lonsdale plant is the major exporter of optical lenses to Africa, Asia and New Zealand. Seven hundred people work at the factory, the majority of whom are local. The expansion of Sola International Holdings is a positive sign that we are on the road to recovery.

South Australian Housing Trust tenants on low incomes will continue to receive substantial rental rebates to ensure that their housing is affordable. Total rent rebates are expected to increase from \$117 million last year to \$122 million in the 1994-95 budget. The second stage of the proposed cottage flat rent increase has been deferred for six

months to provide additional assistance to pensioners, and private rental assistance programs have received a 20 per cent increase.

The State budget highlights the commitment of this Government to restore the health of our State's finances, reverse the uncontrolled debt of recent years and at the same time provide greater certainty in the delivery of essential services and focus on our determination to broaden the economic base of the State. The budget demonstrates the commitment to the hard work necessary to restore the State's finances, to open up future employment opportunities for young people and, after many years, to recognise and act on the needs of the southern area.

I commend the work of our Ministers in putting together a budget that will make this State work again. We have taken a lot of criticism from across the floor but not one member opposite has said anything constructive. Mind you, I guess that would be difficult; they could not get it right in 11 years, so we should not expect any better now.

---

#### FINANCIAL AGREEMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### STATE DISASTER (MAJOR EMERGENCIES AND RECOVERY) AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Disaster Act 1980 and to make consequential amendments to the Local Government Act 1934, the State Emergency Service Act 1987 and the Summary Offences Act 1953. Read a first time.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** 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 likelihood of major disasters (as defined in the State Disaster Act) occurring frequently in South Australia is low and only one such disaster has occurred in the last 20 years, namely the 1983 Ash Wednesday Bushfire disaster which caused the loss of 28 lives and some \$250 Million in damage. Despite this low probability it is accepted by the community that planning for a major disaster is a necessity, particularly for the possibility of an earthquake in Adelaide and for the annual State-wide threat from dangerous bush fires.

Flooding of the River Murray, severe storms, flash floods, hazardous chemical incidents, oil spillages and outbreaks of foreign animal disease are also potential hazards to the South Australian community.

Under the Australian Constitution it is a State responsibility to ensure adequate arrangements are made to protect its community from the effects of disasters. In that context, "disasters" are considered to be catastrophic events requiring extraordinary measures to protect life and property.

In South Australia, the legislative framework to facilitate this responsibility is embodied in the State Disaster Act enacted in 1980; it provides statutory authority for a State Disaster Committee to prepare a State Disaster Plan and to establish a State Disaster Organisation. The Act also authorises the Commissioner of Police to implement the State Disaster Plan in his capacity as the State Coordinator.

The State Disaster Act was last reviewed and amended in 1985 following the 1983 Ash Wednesday disaster. That review had the

main effect of introducing measures relating to post-disaster or recovery operations.

In 1992, the State Disaster Committee commenced a review of the Act to ensure it remained appropriate to the community's needs. The review took into account experiences from recent disasters in other states, e.g. the Newcastle earthquake, the floods in New South Wales and Queensland and the Sydney bushfires. It also considered developments in disaster management arrangements in other states, e.g. Victoria.

This Amendment Bill, proposes to do three main things—

- Firstly, to allow the State Disaster Plan to be implemented for major emergency incidents which do not reach the level of disaster as defined in the Act.
- Secondly, to improve measures for the recovery from disasters by individuals, families and communities; to include the formation of Sub Committee of the State Disaster Committee to prepare and maintain recovery plans.
- Thirdly, to make administrative changes related to the membership of the State Disaster Committee and the provisions for workers' compensation.

In addition, the Bill will provide, as a contingency measure only, the option of using the State Disaster Plan and Organisation for civil defence measures should they ever be necessary.

#### Major Emergency Incidents

Although no disasters have occurred in South Australia since 1983 e.g. from bush fires or earthquakes, there have been a number of major emergency incidents which have identified the need for the State Disaster Act to provide for the State Disaster Plan in certain situations to be implemented for major emergencies.

The State Disaster Committee believes there is a requirement for a middle tier response capability, i.e. to fill the gap between day to day emergencies which are dealt with by the emergency services and full-scale disasters which are managed by the State Disaster Organisation. The need for this broader level coordination of an emergency incident is supported by recent incidents such as the 1986 Mt Remarkable bushfire, the 1992 flash floods in the Adelaide Hills, the 1992 Spencer Gulf oil spillage and the 1992 Gawler River floods.

These incidents showed that the coordination procedures provided by disaster plans are effective for managing the overall response to such incidents.

That State Disaster Plan is implemented by the Commissioner of Police in his role of State Coordinator. It has procedures to deal with complex situations and using it to coordinate the response to major emergencies may prevent an emergency situation escalating to a full-scale disaster. Similarly, in country regions, disaster plans can be implemented by prescribed Divisional Police Commanders acting in their role as Divisional Coordinators. It should be noted that in most States and Territories, disaster plans can be implemented for emergency incidents of the nature mentioned previously.

The South Australia Police has the role in coordinating the response by the various agencies that comprise the State Disaster Organisation. It is also standard operational practice during major emergency incidents for the Police to coordinate support to the 'lead' emergency service or other agency which has the responsibility to deal with the incident. Thus application of the State Disaster Plan in those situations is consistent with existing protocols for coordination between the emergency services.

Implementing the State Disaster Plan for major emergency incidents which fall short of 'disasters' would also mean the State Disaster Organisation and the State Emergency Operations Centre would function more often under real conditions and would therefore be better prepared to operate during disaster situations.

The Bill defines a major emergency and honourable members will note that it will allow the State Coordinator to implement the State Disaster Plan if it is reported to him by a combating authority such as the Fire Services, that a coordination problem exists which should be dealt with under the procedures contained in the State Disaster Plan.

The State Disaster Plan will of course need to be revised to reflect these new procedures and this will be arranged by the Chairman of the State Disaster Committee.

#### Recovery from disaster by individuals, families and communities

Honourable members would be aware that the most significant component of disaster operations is that of the post-disaster or recovery phase. This Bill aims to improve upon the arrangements and procedures put into effect after the Ash Wednesday Bushfire disaster, particularly in the planning process and the involvement of local government authorities in that process.

Importantly, this Bill defines 'recovery' in terms of what might need to be done to restore the lives of victims to as close as possible to their condition prior to the disaster. The legislation will define the range of tasks which Government and administrators may have to address in both the short and longer term.

To facilitate a more effective approach to planning for the after-effects of disasters, the Bill also provides for a permanent Recovery Committee to be appointed by the State Disaster Committee. The Recovery Committee will be responsible to maintain recovery plans and arrangements across the state and to oversee the implementation of Government approved recovery strategies and programs which will of course, involve relevant local government authorities.

The Bill also proposes to improve the administrative procedures for making declarations under the Act. Honourable members would be aware that currently, after a declaration of a "state of disaster" has occurred, a second declaration of a "post-disaster period" must be made by the Governor before the Government can authorise expenditure on recovery measures.

It is an accepted principle that the recovery process commences at the initial response to a disaster and to streamline the administrative process involved the Bill will do away with the second declaration and authorise Executive Council to consider expenditure for recovery measures following from an initial "state of disaster" declaration.

#### Membership of the State Disaster Committee

The membership of the State Disaster Committee is established under the Act and includes the Commissioner of Police but functioning in his capacity as the State Coordinator. Currently therefore, the SA Police Department is not directly represented on the Committee, at least not as far as its operational responsibilities are concerned.

Because the Police have the important function of overall coordination in the State Disaster Plan it is clearly necessary that the Police Department should be represented on the Committee and the Bill will allow for that.

#### Provisions for Workers' Compensation

The Bill also changes the provision for workers' compensation. Currently, Section 19 of the State Disaster Act provides that people who take part in disaster operations and who would not normally be covered for compensation, will be eligible for benefits provided by the Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Act.

However, this is not consistent with the provision of cover for people in similar circumstances, e.g. for volunteers of the Country Fire Service who are covered by regulations under Section 103A of the Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Act. A consistent approach is desirable and it would be more appropriate for such people to be covered under Section 103A of the Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Act.

#### Application of the State Disaster Act to Civil Defence Measures

The Bill proposes to amend the definition of disaster so that the meaning of "any occurrence" will include "hostilities directed by an enemy against Australia".

In 1991, the Australian Government ratified the 'Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions, 1949' thus committing Australia to the protection of the civilian community through civil defence 'humanitarian' measures, when such measures are required due to the outbreak of "hostilities". In this context "hostilities" means action by an enemy against Australia but does not include acts of terrorism. Civil defence measures are non-military and constitutionally, are the responsibility of the States and Territories. It is accepted nationally that they would be provided by an organisation similar to and based on existing counter disaster organisations. The Protocols became law on 21st December 1991 under the provisions of the Commonwealth's Geneva Convention Act 1957.

It is proposed that any need for a civil defence organisation arising in South Australia (particularly for low-level military threats which could develop at short notice) be based on the State Disaster Organisation as it is defined in the State Disaster Plan. To facilitate this proposal will require that the definition of "disaster" in the Act be amended for "any occurrence" to include "hostilities directed by an enemy against Australia". Most other States already have the requirements for civil defence included in their disaster legislation.

Other than this proposed precautionary legislative measure, there is currently no intention to undertake any action to establish a civil defence organisation in South Australia.

#### Regulations under the Act

Presently, the appointment and responsibilities of Divisional Coordinators and the Functional Service State Controllers in the State Disaster Organisation are detailed in regulations under the Act.

These regulations are administrative in nature and are unnecessary. They will be replaced by an Administrative Handbook, prepared and issued by the State Disaster Committee which has the necessary powers to do so under Section 8 of the Act. However, to accord with existing management practice in the Police Department, the Act will authorise the State Coordinator to appoint Divisional Coordinators.

#### Consultation

Besides the involvement of members of the State Disaster Committee, which of course includes the Chief Executive Officers of all of the emergency services and senior officials from recovery agencies such as health and welfare, the State Disaster Committee also consulted widely with local government authorities across the State and the Local Government Association. All of these agencies are in support of the proposals contained in the Bill, however, as mentioned previously the procedures leading to a decision to implement the State Disaster Plan for a major emergency incident will need to be carefully dealt with in the Plan.

#### Conclusion

I submit to Honourable members that the provisions proposed in this Bill will substantially improve our ability to cope with major emergencies and disasters and particularly with respect to the well-being of affected communities and individuals.

#### Explanation of Clauses

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

##### *Clause 2: Commencement*

##### *Clause 3: Long title*

The long title is amended to include reference to protection of life and property in the event of a major emergency and to recovery following a disaster or major emergency. These are two new areas addressed in the Bill.

##### *Clause 4: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation*

A new definition of a major emergency is inserted. A major emergency is an event that is not a disaster but should, in the opinion of the State Co-ordinator, be dealt with under the *State Disaster Act* because of the diverse resources required to be used in response to the emergency, the likelihood of the emergency escalating into a disaster or for any other reason.

The definition of counter-disaster operations is removed. Such operations are to be known as response operations.

The definition of post-disaster operations is removed. These are limited operations for clean up and safety purposes carried out during a specified short period following a disaster.

A new definition of recovery operations is inserted. Recovery is widely defined to encompass all matters involved in individuals and their community returning to a normal pattern of life.

The definition of post-disaster period is removed and the definition of disaster area is amended to remove a reference to a post-disaster period. Under the Bill, recovery operations may take place after a disaster or major emergency without reference to a particular period.

The definition of disaster is amended to ensure that a disaster arising by reason of hostilities directed by an enemy against Australia comes within the definition.

The definition of the State Disaster Plan is substituted to include reference to both response and recovery operations and to major emergencies as well as disasters. It is also made clear that provisions for monitoring circumstances that may give rise to a disaster or major emergency are appropriate in the Plan. The definition also contemplates Divisional Disaster Plans.

##### *Clause 5: Amendment of s. 5—Application of Act*

Section 5 states that the Act does not authorise measures to bring an industrial or civil dispute occurring during a disaster to an end. Section 5 is amended to include a reference to a major emergency.

##### *Clause 6: Amendment of s. 6—State Disaster Committee*

The membership of the Committee is increased to allow for a member appointed to represent the Police (the Commissioner of Police is a member but only by reason of being the State Co-ordinator).

##### *Clause 7: Substitution of s. 7—Proceedings of Committee*

Section 7 allows the Committee to conduct its business in such manner as it thinks fit. The new section requires that 6 members constitute a quorum and provides that the presiding member has a casting vote. These matters are currently set out in regulations.

##### *Clause 8: Amendment of s. 8—Functions of Committee*

The following additional functions are given to the Committee:

- to advise the Minister on methods of combating major emergencies (equivalent to the existing function in relation to disasters) and of recovery following disasters and major emergencies;

- to maintain contact with organisations that might usefully participate in recovery operations and to keep them informed of what would be expected of them in the event of a disaster or major emergency;
- to keep organisations that might usefully participate in response operations informed of what would be expected of them in the event of a major emergency (equivalent to the existing function in relation to a disaster);
- to monitor the standard operating procedures of any body or organisation that performs any function under the State Disaster Plan or that might participate in response operations involved in a major emergency (equivalent to the existing function in relation to a disaster) or recovery operations involved in a disaster or major emergency;
- to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the State Disaster Plan and the response and recovery operations taken during and following any state of disaster or major emergency.

Under section 8(2) the Committee is currently given the power to create such offices as it thinks fit for the purposes of implementing the State Disaster Plan. The amendment extends this to the purpose of preparing the State Disaster Plan and adds a power to assign additional functions to the State Co-ordinator and, with the approval of the State Co-ordinator, to Divisional Co-ordinators. Divisional Co-ordinators are appointed by the State Co-ordinator under new section 9A to have functions and powers under the Act in relation to a specified part of the State.

##### *Clause 9: Insertion of s. 8A and 8B—Recovery Committee and functions*

A Recovery Committee is established. The committee is to be appointed by the State Disaster Committee and is to consist of 3 persons. One must be appointed to represent local government. The members may or may not be members of the State Disaster Committee. The Recovery Committee is subject to control and direction by the State Disaster Committee.

The functions of the Recovery Committee are—

- to prepare for consideration by the State Disaster Committee that part of the State Disaster Plan that relates to recovery in the event of a disaster or major emergency;
- to keep that part of the State Disaster Plan under review and recommend to the State Disaster Committee such amendments to it as from time to time appear necessary or expedient;
- to advise the State Disaster Committee on matters relating to recovery in the event of a disaster or major emergency;
- to oversee and evaluate recovery operations during and following a state of disaster or major emergency;
- to carry out such other functions as are assigned to it by the State Disaster Committee.

##### *Clause 10: Insertion of s. 9A—Divisional Co-ordinators*

A new section is inserted setting out matters that are currently covered by regulations. The State Co-ordinator is given power to appoint Divisional Co-ordinators to exercise functions and powers under this Act in relation to specified parts of the State.

##### *Clause 11: Amendment of s. 10—Delegation*

The section is amended to make it clear that the State Co-ordinator may delegate functions or powers to a Divisional Co-ordinator or to any other person.

##### *Clause 12: Substitution of s. 11—Authorised officers*

Section 11 currently provides that the State Co-ordinator may appoint authorised officers and that persons holding offices prescribed by regulation are automatically authorised officers. The new section continues the power of the State Co-ordinator to appoint authorised officers but allows the appointment to be by class (eg all persons holding a particular rank in the police force). The need for regulations is eliminated. The new section also provides for identity cards for authorised officers who are not police officers and for the return of identity cards and other official items when a person ceases to be an authorised officer.

##### *Clause 13: Substitution of heading to Part 4*

Part 4 is amended to deal with recovery operations as well as response operations (currently counter-disaster operations) and the heading is amended accordingly.

##### *Clause 14: Insertion of s. 13A—Declaration of major emergency by State Co-ordinator*

The new section enables the State Co-ordinator to declare that a major emergency exists in a specified part of the State. The declaration remains in force initially for 48 hours but may be renewed or extended with the approval of the Governor.

##### *Clause 15: Amendment of s. 14—Powers of Minister on declaration of state of disaster or emergency*



The powers of the Minister to authorise expenditure (as approved by the Governor) to relieve distress and assist in response operations in disasters is extended to response operations in the case of major emergencies and to recovery operations in disasters and major emergencies.

*Clause 16: Amendment of s. 15—Powers of State Co-ordinator and authorised officers during state of disaster or emergency*

The powers given to authorised officers for response operations during a state of disaster are extended to major emergencies and to recovery. A provision enabling an authorised officer to require a suspected offender to identify himself or herself is added to the section. This is currently included in the regulations.

*Clause 17: Insertion of s. 15A—Recovery operations following state of disaster or emergency*

The State Co-ordinator is given power to carry out recovery operations for the purpose of carrying the State Disaster Plan into effect. Like the current post-disaster operations, a recovery operation may not be carried out on private land without the consent of the owner of that land.

*Clause 18: Amendment of s. 16—Offences*

The offence of refusing to comply with the directions of the State Co-ordinator or an authorised officer during a disaster is extended to major emergencies. The limitation that the direction be given within a disaster area is removed.

The offence of obstructing a response operation is extended to recovery operations and operates in both a disaster and a major emergency.

Offences of impersonating an authorised officer and of using official items improperly are added. These are currently included in the regulations.

The penalties are converted to the nearest divisional penalty.

*Clause 19: Repeal of Part 4A*

This Part currently deals with post-disaster operations.

*Clause 20: Amendment of s. 18—Protection of employment rights*

The protection given to employees who are involved in response operations in the event of a disaster is extended to employees involved in response or recovery operations in the event of a disaster or major emergency.

*Clause 21: Repeal of s. 19—Workers compensation*

This section is repealed with a view to workcover arrangements being directly handled under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act.

*Clause 22: Amendment of s. 20—Evidentiary provision*

This is a consequential amendment to the inclusion of major emergencies and recovery operations.

*Clause 23: Amendment of s. 22A—State Disaster Relief Fund*

The Fund is currently used for the relief of persons who suffer injury, loss or damage as a result of a disaster. This is extended to major emergencies.

*Clause 24: Amendment of s. 24—Regulations*

The regulation making power enabling specific regulations to be made in response to conditions caused by a disaster is extended to major emergencies. The penalty that may be imposed by regulations is increased from \$500 to a Division 6 fine—\$4 000.

*Schedule 1: Further Amendments to Principal Act*

This is a statute law revision schedule.

*Schedule 2: Consequential Amendments*

References to a state of disaster or to counter-disaster or post-disaster operations in the *Local Government Act*, the *State Emergency Services Act* and the *Summary Offences Act* are updated.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mr Acting Speaker, I rise on a point of order and draw your attention to the fact that the Opposition cannot afford to put even one member in the House today. I think it is of some significance. Members of the Opposition have new offices in this place and they are apparently so comfortable they cannot afford to come down here into the Chamber.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning):** Order! What is the Premier's point of order?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The point of order is that either members of the Opposition come into this House and purport to be part of this Parliament—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I do not think it is a point of order under Standing Orders.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** There is reference to the Leader of the Opposition in the Standing Orders, and I am just clarifying whether there is any Opposition left in South Australia whatsoever.

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

## ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin) and the Minister for Transport (Hon. D.V. Laidlaw), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

## NATIVE VEGETATION

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Infrastructure):** I move:

That this House refers to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee for review regulations made pursuant to the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act 1946 in so far as they define the requirements for vegetation clearance distance around powerlines on public land in non-bushfire-risk areas in the Adelaide metropolitan council areas.

The purpose of moving this motion is to bring the regulations under review of the committee. The current regulations require ETSA to cut trees to a distance of 1.5 metres around high voltage lines and to provide local councils with a vegetation clearance scheme for agreement. These regulations were introduced in 1988, after a lengthy deliberation and consultation process following the devastation of the 1983 bushfires. It is time therefore to review and assess the regulations. Because most high voltage powerlines run along major roads with often significant stands of trees, some councils have been reluctant to accept tree lopping. Other councils have reached agreement with the Electricity Trust as to the scope of such tree trimming.

In an endeavour to resolve this matter, earlier this year I referred it to the Local Government Association, hoping that in the metropolitan area we would be able to reach a uniform agreement. As those negotiations have not yielded a result, Parliament will now have the opportunity, if this motion is passed, to review those regulations. It is timely to do so and I commend the motion to the House.

Motion carried.

## APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances.  
(Continued from 6 September. Page 394.)

**Mr ASHENDEN (Wright):** I wish to assure you, Mr Acting Speaker, and the member opposite that the serious matter I am about to raise is not *sub judice*. I have contacted the Department of Public Prosecutions today to ensure that that is the case, and I have been informed that the matter I wish to discuss is not subject to appeal at the moment. This matter was raised in the *Advertiser* last week. The daughter of the victim of the callous crime I will refer to is a constituent of mine and she has made me aware of information that I believe should be brought before the House. To bring home

the stark horror of the matter, I refer to the *Advertiser* of last week, which states:

Haunted by the image of her husband's blood pouring through her fingers, Alice Hartley is devastated the man who fatally stabbed him will serve a minimum of 3½ years in prison. 'It is a nightmare that never ends' she says.

This is the result of a matter determined in the Supreme Court concerning Mr Jason John Price, who was sentenced to six years and 10 months' gaol for the manslaughter of Clifford Hartley, 69, at Elizabeth on 26 June last year. The article continues:

He was given a non-parole period of 3½ years. Price, 24, of Elizabeth Field, had pleaded not guilty to the charge of murdering Mr Hartley in a toilet at the Elizabeth Shopping Centre. In defence submissions, Price argued he had been mugged and robbed nine days before the incident, and when he encountered Mr Hartley in the toilet he was on medication to overcome the ill-effects of the mugging. Price said he felt a 'rush of adrenalin' when he mistook Mr Hartley for one of the men who mugged him and thought he was going to attack him again.

It is most unfortunate that the victim of this crime died before he could be interviewed by police, because the detectives assigned to the case went on leave and in the five days they were on leave the victim died. In the meantime, a statement was made by the victim to his wife and daughter which unfortunately was not admissible in evidence before the court. However, I would like to read to the House the statements made by the victim to his daughter and to his wife. The first statement from the daughter reads:

Once dad was able to speak he told my mother and myself the details of his attack. He said that he thought the toilets were empty when he first went in, and was standing at the urinal with his pants unzipped. . . when he saw a shadow out of the corner of his eye and sensed someone behind him. The next thing he remembered was falling to his knees in agony. He then said that he felt the knife being pulled out and saw his attacker attempt to stab him again whilst reaching over and taking his glasses out of his jacket pocket. Dad then said he fought for his life, putting up his forearm to deflect the knife which stabbed his head, then grabbed hold of his attacker's hand and attempted to twist the knife away from himself. He said he managed to turn the knife so that it cut his attacker, at which point his attacker turned to flee.

Dad said that he didn't want his attacker to get away so he grabbed his clothing and held on in the hope that someone would come in and, because he wouldn't let go, his attacker then kicked and kicked him in the right side and groin area forcing him to let go. Dad said he tried to go after the man and made it outside the toilets before collapsing.

When I asked dad if his attacker had asked for money, he said that his attacker had made no attempt to communicate and that he would have gladly handed over his wallet had he asked. I also asked dad if he thought the man had been hiding in the toilets. He said he believed he must have been hiding in one of the toilet booths and was just waiting for someone to stab and that he was just unlucky. . . at that particular time.

The wife's statement is as follows:

Our Lynn asked him if he realised he had been stabbed. Cliff said, 'Yes, I do, I do, that lad tried to kill me.' And I said, 'What happened love?' He said, 'Well I was stood at the urinal and was getting ready to go, when I sensed something and saw a shadow out of the corner of my eye. All of a sudden I felt a big pain, a big hurt in my back and I fell to my knees in agony, and I thought to myself, I think I've been stabbed and, as I fell down, I turned round to see who it was and he reached over and took my glasses out of my pocket. I think he thought it was my wallet and then I saw this knife coming towards me, and I thought he is going to stab me again, so I fought for my life. And as I reached up my arm to stop the knife it caught my head and it must have cut my arm as well before I grabbed his wrist and tried to twist the knife away and I think I managed to cut him, but I wouldn't let go so he kicked me.

As he turned to flee all I thought was that, he can't get away with this, someone has to see him, so I grabbed his clothing and hung on in the hope that someone would come in and catch him, but when he

couldn't shake me off he twisted and kicked me in the right side and groin and I had to let go. I staggered outside after him and I must have collapsed on the floor, for I remembered people standing over me and your mum holding me.' Our Lynn then asked him if he thought the man had been hiding in the toilets and he said, 'He must have been because when I went in the toilets they appeared empty. I think the man was just waiting for someone to stab and I was unlucky being there at the wrong time.'

Unfortunately, that evidence could not be put before the court, and it is certainly different from that which the perpetrator of this horrendous crime put forward.

**Mr Foley:** Why not?

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Because it was hearsay and not given to the police, for the reasons I have explained. In sentencing the judge made comments reported in the *Advertiser*, as follows:

Before that, he had been in prison in the Northern Territory where, in May 1990, he was sentenced to 11 years' gaol for 'very serious offences'.

I would like the Parliament to know what those serious offences were. The first was robbery with violence, the second was aggravated assault and the third was grievous bodily harm. In committing one of those offences Price broke into a person's home, tied up the occupants and tortured them. That is the sort of person about whom I am talking, yet the law has allowed this man to virtually get off free, despite having that sort of history. He is that sort of person. We have the evidence from the victim himself about what occurred, yet we can see what has resulted. Is it any wonder that this man's family is so bitter about the very light sentence given to this offender?

Another matter that I find so galling is that the judge referred to Price's 'sad personal history', and he accepted a psychiatrist's view that Price ought to have a 'limited' time in gaol. This is a person who has carried out the sorts of crime I have described, a person who hid in a toilet to undertake a cold-blooded attack on an old man and an innocent victim, and he gets away with three years.

**Mr Foley:** That's disgraceful.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I agree, it is disgraceful. There is another matter that the family has raised with me. In handing down the sentence, the judge said that the medical evidence indicated that the victim did not die as a result of the stabbing but as a result of an existing medical condition. I wish to make the point that the medical evidence that the judge accepted was given by a medical practitioner who had never seen the victim—the victim had never been to him—yet that doctor made the statement that he believed the treatment given by the treating hospital for the pre-existing condition was incorrect. That statement was made by a medical practitioner who had never seen the victim. However, a medical report from another medical practitioner indicates that the treatment given by the treating hospital was absolutely correct and exactly as it should have been. I cannot understand how a judge can turn around and say that this man, the victim of a vicious stabbing, has died not as a result of the stabbing but because of a pre-existing medical condition.

Is it any wonder that the public is becoming so cynical about the law and the way in which it is being so-called 'enforced' in the courts. I have put on record the evidence as given by the victim. I say to the courts, 'You consider this vicious criminal with a record such as I have outlined. You say he ought to have a limited time in gaol. Evidence, which is all supportive of the perpetrator, is taken and the victims, in this instance as in so many others, are treated with disdain.'

I hope the House is as disgusted and concerned as I am about this whole sad episode. I urge the Director of Public Prosecutions to institute an appeal against the very light sentence handed down.

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** The subject I want to discuss is one which, in the nine months I have been in this Parliament, has been brought up on numerous occasions. I refer to graffiti. People might wonder why we continue to debate this matter when I do not believe we are getting anywhere at all. Many constituents come into my office constantly to complain about the incidence of graffiti in the electorate of Colton. As a matter of fact, I was asked to have a look at Seaview Road from Grange through to Henley Beach, and I would be safe in saying that at least one of every three properties including bus stops, bus signs, shelters, public signs and the fronts of people's properties—fences and palings—were graffitied to plague proportions.

We read recently that the Minister for Transport was so concerned about the damage on a particular bus route that she took the buses away for 24-hours and threatened that, if the graffiti on the buses and the damage did not stop, she would take the service away completely. While that was pretty tough and one would have to support her, it is unfortunate that 95 per cent of the community would be disadvantaged simply because of the 2, 3 or perhaps 5 per cent of irresponsible people who caused the damage. I know from my local government background that the cost to the City of Adelaide in one financial year simply to remove graffiti and to provide chemicals for its removal was about \$60 000. One would say that there were far better things that the city could have spent its money on. It could have planted another few thousand trees to beautify the city rather than having people work simply to remove the destruction of irresponsible people in our community.

The other night on television I saw that in the northern districts—I think in the Salisbury area—two or three young lads had caused enormous damage to a person's house. The freestone was marked with black paint, and the railings, the posts and the front walls were graffitied. So incensed was this person that, on hearing the noise, he went outside with a .22 calibre rifle and proceeded to shoot one of the youths. These are pretty drastic measures for someone to take. But the damage to this person's personal and private property so incensed him that he lost total control of his senses.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass):** I remind the member for Colton that that case is still a court case. The honourable member's comments are getting very close to being deemed *sub judice*.

**Mr CONDOUS:** The point I emphasise is that the person was so incensed by the action taken against his property that he took a severe step. In our community we do not make guns available at John Martin's for people of violence or for bank robbers to buy and shoot others. We do not appoint paedophiles as scout leaders in our community. We do not sell marijuana and heroin on chemist shelves for drug addicts to buy freely. We do not hand out free samples of scotch whisky to alcoholics, but we openly allow the instruments of graffiti to be sold unabated and unlimited to young people, who then go on their merry way destroying the visual environment by putting graffiti on public and personal property. We allow people to sell the very instruments that are required by these young people—and maybe there are older people as well. They freely buy as many cans of spray paint as they want: they come out of the store, wait until the

sun goes down and go on their merry way putting their signatures all over properties, defacing them.

When will members of this Parliament—and I say 'Parliament' not 'Government', because it is a joint responsibility—implement measures so that we can say that we are taking a responsible attitude and positive steps to stop the destruction of our environment? We are doing absolutely nothing at all. I think the time has come for this Parliament and for the Minister to start to control the sale of spray can paints and wide felt marking pens. I am quite comfortable in saying that in 90 per cent or more of cases these two things are sold for the purposes of graffiti: in only 10 per cent of cases are they sold for genuine use. Let us face it.

The Opposition intends to introduce a Bill asking the Government to allow people who are 16 years of age and younger to buy scratch tickets. I support that. I would expect the Opposition to then support a Bill—when the Minister draws it up—to stop youths of 14 years of age from walking into a Dulux or any other paint shop and saying, 'I want half a dozen cans of black spray paint.' The youths go out that night and cause a great deal of damage, the repair of which costs councils tens of thousands of dollars. Last year it cost the STA \$1 million to rectify damage on buses resulting from graffiti. That \$1 million could have been spent sensibly in the community but it was spent putting people to work on removing this pollutant.

What should happen—and it is only a recommendation; I do not know whether this is a solution, but at least I am putting forward ideas—is that each paint shop or store that sells wide felt pens should require the person purchasing those items to produce a driver's licence with a photograph so that the purchase of that item could be registered in a book. The council would have the right to inspect the purchase invoices against the sales plus the stock on the shelves and see whether the records are correct. I think the time has come when we should require someone who needs a tin of spray paint to get their mother, who is over 18 years of age and in a position of responsibility, to purchase it on their behalf. The same should apply to wide felt pens.

I see nothing wrong with that, because at least we would have some sort of register showing where the product has gone: we would have some control and could at least follow it up. The time has come. I know that people in my area are absolutely incensed. I get sick and tired of driving around my electorate and seeing that freshly painted bus signs have been vandalised, as have shop signs that are left outside overnight. We must do something responsible and reach the point where by implementing certain actions we are overcoming the problem. I am sure that the people in Colton, especially those who have complained to me, are looking forward to some sort of action, and I hope that that happens very soon.

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** In this contribution I support the 1994 budget handed down by the Treasurer on 26 August 1994. I find it very bemusing yet somewhat tragic that members opposite, all two of them, should be critical of a strategic plan by this Government to right the wrongs of 11 years of total mismanagement and blundering in every single area of the State's finances. It was the Premier, Mr Brown, who said on 26 August 1994, 'This is the first budget in 10 years which faces reality and addresses the real issues.' Of course, he is absolutely right. It is all about jobs—giving the people of this State the opportunity and the confidence to obtain a job, thus to have the financial security and the

stability that only a job can provide. It also provides much needed self esteem.

This budget signifies a positive and commonsense program of reform to ensure more efficient delivery of services while carefully targeting significant levels of spending at the most fundamental social and economic problem that we face, and that is unemployment. What a mess we inherited. When a mess is inherited, tough decisions have to be made to get things back to order again. Yet, because of the Brown Government's prudent management and planning since December 1993, the pain most certainly has been minimised by the creation of efficiencies across key community services.

Two areas of particular interest to me and certainly to the people of South Australia surely would be health and education. It is important to note that in the area of health, one area which has been soundly abused and picked on by the Opposition since the budget was handed down, our key commitment was to halve hospital waiting lists in the first term of government. The 1993 election commitment has been exceeded by \$1.5 million. This financial year, this Government will be spending \$1 397 million on health and \$1 145 million on education. The level of Government spending, particularly in the key area of education, is above the national average.

With respect to the area of health, contrary to the criticism from the Opposition over the past few days, there is major reform in the health sector, including the introduction of casemix funding, and this will maximise incentives for hospitals to provide services in the most cost effective way, while standards of patient care are maintained. Under casemix funding, the major hospitals will have \$7.5 million available to reduce elective surgery, via the booking list pools created under the hospital services improvement strategy. It was Labor which acted as if the State Bank disaster had never occurred, and members opposite still duck for cover and hide when it is mentioned. It would have no impact on the State's finances! It continued to fund real increases in the health budget every year except 1991-92 when the budget was increased in line with inflation.

As Minister Armitage said recently in a press release, what really separates the previous Government's approach from this Government's approach is that, while we are taking the hard decisions to rein in the budget, we are giving health administrators the management tools which show them for the first time where they are inefficient. It gives them the opportunity to change rigid work practices and to allow them to involve the private sector where the private sector is demonstrably more efficient for the same quality.

Casemix shows administrators where they are inefficient or efficient in relation to their peers. It rewards the efficient. For example, the Lyell McEwin Hospital under casemix has been under-funded for about \$600 000 per year for many years. Casemix redistributes the money among the hospitals using an objective measure. Contestability also gives the administrators the flexibility to look for reforms from within the system and, if they cannot be achieved, it allows for competitive tendering to provide quality services at the most efficient prices.

As to education, notwithstanding the garbage that constantly oozes from Ms Clare McCarty's lips and from her crony unionists and our worthy Opposition, amid threats of strikes and cries that the budget breaches election promises, the truth is that education is now well and truly back on the rails, and a great deal of this credit must go to Minister Lucas.

There are still scare tactics engineered by the Opposition that schools will close in droves, and we hear it every other day. These deceitful tactics are still being used at the present time and they are tactics which were heavily promoted in the Torrens by-election and were also part of an unsuccessful lies and scare campaign promoted during the 1993 State election. As Minister Lucas has already informed the people of South Australia:

The Government's policy on school closures is exactly the same as that of the previous Government. That is, the decisions on closures or amalgamations will only be taken after consultation at the local community level so that everyone will have an opportunity to at least put their point of view. Over the next three years the ball park number of school closures is expected to be 40.

In fact, that is what we were promised prior to the election. This is a favourable outlook when compared with the record of the previous Government, which closed about 70 schools over the six years or so prior to the 1993 State election, an average of about 10 per year.

As the budget clearly indicates, achievement of the 1994 education savings target of \$22 million will mean a reduction of 422 teaching positions. This will result in an increase of an average of one student in the primary and junior primary schools staffing formula and an increase in the secondary school practical class size averaging 1.5 students. These formula changes, based on the 1994 enrolments, would mean that almost 75 per cent of all junior primary and primary schools would not lose a teacher, and the remaining primary and junior primary schools would lose a maximum of 1.1 teaching positions. After these adjustments, South Australia is still likely to have the second lowest pupil-teacher ratio among the States, and it remains well below the national average.

With four previously disastrous budget debacles under the former Labor Government which, first, forced up Government debt and, secondly, reduced the number of private sector jobs and slashed essential services, the 1994 budget is designed to, and certainly will, reverse the previous trends. This budget handed down by the Brown Government is designed to stimulate economic growth and job creation which was sadly missing during the last 11 years of the Labor Government. The Treasurer, in his report, says:

With this budget, the Government is demonstrating its commitment to the hard work necessary to restore the State's finances. The long-term financial strategy is being built on a firm foundation of on-going savings—not on short-term, one-off measures. It is a budget which clears the way for economic expansion and job creation.

Again, I emphasise the importance of job creation, because that is basically what it is all about. The Treasurer continues:

It is directed to securing lasting benefits for the State and South Australians.

In summary, it is a strategy to achieve financial, economic and social benefits that will last, and last well and truly into the twenty-first century. I support the Bill.

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** I rise also in support of the budget and in doing so I wish to address three issues. First, I merely highlight in the budget some of the positives occurring in my own electorate of Light. In the health budget the Minister has announced that the 86-bed Gawler Hospital will be completed this financial year. It is estimated that that will occur in late October, and the Government has committed a further \$8 million to that project. This will deliver to the Gawler and Barossa communities a first class hospital bringing all hospital services together, such as family services, physio-

therapy and X-ray services. The hospital also contains a private bed component, which has been sorely lacking in the Gawler area. In addition, funding is being provided to country regions for the establishment or expansion of multi-disciplinary mental health teams. A half-time psychologist will be provided to this end for the Barossa and Light area, and a commitment of \$45 000 has been made in the budget this year.

The education budget will have significant effects on the electorate of Light. Probably one of the most significant capital investments in Light has been the recent announcement of a planned new suburb in Gawler called Hewett, which will see the advancement of 1 000 new homes in the area over the next five to six years, the building of those homes to be commenced within the next 12 months. As a result of the influx of people into the Gawler township, the Minister for Education and Children's Services has allocated a new primary school to Hewitt at a capital cost of \$4.3 million, and this year \$1 million is to be spent on preliminary work for the commencement of that primary school. An associated preschool will be located on the same grounds. That will involve a total cost of \$460 000, of which \$260 000 is to be spent this financial year. The Mallala Primary School is also located within my electorate. A capital upgrade of \$1.1 million is to occur there, and \$1 million of that upgrade is to be spent in the 1994-95 budget.

I turn now to the area of EWS activities. For some time the Barossa has been complaining of dirty water. Luckily, perhaps, one of the up sides of the drought this year is that we are continuing to receive pumped Murray water, so we are not receiving water from the Warren reservoir, which has a particularly distasteful colour. The Minister has announced that at Swan Reach pressure reducing valves will be installed this year at a total cost of \$400 000 and an estimated expenditure this year of \$250 000.

In the area of transport, the Minister for Transport has announced that the Sheoak Log bypass will be constructed this financial year at a cost of \$2.5 million, and \$2.16 million of that is to be spent this year. This is a sorely needed bypass. It is an area through which a lot of heavy traffic moves. Currently the township of Sheoak Log is in an 80km/h zone, and I have been in that township a number of times when vehicles have travelled through it at speeds far greater than 100km/h. The bypass will make it far safer for Sheoak Log residents and those people who work at an engineering enterprise there, as it is adjacent to the main road.

Further down the road, \$3.4 million has been allocated towards the Daveyston bypass. Again, this is a particularly winding stretch of road which offers few opportunities for overtaking motorists. The bypass at Daveyston will be a particularly good thing for that town; \$500 000 is to be spent on it this year, and I can assure members that residents of that area will be particularly pleased.

Also dealing with the area of transport, although it is perhaps not related quite so much to the budget, I noted that in her speech in another place yesterday the Minister for Transport informed Parliament that not all the land which houses storage sheds at Dry Creek will be sold by the department. This matter involves SteamRanger, and, with the Minister's announcement that she is keen that an opportunity exist for SteamRanger or another interest to operate a historic rail service to the Barossa valley, it is particularly necessary for storage sheds to remain in the Dry Creek area for the purpose of utilising the broad gauge line going to the north.

I might add that SteamRanger has also run trips to Riverton and other places north over a long period, and it would be a pity if the transfer of SteamRanger to Mount Barker prevented it from exploiting opportunities to the north of Adelaide. This matter has been particularly noted by the Tourism Commission, which has confirmed that such an initiative is long overdue and has particularly high tourist potential.

I visited Victoria earlier this year and looked at historic train services there, and particularly at the operations of Puffing Billy, which carries 144 000 passengers each year. The Historical Society, which supports the Puffing Billy enterprise, has 1 000 volunteers, and 30 full-time staff operate the train. The group operates with the help of Army engineers. Many bridges and repairs to the track are needed. Army engineers have become involved and, instead of going off into the donga somewhere and building and then tearing down a bridge as an exercise, they have built bridges for Puffing Billy over there. So, both areas have benefited: the Army from having a purposeful effort in constructing its built engineering works and the Puffing Billy group in getting its works undertaken at significantly reduced costs.

While I was there I looked at the souvenirs sold in the shop. The manager mentioned to me that there is a market for high cost souvenirs, for instance, woollen jumpers, particularly among Japanese tourists. He said that he had been in the shop when a Japanese tourist purchased four of these at \$150 each, and he said it is a particularly good item which we should be promoting more to tourists inland.

I turn now briefly to the net unfunded superannuation liability referred to in the Audit Commission report earlier this year. The Auditor-General highlighted this in his report yesterday, noting that net unfunded liability has risen from \$2 500 million in 1989-90 to \$3 946 million in 1993-94. This Government was ridiculed by the Opposition for including this figure in the total State debt. I might add that it has risen by \$1 400 million over four years, and the Auditor-General noted that, if it were not for some separation packages taken this year, the unfunded liability would have been much higher. So, by doing something about reducing this unfunded liability, the Government has been extremely responsible. Indeed, it will continue to be responsible.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):** I want to raise two issues this afternoon. The first concerns transport, which is of great concern to my electorate. Many people in the Taylor electorate were concerned when they heard the reports of the submission that the Minister for Transport had taken to Cabinet proposing dramatic increases in public transport fares and the reintroduction of a new zone system that would see an extra impost, or travel tax, on those who live in outer urban areas. As I said yesterday, this issue should not be taken lightly. People do not travel long distances because they want to sightsee; they travel to get to work or to do their shopping. They do not choose to take a bus trip of 30, 40 or 50 minutes; they do that because that is how far they live from the place to which they want to go. That issue was very much overlooked by the Minister for Transport in her Cabinet submission, and I believe it will ultimately be overlooked by the Cabinet as it shows such cynical disregard for those who live in outer urban areas.

I want to highlight this issue because, since I was elected to the then seat of Salisbury, I have spoken on behalf of the transport needs of those not only within my own electorate but in outer urban areas. Without breaching Cabinet confiden-

tiality, I can say that I have maintained consistency on that issue throughout my time as a member of Cabinet and spoken against the advice we were receiving that greater charges should be put upon outer urban area residents. My record on this matter is particularly good.

In raising this issue, I had some information provided to me a short time ago by a good friend of mine, Sandy Morrison, who had just been to Melbourne to see the Crows play there. Unfortunately, it was a long trip for not much result, because they did not do particularly well. On top of that, the cloudy and poor weather in Melbourne meant that it was somewhat of a damp weekend all round. But it was an even damper weekend, because she and those with whom she travelled were using public transport and they saw at first hand exactly what the Kennett Government has been doing to public transport in that State.

It started on what may seem as a trivial matter, but symbolic of the kind of issue that is involved. As out-of-State people they went to the information booth at the railway station to ask when the next train would be leaving. The response was, 'Twenty cents, please'; they were not to be given that information free but were to be charged for it. When they said, 'This is amazing,' the fellow behind the counter at least had the candour to say, 'Well, we have a new Government here.' The response by these people from South Australia was, 'We have a new Government in South Australia and we are waiting to see the same sorts of things happen there because we are seeing it in so many other different ways.'

They paid their 20¢ and got the information and then travelled from downtown Melbourne to Glen Waverley, a distance involving about 40 minutes on the train, so it is equivalent to a journey from Adelaide to Gawler or to Noarlunga. Of course, it is further from Adelaide to Salisbury. However, parenthetically, I note that if on a Saturday one were to travel from Adelaide to Salisbury, to Gawler or to Noarlunga and back again, one could do it for \$4 because a day trip fare is available. That is the result of the fare initiatives that we introduced when we were in Government that provided for such things: the fare per person would be \$4.

They found that they had to pay not \$4 but \$6.70 to get a return fare from Flinders Street to Glen Waverley. That did not get them to where the football was to be played, but more of that in a moment. To mention a related issue, when they got the information brochure from the person at the railway station, they were interested to note that on the inside cover, where it refers to the purchase of Met tickets, as they are called, it stated, 'All major credit cards will be accepted.' At \$6.70 one would want to have access to all major credit cards to pay for the return fare to get out to Glen Waverley to watch the Crows play a football match.

They paid their \$6.70, because they were not going to travel all the way from Adelaide to Melbourne to be put off by the outrageous fare they were being asked to pay. But there was more to come when they arrived at Glen Waverley. They had to hop on a private bus. The private bus system now runs the route from Glen Waverley station to AFL Park, so they had to pay more money for that. They could not take a transfer ticket from Flinders Street, so already we have \$6.70 on the meter and another amount to come. They walked up to the first bus and asked how much the fare would be. The driver said it would be \$4. They protested about that, and I understand that the response from the driver was not too

dissimilar to the response from the person at the information booth, 'Oh well, we have a new Government, you see.'

So, now they had to pay an extra \$4, bringing the total to \$10.70 to travel a distance equivalent to Adelaide to Gawler or Adelaide to Noarlunga and back again. That was \$10.70 for a journey that one can do here, as a result of the previous Government's initiatives, for \$4. I think that clearly shows how much the Kennett Government has failed people in Victoria and how much the Minister for Transport's submission in this State will, I am convinced, fail people in South Australia.

In the words of the Minister for Primary Industries, who is wont to say, 'But there is more,' there was more on this occasion, too. They went into the ground to watch the match, and as I say the Crows did not win, which was dampener enough. There was a grey sky and drenching rain, so they were even more damp as a result. They then went outside with the large crowd and three buses were waiting, two of which immediately filled up and went off. The third bus, with its engine running but no driver apparent, just stood there, stood there and stood there for a total of 45 minutes. Why was that? It was because no driver was available. The security guard at the ground had to go off and find a driver for the bus, with people standing in the pouring rain. After having paid \$10.70 for the privilege, this private bus operated section of the route was delivering an incredibly poor service. Finally, the bus took off 45 minutes late. They would not have wanted to have any connections to make at the other end, because any connections would long since have gone, or if the people concerned had any appointments to fulfil they would long since have been well overdue.

I can recall the days of private operators in the Salisbury area because I have lived and worked in that area for what amounts to a quarter of a century. We had them in the first half of the 1970s. I do not dispute that they were very nice people who operated those private services, and they generated lots of stories which were rather mirthful. We used to enjoy some of the stories. However, in terms of providing a cost-effective and efficient service, they did not do that. That is why in 1975 the services were taken over by the STA.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** In that situation we got a much better public transport service in the Salisbury area.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The member for Wright can go on all he wants, but the reality is that, if he asked people in the Salisbury area whether they were better served before 1975 by the private operators than after 1975, he would find that they were worse served before 1975.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I should like to relate one of the mirthful stories that I know about regarding how the private operating system ran. This is a story related by the late Jack Young, a former Alderman of the City of Salisbury and a very well respected person in the area. One day, when he was ill with a cold, the operator of one of the private buses stopped at his door asking after him (with passengers on the bus, I may say), found he was ill with a cold and said, 'That's okay. I'll bring back some lemons for you so that you can have some lemon and honey.' The driver was in fact the operator of the bus company.

Jack Young thought that the driver would drop the passengers at their destination and, at the next convenient time,

return with some lemons, which would be very nice of him. The driver came back very quickly indeed. He had taken his passengers on the bus to the local greengrocer's where he bought some lemons. He then delivered the lemons to the ailing Jack Young with his passengers haplessly waiting, wondering when they would reach their destination. It is a story that has created a lot of mirth over the years; it is rather a nice story in its own way, but it highlights the point that it was hardly an efficient service.

It was hardly a service designed to help people who had to go about the day-to-day business of getting to work and back or getting to the shops and back. While it is a fond memory of nostalgia to think about such quaint practices in the operating of private bus services, it is not what the people of Salisbury want today. The people of Salisbury today want an efficient public transport system. They want a system that is cost effective, reasonably priced and reliable.

That system was delivered to them over the 1980s. I take considerable pride in the fact that I played a key part in delivering that system to people in outer urban areas, so that they could be guaranteed reasonable fares that did not lumber upon them the impost of distance simply because they could not afford the higher real estate prices closer to Adelaide. On top of that they had an efficient service, delivering bus routes to within 500 metres of most people within the electorate. Again, I take considerable pride in that.

The opening up of a bus service to Paralowie and one to Burton is something I fought for and achieved. I also fought for and achieved improvements in the night time and weekend services to areas such as Parafield Gardens and Salisbury North. We are now at risk of seeing all that dispensed with; of seeing all that go because the Minister in another place believes that the most important thing about public transport is not the provision of a good and cheap service to people who use public transport but, rather, the bottom line in the annual accounts of TransAdelaide.

I hope that outer urban members on the other side will realise how much is at risk as a result of submissions from the Minister for Transport in another place. I hope they realise just how much is at risk for them, speaking politically, but more importantly—because I do not really care about their political fortunes—for the residents of their areas, particularly in the south, who may well argue that they are being forgotten by this Government. A number of other similar issues come through in the budget. I now turn my attention to a matter that I find is of growing concern.

I raised the point earlier in the year that, at the time, there appeared to be an orgy of self-congratulation by the Government on having won the election on 11 December. That was not unreasonable. I said at the time that I could understand that happening, although I noted that it had gone on for some months, and it was starting to reflect badly on the Government. We are seeing it continue, but more worrying for the Government itself, and certainly for South Australians, is that it is now changing into an arrogance of power. It would be worthwhile for members on the other side to stand back and look at how this arrogance is displaying itself. I know there is some cynicism about that comment because some members have not been in this place before.

They were only elected at the last election and so have not seen what is an appropriate way for things to be handled in this Parliament. I would suggest they seek advice from people who have been here longer. They should ask someone in the privacy of the corridors—they do not have to say it in the Chamber—‘Is this really the way that Ministers should be

performing? Is this really the way that a Government should be performing in terms of obtaining the highest respect of the parliamentary process?’ I am certain that those who are honest in their answers on both sides of the House would have to say that certainly the track record is not always perfect, and I acknowledge that in terms of the Government of which I was a member for 11 years.

The Labor Government has never been guilty of the gross abuse, the gross arrogance of power that we are starting to see from this team that has been in Government for only nine months. As an example, I refer to the answers that have been given to questions on a number of occasions. The Opposition has raised a number of issues in the public interest that need to be raised, and what we receive in return is no more than abuse. That is fine. I can live with any abuse members opposite want to give. However, we ask questions because we want answers.

Members opposite can have their moment in the sun, giving all the abuse they want. They can flatter their own egos and have this orgy of self-congratulation if they want. It is not exactly very good theatre but, nevertheless, let them do it if they wish. However, at the end of their remarks, they should at least give the answer. They should at least face the issues raised in the question. I suggest that a number of questions asked today in this Chamber were left significantly unanswered. I think they leave some mines in the political minefield for the Government because of that, but that is the Government's problem. I believe that it is a sign of arrogance finally overcoming the capacity to recognise what good Government is all about. We have seen that day after day. I suggest that—

*Mrs Penfold interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Another new member speaks. I suggest that the honourable member reads some samples of *Hansard*—and I am not suggesting that reading past issues of *Hansard* is particularly edifying—over the past 11 years, wherein she will discover that, despite the political differences in this place, questions were at least answered. In terms of the arrogance—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** And, may I say—somewhat unlike what is happening in this place at the moment—answered truthfully. I can assure members opposite that there were a number of things said in answers not only today but yesterday and other days that are quietly ticking away, because we happen to know—and we will finally ferret out the truth to prove this—that what has been said in this place has been significantly untrue. I can say no more than that because Standing Orders do not allow me to use a word that would be entirely appropriate to use in any other arena.

I refer to other evidence of this arrogance of power that is showing up in this Government. We have the situation of the Estimates. Last night the Deputy Premier took issue with the fact that I and others on this side have complained that the program papers will not be here until Thursday. He said, ‘What is the Opposition complaining about, because they always used to come out on the Thursday?’ The Minister at the table nods his head in concurrence with that. The one thing that is missing is that normally, after the second reading debate, Parliament rose for a week. We had that extra week off to consider the matter of the program papers.

That is not to happen this year. We are to get these papers perhaps on Thursday—although there is no guarantee of that—and then have Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday to look at them. I do not mind giving up my weekend to work

on this. I have given up most of my weekends during my parliamentary career to date to work on parliamentary matters, so it will not be particularly unusual. However, it means that the staff who support us will likewise have to do the same. Again, that is an attempt to misuse the system most unreasonably. The more serious issue, in terms of the arrogance, relates to how the Estimate Committees have been scheduled.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Spence will not speak across the Chamber.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I challenge any member opposite who was here before to go back over my record as a Minister in respect of handling Estimate Committees matters and being amenable to the scheduling of my Estimates day. I believe that they would have to say that I was very amenable; I fitted in with whatever the Opposition wanted in that regard. Likewise, as a Government, we went to great lengths to accommodate the then Opposition to ensure that it had no major problems. If the Opposition had a reasonable argument for changing a Minister to another day to suit the convenience of the shadow Minister, we obliged.

I know that to be the case because I can recall talking with the Hon. Don Hoggood, who was the Minister responsible for those matters at the time, and the Hon. Frank Blevins, both of whom would say, 'We are changing this around to suit so and so on the Opposition side.' And that is the way it should be. We have raised a number of issues with the present Government on this matter, not just once but on a number of occasions, and the answer on each occasion was: 'no go—no budge'. No accommodation was made at all and there was no sense of being obliging.

One of the reasons why the Government was not prepared to move after reasonable requests were made by the Opposition—and I will detail them in a minute—was that the Hon. Diana Laidlaw had a dinner party and it would be inconvenient for her to move the dinner party.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am very sorry about that, but I regard it as a contempt of Parliament, as the member for Spence has just said, that the reasonable request of the Opposition to have some rescheduling done, for reasons I will detail in a minute, should be rejected and that one of the reasons why it should be rejected is that it would inconvenience the dinner party of a Minister in another place.

**Mr Atkinson:** Let them eat cake!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes, 'Let them eat cake' is the kind of attitude that we have seen. We put to the Government that one of our problems concerned the number of duties that shadow Ministers in this place have to carry out. Clearly our numbers are much smaller than they were, so we have heavy shadow ministerial loads. That point is accepted—it is the result of 11 December. We do not like it, but that is the result, so we have to live with it. The shadow Ministers in the Upper House cannot serve on the Estimates Committees, so the shadow Ministers in the Lower House have to bear all the burden. There are six of us to carry out those duties, and you would have thought, therefore, that the Government would make every reasonable attempt to prevent shadow Ministers having two of their responsibilities listed at the same time in both Committees A and B.

I can assure you, Mr Acting Speaker, that the previous Government went to the trouble of being obliging to the Opposition in matters such as that, to the considerable inconvenience of Ministers. I had my days shifted around

from time to time. I was told, 'You are being shifted now because it does not suit the Opposition to have you on that particular date.' That is fine; that is the way it should be. But this Government will not do it. I just point out some of the issues that we have. We are not dealing with minor portfolio areas: we are dealing with major portfolio areas over which this Government obviously does not want to have the scrutiny of the appropriate shadow Minister.

On the same day the Treasurer will be appearing before Estimates Committee A, the topic of education is listed before Estimates Committee B. The member for Playford is not only the shadow Treasurer but he is also the shadow Minister in this place representing the shadow Minister of Education in another place. These are not petty cash areas of Government: these are major areas of Government. Yet, this Government, not wanting to have reasonable scrutiny from the appropriate shadow Minister, has said, 'You take your pick; you cannot have them both; you have to do one or the other.'

You might say that, in the way of the mathematics of 11 members of the Opposition in the Lower House, it is not possible to avoid that happening once. I will pay that; maybe it would happen once. However, it happens more than once. The same thing happens again the next day in relation to another very important area, namely, transport. The member for Spence, who is the shadow Minister for Health and who is also particularly concerned with transport matters, both from his own personal strong interest in the matter and also because he represents the shadow Minister in another place, will have to be in two places at the same time.

Again, we are not talking about petty cash areas of the Government: we are talking about major portfolio areas where we see the Health Commission as a big loser in this budget, and therefore deservedly bringing upon the Minister rigorous questioning during the day from a person who is then going to have to be in another place at the same time dealing with transport, where we have the issue of a Government that is chaffing at the bit wanting to charge higher transport fares for those in outer urban areas, and implement a number of changes to the transport sector that should not be allowed.

**Mr Atkinson:** They do not want scrutiny.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** That is clear: they do not want scrutiny, and they will do anything to avoid it. Maybe I am being unreasonable to complain at two instances. It goes on. In the words of the Minister for Primary Industries, 'But there is more.' On 21 September the shadow Minister for Infrastructure is required in this place to ask questions on EWS matters, and on the same day he is required in the Committee relating to correctional services matters. The Minister at the table is the Minister responsible for that area. I am well aware that he does not want the member for Hart asking him questions on these matters; he is embarrassed by the number of things that the member for Hart has shown up already. But this Government has done what it can—

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. The Leader is attributing improper motives to me, as Minister, and he has implied that I do not want the member for Hart to question me in the Estimates Committee. I believe that, in so doing, he has transgressed Standing Order 127. I am very happy to have the member for Hart question me at any time.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. The Minister will have the opportunity to raise issues later in the debate.



**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The Minister is obviously aggrieved by this matter. I suggest he takes it up with the Deputy Premier and find out why the numerous requests we have made to have issues such as this sorted out have been rejected without any attempt at amendment—not even a symbolic attempt at amendment. There has not even been one minor shift of a Minister or a Committee—nothing! I suggest that is where the issue is. Maybe the Minister is prepared to make a fool of himself in front of the member for Hart, but I can assure him that the Deputy Premier is obviously not prepared to let him face that, unless, of course, he is protecting the Minister for Infrastructure. It does not stop there.

The very important area of community welfare is listed on 22 September, and anyone who was watching the *7.30 Report* the other night and listened to Elizabeth Morgan speak about how much this budget is an 'all pain, no gain' budget, which is the very point I have been making for sometime now, will understand how important the community welfare area is. The shadow Minister who has the responsibility for that matter is also required to be in two places at once, because Mines and Energy is listed in the other Estimates Committee at the same time. So, the member for Playford again is caught by this same Catch-22 situation of having to be in both places at once.

**Mr Atkinson:** Too many coincidences.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Here we have a situation where, as the member for Spence says, there are just too many coincidences. I would like to hear an explanation from the Government, particularly the Deputy Premier, whose responsibility it has been to handle this matter, as to just how he regards this as a reasonable approach when the only accommodation that has been given by him is to a Minister on his own side so she can have a dinner party, and absolutely no accommodation has been given to members on this side. Members opposite baulk when I call that arrogance; they baulk when I say that is an arrogance of power, when this has happened within nine months of them being in Government. Do members opposite think they have the right to run the State in this way and bring it that kind of disrespect?

The Opposition does take exception to that, and it will continue to take exception until this Government realises that there is a proper way of handling these sorts of matters. I invite backbenchers opposite not to take issue with their ministerial colleagues in this place—that would be too embarrassing, and I know that a number of them have already done that and perhaps they have been chastened enough for the sins of doing that—but I do invite them to raise the matter in their Party room where they have the legitimate right to speak out against this arrogance of power and say that not only is it a wrong thing in its own way because it abuses the respect that people ought to have for the parliamentary system but it also puts at risk a number of their own members. They should take that opportunity to say, 'Stephen, you've got it wrong; we are not going to get anywhere with this kind of arrogance. It will finally trip up the Government.' And assuredly, Mr Acting Speaker, it will.

The Opposition has many questions that it will be asking during the Estimates Committees—I can assure members opposite of that. However, it would have been reasonable to allow the appropriate shadow ministerial responsibilities to be dealt with much more efficiently and with much more respect to a system which relies upon the Opposition being present to rigorously question the Government's policies than has been evidenced by the Deputy Premier's own cynical abuse of the system.

I hope that the next time I have the opportunity to speak on the Government's performance it will be with more appreciation about the Government's changing its ways than has been the case to date.

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** I bring to the attention of the House the fact that Breast Cancer Awareness Week will commence on 19 September. As we will then be dealing with the Estimates Committees, today is probably the appropriate time to start addressing this issue. The statistics of breast cancer are frightening: one woman in 14 will develop breast cancer during her life. This year the disease will claim 2 500 lives. In 1992, 27 per cent of the diagnosed cases of cancer were breast cancer, with an estimated 7 500 new cases being diagnosed every year. Described as the western lifestyle disease, breast cancer remains the major cause of cancer deaths in women, yet prevention and cure remain a mystery.

More women are becoming concerned, but there needs to be increased funds into research and education, and it is important that we all realise that for some if not all women the only thing that will save their lives is their becoming aware of their bodies, being in tune, and knowing what to look for, when and why. Unfortunately, not enough women are aware of the threat of breast cancer. Earlier this year, Dr Hewson launched the Lobby for Life kit at Flinders Medical Centre. He read a letter to Mrs Hewson from a cancer survivor. It was an enormously powerful letter, one that spoke about the survivor's disbelief at the diagnosis of malignant cancer, that it was all a terrible mistake.

This survivor has become South Australia's front runner in the campaign to raise money for breast cancer research. At 35, with a 16-month old daughter and no family history of breast cancer, why did Mrs Hemming get breast cancer in the first place? Breast cancer has been part of Mrs Hemming's life for seven years. She was given the all clear only six months ago. If she had not found the breast lump in late 1986 through self examination, her doctor said, she would have been dead within six months. Mrs Hemming's letter described her fears, her first mastectomy and her second six months later. She recorded her depression, eating binges and weight gain and, toward the conclusion, she tells how she took up running, which helped her to overcome her despair.

Lesley Hemming has literally run for her life from breast cancer and I guess in many ways she was lucky and we are lucky. We are lucky that this lady had the strength to go on and the determination to fight. Not only has she been given the all clear but she is sharing her plight with us all and giving breast cancer an arena in which to be heard. Last year \$1.4 million was devoted to breast and prostate cancer research compared with \$11 million spent on AIDS and, even though after much lobbying Federal funding for breast cancer has increased, we still ask whether it is enough.

In South Australia in the eight years between 1985 and 1993, 118 men and 6 women died from AIDS and 220 women in South Australia die from breast cancer every year. At any one time, 60 000 women in Australia have breast cancer. Governments have ignored the problem of a lack of radiation treatment centres around Australia as they are considered too costly. There are no centres in country areas of Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania, and none in New South Wales north of Newcastle.

The funding allocation from Canberra can be described as trivial. Funding must be increased substantially. Breast cancer is still the most common cancer among Australian women. Excluding skin cancer (a non-melanoma cancer), it is twice

as common as cancer of the colon and melanoma. As I mentioned earlier, about 1 in 14 women will develop breast cancer in their lifetime. In South Australia 773 cases were diagnosed last year and 248 women died from breast cancer last year.

I suggest to the House that over the next week or two members consider this important topic, because breast cancer awareness is on the increase. It is something which is close to all of us and which we should be looking at.

**Mr WADE (Elder):** I was pleased to hear the Deputy Leader talk about power, because that is what I will spend the next 10 minutes speaking about. I spent many years, in fact too many years to remember without feeling that twinge of age, as a human resources practitioner. The nature of that type of work tends to be that one spends day in and day out, week in and week out, year in and year out listening to the problems of others and doing the best you can to assist them. If you do not extend your social circle to include people who are not seeking your professional help, you suffer the trauma of emotional burnout. Social workers, priests, counsellors, police and people in other groups dealing with other people's daily problems are prone to this burnout.

The pressure on elected representatives—politicians—is real, continues every day and is more acute because of the expectations of most people walking through the door that you are in a position to fix their dilemma. Normally, such a person has been everywhere else without success and the bell is tolling as they walk through the door. Usually a time constraint is involved and the pressure is on to help people who perceive themselves to be suffering the barbs of an unfeeling bureaucracy or who are experiencing the pain of being on the outer of normal life.

It is the pain of those who are in crisis, either through circumstance, poor decisions, confusion or playing out the role that society's stage has meted out to them. They are in crisis. Perhaps it is the first time in their lives that they are feeling powerless to handle a situation. Perhaps it is an everyday occurrence for some who are the victims of those who seek power over others at whatever cost. This power takes many forms. For example, there is the power to deny access, the power to remove security, the power to affect someone's financial situation and the power to deny information—to name just a few.

Irrespective of the type of power being exercised, it comes down to the basic fact that it is a person or a group of people that wields that power. It is the growth of unbridled power which is stripping the very fabric of free will from our people and which is denying them natural justice and control over their own lives, so it is natural and correct that this Parliament of the people expose the abuses of responsibility that are perpetrated on South Australians on a daily basis. Certainly, this Parliament should do all within its power to correct those abuses and prevent their continuation. The member for Spence shakes his head; he obviously disagrees.

This Government was elected to correct the most blatant abuse of power ever experienced in South Australia and to manage South Australia back to prosperity. This Government was elected to re-install pride of accomplishment in all South Australians. Most importantly, this Government was elected to ensure that such abuse of power will never again be allowed to occur. But there are those who fear the changing times, who are so wrapped up in their own egos and who are so conditioned to one way of thinking that they cannot see the danger they are inflicting on their fellow citizens. They live

in a virtual reality of their own making, cocooned from the suffering that they cause others. Some live in our print media, where we can read of claimed dissension within Government ranks, so-called facts about electoral boundary changes, unfounded criticism of Ministers and ill-informed postulations by ill-meaning reporters who do not even check their facts before rushing off to print sensationalist garbage. However, things are changing.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr WADE:** I am sure members opposite will be pleased to know that things are changing. Through bitter experience South Australians have learnt not to accept what authority tells them to be true. They question, they ring up, and they say, 'I have just read this article; is it true?' The common people have more commonsense than the common reporter in the common print media. What I am saying is not a new revelation.

I am sure that members opposite know and recall that many years ago a journalist was so disgusted with the half truths, the misrepresentations and the downright lies that were being published in so-called respectable newspapers that he chose to do something about it. He vowed never to put his name to a story unless it was a verifiable fact. He did not go out of business. His reputation for factual reporting became so great that, when Krakatoa Island erupted with a force that was heard around the world, all the early reports were dismissed until his newsagency confirmed the event. People then chose to believe it.

The man's name was Paul Reuter. He was later made a baron. He established Reuters newsagency in 1849 and it is now one of the largest and most outstanding press associations in the world. His success was in printing the truth. He gave people the truth without fear or favour, and the people reciprocated by putting their faith in him and by buying newspapers that printed his articles. It is a lesson in business and perhaps a lesson in politics that possibly needs to be re-learned in the late twentieth century.

Some people live in the cloistered comforts of an all powerful bureaucracy, nestled in the safety of official procedures and administrative guidelines which are designed to cover every conceivable condition known to man. If in doubt, follow the set procedures. If the procedures do not cover it, give it to somebody else or give it to someone higher, or refer it to another department, or put it aside and hope it goes away. It is in the realm of this bureaucratic maze that many of my constituents find themselves hopelessly lost and totally powerless. The power of established customer practice can be almost unbelievable at times.

Winston Churchill came across it during the Second World War when manpower was critically short. Mr Churchill was watching artillery gunnery crew at practice. One member picked up a shell and passed it to another; that person placed it in the barrel; a third person set the angle of the cannon and fired it; and during the process a fourth person stood to attention 20 feet back from the artillery piece. Churchill asked why the gunner was standing at attention 20 feet back. The answer was, 'We do not know.' He said, 'Find out.' They did. The fourth gunner's job was to hold the horses so they would not shy at the noise of the gun. Horses had not been used to pull artillery pieces for nearly 20 years but procedure said there had to be four soldiers to man an artillery piece, so four soldiers were allocated. Naturally, Churchill changed the rules and released thousands of soldiers to undertake worthwhile duties. Sometimes what is no longer necessary is perpetuated.

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

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** Much has been said by members opposite about how uncaring this budget is and how it has forgotten the average South Australian. Let me remind members opposite of how caring they were in the past 11 years. I acknowledge the honesty of the member for Spence last night: I applaud his comments when he effectively admitted that things had not been all that well for South Australia under the Labor Government. However, what members opposite fail to realise is that choices have to be made. In an ideal world, in a utopia, where we keep on giving things that we do not have, we would not have made the choices that we made. However, we had no choice, and that was not because of the policies of this Government: it was thrust upon us by what happened previously.

The topic of my first economics lecture was scarcity. The problem of scarcity is with us today as it is in every case. The Government faces the problem of scarcity as does every family, and choices have to be made. If you have more of one thing, you have less of another, and vice versa. It is called the production possibility curve. If we in South Australia had continued in the direction of the past 11 years, the choice would have been to keep on borrowing to fund what we had become accustomed to. I am talking not about the things we need to have but about the things that are not absolutely essential in every case.

Choices have to be made. They will not always affect people equally, but nevertheless one has to make a choice as to how to achieve the best for society in the future. That is what this budget is all about. How can we get South Australia back on the rails and make sure that South Australians are better off not only now but also in the future—not only for themselves but for their children? That is what this budget is all about.

The member for Spence asserted that the Government was making decisions on political grounds and was trying to look after marginal seats. He made a slip, because in over-protecting his shadow portfolio of health—and he did it well—he claimed that the Government has sacrificed health for the sake of education. He was assuming that somehow education was well off. If the member for Spence is right, a lot of other members opposite are wrong. The Government did not make that choice: it made a choice based on what is best for all areas, and it tried to get the best with the limited resources it was left with once it came into power. If you look at the budget, you see that choices were made in order to improve the lot of all South Australians.

The budget is about looking after the State at present but also having a vision for the future. It is about making sure that we restructure and put things in place, such as capital works, which have been so neglected during the years of Labor. In this way, in the future we increase the total production possibility curve of the South Australian economy. That is what it is all about. Governments must act in the interests of all South Australians.

The Opposition talked about broken promises, but the broken promises we heard about are not easy to find. If we listen to SAIT, and I suggest we do not, we are told by the teachers union that half of Adelaide's schools will close or amalgamate if the Government accepts the report's recommendations. We said that about 40 schools could be closed in three years. We will adhere to that, and there will be consultation. I cite some of the promises:

Support early intervention programs because more severe learning difficulties may arise later if identification and intervention is not made at an early stage.

That is a commitment to make sure that things are not only better now but will be better in the future: to secure a base for future development. Further:

After consultation with teachers, introduce a comprehensive teacher appraisal system in all our schools. The primary focus of appraisal would be to produce an agreed program for the development of individual teacher skills.

We promised that, and we will keep to it. I refer to the following promise:

As a result of this funding commitment, average class sizes can be maintained at current levels.

For some schools that has not been the case, but for three-quarters of the primary schools that is not a bad promise. Let us be realistic. Instead of members opposite nitpicking on everything, let us consider what we have done in the situation in which we find ourselves. We have not done too badly.

Some people refer to me as being a little wet, or say that I am wet behind the ears. I never thought I would see the member for Torrens as a soggy socialist. Yesterday she suggested that we were completely insensitive and said that, somehow due to the changes in fares, kids would not be able to go to school, and on wet days they would not be able to go to school at all. Can anybody believe that? It is the role of the Opposition to ascertain whether people are genuinely in need or affected by certain policies, and the Government accepts that. But to come up with old slogans of class warfare, suggesting that we on this side do not care, suggesting that people who send their kids to private schools are benefiting at the expense of people whose children attend State schools, is disappointing. Many people who send their children to private schools are also struggling and make great sacrifices to send them there. That is their choice, and no-one is suggesting that they should be advantaged. Nevertheless, it is wrong to use that sort of analogy and say that we on this side do not understand or care.

I can tell Opposition members that I understand the situation. Being a sole parent with three children, I know how difficult it is to bring up children in these times. Nevertheless, this is the budget we had to have. For the sake of the future, we have to make some changes and try to increase the State's production possibility curve. We will do that only if we increase our production and export potential. That is the only way we will be able to fund those programs that we believe are essential for all South Australians. We want to provide more funds for health, education and transport. If the funds were there, if we were not in such a hole, that would be possible.

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

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I must admit that I was not expecting a good news budget as it relates to Goyder, but looking through the budget papers I must say to the Government, 'Thank you for the way you have gone about allocating the moneys and for at least recognising the need for regional areas, and in particular the rural area of Goyder, by providing for certain capital works and certain ongoing expenditure.' In fact, roads and schools have benefited most in my electorate in this year's budget. In addition, we have had smaller grants to areas such as water reticulation, health, electricity services and jetties. Further benefits will come from continuing incentives offered to farmers, through stamp

duty exemption and the young farmers incentive scheme, as well as maintaining rural extension services.

In fact, it is quite incredible when one thinks that Goyder will benefit from this budget, which at the same time has started to rectify the economic mess in which the previous Labor Government left our State. In this respect, the budget seeks to deliver some 10 000 jobs in the private sector and provide a new era for economic opportunity in South Australia.

It is very heartening to see that the Port Wakefield to Wild Horse Plains section of the dual highway will be completed by April of next year. Quite a few members use that road on a regular basis, and I am sure that they will appreciate how it has made travelling between Gepps Cross and Wild Horse Plains (eventually through to Port Wakefield) so much safer and in turn so much quicker.

I know how frustrated I have been on so many occasions when travelling on that road when I get behind a line of perhaps 10 cars or so, particularly with a slow moving vehicle in front, and no-one wants to pass. Instead of travelling at the 110km/h limit, we are travelling at about 60km/h. In those circumstances, people start to take risks and pass when it is not entirely safe to do so. It is no wonder that over the years there have been many accidents on that section of the Port Wakefield Road. Those problems have now virtually disappeared between Gepps Cross and Wild Horse Plains. It is quite amazing to see how the traffic builds up on the single lane section between Wild Horse Plains and Port Wakefield. Last Friday night there was a massive line of some kilometres of motorists travelling towards Yorke Peninsula in that single lane section.

I was interested to hear from the owner of one of the businesses in Wallaroo that each time a new section of dual highway has been opened on Port Wakefield Road his business turnover at Wallaroo has increased by 10 per cent. He is hoping that when the final section is opened it will increase by another 10 per cent. That just shows how people are happy to travel through to more distant areas if they can be provided with a safe and efficient means of doing so. That road is mentioned in the budget for completion to Port Wakefield.

The Salisbury Highway-South Road connector across Port Wakefield Road is also scheduled to be completed in February 1996 and some \$12 million has been allocated for this coming year. I believe that that will make it much easier to get out of the city in the bottleneck area around Gepps Cross and also in a westerly direction towards the Port. My only concern is two lanes have been allowed to go through where the overpass bridge will exist, and I have taken up that matter with not only the previous Transport Minister but also the present Minister.

I have been assured and reassured that two lanes will be quite adequate for the traffic that is heading north, because they say that so much more traffic will go over the bridge or use the alternative road. I will take the word of the experts in this case and trust that my overtures on more than one occasion have not fallen on deaf ears and that a proper analysis has been made.

Another road to be commenced in my electorate is the one between Wallaroo and Kadina leading on to Port Wakefield. Some \$1 million has been allocated to reconstruct the road this year. The total cost is \$4.28 million and, while I certainly would have liked a little more money for this financial year, I am grateful that at least this work has been commenced. We

trust that it can be completed in the following year; in fact, it is due for completion in 1996.

I became aware of the condition of this road many years ago when I travelled on it, but when I sought to become the member for that area, encompassing Wallaroo and Kadina, in 1985 (in the 1982-85 period it was not in my electorate) I well remember a farmer calling me during the election campaign and asking, 'Mr Meier, are you aware of how rough the road is?' I replied, 'I certainly am.' He said, 'I want you to go over it with me in my grain truck', to which I responded, 'I don't think I need to do that. I'm fully aware of it.' He said, 'Yes, I want you at my place in a fully laden grain truck. Can you be there at 7 o'clock one of these mornings?' So, two mornings later I was at this farmer's place. We hopped into his truck and we went over the Kadina to Wallaroo road, and I appreciated more than ever just how rough it was and how a farmer's truck is perhaps one of the worst vehicles for feeling all the bumps on that section. That problem will be removed in the next year and a half.

Another road that has been long in the making is the Port Wakefield to Auburn road, in particular from what we would call Halbury to Auburn. Thankfully, I note that it is to be completed in February 1995, with another \$400 000 ensuring that the road will be finished. There are several roads in my electorate on which I am disappointed that money will not be spent, the main one being Brinkworth to Snowtown. I will continue to push for that to be bituminised and, likewise, the Brinkworth to Blyth road. On both of these roads there is a certain amount of bitumen, but it is urgent that the Brinkworth to Snowtown road be upgraded, for a variety of reasons.

I think that most members would appreciate that this Government has provided a lot more money on capital expenditure in education than has previously applied. We have not heard a lot of positives from Claire McCarty, but I am sure that behind the scenes she must be applauding the increase in capital and maintenance expenditure in this budget.

**Mr Ashenden:** She wouldn't have the intelligence.

**Mr MEIER:** You don't think she would have the intelligence?

**The Hon. W.A. Matthew:** She wants to run for the ALP.

**Mr MEIER:** She seems to have a close affiliation there. The positive thing is that \$600 000 is to be spent on the Kadina High School, and nearly \$1 million is to be spent on the Balaklava High School. Balaklava Primary School is also to have money spent on it and the Moonta Area School is to have a library extension. In addition, money will be spent on maintenance at various schools, including Ardrossan. I know that all those school communities are delighted that this Government is making additional expenditure available in those areas.

Another allocation that gives me great pleasure is the \$270 000 to be spent on the Edithburgh jetty, because that jetty is so long overdue for repairs. It is a major tourist destination, so let us hope that this will help in that respect. There are so many other things that I would have liked to highlight in the budget, but for me it is basically a good news budget.

**Mr BASS:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr BASS (Florey):** In my 10 minutes I will speak on a matter that is rather alarming if you know the problems

associated with it. On Monday 5 September an article headed 'Alarm at our boozy nation; alcohol and drug use survey' appeared in the *Advertiser*, stating that a Salvation Army sponsored national survey of people aged 14 and over had found that 33 per cent believed that injecting themselves with heroin each day did not present a risk to their health. The same survey found that 37 per cent of the people spoken to believed that the daily use of marijuana, that is, smoking it, also would not be adverse to their health.

As I have said in this House previously, I believe that I am well qualified to speak on the subject of drugs and would like to warn the people of South Australia exactly what the use of drugs can and will do if one is tempted to use them. Earlier this year I spoke in this Chamber on the substance in marijuana, tetrahydrocannabinol or THC, which, when drawn into the lungs in smoke form, gives one a feeling of euphoria, but at the same time it damages one's lungs much in the same way as nicotine, while it also slowly kills the brain cells.

I will not go into what marijuana does in any depth, because I have already canvassed that, but I will deal with the drug heroin. Heroin in its purest form is illegally imported into Australia and, from my experience and the experience of many people in the drug scene, especially police officers, we find that when it is imported into Australia it is No.1 grade and 84 per cent pure. The other 16 per cent is usually substances that have been used in the manufacture of heroin, that is, from its raw form into powder form. Some of the 16 per cent has been found to be a small amount of arsenic and other chemicals that are used when the heroin is made into the white powder.

When it arrives in Australia it is sold to an unscrupulous drug dealer who pays quite a substantial amount for a kilo of heroin. In order to make a profit, he takes it home, puts it in a bin and adds a kilo of white powder. In most cases they put in a white substance so that it does not look any different from the heroin. Usually they use glucodin or sugar, and from the one kilo they make two. They then go off and sell it in 10 gram bags. The 84 per cent pure heroin when it arrived is now cut with a kilo of glucodin, so it is now 42 per cent pure.

As the heroin is sold again, the person who buys the 10 grams may or may not be a user. He might be in it for the profit, so he gets some white powder—and we hope it is glucodin, but it may be sugar or salt. I have known Alka Seltzer to be used to make up the weight. Every time it is cut, the strength of the heroin in the white powder is reduced by 50 per cent, so in the second cut it is down to 21 per cent. In the next cut it is only 10.5 per cent pure heroin and it is mixed with another white powder. Finally, if it is cut into a gram, from that one winds up with a white powder which is only 5 per cent to 6 per cent pure heroin. The majority of the bulk is made up of glucodin, sugar or some other white substance.

Therein lies the problem. As the heroin changes hands and is cut from time to time, when the user buys 2 or 3 grams of heroin he or she has no idea how many times it has been cut or what it has been cut with. So when he or she injects half a gram of heroin, they hope that it is only 5 per cent to 6 per cent pure. If a drug addict injects half a gram of heroin which turns out to be 50 per cent or 25 per cent pure, he or she very quickly overdoses. Why do such people overdose? We can only make our bodies work at a certain speed.

I like the analogy of putting rocket fuel in a four-cylinder car. When it takes off, the car goes wonderfully, it goes faster than it has ever gone before, but after half a kilometre the pistons are going up and down so fast and the spark plugs are igniting the rocket fuel that the engine cannot take the strain

and it blows to bits. When a person injects himself with very strong heroin, his body feels it, he gets a good feeling, he feels great, his heart starts pumping, pumping, pumping and, like the engine, it just cannot take the strain and, as the druggies say, he ODs—overdoses. It gives the body so much energy that it cannot take the strain and it gives out.

I remind the 33 per cent of 1 229 people who were surveyed that when they inject themselves with heroin they have no idea how strong it is, so it is pot luck whether they will get the good feeling or whether it will kill them. Has it been cut with glucodin? I once saw heroin cut with white substance scraped from a car battery. Drug dealers and users have no concern other than to get themselves an injection and to sell half of what they have to someone else so that they can get themselves another shot. Anyone who considers that an occasional daily shot of heroin is not dangerous should beware, because eventually if people are using heroin they will get a strong dose or a dose that has been mixed with something that will kill them anyway.

I know of another example where someone got some tablets, pulled apart the capsules and found white powder, so they mixed that with the heroin. It could have been duraphet or duramine, which would give one a good feeling and make the heart race, but one would OD. I always tell people that if they want to go on drugs it is like jumping out of an aeroplane without a parachute. One gets a wonderful view, there is fresh air, one is hurtling to the ground and it is lovely, but there is only one result at the end: one hits the ground and stops dead. I can assure members and people outside that if they use heroin they might as well go and jump out of an aeroplane without a parachute, because in the end they will OD—they will be dead.

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

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** In my grievance debate on the budget I want to speak on capital items as they relate to the Mitchell electorate. There are two items in particular to which I refer: first, the \$5.8 million that has been allocated in the capital budget for the upgrade of the accident and emergency centre at the Flinders Medical Centre; and, secondly, the \$4.24 million that has been allocated for the development of the Marion Community Health Centre.

Much has been said about health, both in the House and also in the electorate of Mitchell. Many of those statements have been made by people with a political agenda who do not have the interests of the community at heart. I will deal with the self-interest groups in the area of Mitchell later. To meet current demands, major extensions to the accident and emergency service of the Flinders Medical Centre are due to commence in October this year, with an estimated completion date of June 1996. The extensions focus on the physical and functional needs of patients seeking emergency care. Improved facilities will provide for an additional room in radiology; resuscitation treatment for up to four patients; an additional eight treatment cubicles; and a new paediatric waiting and centralised treatment workshop.

As well, the facility will lead towards the proposed private hospital development at the Flinders Medical Centre, which will reduce the demands of private patients on public sector hospital beds in that area. Like all areas of Adelaide the electorate of Mitchell is suffering from a high waiting list of people seeking elective surgery. Unfortunately, because of the problems of the past, even people requiring open heart surgery through to removal of a hernia having suffered as a

result of these huge waiting lists. The proposed development at the Flinders Medical Centre is to be applauded.

I understand that the plans for the development of the emergency and accident centre will be submitted for approval to the Public Works Committee in the next couple of weeks. I am looking forward to that development because I feel it will be quite exciting for the electorate of Mitchell. The Marion Community Health Centre has a budget of \$2.4 million, and it is associated with the amalgamation of a number of health centres in the electorate of Mitchell, including the Clovelly Park Health and Community Centre, the Marion Youth Project and a number of Marion Council health facilities.

As outlined by the Minister for Health, a number of inefficiencies have occurred within the health area, especially in the area of community health centres. My electorate is served by the Clovelly Park Health and Community Centre, the Marion, Brighton and Glenelg Health and Community Centre based at Hamilton House, the Brighton and Glenelg Health and Community Centre and the Marion Community Health Centre. At this stage, the electorate of Mitchell has four funded community health areas.

As well, the Marion Youth Project, currently located on the former Oaklands Park Primary School site and owned by SGIC, must relocate because that site has been sold to Westfield. The Marion Youth Project does an extremely good job for the youth in my electorate and provides a very good service. With the announcement of the new development for the Marion Community Health Centre, the Marion Youth Project will have a new home for the youth of that area. The development of the Marion Community Health Centre heralds the first development project announced for the Marion Regional Centre which is bounded by Sturt, Diagonal and Morphet Roads and which was subject to much criticism back in 1990-91.

It has laid dormant for some time awaiting, first, the conclusion of the supplementary development plan and, secondly, future development. This is the first development in that area. That development also coincides with the soon to be announced \$100 million upgrade of the Westfield Shopping Centre at Marion. That shopping centre is the largest regional shopping centre in South Australia and, with the proposed upgrade, it will become the third largest regional shopping centre in Australia. I understand that the upgrade will lead to about 800 jobs in the construction phase over a period of two years.

Further, a discussion paper will be issued on a situation that I have been pushing for a long time, and that is to locate a bus transport interchange in that regional centre. Shortly the Mitchell electorate will see further development of the accident and emergency centre at the Flinders Medical Centre and the Marion Community Health Centre. That will lead to a number of jobs for the unemployed in Mitchell. It is extremely welcome news for those people.

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

**Mr FOLEY:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! A quorum is not present. I will resume the Chair in 10 minutes.

*[Sitting suspended from 7.33 to 7.45 p.m.]*

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There has been considerable difficulty in certain parts of the building where the bells are ringing for only brief periods. Members have experienced difficulty with conversations from the other Chamber coming through their systems. We will do everything possible to rectify the problem. I suggest to members that, when the bells ring, they make every endeavour to come to the Chamber as soon as possible. Everything possible will be done to ensure that the difficulties experienced on this occasion do not happen again. I have just been outside the Chamber to listen to the bells and they are still ringing intermittently.

**Mr CAUDELL:** At long last I have a chance to finish my speech, and with so many people present. It is unfortunate that not too many members of the Opposition are present, and that reflects the number of members opposite who have contributed to this debate. Only one Opposition member has contributed, whereas nine Government members have spoken. So it is obvious that members opposite are more sprinters than long distance runners and that they have completely run out of puff as far as the budget is concerned. It is obvious that they have laid down and died because they have run out of things to say.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CAUDELL:** Obviously, they agree with the comments of Government members.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CAUDELL:** The member for Playford should sit down before he starts speaking. Yesterday the member for Giles, in relation to the Housing Trust, said:

The Housing Trust has never been a welfare housing institution: it has always been a public housing institution with all members of the public being eligible to be housed by the trust.

It is obvious that the member for Giles has followed the philosophy of housing for the greedy rather than for the needy, because he went on to say:

The question of going to market rent will give many of my constituents a great deal of pain.

The idea behind Housing Trust market rentals as accepted and promoted by both the Federal and Queensland Labor Governments is that those people with a job, a car, a nice little income and so on should be paying market rental and those people who are on social security pensions or on some other forms of benefit should receive rental assistance. That is the philosophy of those two Governments and it is the philosophy of this Government, but obviously that pains the member for Giles, who prefers to promote the greedy people in this society, as is obvious by his comments, to which I have referred. The member for Giles used the old phrase that he used all the time before the election—

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

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I congratulate the Government, particularly the Treasurer, on a very fine budget. It just goes to show that we can still have faith in the people of South Australia, because you can deliver a budget which is not exactly popular but which the people will accept for the document that it is. In my electorate people are smarting badly because of the drought, but they have accepted the budget very well as they are being responsible and they are prepared to do their share in relation to turning this State around.

This budget will secure South Australia's future. It is high time that a Government took a responsible attitude and did

what it needed to do to establish the future of South Australia. It is all very well, as years go by, to bring in budget after budget that is deficit funded and to allow the Government superannuation fund to run out of control thinking, 'We will not be here when the problem needs fixing.' It is great that this Government is able to do that now. It brings about recovery through reform, which sets the economy on a track of sustainable long-term growth, and that is what we are all about. It signals in the clearest terms that the priorities are economic growth, the creation of jobs and debt reduction to ensure a better future for our State. It is all about jobs—real jobs.

I know of so many companies and manufacturing plants that are no longer in business in South Australia. They have either gone interstate—particularly to Queensland and Western Australia—or, in more recent days, overseas to New Zealand. Why is that? It is because South Australia has not provided an encouraging climate or encouragement for positive thinking for the future. Companies have seen their future best secured by heading overseas and, as a fourth generation farmer and a fifth generation South Australian, I am upset to see what has happened over the past 20 years in this State. Under Sir Thomas Playford South Australia led the way. It set the rules and gave good examples, and the rest of Australia followed. What has happened since then? We have gone in the opposite direction. It is an absolute disgrace.

I am happy that the budget has been received as it has. However, there is no doubt that the Government had to tackle some rather unpalatable decisions and it is pleasing that most South Australians have accepted the need for those decisions. At a time when South Australia is in a chasm of debt, with a massive recurring interest bill, with industry floundering and with poor employment prospects, these hard decisions have to be taken to turn the economy around. Certainly, I welcome the comments of the member for Hart, who basically admitted that the former Government had failed. He was not a member of the former Government but he was an adviser to the previous Government, which failed miserably and badly, and we will all pay the price for that.

To hear his comments today—and I am awaiting other such comments by the Opposition about the budget—I am amazed, especially that members opposite can speak in such a blinkered manner and carry on like parrots, blaming the new Government for the problems. We have problems and we will have them for 10 years. So far as I am concerned, the new Government has 10 years in which it can turn back the problems confronting us—the problems that the Bannon/Arnold Governments created for us in the long term.

As to the budget and the people of Custance, I am happy that the Government has changed priority as to what it does with its money. It is spending its money, getting real value for the dollar and making people responsible for what is being spent. The Government is looking at the big ticket items. It is easy to criticise a Government for pruning or modifying education and health spending in the budget but, when people know that more than 60 per cent of the total budget is spent in these areas, obviously they are the areas to be pruned.

I am confident that education provision in South Australia will not fall below a high standard, and the same applies to our health system. In Custance we have been lucky to have been granted a new school at a cost of \$4 million at Tanunda. The people of Custance were very happy about that, but the news greeted with the greatest excitement is the forecast that in the near future we will see clean water in the Barossa Valley. Barossa Valley residents pay the same for their water

as everyone else in South Australia, but they get a bonus—they get dirt with it. It is a disgrace. Even though the Barossa Valley is touted repeatedly as South Australia's tourist jewel, when people stay at the four star hotel or motel they see that the water in the main is unfit to drink, and so a jug of clean water is provided. This is the most important news for people in that region.

Certainly, people throughout the whole area are excited and ecstatic that the Government has promised within 10 years to complete the Morgan to Burra road. For 60 years eight previous members of Parliament have sat in this place and promised this road, but they have all failed. Certainly, I am not leaving this place until the Morgan to Burra road is sealed. However, it appears that I can leave sooner rather than later, because the Minister has flagged this year that three more kilometres at the Morgan end of the road will be completed, with full exploration of the total project and full exploration of all the material required.

No other project in South Australia would create as much relief, as much regional employment and as much renewed confidence—not only to my region of the Mid North, the Barossa and the Clare Valley, but also to the Riverland (connecting the two regions)—as this would create. I think it is a disgrace and an indictment on this place that this road has been allowed for so long to remain in its present condition. It gives me a great feeling of confidence and satisfaction that, in the four years I have spent in this place, along with the member for Frome, we might be the two knights in shining armour who eventually carry the holy grail.

*Mr Andrew interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** We can include the member for Chaffey in this as well. This Government will deliver the goods. It will put in place things that are tangible, things that matter and things that last. We have had Governments that delivered so-called benefits. We have had so many projects and promises made that never saw the light of day. The Hall Government was defeated on the issues of Chowilla and Dartmouth. A Labor Government was going to build Chowilla and what happened? It did not do so. There has been so much charading and double-dealing by previous Labor Governments but at long last we are seeing some actualities in this State involving public works that really matter. I also note that the Clare District Hospital has had its funding increased.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** As the member for Ross Smith jokingly says, 'We have a drought.' I do not see a drought as being humorous. About half of Custance is not looking too bad, although the other half is looking very poor. I ask the member for Ross Smith to have some compassion for these people. How would he like to be on a negative income? How would he like to spend an average of about \$80 000 or \$90 000 per year receiving no return, as well as having to put in a crop the following year. What help have Governments been to these people? I welcome the comments today from the Minister for Primary Industries, who is doing something about the matter. He will speak with the Federal Minister tomorrow because we have a serious problem here.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass):** Order! The member for Hart will have his turn.

**Mr VENNING:** I want all members of this House, be they Government or Opposition, to have a little compassion, because many people out there are suffering at the moment. If we can get big rains within a couple of weeks right across

the State a lot of people can salvage something out of this harvest, but time is limited.

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

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** In my very brief contribution tonight I will talk about this budget, how it impacts on my electorate and how it impacts on Labor electorates: a constituency for which this Government has absolutely no consideration; electorates that this Liberal Government has forgotten. This is a budget of the rich and of the privileged. This is not a budget about compassion; this is not a budget about working people: it is a budget about rewarding those in the community who put their money into and their support behind the Liberal Party. What has this Government done? It has neglected Labor electorates. The electorate of Hart has had little or no capital works money spent on it. Barely a dollar has been spent on a school or a road in my electorate.

What has this Government done to the kids, parents and families of my electorate? I refer to the school card concession. At Taperoo East Primary School in my electorate 75 per cent of the parents of children who go to that school are on one form of social welfare or another: 75 per cent of those families have been absolutely kicked in the guts by this Government, as they have lost a great subsidy that they enjoyed in terms of getting their kids to school.

That was a subsidy that enabled them to pay their school fees, but it has gone right out the window, as this Government has picked on the most vulnerable in our community. It is not good enough that members sit opposite and display this arrogance, disregard and contempt for the working class people of this State. Members of the Government, be it the Premier or his colleagues, are walking cocksure through the electorate. The Premier and the Treasurer are walking through the electorate as if they are the greatest living politicians in this country's history. I say to the Premier and to the Treasurer: their day will come, when they are brought to account and are exposed.

I look at members opposite and ask: what about the forgotten south? Look at the members for Kaurna and Reynell. What are they doing already, as they put their newsletters out in the electorate? There is not one mention of the Liberal Party. After six months in Government, the one-time member for Kaurna puts out her newsletter and there is not one mention of the Liberal Party. The member for Reynell puts out her newsletter, with no mention of the Liberal Party. I say to the member for Kaurna: why do you not mention the Liberal Party? She knows that it will cost her votes. She knows she will not be coming back in three years. This budget has been her death knell.

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

**Mr FOLEY:** Absolutely, and what was it? It was when members were thinking of their own patch. They did things to get themselves re-elected. Within six months of being elected, the members for Kaurna and Reynell are doing it. The Minister knows quite a bit about electioneering. He knows he has members in the south who are panicking. There is not one item in this budget that benefits the south.

**Mrs Rosenberg:** Oh, bull!

**Mr FOLEY:** Not one item.

*Mrs Rosenberg interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Kaurna is out of order.

**Mr FOLEY:** As my good friend John Hill goes around doorknocking in the seat of Kaurna, he is already getting the

feedback that this Government has spent no money in the south. I want to talk about my electorate. My electorate has—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order.

**Mr FOLEY:**—been absolutely shafted by this Govern—ment's budget. It has attacked those in our community least able to support themselves. Members opposite can all say that this is a great budget, and that they are proud to be part of this Government, but I want to know how they look at those in our community who rely on things such as school card and the State system of education. Members opposite have increased class sizes, having said, prior to the election, that they would not do it. Members opposite have also made cuts in the health area. What the Government is doing to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital affects the constituents of my electorate. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is an important institution for the health and well-being of my electorate.

**Mr Andrew:** How would you balance the budget?

**Mr FOLEY:** You will not balance it by closing the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. One of the great—

*Mr Andrew interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Chaffey is out of order.

**Mr FOLEY:** There are members in the western suburbs prepared to support the Queen Elizabeth Hospital—my colleagues the members for Spence and Price and me. We are standing up for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Where is the member for Lee? Why is he not opening his mouth and supporting the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? This Government's agenda is to wind back the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, reduce the services provided, and turn it into nothing more than a rest home.

**Mr Lewis:** That's not true. That's deliberate deceit.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Ridley is out of order.

**Mr FOLEY:** The member for Lee should join me, the member for Price and the member for Spence in standing up for the western and north western suburbs of this city.

That is because the Labor electorates—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:** The working class of this State is receiving absolutely disgraceful treatment from this Government. The working class of this State is being punished for not voting Liberal. It pains me to see a neighbouring MP such as the member for Lee unable to influence Government policy or to stand up for the community health centre at Port Adelaide. The Port Adelaide Women's Health Centre and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital have no defence. It falls back on the member for Spence, the member for Price and me to defend the north-western Labor electorates, because we care and we are in there fighting. What about the Housing Trust? What has the Government done to the Housing Trust tenants of my electorate? It wants to bring in market rents, in an electorate like mine that needs a significant amount of public housing. This Liberal Government is penalising those in my electorate least able to afford housing. It wants market rents.

Why must the Liberals take the easy option for a conservative Government and attack those in our community least able to afford their way in life? Why do they do it? Why can they not tax the rich and the privileged? Why can they not take money away from the rich parts of Adelaide? Why should Burnside, Unley, St Peters and all those extremely affluent, privileged areas of this city continue to be privileged, whilst



the Government negates any commitment it may have given in the south prior to the election? The Government continues to negate any moral obligation to support the working class electorates of this State—it is all about the privileged and the rich. As a Labor politician I stand proud in this Parliament, prepared to defend the working class and, if need be, my colleagues will defend the south, the north-east and the seats of the south-west part of this city as they realise that this Government is nothing but a conservative, Tory Government of the privileged and the rich.

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

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I refer, first, to the Estimates Committees next week. I notice that two motions have passed this House. One went through last night—the normal motion which is passed every year and which sets up the Estimates Committees—and the other was passed this afternoon and called on Ministers from another place to come here at an appointed time so that not only the Opposition but all members of this House can have closer scrutiny of what is going on. I was very interested in the timing, because a couple of weeks ago I received a letter with the suggested timetable for the Estimates Committees.

For new members, Estimates are very important. The Minister fronts, sometimes with a cast of thousands from different departments. I think the record here when we were in Government was 128 people who came down with the then Minister of Health. In fact, I counted them on that day and I wondered whether anyone was left in the castle to run the show. The one thing about which there was no doubt was that people were made available so that they could answer questions not only for Opposition members but for backbench Government members as well.

When I received this list, I spoke to the staff on the second floor, in the penthouse where the Opposition resides. We looked at the whole matter, and we said, 'Maybe we ought to contact the Deputy Premier and just point out to him that the shadow Minister for Transport and the shadow Minister for Health are one and the same person.' Indeed, although he is a very effective shadow Minister, even he will find it difficult to be in two places at the same time. Then we found—

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** That's your problem.

**Mr QUIRKE:** I will return to the arrogance of the Minister and the rest of the Government in a moment. We then found that the portfolios of Treasury and Education would clash as well. So, I approached our staff, and we communicated with the Government and were told a couple of interesting things. We were told that the Government fully understood that the role of the Opposition was to scrutinise the accounts, and it would do what it could to enable us to do our job. I was pleased to hear that, but then we were told that it would not change the timetable. It said it could not change the timetable because one of the Ministers, who shall remain anonymous—I do not want to throw in the Minister from the other place—is apparently having a dinner party one night. And we were told—

**Mr Clarke:** But isn't she the only female in the Cabinet?

**Mr QUIRKE:** Well, the member for Ross Smith is more daring than I am. That Minister absolutely refused to change the timetable because she is having a dinner party. That is the contempt that this Government shows for the Estimates Committees.

**Mr Caudell:** Did you get an invite?

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning):** Order! The member for Mitchell is out of order.

**Mr QUIRKE:** The member for Mitchell asked whether I received an invite. I would have been quite happy to receive an invite but, indeed, I did not. However, I will say this to the member for Mitchell: this is an issue that will not go away. We have seen this Government get progressively more arrogant, and indeed—

**Mr Clarke:** Feral, I would have said.

**Mr QUIRKE:** No, arrogant I think; they may become feral next week. Members opposite know full well the clashes that this has caused, and they know full well the implications of that. I just remember all the times that we shifted Estimates Committees to suit the Opposition. We did that because in essence the Estimates Committees procedure is for a proper scrutiny of the accounts, and the role of the Opposition is essential to that. That has not been the case this year. I checked as late as five o'clock this afternoon, when I submitted to the Government for those areas of my shadow portfolios the times that I believe that certain staff members will be required here, because I do not believe that people ought to be kept here late at night in the galleries unless they volunteer to do so. I would not wish that fate on most people.

When I submitted those lists I said, 'Before I get on my feet tonight, can I tell the House that the situation will be a bit different, that the deputy Premier has managed to convince some of his colleagues to just put off the dinner party and maybe not treat the Opposition with the contempt and arrogance during the Estimates that we see every day during Question Time and a range of other parliamentary functions?' I regret to report that the cooperation we have shown to the Government where we have sought to minimise the problems for the Government next week was certainly not reciprocated.

I would like to read into *Hansard* a letter. This is a technique I learned from the good Minister opposite. When he had a few minutes to spare in his speech, he always used to bring in an interesting letter or two from his constituents. Well, I have received one from Penrice Soda Products. I never saw this in any of the media, but it appears that not everybody is in love with this budget. I wish I had had this letter yesterday for the main part of my speech, but I will read it now. It states:

I am writing to you to express our disappointment and concern at the significant increase in Government-related charges applied to industry like ours in the recent State budget.

In particular, I refer to the increase in natural gas prices emanating from the additional charges on the Pipelines Authority of South Australia. We have been advised by our suppliers, Sagasco, that they intend passing on the total increase to us. This has the impact of increasing our costs by some \$450 000 per annum. In addition, the flow-on effect from other suppliers for this cost will add further to our manufactured cost.

The payroll tax changes will have the impact of increasing costs by a further \$85 000.

Other charges for land tax, etc., will no doubt also increase our cost base. Overall an increase of some \$550 000 per annum adds nearly \$1.67 per tonne to the cost of our product. We cannot pass on these charges to customers as the soda ash industry is a mature one and is under extreme price pressure.

I point out to members that industry is starting to wake up. Like the rest of the community, it thought that this budget would have some nice little things in it and that it could sit back. I recall on the day when the budget came down that we had a representative of the employers saying, 'It's not so bad. It's all right.' But employers are starting to do what the Opposition has done: they have looked very closely into the

budget papers. The budget speech was so short this year that one could not use it for swatting flies, but the budget papers have a lot of detail in them and we are starting to find out, as are Penrice and other companies.

In the Estimates Committees procedure next week let it be known that it does not matter what this crowd does because we shall be there. We are going to probe and ask questions. Members opposite can have their dinner parties and do what they like, but we are going to be there. Every time this Opposition is treated with the same contempt as it is treated by this Government, we will draw that out in the public arena and we will tie that to the State Bank and all the other things over the years that we heard from Liberal members about how it would have been different had we listened to the Opposition. Obviously in government they have a very short memory indeed. I crave your indulgence, Mr Acting Speaker, and that of the gallery tonight. I hope that where this debate is concerned we get—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I remind the member that it is against Standing Orders to refer to the gallery.

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** I was going to refer to some of the comments made by the Opposition during the budget debate, but as it has been so small minded I will talk about the things that I had in mind. The one thing I will comment on is that no Opposition member has mentioned the money that has been spent on their new offices. No-one seems to have complained about that expenditure. With the small mindedness of their comments, I think we should have left them in their small offices, which certainly suited their minds.

In education, I am pleased that we have allocated \$10 million to fund the early years of education. I believe that this Government is committed to making the early years of education a priority in the department. There has been a specific allocation of \$2.5 million for initiatives under the early years strategy, with the key priority to identify children with learning difficulties and to allocate resources to assist them.

This funding will certainly ensure that more children who need help will receive it promptly and effectively. This will include such things as speech pathology, extra assessment services and a small increase in the number of special education teachers. There will also be a major initiative in training and development of classroom teachers to identify those students who need help and the teachers who can do that in the best way.

The overall budget for education is based on \$40 million savings over three years. The savings for this year are \$22 million. With all the hype about teacher losses, I would like to put on record that in the electorate of Kaurna two schools will gain teachers, three will have no change and four will lose a teacher. Schools will be staffed on the basis of one teacher per 26 students in junior primary and one teacher per 30 students in years three to seven. With the cuts to teacher numbers and the staff to student ratio everything will be done to keep the effect to a minimum. Even with the cuts to the student to teacher ratio, Government schools in South Australia will still be 10 per cent better off than non-government schools. We will still spend \$1.1 billion this year on education and children's services.

The Opposition tends to overlook the amount of money that is spent and concentrates far too much on the amount of money that is cut. No-one wants teacher numbers to drop but,

when compared to the suggestion that SAIT has made of a loss of 3 000 staff, the result is certainly not excessive. I believe that if we work together our children will continue to receive a high standard of education. School service officers will be decreased by 37.5 full-time equivalents. This is far lower than the projected decrease would have been if we had not varied the formula for 1994-95 so that they are no longer linked to teacher numbers.

The changes to the school card need to be mentioned because the original goal of the school card was to provide assistance to those who truly needed it and who were suffering from extreme financial pressure. The Government will continue to provide the school card to those families who are suffering this extreme financial pressure. The changes will see about 10 per cent fewer students receiving the school card.

The school card changes may be seen to have an effect on school income. For this year, 90 per cent of the current school card students will continue to receive the school card and, in the longer term, 80 per cent of current holders will continue to receive it. We believe that families who no longer receive the school card will be able to afford to pay school fees. We have also changed the rules for the use of the school card so that schools will now be entitled to hold on to the total amount of school card payment if it is less than the school levy. Also, school support grants have not been cut, and there is a CPI increase in the level given to schools. We are intending to allow more flexibility for schools to collect fees, that is, we will support schools using debt collection agencies so that debts are kept to a minimum.

All preschools and child-parent centres will be brought into an equal line so that all preschools will be staffed on a one to 10 ratio for high need areas and a one to 11 ratio for all other areas. They will also be allowed the flexibility of one qualified to one unqualified early childhood worker. As part of the 700 new traineeships for youth, our Government will employ 250 new trainees between the ages of 17 and 24 over the next two years. They are likely to be employed in the child-care and administration school support areas. Dental services at all primary schools will not be affected.

The State budget includes a 50 per cent increase in places in learning centres for students with behavioural problems. The Government will commit \$2 million over the next two years to increase resources in the important area of behaviour management. Teachers and principals, and particularly parents, have complained for years about long waiting lists and the lack of places at learning centres. Many parents have complained to my office about student behavioural problems in our electorate and violence in our schools. Students can be excluded from school for up to 10 weeks for misconduct, but this is of little use if no place is available for them to attend for help.

The increased funding will provide an increase of 100 places in learning centres and annexes, increasing staff numbers. The money will also be used directly in the southern area for the establishment of an annexe or alternative school in the southern suburbs. We will also move to give principals greater power to expel students over the age of 15 who have significant behavioural problems.

Most problems in schools are caused by a very small number of students, but they cause significant disruption to the whole school and have an affect on the learning outcome of all students and will not be tolerated. Our Government is about protecting these students and teachers who are at school for the right reasons. The 6 to 12 school at Seaford has been

announced as part of the \$15 million package, and stage one is planned to be opened in the 1996 school year. This school will be the first purpose-built school to meet the new junior secondary and senior secondary roles currently being developed within the Department for Education and Children's Services.

It will also include a shared recreation library resource and car parking facility for the local community. The \$400 000 project at O'Sullivan Beach will involve the amalgamation of the primary and junior primary schools to form a single reception to year 7 school, and will include upgrading of the primary school buildings. Funding for the project will include a contribution by the school from the 1993-94 back-to-school grant and from the sale of the former junior primary school building. This development will ensure that students from the O'Sullivan Beach area will be able to enjoy and benefit from upgraded surroundings in one school during their pre-secondary years. It is likely that the former junior primary school building will be sold to the southern Montessori group and will provide greater educational choice and diversity in the area. The redevelopment of the O'Sullivan Beach school is a good example of community support providing the opportunity to upgrade school facilities.

A local southern industry, Sola International Holdings, will expand into a research and development facility under agreement with the South Australian Housing Trust. The Government has allocated \$4 million for this project. It will be commenced in September and is due for completion in March 1995. This is another job creation scheme for the local southern area. Acute in-patient psychiatric beds will be transferred from Glenside to the Lyell McEwin and Noarlunga Hospitals. The Noarlunga Hospital will receive \$1.15 million to add a 20 bed acute in-patient psychiatric facility to be completed this financial year.

In addition, amounts of \$160 000 and \$65 000 will be provided to refurbish two properties to house community mental health and rehabilitation teams. This is in line with the national mental health policy of providing treatment within the local communities. A big boost for Kaurua and all the southern area is the approval of the \$5.8 million upgrade to the accident and emergency service at Flinders Medical Centre, which will commence in October 1994 and be completed in June 1996. A number of parents have contacted my office about the unacceptable waiting times and lack of privacy at the Flinders Medical Centre emergency service area, and this certainly will address some of those issues.

The health budget, it must be remembered, is being reduced in real terms by 3.2 per cent, and this will have no significant impact on services to the public. The capital program has increased to \$81.5 million. Of most interest is the extra services for palliative care and extra social work counselling and domiciliary care programs, and the Royal District Nursing Society receives a new funding boost of \$227 000.

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

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** It would be appropriate at this time for me to refer to the political assassination of Mr John Newman, the member for Cabramatta in the New South Wales Parliament. Mr Newman was, for a number of years until his election to the New South Wales Parliament in 1986, an organiser and official of the New South Wales branch of the Federated Clerks Union of Australia. As a former national president of that union, I would like to pay tribute to Mr

Newman's work, both as an official of the clerks union in New South Wales and as a parliamentarian. Unlike the member for Spence, I did not have the good fortune to know Mr Newman personally, notwithstanding that I was a branch secretary and later a national president of the clerks union; the New South Wales branch of that union is a very large body and I did not get to meet every one of its officials. I am sure all of us regret his untimely death, and in particular the manner in which he met his violent end, which is an anathema to our free and democratic society.

I made my contribution to the State budget yesterday and I do not want to go much further. However, I will honour an undertaking that I gave to the Minister for Education with respect to one part of the budget, which I commend him for. I will certainly list all his atrocities elsewhere, but I give him due credit for allocating \$2 million for a substantial revamp of the buildings and the structure within the Northfield Primary School, which is in my electorate. I will overlook his uncharitable press release to the local newspaper last week in which he laid all the credit at the feet of the Federal Liberal member for Adelaide with respect to persuading her to increase funding for that school, notwithstanding that the school is not even in the Federal District of Adelaide. Nonetheless, I accept the fact that in politics you use whatever you can.

Prior to the allocation for the capital works program relating to the Northfield Primary School, I promised the Minister that, if he found it in his heart to grant that \$2 million request (which is much overdue), I would commend him for it publicly, and I have done so in this House today. I also sought to include that in a press release in the Messenger newspaper of last week, but his own press release, extolling the virtues of the Federal Liberal member for Adelaide—notwithstanding the fact that the school is not in her electorate—got in before mine.

I have been reminded of various things that happened 14 years ago, and members of the Liberal Party should take note of them. I have in front of me what is known as the white ticket. In ALP parlance, it is the official ticket for the election of office bearers to the ALP at the June 1980 State conference of the Party. The white ticket was known in 1980 as the machine ticket and it listed the favoured candidates for State executive, platform committee, national conference and two other very important committees, one being the campaign committee, which galvanises the Party's election chances, particularly in State elections. Only five people were required, but some 12 people were seeking election to that campaign committee.

I noted that one of the names was that of a Mr John Cummins, who was seeking election as a campaign committee member—the same gentleman who is the member for Norwood but under the Liberal banner. Would you believe it? On the official ticket for the campaign committee—and only five were required—the machine had him at number 12. I noticed that it had been overwritten by hand at the time with the number 4, the number 4 being inserted by a very prominent member of the left wing faction of the Labor Party. Mr Cummins certainly had very strong support from the left wing of the Labor Party at that time. I also noted that 11 people were to be elected to the membership development committee, and 13 people were seeking election, one of those being Mr John Cummins—

**Mr Foley:** Not the John Cummins?

**Mr CLARKE:** The John Cummins.

**Mr Foley:** The member for Norwood?

**Mr CLARKE:** The Liberal member for Norwood. On that occasion he was blessed by the membership ticket at number 4, so he was guaranteed election because the official ticket said he would be. What I found particularly interesting was that, with respect to the campaign committee, the left wing of the Labor Party supported Mr Cummins at No. 4 because of his very left wing views on foreign affairs. He adamantly opposed the annexation of East Timor by the Indonesians in 1975, and he was a very strong opponent with respect to the American bases at Pine Gap and Nurrungar. He would often speak at ALP conventions and at State council meetings, demanding their immediate cessation of activities in this country because they were part and parcel of the CIA infiltration of our body politic.

Somehow over these 14 years, Mr Cummins has found the road to Damascus far more quickly than Paul. I am sure members would be interested in knowing the results of that vote, and I also have the returning officer's report for that June 1980 conference. Entitled 'Ballot for members of campaign committee', it states:

Of the primary votes that were cast for the 13 candidates—  
and remember that nearly 96 000 votes were cast—  
Mr Cummins received 8 411 votes.

After the distribution of preferences he was not successful in being elected to the campaign committee. One conclusion that can be drawn from that is that the Liberal Party was extremely smart in being able to plant within our Party an *agent provocateur*—very much along the lines of Charles Colson within the Republican Party when Richard Nixon ran for the presidency in 1968 and 1972—pretending to be a wild, left wing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CLARKE:**—red flag waving person demanding the exiting from Australia of American bases, and therefore acting as that *agent provocateur* within our Party and wanting to get on our campaign committee to do one of two things: either simply to propound his left wing views of those days or, in fact, to do a 'Charles Colson' and steal our campaign material for the 1982 State election. How fortunate the Labor Party was that it defeated both him and the wild left wingers who were supporting him in 1980, and that it ensured that he did not get on our campaign committee so that he could leak out that valuable information in the 1982 State election campaign.

**Mr Quirke:** He's the only one on either side that ran for preselection for both Parties.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CLARKE:** I think that is so, but the Labor Party has a far more rigorous preselection process because it ensured that that sort of trickery and skulduggery would not be rewarded. Having seen such barren land and the fact that the Labor Party is far more alert to the shenanigans of the Liberal Party or the extreme left within Labor's political spectrum, Mr Cummins has joined the Party of members opposite and is now the Liberal member for Norwood. I wonder for whom he is now the mole: is he the mole for the Liberal Party; is he the mole for the Labor Party; or is he the mole for some Trotskyite far left faction hungering for the days of the return of the Soviet empire? I guess time will tell.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. There is too much noise in the House.

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** In this grievance debate, I want to use the available time tonight to highlight some of the specific and very valuable benefits that this 1994-95 State budget will bring to my electorate of Chaffey. However, by way of introduction I want to endorse very strongly the comments made by my colleagues on this side of the House, both in this debate and in speaking to the second reading of the Appropriation Bill, indicating that, although this budget is a tough one, it is undoubtedly a very responsible and progressive budget. It provides the foundation and framework to rebuild South Australia. It marks a new era of economic opportunity for this State and for the Riverland, which of course takes in the Chaffey electorate and which is, as an electorate, well positioned to capitalise on this brighter future for the State.

Putting it simply, this budget is aimed at reversing the uncontrolled growth in debt which accrued under the previous Government and which we can no longer afford to sustain. We can no longer afford to spend more than we earn. Of course, the target is for greater employment and economic growth and, as these targets are met, not only will it impact and address the social problems that we have in the community today but also it will generate the dollars to improve further the quality of Government services that we are committed to supplying in South Australia.

I turn specifically to a number of areas in the budget which, as I indicated initially, will make a direct and valuable contribution to the electorate of Chaffey. First, as to economic development, appropriately and importantly the budget reflects the Government's priority for economic development. This will create the jobs that we need, especially for the youth in our community who want to work. The \$150 million allocated to economic development programs will attract investment and jobs. Of that, \$24 million has been specifically allocated to the South Australian Development Fund, which incorporates the Regional Development Payments Program, the Regional Support Program and the Export Development Program.

These dollars and the specific programs mentioned will provide direct assistance for businesses to expand and relocate to existing regional and rural areas of this State. It reflects strongly the election commitment of this Government to recognise the importance and value of rural and regional South Australia to this State. These programs directly give the required incentive for the growth that must and will happen throughout South Australia, particularly in our regional areas. In the Riverland, with the current growth in value added products, in export industries, of course led by the current buoyant expansion of the wine industry and value adding in other horticultural products, those industries and the region together are poised to tap directly into those regional and export development programs and incentives as announced in the 1994-95 budget.

As to capital works, I applaud the Government's decision to increase the capital works program in the budget. A 14 per cent increase in real terms over and above what was spent in the last 1993-94 budget certainly deserves applause. Not only will it generate a significant increase in the number of jobs but also it will start to redress the appalling deterioration in our capital infrastructure in this State that was deprived of funds by previous Governments, as over the past decade or more our assets were allowed to run down or have been sold off merely to be used to pay for the recurrent account of our annual budget.

I note specifically the Government's commitment to the continuation of the rehabilitation of the Government irrigation schemes in the Riverland with a continuing commitment of \$5.1 million to continue this rehabilitation. In doing so, it not only recognises the productivity and efficiency that will be generated by horticultural industries but it also recognises the improvement and the advantageous impact it will have in terms of the environment, with reduced drainage impact on the Murray/Darling system.

Further, in relation to the capital works programs, I am delighted that the electorate of Chaffey will receive as part of that program \$5 million over the next four years for the construction of a new senior secondary facility to meet the needs of Glossop High School. Although planning for this school upgrading and redevelopment has been ongoing for a number of years, and despite local comment that the school upgrading was nearly included in last year's State budget, the facts are that no detailed costings had been done and it was merely on the general list, as many schools have been over past years. Therefore, given the current economic climate I am very pleased indeed that consideration has been given to this education need in the Riverland. Although the final site for this new development is still being considered, it will be determined by continuing community consultation, and I look forward to the fine tuning of these negotiations with the Department for Education and Children's Services to establish that school in the future.

In the education arena in general, contrary to the alarmist, reactionary and attempted divisive pronouncements of the local SAIT representative, teacher cuts in the Riverland will be minimal based on projected enrolments for 1995. Of the 17 primary schools in my electorate, only two will be affected by a maximum of a 1.1 full-time equivalent teacher reduction. Of the four high schools, the net variation for 1995 at this stage is expected to be less than four full-time teachers. The Government is honouring its commitment in terms of changing educational priorities to think of our children's future. The region will share in this increase of \$10 million in the education budget for the early years strategy and will benefit from the increase in speech pathology services, the increase in special education teachers, and the increase in resources for the early intervention programs.

In the health area the most significant of the savings identified in this budget will come from the introduction of casemix and contestability in the large hospitals in the city. I am pleased to note that all Riverland hospitals, because of their commendable past and current above average efficiency performance, will be net beneficiaries under the casemix system, but more particularly the Riverland will benefit from a number of funding increases for specific programs. There is increased expenditure for the palliative care counselling service, and the electorate will be the recipient of a half time position for a resident psychologist. It will also benefit from expenditure of \$600 000 on a new breast X-ray unit which is expected to be commissioned and in service next month. In addition, the Riverland will receive funding for two of the special 18 pilot programs out of the health budget. One will be to establish a domiciliary midwifery scheme: a special service in the area. It will provide mothers and their families with follow up support, education and nursing care which would otherwise be provided in a hospital. It will be provided more valuably and will be more conducive to the familiarity of the home environment.

Further to this, we were successful with a special scheme to improve the discharge of older residents from hospitals.

This special health scheme will aim to provide for better planning, reduce the stress for all involved and increase the assessment of the home environment so that there will be greater assistance and coordination with additional community nurse time and greater liaison with hospital, aged care and local GPs.

The list goes on, and I can point to a whole range of portfolio areas. I refer to tourism, which has had its budget increased from \$26.9 million to \$29.1 million with further national and international marketing, and that is a bonus for tourist regions like the Riverland. Importantly, training and employment are not forgotten. There are special incentive schemes, including the trainee development scheme, the employment broker scheme and the group training subsidy scheme in which the Riverland is already participating strongly and setting the pace. It has been well received in the Riverland. In the transport area, the Berri bypass road of the Sturt Highway will receive significant funding. The Morgan-Burra Road will have full survey and design started on it. It represents a whole ambit of bonus and contribution to my electorate.

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

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Over the past few months I have spent a lot of time working with women in the women's community health centres around Adelaide in relation to their fears of large cuts as a result of this budget. I will spend my time tonight talking about that. The fears expressed by the women in those centres were realised in the budget that was brought down a couple of weeks ago. I will detail those cuts to the four centres, and I will talk about the effects of those things and the fears that the people in the communities in those health centres now have in relation to their services. I refer to the Adelaide Women's Community Health Centre, where there has been a cut of \$53 000, and the Dale Street Women's Health Centre at Port Adelaide, where there has been a cut of \$26 000—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms STEVENS:** The Southern Women's Community Health Centre received a cut of \$25 000, and the Elizabeth Women's Community Health Centre received a cut of \$21 000. The three regional women's health centres have been told that their funds will be cut by a further 5 per cent over the 1995-96 and 1996-97 financial years. The three regional centres are the only services which have been given cuts over this period, apart from CAFHS, which has been told that it will have to do more work in the youth area. It has been given an extra \$1 million for immunisation, but it has been told that it can expect cuts of \$900 000 over the next two to three years. This is a small amount compared with its total budget.

On the other hand, for the three women's health centres, it is a very large proportion, and they have fared far worse than any other area. How were those cuts determined? As usual, and this seems to have been the way of all the discussions that have occurred between the women's health centres and the Health Commission, there has been little information on the rationale behind these cuts. They were obviously not related to the needs of the areas which they service. This can be seen clearly when we look at the funding of the related community health centres. For instance, in the northern region, community health centres—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much noise in the Chamber. I cannot hear the member for Elizabeth. I refer particularly to members on the front benches.

**Ms STEVENS:** If we look at the funding for community health centres to the north and south of the metropolitan area, we see that general community health centres in the northern area were not cut and the Noarlunga Community Health Centre was not cut, but both the Elizabeth Women's Health Centre and the women's health centre in the south were cut markedly. If there was a great need for health services in the north and the south, which no funding cuts to the other services indicate, why were the women's health centres cut, or does it mean that women's health centres do not matter and that women's health services presented by those centres are not needed?

The other thing that is important to note is that these calculations and this 5 per cent cut is a dishonest figure. The figure on which the 5 per cent cut is based also includes grant moneys that were received on a one-off basis from the Federal Government. Also included in the calculation on which the 5 per cent has been taken was any budget carryover from last year. Women's health centres knew that it was going to be difficult and took measures last year to save money and be prudent in their expenditure, but now these savings have been built into the total from which the cuts have been made.

What does this mean for our centres? Our centres are small and together comprised only \$1.93 million, a meagre .15 per cent, of the total health budget last year. When you have such a small budget, you cannot sustain that level of cut and still remain viable. This will certainly be the case for regional centres. The centres have constantly been told that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! There is far too much audible noise in the Chamber. The member for Elizabeth is not getting any support, even from members on her own side. Please give the honourable member a chance.

**Ms STEVENS:** The centres have constantly been told that one way to make savings is to become more administratively efficient. This idea is based on the assumption that the centres are top heavy with administrative staff and that cuts can be made in this area without impacting on the delivery of service. The reality is far from this. A recent paper by the combined women's health centres demonstrated that, of total staff time, approximately 70 per cent is utilised in direct women's health service delivery, and approximately 12 per cent is spent on administration that directly supports this service delivery; for example, maintaining the library, the information pamphlets, the resource files, making appointments, managing case notes and typing referral letters.

Without this type of administrative activity, service delivery could not occur. It is absolutely necessary. Approximately 14 per cent goes into administrative activities directly resulting from requirements of the South Australian Health Commission itself; for example, providing activity, financial and work force data. The remaining 4 per cent of total staff time is spent on other administrative duties. So, only 4 per cent could be put in that category of other duties. The South Australian Health Commission and indeed the Minister for Health have repeatedly stated that cuts must not affect the delivery of services. Clearly, any cuts to women's health centres will impact on service delivery; there is simply nowhere else for the cuts to be made.

So, what is the future for women's health centres? At the moment the future looks very bleak. A very clear message from an extremely well-attended public meeting a month or so ago which was attended by the Minister gave him a clear message that women's health centres provide a very important role in our community. Indeed, they have been doing this for over 10 years. They were established with bipartisan support and have worked in communities with a community ethos, participation at grassroots level, doing primary health care and taking a very important role. This has been happening successfully for 10 years.

That message was given to the Minister by several hundred women at that meeting a month or so ago. The message was also that the women of South Australia want more, not fewer services for women. The clear message from the Government, however, after 10 years is that these centres are not important, they are not worthy of the funding to keep them going and they are not regarded as a necessary part of our health system.

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** Mr Acting Speaker, it is amazing that, 30 years after the event, the Opposition has finally discovered Cecil B. De Mille's production of the *Ten Commandments*. We have known for 12 months that all we see opposite is a heap of fog. They have suddenly realised if they rumble loudly enough and produce the occasional flash of lightening they might perpetrate a giant trick on South Australians so that they might believe they are about to appear with the Ten Commandments. That is the sort of rhetoric that we heard. I enjoyed the member for Hart's speech tonight. I was sitting in a Presiding Members' meeting with a number of other people and we did not even have the loud speakers on. We enjoyed the member for Hart's speech; he was yelling so loudly that he interrupted the whole meeting—and that was without amplification! They seem to think that, if they yell loudly enough, lace their speeches with calls for social justice, thump the table and otherwise perform like those mammals they got rid of from Marineland, South Australia might take some notice.

The member for Elizabeth made an interesting contribution, and actually illustrated how much out of step the members opposite are. It is about time they realised what the rest of South Australia already realises, and that is that there is a new Government in this State which is committed to the welfare of all the people of South Australia and which is no longer prepared to knee-jerk react to the biggest and best pressure group on the block. For 10 years in this State we have seen Government according to the whims of pressure groups.

The better the pressure group; the better organised the pressure group; the louder the pressure group yelled, the more it squeezed out of the last Government. I can say, on behalf of all members of these Government benches, that that is exactly what was wrong. They were so busy squeezing the lemon in every direction, squeezing juice for this pressure group or that pressure group, this interest group or that interest group, that half the basic services were never attended to. They spread the cream so thinly that in the end you could not even taste it, and they tried to call that good Government. This Government has three years to run, and this Government will show the ragtags sitting opposite, the ragtags pretending they know what Government was about, what good Government really is about. This Government will set a standard that every other Government for the next 50 years will be forced to follow.

Instead of sitting bleating and saying 'Women demand more; women want this and other people want that, and somebody else tomorrow will want something else'; instead of doing that, the member for Elizabeth would be better coming in here and saying 'This is best for all South Australians': not 'There was a big meeting and it was well attended, therefore the Government must acquiesce.' I was not at the meeting. I am sure the member for Mitchell was not and I am sure a good many other citizens of South Australia were not. Perhaps we do not count because we were not at the meeting, but I put to you that this is a Government for all the people. This is not a Government for minority groups.

*Mr Caudell interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning):** Order! The member for Mitchell is out of order.

**Mr BRINDAL:** We have heard a lot in this budget about education; we have heard how catastrophic education was. Interestingly, we heard even more before the budget than we now hear. I can remember members opposite marching very vigorously to the drum beaten by the Institute of Teachers and saying that thousands of teachers were to lose their jobs; hundreds of schools were to be closed; class sizes were to swell to the point where you could not fit them into classrooms; and nothing was ever going to be the same in education again. What is the reality? The reality is 420 teachers, not 2 000. The reality is small rises in class sizes, minimum rises in class sizes, and the reality is a new and accountable system of education.

The member for Playford yesterday spoke to this House about having the best system of education. As I said in this place last night, the problem with his speech is that he measures the best system of education by the amount of money the Government throws at it. There again is the difference between this and the previous Government. Members opposite believe that, if ever there was a problem, some way of fixing it was to write a bigger cheque. If you could not fix it with cheque A, next year you went along and wrote cheque B, which was bigger than cheque A. As long as the cheques that you wrote every year were bigger than the cheques you wrote in the previous year, you could say you were moving ahead, you were achieving something.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** As members opposite rightly interject, the cheques bounced all the way out of the State Bank. They thought that more money meant more services. They thought that more money meant better, and it did not; it never, ever did. And their education system, their system that they said was so good, brought me and a number of others into this Chamber, because unashamedly I saw what was happening in education under Labor and decided that something needed to be done about it, and a number of people have come in here to try to do something. Is it not interesting that the Opposition is currently reduced to one member? Perhaps they do not like liberal doses of the truth. Perhaps they do not like to hear a message that cuts close enough to the bone that they have to walk out.

But I am sure *Hansard* is quite capable of recording the name of the member for Napier as being the only member of the Opposition benches who bothers to attend this Parliament; who bothers to sit in here and join in the debate in the Chamber. And, of course, we have the erstwhile member for Spence, who has just bicycled in on his way to or from somewhere. He probably just came in from a church service.

I have every confidence that under this Government we will see the best education system in this country. It will be

an education system based not on money but on good teaching, a nurturing environment for children and performance. The Teachers Institute was very quick to have convinced this community that bigger classes meant poorer teaching, but that same Institute of Teachers was never willing to permit any Government to check the attainment levels of children. It is very interesting that, while it now continues to say that bigger classes would be bad for education, there is no proof of that. There never has been any proof, because the very people who kept putting forward that proposition would never allow that proposition to be tested.

This Government is allowing the attainment level testing of children. That means that in 5 or 10 years we might be able to have a legitimate and informed debate on what constitutes an optimum class size. It might actually be possible to have an intelligent debate, because we will have some measured facts which we can look at. That is something members opposite completely refused to do when they were in government, because the people who dangled their strings on South Terrace and out on Greenhill Road and who kept members opposite in government for so long did not like it, and what they did not like did not happen.

Well, there is a new and decent Government on North Terrace, and there is a Government that is governing in the best interests of South Australians. It is not governing in the best interests of its mates, the biggest group to have met most recently or the Minister's last dream. I believe this whole place was run by Ministers' going to bed at night, dreaming up a crazy idea and bringing it in here the next day.

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

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Barton Road runs between the north-western corner of North Adelaide and the suburbs of Bowden and Ovingham. The road carries the number 253 bus and has been used for more than 100 years by people in the Town of Hindmarsh and the western suburbs generally to travel to places important in their routines, such as St Laurence's Church, St Dominic's Priory School, Calvary Hospital, Mary Potter Hospice, the Red Cross, the Helping Hand and the specialist doctors and dentists whose consulting rooms are in that area. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, will notice that some of these institutions are Catholic.

**Mr Brindal:** So?

**Mr ATKINSON:** I may make it relevant as the speech goes on.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** As a matter of fact, just to reply to the Minister for Industrial Affairs, I am an Anglo-Catholic.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Spence well knows it is completely out of order to reply to interjections.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley is being frivolous.

**Mr ATKINSON:** The Minister for Health lives at 72 Molesworth Street, North Adelaide—not far from Barton Road. He did not want people who live in the Town of Hindmarsh or, indeed, the western suburbs, travelling on the streets of North Adelaide. In the 1980s, the Minister for Health sought to have Barton Road closed, and that is a fact. This was one of his early collaborations with his neighbour, Alderman Jane Rann, with whom he is now working to make Lord Mayor of Adelaide. Alderman Rann, nee Jose, is now leading the charge to deny Calvary Hospital planning permission for an upgrade. Alderman Rann is trying to force

a Catholic hospital to spend thousands of dollars not on healing the sick or delivering babies but on an appeal to the planning tribunals to force the Adelaide City Council to make a reasonable decision.

The other North Adelaide resident in this tale is the Minister's sister-in-law, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, who just happens to be the Minister for Transport. In November 1987 the Adelaide City Council sent in the bulldozers to rip up Barton Road. Council sought no lawful authority for the closure and road works—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Members will come to order.

**Mr ATKINSON:**—and did not initiate a road process order under the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act until five years later. In place of Barton Road a narrow S-bend was constructed for the buses and 'No Entry (Buses Excepted)' signs were erected at each end.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** Members are interjecting about members of Parliament who live in North Adelaide, and they have mentioned the Hon. Chris Sumner and the Hon. Peter Duncan, but they have not mentioned the Hon. Jamie Irwin, who has the decency to support the reopening of Barton Road, unlike the Ministers for Health and Transport. People from the Town of Hindmarsh had to use one of two lengthy detours to get to the part of North Adelaide they can almost spit on from their homes. For 180 degrees on the eastern side of North Adelaide there are 10 crossings: to the city, College Park, Gilberton, Medindie, Thorngate and Fitzroy—the dinner tables of which members opposite attend often.

Along the 180 degrees to the west of North Adelaide facing Bowden and Brompton there are no crossings, because Liberal Party MPs and Adelaide city councillors do not go west. They are not interested in the west: they do not have social intercourse with the west. So there are no crossings from North Adelaide to the west. The then Lord Mayor, now the member for Colton, wrote to Mr Trevor McFarlane of North Adelaide to tell him he did not see why people were complaining about having to drive 'a few extra kilometres'—the member for Colton's words. I hope the member for Colton now has a different perspective on this issue.

*Mr Condous interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** He says, 'Of course I do.' I am pleased to hear that. I hope he raises it in the Party room. When veteran traffic controversialist, Gordon Howie, challenged a police expiation notice issued to him for driving through the bus lane, he responded with a Supreme Court appeal. Mr Justice Duggan found that there was no warrant for the closure and the 'No Entry' signs were of no effect. More than 1 000 motorists and cyclists (and I am glad the member for Adelaide is back here now on this issue) from the Town of Hindmarsh and from North Adelaide use the bus lane each day in defiance of the Minister for Health's 'No Entry' signs. Although the 'No Entry' signs are of no legal effect and the road works that dug up the original Barton Road are an unlawful obstruction, the Minister for Health's sister-in-law—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat for a moment.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Chair needs no prompting from backbench members. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The member for Spence referred to 'the Minister for Health's 'No Entry' signs'. They are absolutely no responsibility of mine.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The Minister can make a personal explanation at the end of the debate.

**Mr ATKINSON:** It is a wise ruling on that frivolous and time wasting point of order. So, the Minister for Health's sister-in-law refuses to do her legal duty as Minister for Transport and order the signs down and the road reopened. Indeed, she is about to acquiesce in the closure of War Memorial Drive at its western end, denying western suburbs residents a means of access to the city. Not only is Barton Road to be closed by this crowd but War Memorial Drive will also be closed. In May 1992 the Adelaide City Council tried to close Barton Road formally under the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act. More than 500 written objections to the closure were lodged, 100 of them from North Adelaide residents, and another 500 signed a petition against the closure.

*The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** Wait for the redistribution mate, because when you have to contest the suburbs of Bowden, Ovingham, Brompton and Ridleyton, you will get defeated. I would bet you won't say that when the redistribution comes down. If the town of Hindmarsh is in the State district of Adelaide, the member for Adelaide will not be running against me; he will not have a show. He will run away to some other seat. The Surveyor-General recommended to the Minister for Lands that the road not be closed, and the Minister accepted his recommendation.

Neither the Adelaide City Council nor the Liberal Party would accept the Supreme Court decision or the Surveyor-General's recommendation. The council tried to use section 359 of the Local Government Act, headed 'Temporary Closure', to stop motorists and cyclists using the bus lane in Barton Road. Motorists and police have ignored the council's use of section 359, I am pleased to say. It will not stand up in court.

Adelaide City Council, led by would-be Liberal candidate Jane Rann, is now trying another method to fine motorists and pedestrians at least \$75 each time they use Barton Road. The latest attempt is in the *Government Gazette* of 25 August. The notice from the Adelaide City Council, in that council's usual treacherous style, gives no indication that it is about Barton Road. It seeks to open on the deposited plan a new road at the site that conforms to the bus lane. If the application is granted by the Minister for Lands there will then be two public roads on the deposited plan, one superimposed on the other. The council will then apply to the Minister to reverse the earlier decision preserving the original Barton Road. The old Barton Road will be removed from the deposited plan and the bus lane will become the new Barton Road.

I urge the Minister for Lands to resist the urgings that he act corruptly by overturning a valid decision by the Surveyor-General and previous Ministers. The circumstances now are no different from what they were then.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. If members wish to bring discredit upon the House with such a noisy rabble, that is the members' discretion, but I assure members that will be the end of it. I will have no hesitation in naming the next person to offend. Please do not challenge the Chair.



**Mr ATKINSON:** I hope that Liberal backbenchers in the western suburbs will rally to the defence of their constituents because I can assure them that support for access to western North Adelaide via Barton Road is supported in Colton, Peake, Lee and Spence.

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** My admiration goes to the members of the *Hansard* staff for having to endeavour to take down the diatribe that we have heard from the member for Spence. There is no doubt that he is very worried about the coming redistribution of boundaries. He has had to drag Barton Terrace out of the bottom drawer again. For years he has been going on about the Barton Terrace closure. He was never able to achieve anything in relation to having that road reopened while his own Party was in Government and he has not had it officially reopened. The Lord Mayor, Henry Ninio, wrote to me saying that it will not be reopened, so the frustrated member for Spence, as a shadow Minister with important issues affecting the people of South Australia, has had to resort to the usual bash and brash and carry on about Barton Terrace. I would have thought that the shadow Minister for Health would have more important issues to raise during this grievance debate and more questions to ask of the Minister for Health.

**The Hon. M.H. Armitage:** He has not asked one question on the budget.

**Mr BECKER:** I understand from the Minister for Health that the member for Spence has not asked one question or sought any information whatsoever about the health budget. Therefore, I assume that the member for Spence is pleased with and accepts what the Minister for Health has done in relation to the health budget. I commend the Minister for Health because his budget no doubt has been accepted with gratitude by the member for Spence. I suggest that the member for Spence would be well advised to spend more time looking for his pushbike and getting around his own electorate and visiting the hospitals and various health centres so that he may know what is going on.

There has been a trend emerging lately that worries me very much. Various organisations—and I am a great supporter of private enterprise—are trying to beat Government regulations and rules in relation to Government fees. Recently a constituent of mine brought to my attention an organisation called the Australian Fun Club. He purchased a ticket for \$2 thinking that he was buying a raffle ticket for a car. He found out that it is a membership discount voucher and that if he rings 0055 89108 he will be advised certain details as to the benefits of his membership. The membership for \$2 expires on 31 December 1994 and it will entitle him to enter into a draw for what he assumes could be a Toyota motor vehicle valued at \$38 000, and there is a membership number of this particular car. However, when he looked at the back of the ticket he saw that the Australian Fun Club states:

Thank you for supporting the Australian Fun Club. Your continued support will enable us to assist worthy charitable causes, medical research and community groups and services.

That sounds very nice. It continues:

Your membership discount voucher entitles you to various discounts and services; for more information regarding our club and these discounts phone [that 0055 number] at the budget rate of 35¢ per 60 seconds.

The club offers the following prize choices:

- (1) Bikes plus \$10 000 cash.

The member for Spence would be advised to look at this because he could recoup his pushbike. It continues:

- (2) Boat plus \$10 000 cash
- (3) Toyota Vienta TS-V6
- (4) Commodore S-Pack-V6
- (4) Mazda 626 5-door-V6 (manual).

The club offers five prize choices to a total value of \$38 000. The club points out that:

Motor cars come with 12 months registration and insurance and have demo mileage for display purposes.

It then sets out conditions of entry. The following address is shown:

Australian Fundraising Consultants, PO Box 269, Belair, SA.

Apparently this organisation has been soliciting various charitable organisations and will sell you membership club books for \$1, whereas you can sell the tickets for \$2. So the fundraising organisation, the charity, can employ people to sell memberships for the fundraising club for \$2. For argument's sake, if they buy \$500 worth of tickets they can sell them for \$1 000 and naturally the charitable organisation makes \$500.

With this type of organisation there is very little public accountability that I am aware of at present. I have discussed this with the Treasurer and I see that it could be a means of avoiding paying stamp duty, taking out a licence and, as I said, accountability to the Government as far as a raffle is concerned. This must be some considerable raffle if the ticket number is about 248 000.

Under this system you could assume that this organisation, the Australian Fun Club, could sell tens of thousands of tickets. It could well exceed the five times ratio of prize money that you are permitted to raise under the small lotteries and licences legislation. However, the Government gets no benefit at all. No-one knows how much goes off in fees and charges to the organisers and promoters of this raffle. That is what worries me because in theory you are not permitted to employ people to sell raffle tickets, scratchy tickets or whatever for charitable organisations. Yet in this State, for years, certain organisations have got around that procedure, and have been doing it quite blatantly. No action was ever taken by the previous whimpy Government and no action appears to have been taken at the moment by our new Government. However, what annoys me is that here is someone who I think misleads you: you think you are buying a ticket in a car.

You buy a ticket to win a car, but in fact it is a membership and you have to spend a considerable sum of money to find out what the benefits are. As I said, this organisation could raise tens of thousands of dollars and pay out a prize, but no-one would even know whether it raised the actual money.

I can only say to the people of South Australia: be careful. We support any endeavours to assist charitable organisations. It is difficult to raise money today for the arts, sport, recreation and the various health and welfare associations that need money to assist those who are less fortunate than ourselves, but I take strong exception to promoters and entrepreneurs who abuse the system and who, despite the good intentions enshrined in the legislation, use loopholes to fleece people in this way.

As I said, I hope it is not true, but there is no way that I can see total accountability to this organisation. Therefore, I ask the Treasurer to look into the matter. When time permits and staff resources can be made available to a committee such

as the Economic and Finance Committee, we should look into the fundraising activities of some of the so-called charitable organisations in our community in order to assess the amount of commission that is taken out of these publicly raised funds, because it is alleged that, on occasion, between 60 per cent and 70 per cent is absorbed in administrative costs, fees and so-called commission. You find that some charitable organisations are being used to raise anything up to \$240 000 in raffle donations, yet when the net proceeds come through they are lucky to get \$40 000.

As far as I am concerned, that type of system is not permissible. We have strict laws in relation to lotteries, casino operations and poker machines, and I think it is about time that we looked seriously at the whole of the fundraising issues for these various welfare organisations.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I want to say that the previous speaker, the member for Peake, in the light of his experience in this Parliament, deserves, at least in his final term, a front bench position. Hopefully one day a numberplate will be named after him—perhaps the Becker State.

I want to talk today about some confusion in Government ranks in relation to asset sales. The Deputy Premier today contradicted an announcement made yesterday that the Entertainment Centre would not—I repeat ‘would not’—be sold. We all remember that in Parliament on Tuesday the Minister for Tourism said that the State Government had no intention to sell the Adelaide Entertainment Centre, but today the Deputy Premier confirmed that the Government’s list of assets to be sold, which includes the Entertainment Centre, is still valid and still in force. So, there appears to be total confusion in the Cabinet over asset sales.

We all remember that during the last State election campaign the then Leader of the Opposition, now Premier, listed as part of his recovery strategy a group of assets that he said would and must be sold as part of the Government’s debt reduction strategy. That list included SGIC, the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, properties of the South Australian Urban Lands Trust and the Adelaide Entertainment Centre. Today, I asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer to release a new list of Government assets that are up for sale following the announcement yesterday by the Minister for Tourism that the Entertainment Centre would definitely not now be sold. I remind members that the Deputy Premier told Parliament today that the Premier’s list is still valid. He said that the Government said right at the outset that it had a list of assets and that it was explicit about them before the election.

He told this House today that the list has not changed; the time frame for the sale of assets would be subject to the best market conditions prevailing. Later, in respect of my question, the Treasurer again said, ‘The assets were as listed. The sale will take place at the most convenient market time.’ It is important for the taxpayer, for this Parliament, for the financial institutions both locally and interstate and, of course, for the benefit of their own members, that a genuine list of assets for sale and a timetable for their selling is released. It seems, however, that this afternoon the Deputy Premier has overruled the announcement by the Minister for Tourism that the Entertainment Centre would not be sold.

I am not sure whether that is a Mickey Mouse asset strategy or simply ‘confusion on ice’ over the Entertainment Centre. Of course, there has been some dispute. We have heard speaker after speaker from the Government side saying,

‘There are no broken promises; we are keeping faith with our promises.’ Let us go back and look at some of those promises. Let us remember that on 26 July 1993 the current Premier told the Public Service Association, ‘What we say is what we will do. Don’t read my lips: what we say is what we will do. Watch what we do,’ and we are.

Let us go through some of the promises. The Liberal Party promised to allocate an additional \$6 million annually to public hospitals. It said that it would retain within the health system all savings generated so that increased funds can be provided for direct patient services—that was in the Liberal health policy of December 1993. Of course, we have now heard that \$32 million will be cut from health, the largest single blow in a budget that takes the axe to public services. Again, that is a reflection of the lack of clout of the Minister for Health in Cabinet. A further \$33 million will be cut from the health budget over the next two years. Of course, we have heard that secondary school students who do not qualify as school card holders will no longer be eligible for free dental services. Country pensioners will have their 100 per cent concession for ambulance services cut to 50 per cent. They are a few of the promises on health that have and will be broken.

We then had the promises on education. We had a great deal of grandstanding. Dean Brown would become the education Premier. Of course, the policy speech of 28 November 1993 stated:

Education spending will increase in 1994-95.

Remember the former Leader’s words, ‘No ifs, no buts. Education spending will increase in 1994-95. This will ensure average class sizes are maintained,’ the present Premier said in that same policy speech. These promises have also been broken by the Brown Government. We see \$22 million cut from the budget in 1994-95; reductions to increase to \$40 million over the next couple of years, 422 teachers’ jobs to go; class sizes to increase; and the school card cut by \$3.3 million.

Then, of course, there was that other fundamental categorical promise of no increases to fees and charges above inflation. We all remember that promise. Let us remember too the words of the Premier:

I will go on record here and now with the promise to resign as Premier if I am forced to introduce new taxes or increase the rate of existing ones.

He vowed that State charges would increase under a Liberal Government at a rate no greater than inflation, according to the *Sunday Mail* of 5 December 1993. So, let us look again at how these promises were broken by the Brown Government, and are in the process of being broken. On 1 July more than 800 fees and charges were increased, more than half of them above the rate of inflation. Sewerage rates are also up 10 per cent, raising \$15 million in 1994-95; driver’s licences up by 5.6 per cent; Housing Trust rents up; basic hunting permits up by 10 per cent; and registration of fish processors up by 280 per cent.

Perhaps they were talking about no increases of fees and charges above the inflation rate in South America—I do not know. Perhaps that is the way that the trickiness of the Premier will seek to get out of that promise. Fishery licences are up by 10.5 per cent; miscellaneous fishery licences, by 26.9 per cent; and abalone fishery licences, by 26.9 per cent to \$47 017. Then, of course, the general exemption from land tax will be lowered from \$80 000 site value to \$50 000. That was the media statement by the Treasurer on 25 August. This

will raise \$4.8 million in 1994-95. Let us go on to some other promises. The Premier said he was not going to break promises. We have had to not just read his lips but watch what he would do. Let us have a look at another categorical promise. In response to a question about cuts to the Public Service quoted in the *Advertiser* of 1 December, the Premier said:

We have said that we have exactly the same targets as put down by the Government which is 3 900.

Let us look at how that promise was broken by the Brown Government. The Premier said in this House on 2 August:

The figures I gave yesterday were absolutely spot on, namely, 5 000 to the end of June and another 5 500 over the next three years.

So, how does that 5 000 to the end of June and another 5 500 over the next three years compare with his promise before the election that they had the same target, which is 3 900? I have said already that, of course, education is one of the big losers in this budget. We have been told that the education budget will be cut by \$22 million with more to be cut next year. And so, the constituents of members opposite in southern seats, marginal seats and safe seats will be asking how much money has been ripped out of their local schools. About 40 schools will close, but no list has been provided, despite promises of consultation: 422 teachers will go; will their schools have fewer teachers? School class sizes will increase on average by more than one student each and some maybe more.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader's time has expired. The member for Frome.

**Mr KERIN (Frome):** First, I would like to congratulate the Treasurer on introducing his first budget. He was left a Treasury portfolio that was in absolute tatters, and he has done a remarkable job in producing a budget as thoroughly responsible as this and in setting an agenda for recovery in this State. He was really left a massive debt. The question was asked by my colleague earlier this evening regarding what was left in the Treasury and, as the member for Hart said, 'You got left a challenge.' The Treasurer has done a great deal in meeting that challenge. The budget goes a long way to reversing the uncontrolled growth in debt that we have seen in recent years and to returning to an approach of responsibility to those who follow us both in ordinary living and in governing this State.

Concerning the budget, I have been most pleased with the local feedback I have received in the Frome electorate. What people are basically saying is that at last we have seen a responsible budget. Most people are welcoming the increase in capital spending (which is up 14 per cent) and the decrease in recurrent spending. I think that most people identify that that was where things were going wrong and that the change from recurrent to capital spending is an important indicator of the Government's direction for the future of South Australia. It really is a start to addressing the crumbling infrastructure which we have taken over, particularly in our schools.

The other thing that has been interesting when talking about the budget with constituents, particularly in Port Pirie—and a lot of these people were past supporters of the Labor Party—they very quickly say, 'Well, you blokes didn't cause the problem anyway,' and they appreciate the position in which we have been left.

If the Labor Party thinks that people have forgotten that fact, it is very wrong. I have been surprised by the lack of comment about the budget out in the electorate. I think that

most people took it as absolutely necessary: the budget we had to have. In this Chamber, the Labor Party seems to have approached it in much the same way. There has been a distinct lack of questions and comment about the budget, and, although many members have had the opportunity tonight to attack it, we have heard only the member for Playford having a bit of a grizzle about not receiving a dinner invitation and the member for Ross Smith talking about the departure of the member for Norwood from the Labor Party and the resultant drop in the average IQ, but we have heard very little about the budget.

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**Mr KERIN:** Not too many travel concessions on school card occur in my electorate. Buses do not go that far. The budget certainly did not reach anywhere near the expectations that have been touted in the public forum by Clare McCarty and her supporters. I never cease to be amazed at her mock indignation at the actual cuts in education which are absolutely dwarfed by her claims, predictions, scare tactics and all the other rubbish that she would feed to anyone who will listen. She seems to have a dying audience at the moment, as I think fewer people are willing to listen to those arguments.

Despite what has actually happened, the noise about education still continues. There are still incorrect figures being touted and false claims being made which are unfair and insensitive to communities. Mischievously rumours are being spread to try to keep the pot of discontent brewing and to prop up the discredited union campaign against the Government. Last week in Port Pirie, where an amalgamation of high schools is taking place, people were running around saying that the amalgamated school next year would be staffed only as one school, despite constant assurances that it would be staffed as two. The Minister for Education was very quick in giving written confirmation that the amalgamated school would still be staffed as two schools in 1995 and also in indicating to those concerned the extra allowances for 1996 and 1997.

Of course, no-one knows where the rumours start, but I would ask those who start those types of rumours to consider the damage that it does to the amalgamation process when we are trying to get a school up and running in a town. Difficulties arise when amalgamation takes place, and this sort of absolute rubbish does not help. It is about time that the people who started those rumours considered the welfare of the students who will be attending that school next year.

In particular, I applaud the education capital works program and the allocation of \$1.5 million to the Peterborough High School to replace some buildings which have been left in an absolutely disgraceful condition. People at that school were of the opinion that, over time, money would be provided to re-clad it, and so on, and \$1.5 million will allow that school to carry out many projects. Peterborough has gone through a lot of difficult years and this development is a significant boost to community morale. The feedback I have had from that town has been excellent. Ironically, it comes hot on the heels of, yet again, Peterborough High School being named by an Opposition member as being one of 23 schools in my electorate that would close. That is another case of misdirected political opportunism and an attempt at exploiting a community, which has become progressively more cynical over the years as a result of the number of kicks in the guts it has had from Governments, and invariably Labor Governments.

Our assurances about the school being kept open have now been truly underpinned by the commitment of this major

project, and the announcement is a just reward for the Peterborough High School community which, despite the shocking facilities it has had to work in, has still managed to come up with a quality of education which is a true credit to the school community, students and teachers alike. Also I applaud the other significant maintenance moneys coming into my electorate, but I realise that it will take years to repair the damage caused by the last Government's preoccupation with recurrent spending and to remedy its effects on this State's assets. The additional \$7 million for minor works and maintenance in education will be a start, but there is a lot further to go with the state of our schools.

Another area which was disgracefully ignored in the past and about which I get complaints constantly involves the early years of education. The early year strategy initiative will attack the problem and allow the identification of problem children much earlier, and the allocation of \$2.7 million to commence new initiatives to both identify and provide resources to assist those children will be gratefully accepted.

For my area the recognition of the importance of tourism with a good allocation in the budget will go a long way. The funds directed towards marketing, particularly in the Asian area, will give the region a good boost. Also important to Port Pirie and the smelters is the allocation of funds in the mines and energy budget for exploration in the north-east of South Australia and the Broken Hill area to try find more ore bodies to keep Port Pirie going.

Also important to Frome residents and everyone in regional South Australia is the acceleration in the sealing of arterial roads. In Frome, funds have been allocated to complete the sealing of the Burra to Spalding road and to make a start on the Burra to Morgan road, as mentioned by the member for Custance earlier tonight. That is only a start. Our roads have been in a shocking condition. The previous Government and even more so its Federal colleagues ignored country roads for a long time, and we have a long way to go to get them back to a satisfactory standard.

The budget's focus is on jobs and economic recovery. It provides expenditure of more than \$150 million towards economic development programs and job creation. Included in that is \$60 million for the Economic Development Advisory Board, \$31 million for developments associated with the MFP, \$28 million for industrial and commercial programs for the Housing Trust, \$24 million for the Development Fund and funds for the Let's Get South Australia Working program. Certainly, it is a budget of new opportunities for South Australia, and now South Australians can look forward to a real future, one that is not dominated by the spectre of ever increasing debt and the decrease in services that that causes. I support the budget and, once again, I congratulate the Treasurer on the job he has done when faced with a very difficult task.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health):** I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** Before beginning my grievance, I would note a curious thing about the responses of Government members. On the one hand, we are being told by a number of members how dreadful the previous Government was in its treatment of the education system, how it closed down 70 schools and shed 1 000 teachers. On the other hand,

and the member for Unley's speech reminded me of this, we are told that the previous Labor Government responded like puppets on strings pulled by SAIT. The Treasurer mentioned last night that we should get our act together, but I think that perhaps Government members should get their act together about their view of who pulled the strings for the former Labor Government.

I have to disappoint the member for Unley in another respect, too, because mine will be another plea for social justice. I am aware that members opposite do not set much store in social justice. In fact, it is a term that is almost forbidden now—it is almost a dirty term. In fact, when the shadow Treasurer in his reply to the budget remarked that no-one liked to be reliant on Government handouts, it was greeted with a great deal of derision and ridicule by members opposite. I never cease to be dismayed by this sort of attitude. It is a typical Tory line, that people like to queue up for handouts, that all they want in life is a hand-out from the Government. I am aware that not all Government members take this line, but a sufficient number of them do to make me nervous about what will happen to those people in our community who are dependent on benefits. The number of unfair myths perpetuated by hardliners in this Government is ludicrous.

An example of this occurred during the WorkCover debate. WorkCover payments are not so much Government hand-outs as entitlements to workers, but nevertheless it seems to be the view of the Government that they are hand-outs. During the debate on WorkCover in the last session, when a number of so-called draconian reforms were brought in, the Government trotted out trite examples of minor payouts to support its case. A few anomalies, some of which we discovered were not even accurate, were brought out to support the cut backs.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** I will tell you later. An increasing number of people are coming to my office who need help in negotiating problems caused by the fact that they are on WorkCover benefits. Most of these people seek some reassurance that this will not get worse. This is a reassurance that I am not able to give them because the Government has quite clearly signalled that it will get worse for people on WorkCover. The people who come to my office are required constantly to attend reviews of their cases. They must visit a number of different medical practitioners in response to sceptical case workers who send them from doctor to doctor to try to get the answer that WorkCover wants: that in fact people are hypochondriacs or that their condition is really not that severe.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** This is another of the myths being perpetrated. The Government likes to think that that is more the case—that people are trying to rot the system. That occurs in very rare cases. In fact, it is more the case that patients are forced to go from doctor to doctor, and in some cases they are almost experimental subjects for WorkCover as they are required to try different medications. A number of these people are in constant pain and suffering and are still having to constantly and repeatedly justify their case to WorkCover. Frequently, these issues get absolutely lost in the labyrinth of WorkCover bureaucracy which has been made worse by the cutbacks in staffing that has gone on there as a result of pressures to reduce costs. Several of the people who have come to see me are also suffering from stress-related injuries. The Government is attempting to deny the very existence of stress-related claims.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** By and large it is a myth that people just go off on stress for the fun of it. The strong indications from this Government are that it plans to further cut into conditions available to injured workers. Another group which has been vilified by members opposite is single parents. Some members opposite prefer not to look into the situation but prefer to believe the myths perpetrated about this group in the community. For example, a single mother came to my electorate office because she had moved from a Housing Trust house in the Riverland to another Housing Trust house in my area. She was owed \$30 by the Housing Trust office in the Riverland. Through some minor departmental error, this payment was not received as promised when she moved down to my area.

This woman, whom I hasten to assure the member for Lee has only one child, had budgeted so carefully and accurately that this missing \$30 was threatening to cause her dire problems. She and her child sit around in blankets during winter to cut down on heating bills. She carefully estimates bills like electricity and the phone and puts enough aside each week to cover them. The small amount that is left goes on living expenses. Any little bit left over and above that is obviously spent on her daughter. This is not unusual because to meet the necessities of life on that very basic benefit single mothers have to do this.

Those on benefits are not in a position to sit back and enjoy the good life. They are constantly required to fill out forms, talk to counter staff, reiterate their poverty and necessitousness. I must tell members opposite that this is not a pleasant procedure for those people. People who need benefits, either temporarily or permanently, are proud people, proud of the way they have raised their families and worked and contributed to the community, and this is the way they are being treated. If they go into temporary or part-time work, they are back and forth from department to department filling out forms. I am pleased to note that the Federal Government has actually made some long overdue reforms in this area, and it is a good start.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** The Federal Labor Government has initiated these reforms, but the State Liberal Government still refuses to recognise the condition of these people, and has added to the cost of difficulties of single parents and others on benefits, measures which are insignificant to members opposite but which are vitally important to those in the community who are on benefits. I will quote from an excellent report by S.F. Lambert in the *Australian Economic Review*. He says:

The children of sole parents face similar economic difficulties. Poverty throughout childhood in their schooling years places them at a competitive disadvantage relative to children from better-off families.

Maybe that is in terms the Government would understand, 'competitive disadvantage'.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** That is in the business terms that perhaps you people understand. These people are at a competitive disadvantage compared with other people, and they need social justice reforms to ensure that that disadvantage is redressed. Again, quoting from the same document:

The high levels of poverty experienced by sole parents provide reason for concern that the support provided to sole parents is inadequate.

The statistics provided in documents like this and numerous other reports are still not enough to convince members

opposite that people on benefits are having a very hard time of it and need all the support and the redressing of this situation that Governments are able to provide. They do not like to hear the words 'social justice' because they are aware they are not providing it.

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

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** The first budget of this Brown Liberal Government is to be applauded by thinking South Australians. I recognise that members opposite should be able to see the advantages to our State that will flow from the measures being undertaken by the Government. I take my responsibilities as member for Lee very seriously. If there have been any cuts in this budget that have in any way been detrimental to my constituents, I have made the effects very plain to the relevant Ministers. I come here today to praise this Government for the fair, intelligent manner in which it has been conducting the economic affairs of this State.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr ROSSI:** I do not know. We will just wait and see. The people of Lee know that times are tough, thanks to the incompetent manner in which this State was run by the previous Labor Government. They know we cannot do all that we would like to do. Nevertheless, I am very pleased to see that the Government is keeping its promise. It has a very good record on the allocation of \$1.3 million for the redevelopment of Seaton High School and a further \$115 000 is to be spent on maintenance. The Government also provides a new out-of-hours school care program at Seaton Park Primary School. It is also providing out-of-hours care for the Semaphore Park Primary School and the West Lakes Shore Primary School.

These programs are designed to provide care and recreation activities for primary school children whose parents are working or seeking work or study. Waiting lists for operations at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will be substantially reduced, thanks to the planned merger between the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital. This is great news for the residents of the electorate, whose hospital has been under threat, thanks to the policies of the previous Labor Government and especially the member for Spence, because the hospital is in his electorate and he has done nothing since he has been in this House to protect the finances and the patients who go to that hospital. He has not been able to open Barton Terrace in his own electorate, when only one vote would have assured him of that.

**Mr Atkinson:** You support closing Barton Road, do you?

**Mr ROSSI:** I didn't say that. I said that you did not have the guts to cross the floor and get your road opened when your vote counted.

**Mr Atkinson:** On what motion?

**Mr ROSSI:** What Bill?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member will not conduct a conversation across the floor.

**Mr ROSSI:** The introduction of sixty new beds in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will lead to the reallocation of resources to the public patients, thus reducing the waiting list for surgery at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Currently about 100 private patients are using public beds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but under this new proposal they will be able to take up the private bed option, thus reducing the burden on the public system. The hospital will also get to keep its status as a teaching hospital. I am also pleased to see that funding for disability services has been maintained at

previous levels and that palliative care has been given a funding boost.

This budget predicts full-time employment growth by more than double last year's. This means 10 000 new full-time jobs this year. This is in stark contrast to the Bannon/Arnold Government which lost more jobs than it ever created. This is a budget to restore jobs in South Australia, and we are already achieving that aim. Never before in South Australia's history has a new Government come to office and found the State in such a mess as was left by the Labor Party. The plain fact of the matter is that Labor cannot govern. It does not know how to handle money or operate a business. It does not care. This is why it will be a long time before Labor will ever form a Government here in South Australia again, and this is why Paul Keating's days in the Lodge are numbered. Also, to add to this, it is quite interesting the way that members opposite mislead in their public statements.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr ROSSI:** I asked the Clerks of this House to produce some documents for me in regard to the oath and the affirmation. I notice that only three members opposite took the oath: the members for Ross Smith, Price and Playford. As for the two new members since the Forty-Seventh Parliament—

**Mr FOLEY:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I ask you to rule on the member for Lee's reflecting on other members of this House.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is always some frivolity on questions like this. It is the Speaker's prerogative to name the member in the case of repetitive frivolity, and there have been two or three examples this evening. I am well aware of the baiting that is going on currently. The member for Lee.

**Mr ROSSI:** I have noted since I have been in this House that these three members have been relatively honest, compared with some of the others who did not take the oath. If I can stress what the difference regarding the oath is; the oath reads:

I . . . do truly and solemnly affirm that I will be faithful to bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, her heirs and successors, according to law, so help me God.

The affirmation does not have the words 'so help me God.' But those people who do not believe in the truth, who believe in misrepresenting the electors—

**Mr ATKINSON:** On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, the member for Lee has implied that members who take the affirmation are unchristian, whereas in fact that is not the origin of the affirmation in our constitutional law. Indeed, the affirmation was introduced for certain types of Christian who did not believe in taking oaths.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member has made his point of order. As a matter of fact, the Chair was just about to point out to the member for Lee that he was developing an argument attributing some improper motive to members when, in fact, under the parliamentary Constitution, it is perfectly proper either to take the oath or to take the affirmation. There is no impropriety, and I would ask the honourable member to steer away from that line of argument.

**Mr ROSSI:** I am just saying that in my observation in this House, in the short nine months I have been here, there is a correlation between people taking the oath and people taking the affirmation. I am not saying that it is illegal, because it is there.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ROSSI:** If you are a Christian, you would be fearful of God. If you are not a Christian, you would do whatever you like; you are accountable to no-one except yourself.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I remind the honourable member once again that religious freedoms also include the freedom not to follow a religion. And the honourable member was pursuing a line that the Chair had advised him not to pursue.

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** I am almost speechless after that.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** No, it's fine; I am getting my breath back. It's all right. I wish I had something as entertaining to comment on, but I draw to the attention of the Government the difficulties being experienced by a program that has had its funding reduced or possibly cut, a program called Street Legal. I believe that members of this House will agree with me that this is a great shame, considering the results it has achieved. The program commenced in October 1991. It is a program for juvenile motor offenders and has had considerable success with young people who have offended. These juveniles go out and steal cars. There are high speed police chases and there are often accidents, as there was interstate where a couple of young people died most horrifically. Fortunately, in that incident other bystanders were not involved.

To this stage I understand there have been about 143 participants in this program. Thirty-five of those have become employed, and that is a remarkable effort. Fifteen have returned to educational programs—

*Mr Caudell interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I am sorry to let you down; it was not. Only 36 of those have re-offended, and that is quite a remarkable program. As I understand it, the program relies on funding from several sources: the Attorney-General's Department, Youth Affairs and the Department of Correctional Services. Unfortunately, without committed funding the program will have to cease. Currently, staff wages are paid for by the Department for Family and Community Services, and I understand the rent has been paid up until about mid 1995, but it is the day-to-day running costs that are affecting the activities of this organisation. What it needs is a commitment of 12 months' funding, which would give the program a better opportunity to manage its affairs and budget in a way so as to make better use of the dollar for the maximum benefit of the participants.

The current practice of stretching the dollar to keep Street Legal going is a bandaid measure and is a great credit to the staff who are doing a wonderful job, but they are able to hold the project together only on a daily basis to provide the service to participants. The program is of tremendous benefit to the community. If we can keep young people off the streets, stop them from constantly re-offending or offending, that is obviously of benefit to the community. These juveniles have been rehabilitated and the statistics which, as I said, show that only 36 of 143 have re-offended, prove that the program is needed and is working.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** You've got to at least give it credit for the fact that things are changing, and I will refer later to the matter of the cost to the community of leaving alone these wayward people. I will outline the ways in which the program is helping some of these people. It is helping juvenile

offenders, including Aborigines, and we heard yesterday about some of the benefits that we have been giving to some in our indigenous community, and those from multicultural backgrounds. It is involving them in learning many skills in the automobile repair industry: panel beating, servicing cars, detailing, mechanical repairs and associated tasks such as welding. The participants are gaining skills—and these are useful skills, which are helping them to find employment. They are supervised by qualified mechanics, panel beaters and youth workers who have specialised skills in the understanding of young offenders.

The program was introduced to provide options for youths who have dropped out of society or who have been unable to cope with mainstream education systems and those who have had difficulties at home. It provides an opportunity to lead a constructive lifestyle, achieve personal stability and regain their self-esteem—one of the things that young offenders are particularly lacking in, because the community tends to disregard them. These participants are encouraged to gain employment and become responsible citizens. The majority of Street Legal participants have experienced family disruptions caused by domestic violence and frequent abuse, alcohol abuse and abuse of other substances. These youths are operating without a sense of direction. Their involvement with motor vehicle offences is a way of expressing their marginal status. This behaviour is not acceptable in society, and we in this place have a responsibility to such youth. The cost to the community is great. To incarcerate a youth costs the community about \$100 000 a year; that is an all-up associated cost. This program is saving the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Yes, that's right. But you're going to do nothing to assist these youths. We'll just chuck them in with the rest of the offenders and let them fend for themselves. That is not a very community-minded attitude. Social justice has just been mentioned, and I am sure that we are offending you. Savings do not include the substantial savings to human suffering and property. That is the other thing.

What about the victims? We need to look at that as well. This program is of great benefit. It is a unique program and has a great ability to gain family involvement where the family did not participate before. This program is getting work experience and employment for these offenders where no employer would take them on before. They could not risk it. There is community involvement and the Variety Club is involved and that says a great deal. Young people need to gain self esteem, need to have faith in society and faith in our system. The program is giving them that. A number of youth have already returned to the education system. Others wonderfully have found employment and that is very important.

I have no doubt that without the support and encouragement from the program and that of the youth workers and support staff, many of these young people would be in the courts today. Any program that keeps our young people from participating in their past illegal activities is worth supporting. There are just too many young people committing street offences because of social circumstances, lack of direction and peer pressure. What price do we have to place on life because of accidents from stolen cars involved in high speed chases? Whatever price we are paying it is too high, particularly when we can do something to curtail these activities. Money should not be a consideration in this matters—

**Mr Brindal:** Why didn't you do it when you were in government?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** As I said to the honourable member before, you are in Government now and if you believe that we did the wrong thing, then it is up to you to change it and to make the difference and do the right thing. You keep preaching to us constantly, so let us see some action. Something that would be dear to your heart is loss of property. A lot of property is lost in accidents, never mind the loss of lives. You can do something about stolen vehicles.

The activities of Street Legal have lightened the burden on other agencies, freed up the courts and reduced the overall cost to the taxpayer, which is a good thing. Less time is being wasted for the police, some of whom I understand take a keen interest in this program. If we need to base the effects of the program purely on dollar terms, the Government and taxpayer will be well in front by continuing to support Street Legal, not that money should play any part in human suffering. This program has been used as a model interstate and it seems ironic that this one, the one that set the standard, is likely to fold because of lack of Government support. That is current lack of support. I am certain that members in this place will agree with me when I say that it is a great shame considering the terrific results it has achieved.

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

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** It is not with any pleasure that I rise this evening to participate in this debate because I have to bring to the attention of the House matters which grieve me immensely. They are cases of what I consider to be circumstances relating to the bungling of government in its approach to the administration of affairs as it has seen its role as opposed to the rights of the citizens upon which government decision has infringed unlawfully. For the benefit of other members of the House I will repeat it—unlawfully. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources has sought to deny people access to processes which would otherwise provide them with access to natural justice and processes through which they have been denied access to incomes they would otherwise have been able to obtain.

Notwithstanding their protests and the protests made on their behalf by officers of the Minister, I find nonetheless that they have been denied justice by a subjective interpretation of the law. It has not been an objective interpretation based on a court determination because that is denied, but a subjective determination of the law. That was not even the law of the land; it was the department's interpretation of the Minister's second reading explanation. I am talking about the Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

I believe that the Native Vegetation Authority has acted outside the law, without due regard for natural justice, without any reasonable consideration of the rights of any citizen who has come before it on its subjective interpretation of the Minister's second reading explanation that it believed gave it the authority to act in the way in which it chooses to act now. The sooner all members of the authority are dispatched by name to the history books and it is otherwise reconstituted with responsible people willing to make objective assessments of its role and function, the better it will be for justice, and for all South Australians. Presently it is a blight on our otherwise immaculate more than 150 years of democratic Government in this State—immaculate by comparison with the way in which it acts, decides and tends to authorise people working for it to act.

Section 27 of the Native Vegetation Act provides:

Subject to any other Act or law to the contrary—

- (a) native vegetation may be cleared with the consent of the council given in accordance with section 29. . .

Section 29(4) provides:

The council may give its consent to clearance of native vegetation that is in contravention of subsection (1)(b) if—

- (a) the vegetation comprises one or more isolated plants; and  
 (b) the applicant is engaged in the business of primary production; and  
 (c) in the opinion of the council, the retention of that plant, or those plants, would put the applicant to unreasonable expense in carrying on that business or would result in an unreasonable reduction of potential income from that business.

Subsection (1) provides:

Subject to subsection (4), in deciding whether to consent to an application to clear native vegetation, the council— . . .

- (b) must not make a decision that is seriously at variance with those principles.

It has to be subject, as it states, to subsection (4). None of its decisions has ever taken into account subsection (4). It has always relied on its own bigoted prejudice to determine those issues and it has always relied on the same incompetent attitude to determine whether compensation ought to be paid to the hapless citizen who falls under the control of its jurisdiction.

**Mr Quirke:** Talk to your Minister.

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes, I have talked to all Ministers, and the consequences do not make me happy, as I said over five minutes ago. As an ordinary member of this place in this grievance debate I am raising this matter on behalf of my several constituents and those of several other members who are aggrieved by the injustice that they suffer in consequence of the incompetence of all parties involved in the determinations, and that includes every Minister who has ever been involved in the administration of this Act.

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** I said 'incompetent' and I mean it. More importantly, if we do not act, we will deserve the kind of contempt which thinking people, whether they be in universities, law faculties or leaders of industry or ordinary citizens, will visit upon us, not as a Government but as members of a Parliament established in the tradition of Westminster through which the grievances of citizens can and need to be aired for the sake of their just cause where they are otherwise impecuniously mistreated by the administrations established by this institution and its Acts.

If we shrink from that responsibility then we will deserve, as I have said, that ignominious contempt with which we will be treated as elected representatives in this place, and it, the Parliament, will be in some measure equal, be treated with contempt in the same way as we are to be treated with the same contempt.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** The member for Ross Smith needs to recognise that although it may please him at this late hour to interpret what I have said as being said in jest, it is not: I am deadly serious. If this kind of maladministration continues then I will continue to raise my voice even more vehemently in opposition to it.

I draw the attention of the House not only to the plight of people like J.R. and V.G. Paige, who have a chronology in their reasonable legal applications that have been put before the Government since 6 June 1983, when they sought to clear a section of 50 hectares on sections 22 and 25 in the hundred of Peake, right through to the present time, which covers not

just one, two, three, four or five pages but which goes to six pages, in which they have civilly sought to be considered in reasonable submission of their case. Now let me note another botch by the same department. It has sent out letters about the use of tyres to stop shoreline erosion around Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert. The department has said that landholders who want to stop the erosion that has been created by the Government's lifting of the level of water behind the barrages by putting tyres at the water's edge to take away the shore-line wave energy are accused of engaging in illegal dumping of waste. How ridiculous can you get?

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles):** I find it difficult to follow the member for Ridley in a chronological sense, not in any sense that his contribution is not coherent, and I have a great deal of sympathy for the position in which this Government has put him. It is quite unconscionable and I want to say to the member for Ridley, as a fellow country member of this House, that he has my support in taking on this eastern suburbs Government. I am sure that I will be able to persuade a number of my colleagues on this side also to support the member for Ridley.

Some members opposite and Government supporters have treated the contribution of the member for Ridley as something of a joke. I can assure them that people on this side do not; we do not find it funny at all.

Here is a member of this Parliament who represents one of the electorates that is probably the most severely affected by this budget. The electorate of Ridley, the electorate of Giles and a few others have the highest levels of poverty in this State. The top half dozen settlements in this State on the poverty scale are all in the electorate of Ridley. So, this budget certainly affects the member for Ridley's electorate as much as it does electorates on this side.

I admit that the budget does not affect the eastern suburbs—the leafy foothills are not touched, not a blot is laid on them—but, in electorates such as mine and the electorate of the member for Ridley, this budget is felt. All the smirking of the eastern suburbs Government on the other side, the members of Cabinet from the eastern suburbs, does not do them any credit whatsoever.

In this debate, the most inane remark was made by the member for Goyder, who described this budget as a good news budget. I concede that I do not know a great deal about that honourable member's electorate—I concede that quite readily; the electorate of Goyder is pretty well a mystery to me. Many barley growers, if they are not particularly prosperous at the moment, have been in the past.

Essentially, Goyder consists of the Yorke Peninsula, and that may well be one of the more prosperous areas of the State. So it may well be that the member for Goyder is correct: that as far as his electorate is concerned this is a good news budget. It may well be, for example, that all the children in his electorate go to private schools and are not affected by the budget. I do not know, but if his electorate is even remotely like the electorate of the member for Ridley, my electorate and that of every member on this side, this is a very bad news budget indeed.

How can you say that it is a good news budget when you hit every poor student in the electorate who is on school card with an actual cash dollar reduction in the amount of the



allowance? How can you say that that is good news? How can you say to those children in 1994 that they will no longer have school dental services. We are not talking about 1954; we are talking about 1994. There is no-one in South Australia who would not have thought that arguments about school dental services were over 30 or 40 years ago. It may well be that South Australia was a little bit later than other parts of the world in establishing a school dental service, so that at least when children came out of school they had extremely good dental health. However, here we are in 1994 in my electorate, the electorate of the member for Ridley and those of members on this side, maybe not the electorate of Goyder—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Well, I never involve the Chair in debate; it is not done, and you have to stand up for your own electorate. But how can you say in 1994 that the argument about whether children should have a free dental service is on again: that the only way we will be able to get this State back on its feet and give bigger subsidies to business is at the expense of children's teeth?

That is the debate in 1994. Let me say this: the school dental service will be reinstated. It will not be reinstated under this Government, we appreciate that, but it will be reinstated under the next Labor Government, I promise you that. It may well be a while, I do not dispute that. I am not arguing about that, but there will be a lot of children who will not have good dental health until such time as a Labor Government gets back in. Is that not an indictment on this eastern suburbs Government?

A number of members opposite have had the decency to look ashamed at some of these decisions that have been endorsed in this Parliament today. Not only ought they to look ashamed but they ought to be fearful because many members opposite have been reading the *Advertiser* and the *Sunday Mail* and imagining that they have got away with this budget. They are saying, 'There hasn't been a lot of fuss; we've got away with it.' If there was decent reporting in this State—and you certainly will not get it in the *Advertiser* or the *Sunday Mail*—alarm bells would be ringing, but they are not. It is no skin off my nose, I am retiring. Take it from me, that over the next three years the consequences of those mean and miserable decisions will all accumulate.

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I will not; I am retiring. A number of members opposite will not be here either because it is not the eastern suburbs that have been targeted, it is electorates such as Ridley, Giles, Ross Smith, and Reynell. Those electorates have schools with school card populations of around 70 to 80 per cent. I wish the member for Reynell luck in the Caucus when she opposes these kinds of measures. It is too late. Members opposite should not believe that they have got away with the budget just because the *Advertiser* and the *Sunday Mail* are their usual useless, craven, servile selves; do not believe it. Every kindergarten and every school is taking note of what you are doing and what you are supporting. If I was a member opposite on the back bench I would be—

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

Motion carried.

#### ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That the proposed payments for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by Tuesday 11 October, in accordance with the timetables as distributed.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of the Hons H. Allison and L.M.F. Arnold, Messrs Brindal and Condous, Mrs Gerahty, the Hon. M.D. Rann and Mr Scalzi.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Messrs Becker, Brokenshire, Caudell, Clarke, Delaine, Foley and Mrs Hall. Motion carried.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (CLOSURE OF SUPER-ANNUATION SCHEMES) (EXTENSION OF TIME) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer):** 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 purpose of this legislation is to allow a delay on the debate on two other pieces of legislation currently before another place: legislation to close the old superannuation scheme and the Southern States Superannuation Bill 1994 which will not be debated this week as a result of the reluctance of another place to debate the provision of the aforementioned Bills.

I commend the Bill to Honourable Members.

Explanation of Clauses

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Commencement*

These clauses are formal.

*Clause 3: Amendment of s. 2—Commencement*

This clause amends section 2 of the Provision Act by providing that part 4 of the Act will come into operation on 21 October 1994.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bill to pass through all stages without delay.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (26)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J. (teller)	Bass, R. P.
Becker, H.	Brindal, M. K.
Buckby, M. R.	Caudell, C. J.
Condous, S. G.	Greig, J. M.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A.
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Leggett, S. R.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	Oswald, J. K. G.
Rossi, J. P.	Scalzi, G.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wade, D. E.	Wotton, D. C.

NOES (11)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Atkinson, M. J.
Blevins, F. T.	Clarke, R. D.
De Laine, M. R.	Foley, K. O.
Gerahty, R. K.	Hurley, A. K.
Quirke, J. A. (teller)	Rann, M. D.

NOES (cont.)

Stevens, L.

Majority of 15 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I think that it is an absolute disgrace that a Bill is brought into this Chamber at this time of night, the Opposition gives the Government the right to insert the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without it being read, and then members of the Opposition are told that it is to be debated immediately. We have not even had time to read the explanation—not that we need it because we know what this is about. It is a nice little deal that has been done by members opposite in the hope that they will be able to close the lump sum superannuation scheme for good. The Opposition does not have many things—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is there any possibility of getting a copy of the Bill that we are debating? Is that not a reasonable request? I just want the Bill; it is a reasonable request.

**Mr QUIRKE:** That episode highlights the problems. Not only is there no consultation about this measure but it only originated this afternoon in another place. The Bill seeks to fix up the mess the Government has got itself into over the closure of the lump sum superannuation scheme. As I understand it, the Australian Democrats in another place—the architects of the 1 October deadline for the scheme to reopen—were warned somewhat earlier this year that it would take quite a bit to force the Government to bring in reasonable superannuation arrangements, not only for police officers but for all Government workers.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** They've not done it.

**Mr QUIRKE:** Indeed, the Government has not done that. The Government proposes to bring in no more than what the Federal Labor Government in Canberra is demanding, and it will drag the Treasurer into court if he does not give that. There is nothing new in this Bill, which provides for a further extension of three weeks. I will make another prediction. We may not be treated with the contempt with which we have been treated tonight, but we will see further extensions being required because, at the end of the day, members in another place, particularly the Australian Democrats, are under great pressure from many Government workers and police officers who do not believe that the old scheme should be closed, especially when the Treasurer said it would not be closed or affected. The Treasurer said that on the same day that he established a committee to close down the scheme.

This Bill has been cobbled together quickly. The whole matter has not been thought out, and I believe that when the House meets again on 11 October we will probably encounter another proposal to take the matter into November and then December. Eventually the Government will get the message: we will turn up the heat wherever we can to ensure that decent superannuation arrangements are put in place similar to those that existed before. The Opposition will continue to expose the hypocrisy of this Government and its promises; and, on this issue, it made a promise five months after the election and then reneged on it.

The Bill before us is an absolute travesty. Not only did we not have a copy of the Bill and the second reading explanation but we did not have the courtesy of that explanation being read to the House tonight. We oppose this measure, and I am sure that we will have other opportunities to do so again.

It is late at night, and we have canvassed the arguments. Indeed, we have had about nine hours of debate on this measure in one form or another. This will not be the end of it tonight.

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** I support the member for Playford's opposition to the Bill. The member for Playford has eloquently put the Opposition's case, but there are a couple of points I would make specifically in regard to the Bill. Once again the Treasurer's haste, arrogance and buffoonism concerning the processing of important legislation is apparent. First, the Bill is not even subject to a second reading explanation by the Minister in respect of what is going on. Secondly, the Bill is not even available on the floor of the House for members to read. Thirdly, this issue shows that the Treasurer is totally captive of the Hon. Mike Elliott.

During debate on the industrial relations legislation I paid tribute to the Minister for Industrial Affairs concerning his being able to beat up on the Hon. Mike Elliott on important and crucial amendments that the Hon. Mr Elliott fell for with respect to that Bill. On this particular part, the Deputy Premier shows that he is not up to the mark of the Minister for Industrial Affairs because he has had to capitulate for another four weeks on the whole issue. As the Minister knows, on a previous occasion in the last session of Parliament at the closure of the last Bill, the Hon. Mike Elliott in another place insisted on a sunset clause of 1 October this year, which meant that if things were not resolved by this date the old superannuation scheme would reopen automatically, and nothing has been done by the Government in the meantime. As I remember the debate, the member for Playford warned the Government that the time frame it was setting itself, in concert with the Australian Democrats, would not allow it to do what it wanted to do, which was basically to renege on an election promise to all the State's public servants.

The fact of the matter is this: there are at least 800 people, employees of the State, who have submitted applications to be members of the old superannuation scheme which the Government closed in May of this year. For those people there is debate about whether or not they have been legitimately told that they cannot apply for membership of the scheme because they were too late. I cite a small example which I have written to the Treasurer about concerning a Mrs Le Raye who worked for the Flinders Medical Centre.

In February of this year, before there was a suggestion that the Government would rat on its undertaking to public servants on superannuation, she applied through her own pay office of the Flinders Medical Centre to join the superannuation scheme. She was given the appropriate forms, as she believed they were the appropriate forms, by her paymaster. She submitted them in March of this year only to be advised six weeks after she had submitted those forms—on the death knock, on the very day the scheme closed by Government edict—that she had completed the wrong forms. That lady was out of Adelaide. On that day she was intrastate on Flinders Medical Centre business and could not be contacted.

Her husband was contacted when he returned from work after 5 o'clock at night via a telephone message left on an answering machine to find out that his wife would not be eligible to join the superannuation scheme. This was not through any fault of hers, but because she was given the wrong forms by the paymaster of the Flinders Medical Centre and because she believed the Treasurer, when he was Deputy

Leader of the Opposition prior to the election, when he said that the superannuation scheme would not be touched.

There are many such examples as Mrs Le Raye who genuinely and in a *bona fide* manner sought to join the scheme prior to the closure date but who have been excluded by operation. The Treasurer indicates to me by nodding that she will be fixed up and she will be okay with respect to superannuation. I sincerely trust that that is the case and I accept the Treasurer's word on this occasion with respect to that matter and I thank him for it. However, she is not the only example of it. There are numerous cases amongst those 800 people.

But the Government is prepared to concoct this arrangement so that the Hon. Mike Elliott can go away for four weeks and contemplate his navel and cogitate over the issue of the Triple S scheme that the Government has conjured up for him and to work out ways to square up with members of the PSA, the Institute of Teachers, and his probably unspoken commitment to the Treasurer that he will cave in at the eleventh hour, anyway, like he did on industrial relations. However, he has to take four weeks to work out that form of words of reconciling, rattling on everyone. It is not a reason, though, for this Government, with this overwhelming vote mandate from heaven that it wants to point out to us, to capitulate to a minority party that holds four-fifths of five-eighths of whatever the popular vote.

However, I note that the Treasurer nods in agreement that he has found, like the former Labor Government found, that notwithstanding four fifths of the five-eighths of the popular vote he still needs their vote to get it through another place. The issue at hand is that this is a disgraceful situation. It is something that the Treasurer knew fully at the time this matter was debated in the last session of Parliament, that 1 October was an unrealistic date to expect. It is part of the drip-drip-drip process by which ultimately—

**Mr Brindal:** Drip-drip-drip!

**Mr CLARKE:** The member for Unley should stop repeating his middle name. I appreciate his desperation to get onto the front bench, but he just does not have enough votes. He should accept it as a fact of life that he is a loser.

**Mr Quirke:** He won't stop leaking on the backbench!

**Mr CLARKE:** If you would only stop leaking, you would not have that middle name. What I would say at the very least to the Treasurer is this: if you are prepared to go through to 21 October with respect to the sunset clause to allow the Hon. Mike Elliott to cogitate his navel for the next four weeks in the sunshine or wherever, you could at least insist that the Government say to those 800 people who have sought to join the scheme that they will be allowed to join it immediately. Their applications should be accepted immediately and, as far as the remainder of the Public Service is concerned, that issue will be subject to further debate and refinement when we come closer to 21 October.

I will conclude on this point: what worries me considerably is not only the feral nature of this Government but its propensity to procrastinate. The date was 1 October; they are now moving to 21 October; how many more months before they finally bite the bullet and resolve this issue once and for all? How many times will we be here in this Parliament because of the ineptitude of the Deputy Premier and Leader of the House as far as the Government is concerned, and will we be sprung on at about five minutes to midnight on 21 October with another Bill in another capitulation to the Australian Democrats in another place seeking either another extension or some other about-face? It is about time the

Deputy Premier took charge of this issue, took responsibility for it, and at the very least those 800 public servants who *bona fide* have applied for it but who have been left in the never-never without any safety net to hang on to with respect to their superannuation should be allowed entrance immediately, forthwith and none too soon.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I want to make a few brief comments, first about the conduct of this House and of this Parliament. The fact is that this is a rort. We know it is a rort; we know it is a fix. We know it will be changed again. We know there will be a 1 December date, and there will be a 1 January date, but we also have the extraordinary situation which needs to be put on record, that on several occasions during the past week there have been attempts to break the conventions of this Parliament about introducing Bills without the requisite notice.

This evening I was rung by a Minister in another place asking whether I could facilitate the passage of a Bill. The fact is that the Deputy Premier does not even bother to discuss these matters directly with his counterpart opposite. There has been an attempt to foist two Bills upon this Parliament this week without the requisite notice, because of the incompetence on the part of the Government and on the part of the Deputy Premier. We have seen a situation where members of the Opposition, as well as members opposite who do not have a clue what we are debating tonight, are actually being asked to debate and vote on a piece of legislation that we do not even have before us. Mr Speaker, I ask you as the Presiding—

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is reflecting on this House, because this House has made a determination whether it will consider the Bill tonight and he is reflecting on the decision of this House to do so.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is not in accordance with Standing Orders to reflect on a decision of the House. The House has made a decision to allow the debate to proceed, and I suggest to the Deputy Leader that he not reflect on that decision.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** With great respect, Sir, we are talking about a decision made on a Bill that the Opposition did not have in front of it. I will reflect on that decision when I do not have the right as a member of Parliament even to see the legislation which is before me and on which I am being asked to make a decision. It is a disgrace, and I would be very surprised if any member of this House, whether they have been here a few months, 20 years or whatever, does not believe it is a disgrace. It is an important piece of legislation which not only breaks election promises and has been concocted in a back room deal but also has been brought on with no notice, no discussion, no prior warning and no Bill before us.

**The Hon. D.S. Baker:** Are you in favour of it?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** No, I am certainly not, because what we are talking about is a systematic attack on the public sector by this Government. Just a few weeks ago when we were dealing with a related piece of legislation, I pointed out that this has been concocted as something new which is really of assistance but, for those members in the outer southern suburbs who are a bit nervous tonight and who are probably up in their rooms wondering what this is all about, because they have not seen the Bill either, we are seeing attempts to

bring in the absolute minimum level of superannuation possible for public servants in this State.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Bill is extending the previous closure time: it is not about the other two schemes.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition link his remarks to the debate.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** With respect, again, Mr Speaker, these matters are absolutely, totally relevant, because they were brought in here as connected pieces of legislation which have now unravelled and which have then been fixed up behind closed doors. The fact is, Sir, that you, I and members opposite have been asked to make a decision tonight on a piece of legislation that we did not have before us. That is a disgrace; it deserves an apology to every member of this Parliament on both sides. We saw a concocted situation where the Deputy Premier asked members opposite to leave the Chamber, and they scurried out like little reptiles in order to—

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Deputy Leader referred to members on this side of the House as 'reptiles'. I believe that is unparliamentary and ask him to withdraw it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is fully aware that he should refer to members opposite either as 'members' or by their districts. The Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Thank you, Sir. We saw a situation where the Deputy Premier, presumably without a copy of the Bill in front of him, suddenly thought, 'Oh, my goodness, I might not get this through by Mike Elliott's deadline. What am I going to do? Oh, I'll ask my hapless back benchers, because the Whip isn't here, whether they will scurry out the door in an honourable fashion', just so he could enforce a quorum call. They came in here and said, 'Yes, we are right behind you, Sir', even though there was no legislation before the House.

So, I would like to see a ruling, some discussion of procedures of this Parliament, some streamlining of procedures before this Parliament. I would like your advice, Mr Speaker; and I would like the Deputy Premier's advice. Perhaps, in an honourable way, we could sit down in a round table fashion and work out a means of making sure that this nonsense does not happen again. It is absolute contempt for Parliament; contempt for the processes of Parliament; and contempt for the people who elect us.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer):** The problem with members of the Opposition is that they have spent so much time sorting out who will be the next Leader that they—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** That is true. They have spent so much time—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Just hold on a second.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Ross Smith.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I will point out the absolute dishonesty of the statements that have just been made, and I make a number of points. I say they have spent so much time behind closed doors working out who will have the numbers, who will get 6 out of 11 to get up to that front seat, that they are all running over each other at the moment. Frank is there at the moment. They have not really looked at the issue

properly. I know that the person in the other place who is sponsoring this Bill had done a deal, or thought he had done a deal, with the ALP to extend the time for this Bill. I said, 'I am not going to extend the time for the Bill.' He said, 'But the ALP's agreed.' They knew exactly what was in the Bill. They did not need the Bill. The Bill is a one liner and, in fact—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, we are being told that we do not need a Bill before us to consider.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Does the Deputy Leader have a point of order?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** A question of procedure has been raised by the Deputy Premier—that we do not need a Bill before us to consider.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That is not a point of order. The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** What I said was that we did not need a Bill, because everyone knew what the Bill was about. But we did have a Bill and I left instructions for it to be distributed. Somehow, it was not distributed. It was sitting on the desk, as everyone knows. The Clerk of the House picked up the Bill and distributed it. I had left instructions for it to be distributed straight away so that every member of the House had one. As far as I was concerned, every member on that side knew exactly what was in the Bill. I ensured, as far as humanly possible, that they actually had a copy of the Bill.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the Deputy Premier that, if there is any criticism to be levelled, it should be levelled at the Chair and not at the table officers.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I am sorry, Sir. Either it was my fault because the instruction was not passed on properly or something else delayed the distribution of the Bill. However, the point at issue was that every member of Caucus knew about the Bill. They knew fully about the Bill. All knew about the Bill, because the Hon. Mr Elliott in another place said to me, 'I have got a deal. You can like it or you can lump it, but the time is going to be extended.' Then the Hon. Mr Elliott suddenly said, 'The deal's fallen over. The ALP's pulled the plug; you're going to have to support this Bill or otherwise see your Bills on the new superannuation scheme go down the drain.' They are the exact circumstances. So, I had a decision to make.

Because the Hon. Mr Elliott, at the eleventh hour, suddenly found that he did not have the support of the ALP—I do not know whether he had it in the first place, but he is normally in bed with them—he said, 'Government, I have had only four weeks to consider this Bill. I need more time. If I don't get more time, we are going to have the scheme reopened.'

The use by date will expire, and the Government will be faced with enormous liabilities. So, let us be quite clear about the circumstances. The ALP ratted on the Democrats. I do not mind that. I would just like to know what the hell is going on sometimes so that I can force the issue. It was taken out of my hands, as it has been taken out of our hands before.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The issues are quite clear. It is not the sort of procedure that I would ever endorse. I do not want to see this sort of procedure ever again in this House. However, under the circumstances, of which members opposite were well aware, it was absolutely imperative that this Bill go through tonight as everyone on that side understood. I commend the Bill to the House, even though I regret

the circumstances with which we have to deal in this Parliament tonight.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer):** I move:  
*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I just want to clear the record with respect to the comments of the Deputy Premier. The Opposition made no deal with the Democrats on this issue and, if members opposite have information on it, I would like to know about it, because I will then go and counsel those members who may well have made that deal. The Opposition policy on this has been the same as it has been through to May, and it needs to be quite clearly said in this House that we have done no deal with anyone on this. We are simply about the business of protecting the entitlements of superannuants. That has been the position we have developed all along; it is the position we followed through here tonight. No doubt there will be plenty of other opportunities as well to do that.

The House divided on the third reading:

AYES (25)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J. (teller)	Bass, R. P.
Becker, H.	Brindal, M. K.
Buckby, M. R.	Caudell, C. J.
Condous, S. G.	Greig, J. M.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A.
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Leggett, S. R.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	Oswald, J. K. G.
Rossi, J. P.	Scalzi, G.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wade, D. E.	

NOES (11)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Atkinson, M. J.
Blevins, F. T.	Clarke, R. D.
De Laine, M. R.	Foley, K. O.
Geraghty, R. K.	Hurley, A. K.
Quirke, J. A. (teller)	Rann, M. D.
Stevens, L.	

Majority of 14 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

**REAL PROPERTY (VARIATION AND EXTINGUISHMENT OF EASEMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier):** I move:  
*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

During the last Parliamentary session a series of miscellaneous amendments to the *Real Property Act* were passed by the Parliament. As a consequence of amendments moved during the passage of the *Real Property (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act* through the Legislative Council (to accommodate concerns raised by the Law Society Property Committee), the potential scope of the amendments relating to the extinguishment of easements is considerably narrower than had been originally intended.

This Bill proposes further amendments dealing with the issue of the extinguishment of easements.

There is one potential development in the State which is currently impeded by the existence of an easement over a closed road, which has in fact been built over for some 20 years. Under the terms of the *Real Property Act* as it now stands the easement can only be removed from the title with considerable difficulty and expense in locating and obtaining the consent of all dominant owners, believed to be in the vicinity of about 100. The proponents of this development have requested that the Government give further consideration to the matter of the variation and extinguishment of easements.

In order to facilitate this development in particular, but with a view to streamlining the process of the extinguishment of easements the issue has been further considered and new provisions have been prepared.

The amendments provide a mechanism whereby the consent of the owner of the dominant or servient land to the variation or extinguishment of an easement may be dispensed with if the Registrar-General is satisfied that the proprietor's interest in the land will not be detrimentally affected.

Two special provisions are included for the extinguishment of certain rights-of-way. It is often the case that a right-of-way which was originally created to provide access to the dominant land becomes separated from the dominant land by the creation of intervening allotments. Provision is made in this case for the Registrar-General to extinguish the easement if satisfied that there is no reasonable prospect of the proprietor or a successor in title using the right-of-way for access to the dominant land. Further provision is made for the Registrar-General to extinguish a right-of-way where the dominant land is separated from the intervening land and the Registrar-General is satisfied that the continued existence of the right-of-way would not enhance the use of enjoyment of the dominant land.

Each of the provisions require notice to be given of the proposed variation or extinguishment of easement. Section 276 of the *Real Property Act* deals with the manner in which notice must be given. This section provides notice may be given personally or by certified post or by publication of the notice in a manner directed by the Registrar-General. This provision permits consideration of the particular circumstances relating to particular easements in determining which is the most appropriate method of giving notice.

These amendments will provide a useful addition to the *Real Property Act* and will make the processes of extinguishing easements simpler.

I commend this Bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Commencement*

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

*Clause 3: Amendment of s. 90b—Variation and extinguishment of easements*

Clause 3 amends section 90b of the *Real Property Act 1886* inserted by the *Real Property (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 1994*. This amending Act has not yet come into force and therefore consolidations of the *Real Property Act 1886* do not include new section 90b. The Bill replaces subsection (3) of section 90b with six new subsections. New subsections (3) and (3a) replace the substance of subsection (5) but in addition allow the Registrar-General to vary or extinguish an easement without the consent of the proprietor of the dominant or servient tenement if 28 days notice has been given to allow the proprietor to make representations to the Registrar-General. New subsections (3b) and (3c) are examples of the situations catered for by subsections (3) and (3a). Subsection (3d) requires the Registrar-General to be satisfied that 28 days notice has been given to the proprietor of the dominant land before taking action under subsection (3b) or (3c). Subsection (3e) prescribes the requirements for the notice to be given under these provisions. Paragraph (b) of clause 3 removes subsection (5) of section 90b.

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

**ESTIMATES COMMITTEES**

The Legislative Council intimated that it had given leave to the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin) and the Minister for Transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) to attend and

give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

**THE FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH  
AUSTRALIA (CONVOCATION) AMENDMENT  
BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 24 August. Page 273.)

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I have a strong interest in this matter, having been responsible for the reorganisation of universities several years ago, which involved the creation of the University of South Australia out of an amalgamation of three campuses of the Institute of Technology and three campuses of the former South Australian College of Advanced Education: the merger of the Sturt CAE campus with the Flinders University; the merger of the Roseworthy campus with the Roseworthy Agricultural College; and the amalgamation of the Adelaide CAE campus with the Adelaide University.

Those pieces of legislation creating the third university in this State's history with the strongest commitment to equal opportunity occurred with bipartisan support after considerable negotiations. However, it was pointed out to me shortly towards the end of my time as Minister with responsibility for further education that there was a historical problem at Flinders University in relation to convocation, with its role in terms of the governance of the university as well as the Senate's role in the university, as will be clear to most members.

It is important for a university to be considered not just as a body of scholars who are currently studying, teaching or researching there: any real university also actively seeks to include amongst its fraternity those former students or alumni who studied at the university. I think that the Minister is a former Flinders graduate. I get involved in convocation elections at the University of Auckland, even though I left there nearly 20 years ago. It is important that we should encourage alumni to be more involved in our universities not only in fundraising—I know that the three universities are seeking more actively to involve former students in fundraising and sponsoring projects—but also in the continuing life of the university as it evolves.

I was delighted recently that whilst I was strongly critical of the quality rating system brought down by the Federal Government in terms of trying to rate individual universities of Australia in six tiers, which I thought used some fairly spurious criteria, as I am sure the Minister would agree—he nods agreement across the floor—Flinders University comes up very highly in terms of research and teaching in any index of quality of Australian universities. My experience with Chancellor Deidre Jordan and Vice-Chancellor John Lovering is that we have an outstanding world class university at Flinders in a whole range of areas. For instance, today I attended the investiture ceremony at Government House and saw a distinguished emeritus professor in the area of sea level change being given a very high award from Flinders University. There is a whole range of areas in which Flinders University is pre-eminent in this country. That is why Flinders has been so successful in winning research grants over the years.

The convocation problems relate principally to a desire by the university to ensure that places on the Convocation Council are not filled by staff members. I am an active

member of the Council of the University of South Australia, as is Mr Scalzi. It is important for any university worth its salt to have an active lay membership of the council: it is not to be the prerogative, in terms of governance, of the academic, administrative or teaching staff or even student representatives. A university must encourage the lay community, including members of Parliament and representatives from industry, from our multicultural community and from our Aboriginal community to be involved in the decision-making process.

There was a concern at Flinders that the four positions being referred to in this Bill could be filled by existing staff members who were ex-students or alumni. What we are doing tonight is ensuring through this legislation, which has bipartisan support, that that does not happen, and that there continues to be a presence of people on that convocation council who are not existing members of staff.

There have been problems, too, over the years, of course, where the governance of the university council was held up by a small group of people. I have been assured that that situation has been rectified. I have also been assured that, in the process of coming to this Parliament and reaching negotiations with this Minister, and, indeed, I understand his predecessor, that there was maximum effort taken in 1993 and again this year to survey the alumni of the university and members of convocation to see whether they were interested in the reforms that are being put forward now.

I understand that a paper called 'The Future of Convocation' was distributed in June 1993. That paper was given very wide distribution to ensure that all members of the convocation and, indeed, other interested parties—and there will always be other interested parties—were given sufficient and ample opportunity to comment on the proposals.

In addition, I am told that there was a second survey—a direct survey—to ensure that no-one again missed out on giving their points of view about the changes that this Bill is intended to implement. The Opposition, in a spirit of bipartisanship for which we are renowned, is prepared to support the Bill.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education):** I thank the Deputy Leader and the Opposition for their support. It is important that we have bipartisan support for changes to a university Act such as this. We have three excellent universities in South Australia, and I have had the privilege of studying at all three of them—I have done somewhat of a trifecta, I guess.

I believe that the changes to the Act are very welcome. They ensure that graduates of the university will have a strong role to play in the university. As the Deputy Leader pointed out, it will exclude staff members from getting representation on council via convocation. It is important that the graduates of the university have a sense of ownership of the university and that convocation fulfils a genuine role in terms of contributions that graduates can make towards the running of the university.

The Government strongly believes that universities should run and be seen to be running their own affairs. We do not take the view that we should be interfering unnecessarily in their activities. This process that has culminated in amendments in the Bill has been through the usual channels of the university: extensive consultation, discussion papers and the like. The amendments to the Act that are being dealt with here tonight are to be welcomed, and I am pleased that the

Opposition is able to support those measures.

I commend this measure to the House and, on behalf of the Government and I believe all members of this House, I wish the three universities well in the future and I look forward to their continuing to make a strong contribution to the community here in South Australia.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

### MINING (ROYALTIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 August. Page 339.)

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** The Opposition supports this Bill and, due to the lateness of the hour, will be as brief as it can on the key issues. The bulk of the Bill involves the rearrangement of royalties from mining, changes in the rate of the royalty and a small increase in the quantity of royalties that will flow from these changes. The mining industry, in particular, has not sought my assistance to delay these measures. It understands the necessity for them; indeed, it is lucky it will not pay a lot more.

The key issue in this Bill involves the EARF fund. As I understand from this Bill, the royalties that will flow in will be divided so that there will be a pool of funds under this scheme to enable the rehabilitation of quarries, and so on, which are the result of mining operations over the years. This fund will ensure that adequate measures are taken to restore totally those lands to their pre-mining state.

The other moneys that will flow in as a result of this Bill will go into the Government's coffers. I see the Treasurer is in the Chamber: I am sure that he will not be upset by the fact that approximately 50 per cent of the royalties will go into the Government's coffers. Sadly for him, I suspect, from memory that that figure will be only \$1 million, but the Opposition supports both the contribution to consolidated revenue from the royalties and the innovative EARF fund, which will be the chief beneficiary of this measure.

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** My contribution on this measure arises out of my albeit naive concern for its implications on those people who are involved as individual miners. It is not within my capacity as an individual member of this place to determine exactly what will happen, but it seems to me on examining the second reading explanation and the principal Act that the MESA review committee determined that a common royalty rate of 2.5 per cent of the assessed value should apply to all minerals and that the different rate of 5 per cent for extractive minerals should no longer apply.

I looked at the principal Act and found that the word 'minerals' means:

- (a) any naturally occurring deposit of metal or metalliferous ore, precious stones or any other mineral (including sand, gravel, stone, shell, coal, oil shale, shale and clay); or
- (b) any metal, metalliferous substance or mineral recoverable from the sea or a natural water supply; or
- (c) any metal, metalliferous ore or mineral that has been dumped or discarded [by someone else].

My anxiety arises because precious stones are included in the definition of 'minerals'. For the first time, it seems to mean that, in a simple way, people who mine opal will have to pay a royalty, because it is stated in the second reading explanation:

It was further agreed by the committee that the currently assessed value for extractive minerals of \$2 a tonne was far too low and there was a need to raise this in line with other mineral assessments and those prevailing for similar commodities interstate.

In discussions with industry generally, and with the Extractive Industries Association in particular, it was agreed that a more realistic assessed value for most extractive minerals would be \$8 a tonne. My worry—and I will leave it at this, but I want to put it on the record—is that we will now try to recover from opal miners a royalty for the opal they extract. I know, as an international expert in valuing opal who has been invited to speak not only to a conference of the United States Jewellers Association in New York in 1986 but also to people attending the Tucson Gems Show in February of the same year on the valuations of opal, that the valuation is very subjective and that there are great variances across the industry according to the way in which the material is applied.

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** I told you, in January 1986 I went to New York as a guest.

**Mr Quirke:** Where was the other one?

**Mr LEWIS:** Tucson, Arizona. And, for the sake of the honourable member, a couple of years later I accepted an invitation to attend a meeting of the largest gem and mineral society on earth, the Santiago Gem and Mineral Society, which has in excess of 1 300 members, where I again explained how to value opal.

**Mr Quirke:** Did you sell any?

**Mr LEWIS:** I did not go there to sell any, and I did not sell any: that was not my purpose. If the member for Playford would like, outside the Chamber, to make the implications I think he is trying to make by interjection in this place, I will deal with him appropriately. I do not take kindly to those kinds of insinuations. He has enough skeletons in his own closet to be a little more sensitive and considerate of other members in this place, and he does not have the kind of insight or understanding that he presumes by making those interjections.

I bring to a conclusion my contribution by saying that I believe it will be extremely difficult for us as a Government to collect from those people who are engaged in the mining of opal or other corundums, such as chrysoptase, any contribution to the State, and that we will therefore perhaps bring into contempt the law we seek to establish by this amendment through our oversight in not understanding the difficulty of determining what is material extracted for the purpose of deriving income as opposed to that which is extracted for the purpose of deriving access to the ore body mineral, as defined on page 3 of the principal Act. That, in turn, will cause difficulty for officers of the department in their attempt to enforce the law.

**The Hon. D.S. BAKER (Minister for Primary Industries):** I thank members for their contributions. It is quite a simple Bill, which has been discussed with industry. The Extractive Industries Association is in favour of it. Quite simply, as the shadow Minister said, it is about bringing this Bill and the Extractive Industries Association more into line with what is happening in other States. A simple 2½ per cent royalty, which is paid by all other mineral producers in South Australia at present, will be paid. The method of doing that is to increase the valuation of extractive industries from \$2 to \$8 a tonne. This will allow us to put approximately \$1 million into the extractive industries fund, which is for

rehabilitation of mines when they are of no further use, and \$1 million will go into the Treasury, as the honourable member quite readily put it.

The member for Ridley was worried about opals. The royalty will not be collected on opals. However, under the exploration lease for new opal fields, any new fields found outside the existing three major fields as designated in South Australia will attract this royalty because they will come

under the Mining Act. It is a fairly simple and straightforward Bill and I commend it to the House.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

At 11.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 8 September at 10.30 a.m.