

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 15 February 1990

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The **PRESIDENT**: Before I start proceedings I would like to welcome the Hon. Bruce Skeggs MLC from Victoria. He is in the gallery. We are pleased to see him there and we wish him a very warm and cordial welcome to South Australia.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DUNCAN TASK FORCE

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER**: On Tuesday 13 February 1990 the Hon. Ian Gilfillan asked a question concerning a so-called report made to Inspector Litster of the South Australian Police Department by a former police officer, Trevor Allen, then of the Vice Squad. I should make it clear that the 'report' to which the honourable member referred was not a report as suggested by him but a statement made to Inspector Litster in the course of investigations undertaken by the Duncan task force established in 1985. I shall return to this point in a moment but first let me inform the Chamber of the background to this matter.

I remind members that the Duncan task force was formed on 1 August 1985, as a result of a joint announcement by the Commissioner of Police and me. I refer members to *Hansard*, 13 August 1985, page 178. The brief of the task force was to:

- identify the person or persons responsible for the death of Dr Duncan;
- determine Vice Squad policing practices relative to homosexuals in 1972;
- reveal any allegations of corrupt practices amongst 1972 Vice Squad members; and
- determine whether any of the 1972 inquiries were thwarted due to political interference.

The former work of the task force initially led to the charging of three former police officers—Hudson, Cawley and Clayton. Hudson was not committed for trial and Cawley and Clayton were acquitted by a jury. As can be seen from the terms of reference, matters other than whether there was evidence to charge persons in relation to the death of Dr Duncan were within the terms of reference. Inquiries into these terms of reference have continued.

In accordance with this brief the task force (of which the then Inspector J.D. Litster was a member) had occasion to interview former Vice Squad member, Trevor Allen, on four occasions between 1985 and 1989 as part of the Duncan task force investigations. The statements made by Allen in these interviews related to members of the 1972 Vice Squad era being involved in a number of malpractices ranging from larceny of exhibit money, 'pulling' of court briefs, and receiving free meals to improper behaviour. I have been informed by the officer in charge of the Internal Investigation Branch, Commander Lean, that the allegations made by Mr Allen in his statements relate to 1972 and the period immediately following.

During the Duncan task force investigations the NCA was informed of the nature of the issues under investigation. In particular, during the task force investigations, a representative of the National Crime Authority was present at an interview where similar allegations to those made by Allen were made. The NCA also initiated actions which have since become the subject of investigations by the Duncan task force. The Duncan task force is currently preparing a final report. This report will canvass all the issues which were the subject of investigation, including those matters raised in the interviews with Allen.

At this point of time, indications are that there is insufficient evidence to substantiate the allegations made. I am advised by the Commissioner of Police that this report should be completed and available for my consideration in the next few weeks. It will then be examined by officers of the Attorney-General's Department, and I would then expect to be able to provide the public with a further statement. The task force recognises that investigations have ranged over a considerable time span. This was brought about, in the first instance, by the delay experienced with the finalisation of the Cawley/Clayton trial in September 1988. Following that trial a number of issues arose which required further investigation. Difficulty was experienced by reason of witnesses being unable or unwilling to remember events dating back to 1972. Additionally, it was necessary to interview a number of witnesses on several occasions for clarification purposes.

In summary, the investigation has been complex and protracted primarily because of contradictory statements made by witnesses and their inability to be specific in relation to issues raised. So, in short, the allegations referred to by Mr Gilfillan relate back to the time and immediately after the death of Dr Duncan. To date, despite the allegations there is insufficient evidence to prosecute anyone further. They are not allegations which relate to contemporary events within the South Australian police—or to the Vice Squad as it was constituted prior to its being disbanded in 1988. The Vice Squad was disbanded as part of the Police Department's organised crime strategy and not because of allegations of impropriety.

I should add that, along with the privileges that apply to all honourable members in this place, there are corresponding responsibilities. I believe that, with the information I have provided to the Chamber, the question asked by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan can now be seen to have been mischievous almost to the point of dishonesty.

Mr Gilfillan gave the impression, no doubt designed for media consumption, that there was 'a report' alleging that all but three of the then Vice Squad were involved in illegal or corrupt practices. Yet Mr Gilfillan obviously knew that there was no report as such but that it was a statement taken during the course of investigations. There must continue to be a healthy and open debate in our community about what types of structures are most appropriate for combating organised crime and corruption. However, at the same time we must be careful not to run the risk of directing the resources of the investigative bodies we currently have, such as the police or the NCA, from their primary task of tackling corruption and organised crime.

My experience as Attorney-General over the past seven years is that law enforcement agencies can be severely hampered when required to investigate unsubstantiated allegations, some of which may emanate from criminal sources. In this case the allegations coming from a former police officer are actively being investigated as part of the Duncan task force inquiries. There is no such report as referred to by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan, and he could have obtained this

information by reference to *Hansard*, which contains the original terms of reference of the Duncan task force, and a telephone call to my office. Mr Gilfillan no doubt uses his information to advance the cause of his independent commission. On many occasions I have argued that at present there is insufficient evidence to indicate the kind of systemic, institutionalised corruption that would necessitate jettisoning basic civil liberties in our community. I believe this view is shared by members of the Liberal Party such as Senator Robert Hill. Indeed, Senator Hill restated this as recently as last week. If the purpose of Mr Gilfillan's question was to create a media splash, that was certainly achieved. Whether this was ultimately in the public interest is a matter for the community to judge.

QUESTIONS

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question on the subject of Operation Ark.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Last Thursday the Attorney-General, in an answer to a question, said:

Officially I was advised of the Operation Ark report by Mr Faris in December and that an earlier document as Mr Faris referred to it had been reviewed by the authority.

That is consistent with other statements made by the Attorney-General in the Council and in the media. However, yesterday the Attorney-General said that on 19 July 1989 he was certainly aware of the discussion and review of Operation Ark by the new Faris NCA. My questions are:

1. Does not that answer put the lie to the Attorney-General's assertions that he knew of the existence of the Stewart report and the review of it only in December and not earlier?

2. What was the event on 19 July when the Attorney-General became aware of the review?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, it does not. What I have said is perfectly consistent, namely, that I was officially advised of the earlier document, as Mr Faris described it, on 21 December 1989 when Mr Faris transmitted to the South Australian Government the Operation Ark report prepared by him. However, because of the questions asked about this matter, I have checked through records in the Attorney-General's office relating to any other information that might relate to Operation Ark. I have indicated previously that I was aware informally, prior to December 1989, that the Operation Ark matters were under review by the Faris authority. That is a situation that I have made clear on prior occasions, including at press conferences, and indeed in this Chamber I made clear that officially I was advised on 21 December 1989 but that I was aware of a review relating to Operation Ark before that.

I have now checked the dates in relation to that and I can indicate, as I said, that 19 July was a date when I became aware of the Operation Ark matters being reviewed by the Faris authority, as I recall it, at a meeting I had with Mr Faris, Mr Leckie and Mr Tobin in Melbourne.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: He told you that they were reviewing Stewart?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: He informed me then, as I said in my answer yesterday. There is nothing new about this. I have made clear throughout that I was officially advised of a document relating to Operation Ark on 21 December 1989 in correspondence that Mr Faris sent in

which he sent the Operation Ark report, the one that Mr Faris prepared.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Just a minute; I am answering the question. I was officially advised then that there was a document by Mr Faris on 21 December when he transmitted his report. In transmitting the report he said there was an earlier document. There is no secret about that. I have said that consistently over the past two weeks in the press interviews I have given on this topic. He advised me then that there was an earlier document. What he did say—and this needs to be emphasised—is that while there was an earlier document it was not a report of the authority. He made that quite clear. He said it was not a report of the authority which had the support of the NCA.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You knew of the Stewart report in July?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No. What I am saying is that I knew of Operation Ark in May because I received a brief in relation to Operation Ark. What I am also saying is that I was aware that there was a review of the Operation Ark matters that were within the NCA being conducted by the Faris authority. That is no different—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You are changing your story now.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not changing my story.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Yes, you are.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is no different from—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member can say that if he wants to.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: It's true.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is not true.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You have changed your story.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have not changed my story. What I have put before the Council, the situation which I have put at earlier media conferences.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: No, you haven't.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I certainly have.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You have never admitted that.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member can make his assertions and interject out of order. The reality is that I indicated in December that I had received an official notice from Mr Faris in December, at the time he transmitted his Operation Ark report, that there was an earlier document. I have made no secret of that fact and I have referred to that in earlier answers that I have given on this topic in the Parliament. However, I have also said that, informally, I became aware of the review of the Operation Ark matters prior to that date, and I have checked back on the records within the Attorney-General's office, and—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member can shake his head but the fact of the matter is that I have, and I said it yesterday in any event.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is just rubbish.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have indicated on previous occasions at press conferences and I think I indicated in the Parliament that I had become aware of the Operation Ark review earlier than 21 December. However, I was only advised officially by Mr Faris that there was a document—which is what he referred to—prepared within the Stewart authority, which he referred to as a document and said that it was not a report of the authority.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As I said, I have answered the question.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You spoke about a report you were officially informed about. What about unofficially?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I was aware, unofficially, informally before, including at discussions on 19 July, that there was to be a review of Operation Ark matters within the authority.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You have misled the media.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have not misled the media.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Lucas will come to order.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You can continue to make that statement if you want to, but the reality is that the matters are all on the table in the Parliament at the present time. If the honourable member wants to make some point about it, he is perfectly entitled to do so. I became aware, informally, that there was a review of the Operation Ark decisions, or evidence taken, within the National Crime Authority under Mr Justice Stewart. I was not aware that a letter of transmission had been prepared and that that was stopped, until subsequently. However, as I have said, I was aware—and I now have the dates and they are on the record—that a review of the Operation Ark matters as conducted by Mr Justice Stewart was to be carried out by the new authority. However, the point that really needs to be emphasised—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, as I recollect the situation, I was not—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You can't have a review unless there is a decision.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Of course you can have a review.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! the Attorney-General has the floor.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am sorry: someone does not have to have made a decision. It may be that there could be all sorts of options to decide to review the matters that were dealt with by the Stewart authority with respect to Operation Ark. That is the situation. The simple and salient important facts are that the Faris authority decided to review the Operation Ark matters which, as we now know, were specifically determined by Mr Justice Stewart and which were in a letter that was to be transmitted to the South Australian Government. I have had the records of the Attorney-General's office searched, and the South Australian Government did not receive the letter of transmission from the Stewart authority; we did not receive a report from the Stewart authority. We now know that the report was stopped by Mr Faris; we know that its findings were reviewed by him; and we know that Mr Faris wrote another report.

We also know that the so-called earlier document referred to by Mr Faris was, in fact as it now appears, a report completed by Mr Justice Stewart and signed with a letter of transmission. We know all that. We now have a copy of Mr Justice Stewart's report, but the question of what Mr Faris did with Mr Justice Stewart's report is a matter to be resolved within the authority. As I have said before, the Government cannot second guess the NCA in relation to these matters.

I concede that the Government has been put in a difficult position over this matter; that would be obvious to anyone. Quite clearly, it is a difficult situation (one might say it is

an unsatisfactory situation in which to be placed) where a report of one authority is not agreed to by another authority, is reviewed by the other authority and some of its conclusions changed. However, what is the Government to do? If it has an authority that is operating within South Australia, then surely it has to deal with that authority as it is. That is what the Government was attempting to do in dealing with the Faris report sent to it on 21 December.

That is a fair summary of the situation. The precise dates are now clear and in *Hansard*. At a media conference I was not able to give the exact dates, as I recollect, but I have attempted to try, first, to have the records searched to determine what matters relating to Operation Ark are actually recorded, and have attempted by means of my diary to determine when it was these matters were brought to my attention, that is, that there was a review by Faris of the Operation Ark matters.

Having said that, the other important point to emphasise is that there was no discussion by me, by the Chief Executive Officer of the Attorney-General's Department (Mr Kelly), who has had responsibility for these matters, or by the Police Commissioner with Mr Faris prior to that authority taking the decision to review the Operation Ark finding.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Any other Minister?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No other Minister, as far as I am aware. The question the honourable member asked was very wide ranging. The only one who is really in a position to answer that is Mr Faris, if you are talking about officers within the South Australian Police Department. I suspect that the answer is that no-one had any discussions with Mr Faris, in the terms of the honourable member's press release, which had a bearing on Mr Faris's decision to review the Stewart Ark report. I certainly did not have any discussions of that kind. The Police Commissioner has advised that he did not have any discussions of that kind, and I suspect that no-one had any discussions of that kind.

If the honourable member is trying to say that I can answer on behalf of, perhaps, police officers in the Anti-Corruption Branch, or anyone, I cannot, obviously, do that completely. That is a matter that would have to be addressed to Mr Faris. I have formally sent the honourable member's question to the authority for their comment.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have two supplementary questions: what was the event on 19 July when the Attorney-General became aware of the review, and, secondly, if the Attorney-General was aware officially in December of an earlier document or report, as the case may be, knew of Operation Ark in May when he said he had a briefing on it, knew of a review of some aspects of Operation Ark in July, and it was not mentioned in operational reports or at the 1 August meeting 1989, can he indicate why he did not request earlier than 30 November 1989 some report from the National Crime Authority on the progress of investigations relating to Operation Ark?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I took the view that it was a matter for the National Crime Authority to complete its deliberations in relation to this matter and provide the South Australian Government with a report. I suppose that the honourable member could legitimately ask 'Why did the matter take so long? Why did the Government not follow it up earlier?', and I suppose that my response to that can only be—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Didn't want to know about it!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is not true. Clearly, I did want to know about it because I specifically requested the report on that and other matters on 30 November. I repeat: the Government is placed in a difficult situation in relation to this matter—difficult if not unsatisfactory in many

respects—but there is not very much that I can do about that. We must deal with the authority as it is constituted. Until Mr Faris resigned, it constituted Mr Faris, Mr Leckie, Mr Cusack, and Mr Le Grand, with Mr Le Grand dissenting, and it is now obvious that they took a different view of the Operation Ark matters.

So, the honourable member can criticise me if he likes and say that I should have been more diligent in pursuing the matter of Operation Ark and getting it out of the authority earlier than December.

All I can say is that it was a matter for the authority to resolve and report on. They had a difference of opinion. I assume that the reason why the matter did not come forward earlier was because they could not resolve their differences within the authority. It is clear now that they could not, because Mr Faris, Mr Leckie and Mr Cusack took one view and Mr Le Grand took another view. That was a matter that would have to be directed to the authority, I suggest, in other fora, as to why effectively it took from July to December to review the matter and write the other report.

The occurrence was a meeting in Melbourne on 19 July which was an informal discussion that I had with Mr Faris, Mr Leckie and Mr Tobin, at a dinner engagement on 19 July. I was in Melbourne for another matter. Mr Faris had been appointed sometime earlier. It was appropriate to discuss certain matters—which we did.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: What else did you chat about?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, I am not going into the discussions. They were informal; they were confidential and they were not official in the sense of sitting down and exchanging correspondence. They were informal discussions about Mr Faris's attitude to certain matters, where we were in South Australia, and what the South Australian Government's position was in relation to the National Crime Authority investigations. It preceded formal discussions which were held in Adelaide on 1 August, of which members are now aware and which have also been referred to in the Parliament. So, they were the circumstances as I recollect them now. As I said, it was not an official gathering. Notes were not taken. My recollection of the conversations is that I became aware on that occasion that—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Why wasn't Mr Le Grand at this dinner?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: He was in Adelaide. I was in Melbourne on another matter—in fact to give a lecture to a victims of crime seminar. I took the opportunity to meet informally with Messrs Faris, Leckie and Tobin over dinner. We did that. We discussed a number of matters relating to the authority's operations in South Australia. So far as I can recall—and I cannot recall the details of all the discussions—the Operation Ark matter was discussed, and there was an indication that there would be a review of that matter by the Faris authority. As I say, it was not a meeting that was recorded but an informal discussion to discuss aspects of Mr Faris's attitude to the South Australian reference and what the South Australian Government expected out of the NCA with respect to that reference.

I can assure members, I can assure the Parliament and I can assure the public of South Australia that at all times the South Australian Government has insisted to the authority, whether by the granting of the reference on 24 November 1988, whether by my letter to Mr Le Grand on 15 February 1989, or whether in subsequent discussions and communications with the authority, either the Stewart or the Faris authority, that we want the authority in South Australia to do a proper, decent job to get at the basis, if there is any, of any allegations that might have been made

in the Parliament, in the public arena, or anywhere else, particularly during the debate about corruption in 1988. That has been the brief that we have given at all times to the NCA. I anticipate that, as I said, within a reasonably short time, certainly during this autumn session, a fuller report can be given to the Parliament about the activities of the authority in South Australia.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question on the subject of the NCA.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Last week, the Attorney-General said:

To the extent that the Masters' allegations might involve the Attorney-General, it was agreed that the authority—

that is, the National Crime Authority—

would report to the Premier and that the Premier would nominate a contact officer for liaison purposes.

That was from August onwards last year. However, as the Attorney-General indicated, he had written to the NCA in February 1989, seeking the investigation of certain allegations that had been made about him. Therefore, from February to August of last year, the NCA was reporting to the Attorney-General. My questions to the Attorney are: first, is it true that the reporting arrangements were changed because the NCA had expressed a view to the Bannan Government that it was inappropriate for the NCA to continue reporting to the Attorney-General? Secondly, during the February to August period, when the NCA was still reporting to the Attorney-General, was he given any information about the progress of the investigations of the February letter and, in particular, in relation to the answer to the last question, was any information in relation to that investigation provided to the Attorney-General at that informal dinner meeting of 19 July in Melbourne?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: My recollection is that no information in relation to the matters involving me was communicated to me between February and August but, obviously, that is something that I would need to check from any official records that might be within the department. Frankly, I cannot recall what discussions there might have been on 19 July in relation to this particular matter.

As to the reporting arrangements, Mr Le Grand had my letter of 15 February 1989—and I assume that members have a copy of it—which was really a wrap-up of all the allegations made during 1988. It may well be useful if I seek leave to table that letter—I do not have a spare copy—so that members can make their own judgment about it. However, it was a letter dated 15—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You've got to have a copy to table it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Then I will not table it, if members do not want it. I will get you a copy when I—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I seek leave to table a copy when I have it.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think we can do that.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: All right. If the honourable member does not want it, I will not table it.

The PRESIDENT: No, that is not true. My ruling is that you cannot table something that you do not have.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have got it, but I do not have a copy that I can actually table.

The PRESIDENT: If you would like to give the messengers a copy, they will have it copied and you can table it then. At this stage, I am not prepared to accept it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As members do not seem overly keen, or do not feel there is any necessity, to have a copy, I will not seek leave to table it at the moment, because I understand they have it, and anyhow I am sure they have been quite diligent and have run around the media and obtained a copy of the letter, which I distributed to a very large media conference about two weeks ago. However, the fact is that that letter of 15 February was a wrap-up of all the allegations that were made in South Australia during 1988, and anybody who bothers to read the letter will see that it insisted that the NCA should take on these matters and ensure that they were investigated.

An honourable member: That is not what the letter says.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is what the letter says; it certainly is, and I quote:

My purpose in writing to you is to emphasise that the South Australian Government is anxious to ensure that these matters are properly investigated by the National Crime Authority.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That is not insistence.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, the honourable member wants to quibble. I am saying that I am emphasising to the authority that its brief is to include in its investigations the matters raised in the public arena during 1988. If members want further information about that particular matter, then I will refer—and this must be put on the record—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That's not the question. All we are asking is whether the NCA objected to reporting to you.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I know.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: 'Yes' or 'No'.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Then you interject and I respond—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Sit down.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In order to place the matter in context. The fact of the matter is—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections will cease.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Can I answer it?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In the press release of 24 November the Hon. Dr Hopgood said this:

The South Australian reference approved today by the inter-governmental committee will enable investigations of allegations of serious criminal conduct and corruption of public officials including police. The reference will enable investigations of, among other things, outstanding matters arising from the NCAs interim report (received 29 July 1988) and allegations arising from the Masters' report, the Mr X transcripts and allegations in Parliament.

That was his news release on the day the reference was given.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That is not the question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I know it is not; I will get to it. On 29 November 1988 the Hon. Dr Hopgood, in a ministerial statement relating to the National Crime Authority, said virtually the same thing to the House of Assembly. On 22 February 1989, in the speech that I gave in reply to the Hon. Mr Gilfillan's Bill to establish an independent commission against corruption, I said:

The NCA has indicated that it will investigate the allegations that have been made publicly in the media and Parliament to date. It has also called for members of the public to come forward. There is now an obligation on all those within and without the Parliament to cooperate with the NCA.

So, I am pointing out that, from the very beginning of the South Australian reference, the reference was intended to cover matters raised during the corruption debate in 1988. My letter of 15 February canvassed those matters relating to allegations in the *Sunday Mail* of May 1988 (which were provoked by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan); with the Chris Masters *Page One* story (which dealt with corruption within the Police Force); and also with one of the central issues in the

Masters' allegation, namely, 'that senior public officials, politicians included, are reluctant to tackle the issue of public corruption, because they are being blackmailed. The blackmailers are brothel keepers, who are involved in the drug trade and who have videotaped the public officials in the brothels'.

These were the nature of the allegations made in 1988 that provoked that great, at times hysterical, debate about corruption in this State in 1988. I say in my letter, 'These allegations are of the utmost seriousness.' I then refer to allegations in Parliament and the Mr X tapes. I go through certain things relating to those. I then also draw to their attention the possibility that some criminal elements may make allegations for the purpose of disrupting the law enforcement processes and bringing them into disrepute.

I drew their attention to two potential examples of that. One was an allegation relating to the Police Commissioner, in which it was suggested that the Police Commissioner had taken out a contract on the life of Kerry McDowell and the second thing I referred to, in the context of possible criminal elements using misinformation to discredit public officials, was the matter relating to me and, in particular, the allegations placed before me by Mr Andrew Male of the *Advertiser*, which suggested that Patti Walkuski alleged that I had attended her brothel between 1979 and 1982, during which, I might add, I denied that allegation, and called Miss Walkuski a liar in so far as what Mr Male was putting to me was her story. That letter was sent to the National Crime Authority, as was a full transcript of the Masters' allegations. I stated:

In summary, I am writing to you to reaffirm the Government's commitment to have all matters relating to alleged corruption in this State investigated, including those matters which have been the source of media and parliamentary debate, and which are within your term of reference. I also believe that the authority, in carrying out its investigations in this State, should be alert to the possibility of deliberate misinformation being spread so as to undermine those responsible for the investigation and prosecution of criminal activity in this State.

It is important to know that that matter was put before Mr Le Grand in that context on 15 February, if you like, to ensure that the matters were all before him and that the matters that had been referred to in the reference on 24 February 1988 were before the authority, and to insist that, from the South Australian Government's point of view, all the allegations raised in 1988, no matter whom they might concern, should be investigated.

Mr Le Grand got that letter and he raised no objection with me, at any time, about my continuing to participate on the inter-governmental committee relating to the National Crime Authority, and I think if members see the context in which that letter is written there ought to have been no circumstances in which I should not have continued on the inter-governmental committee. He did not object, certainly not to me and, as far as I understand, nor to the Premier. He did not object and Mr Justice Stewart did not during the course of his period as Chairman of the authority.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That is not the question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Just a minute. When Mr Faris took over—and one would have to check exactly what the discussions were within the authority—it seems clear that he decided to activate the particular aspect of the reference, namely, that 'senior public officials, politicians included, are reluctant to tackle the issue of public corruption because they are being blackmailed'. He decided to activate that aspect of the inquiry which, until then, as I understand it, had remained dormant, although it is highly likely that the authority, in conducting other inquiries and investigations, was probably building some kind of database and infor-

mation base in order to move into that inquiry when the time came, but Mr Le Grand did not object.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Mr Faris did.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: What Mr Faris said was, 'We want now to pursue that particular matter', and the South Australian Government agreed that that matter ought to be given a priority. That was, as I said, the discussion in August when it was made clear—I cannot quote precisely—that Masters had made the allegations (although he now denies that it was meant to refer to me). However, the central allegation was made by Masters that politicians were involved. I hope that Masters and Anderson—the people who promoted this story in 1988 and repromoted it again in 1989—have been to the National Crime Authority and have provided the names of the politicians and police officers they say were being blackmailed, because that was the allegation. There was no shillyshallying; a specific allegation was made. But, Mr Faris took the view, with which we agreed, that, in so far as it could be interpreted that I was the person referred to in the Masters allegation, alternative reporting arrangements should be made in relation to this matter, and those were made. He did not object to my remaining on the inter-governmental committee, and Mr Le Grand did not: that is the position.

We have dealt with the matter properly, and I ask members to sit back, take away the flurry of *Advertiser* enthusiasm for my immediate resignation, et cetera, and look at the context in which this letter was sent to the National Crime Authority. To expect anyone to stand aside in those circumstances would be utterly intolerable and untenable, because anyone could be subjected to blackmail by criminal elements in this State, and that is the position that I have taken. I will seek leave later to table that letter. I hope that explains the position and fully answers the honourable member's question.

GRAND PRIX TRAVEL AGENCY

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism a question on the subject of the Grand Prix travel agency.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Last Friday (9 February), the *Advertiser* reported that the Grand Prix Board planned to form a partnership with the travel company Encounter Travel Pty Ltd to organise and sell tours to the Adelaide Grand Prix. This move by the Grand Prix Office has outraged travel agents in South Australia because the Grand Prix Office already has a monopoly control of the allocation of Adelaide's hotel rooms in Grand Prix week. In fact, Mr Chris Clayford, a Director of Encounter Australia, is the same person who for some time has been contracted by the Grand Prix Office to manage the allocation of hotel rooms during Grand Prix week.

Travel agents resent the fact that during the Grand Prix period they are unable to arrange accommodation for their clients and/or their interstate and overseas friends—a normal business practice at any other time of the year. Yet, now travel agents fear they will be further disadvantaged by the Grand Prix Office's using its privileged position in relation to the allocation of accommodation, to enter the field of organised tours, as such a move will provide the new partnership with monopoly rights to organise and sell overseas tours to the Adelaide Grand Prix. Earlier today members of the South Australian Chapter of the Australian Federation of Travel Agents (AFTA) resolved they would ask their Federal Board to request the Trade Practices Com-

mission to investigate the proposed partnership between the Grand Prix Office and Encounter Travel, in terms of restrictive trade practices. I ask the Minister:

1. What arrangements have the Grand Prix Office entered into with Encounter Travel Pty Ltd to organise and sell overseas tours to the Adelaide Grand Prix?

2. Will such arrangements provide the new partnership with monopoly rights in South Australia to organise and sell overseas tours to the Australian Grand Prix?

3. If so, does the Minister believe such a situation is fair and just and, if not, will she endorse and/or support the move by the South Australian Chapter of AFTA for the Trade Practices Commission to investigate the partnership between the Grand Prix Board and Encounter Travel Pty Ltd?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The concerns that the honourable member refers to are concerns that have also been expressed to me by individual travel agents as well as the Chairman of the South Australian branch of AFTA. Indeed, that matter is of concern to me and it is a matter that I have raised with the Grand Prix Office. I have asked for a full report from that office on exactly what arrangements it has in mind with the company known as Encounter Australia in the proposed formation of a travel company.

If there were any suggestion that such a partnership or company would be in a position of having a monopoly situation within South Australia, or if there were any suggestion of any sort of insider trading aspects to the proposal, as has been suggested by representatives of the travel agent industry, then the matter would certainly concern me; I would not want to see that happen. For that reason I have asked for a full report from the Grand Prix Office on exactly what it is proposing. At this point, it is not clear to me what are the arrangements, and I want to study the proposal before I comment on it or indeed get back to the people who have approached me about the issue. From newspaper reports, it is difficult to determine whether a wholesaling and retailing operation or some other arrangement is proposed in the formation of such a partnership. These issues need to be raised.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Wasn't the Government consulted?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I personally was not consulted. I cannot speak for the Government, but I was not consulted about the proposal so I am not familiar with its terms. As I have said, I have sought a report from the Grand Prix Office on what it is proposing. If, for example, the proposal is for a company to prepare wholesale packages which can then be made available to representatives of the industry for sale, then that is a very different proposition from the proposal that such a company would have an unfair advantage over other travel agencies in being able to put package tours together. These issues need to be looked at and clarified before—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: It still wouldn't free up accommodation for other travel agencies.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will address that in a moment. The issues to which I have referred have to be clarified before I can make any judgments about the issue. On the question of monopoly on rooms in South Australia, that point can be clarified immediately, because the Grand Prix Office does not have a monopoly on rooms in South Australia at Grand Prix time at all. The situation that applies at Grand Prix time is that hotels in Adelaide and the surrounding areas have reached agreement with the Grand Prix Office for the provision of a certain number of rooms. As I recall, for the last Grand Prix I think about 1 500 rooms were provided by hoteliers in and around

Adelaide to allow the Grand Prix Office to appropriately accommodate those people associated with the Grand Prix itself, such as the crews, sponsors—the people who make the Grand Prix happen. That arrangement has been entered into voluntarily by hotels in and around South Australia with the Grand Prix Board.

About 7 000 rooms are available in total, and the number of rooms over and above the 1 500 or so that the Grand Prix Office requires for its purposes are available to be sold by hotels. They are available for travel agents who want to put package tours together or service their own corporate clients or whatever it might be to seek and obtain by negotiation with those hotels. At Grand Prix time, the problem always is that there are never enough rooms to suit everyone's purposes. Hotels have their own corporate clients that they wish to service. They have travel agencies they may do business with regularly to which they want to give preference when making rooms available for those putting together package tours.

So, for one reason or another, many people who are associated with the Grand Prix who want to package it as a destination are finding it very difficult to put together those packages. There is also a tendency on the part of some hotel operators to use the Grand Prix Office and the work that it does as perhaps something of an excuse as to why they cannot accommodate a particular travel agent or corporate body when they are approached. There are stories of hoteliers saying to such people, 'Well, the problem is, I cannot give you any rooms because the Grand Prix Office has a monopoly. It has taken all my rooms and there is nothing I can do about it.' That is not actually how things work. That is not the situation. There is not a monopoly situation on rooms as it relates to the Grand Prix Office at all, as I have already indicated. There is always a problem in making rooms available for the huge range of people who want them. That is a very separate issue, and I have addressed that question of the monopoly.

I am not sure or clear at this stage about the proposed arrangements with the establishment of a travel company. I am certainly asking the sorts of questions that members of the industry are asking and, if there is any suggestion that there is anything improper about those arrangements, I will want to take that matter further because it is not appropriate that the Grand Prix Office should place itself in such a situation.

I am quite certain that the Grand Prix Office would not want to be in such a situation because it prides itself on working with local industry and working cooperatively with various segments of the tourism industry within this State. It views its work in attracting people to South Australia as being complementary to work that is undertaken by people in various segments of the industry. The first thing that has to be said is that members of the industry do not know what the arrangements are. They would like to know, as would I. As soon as we can establish what they are we can sort this out.

LETTER TABLED

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I seek leave to table a copy of a letter dated 15 February 1989 from the Attorney-General, C.J. Sumner, to Mr M. Le Grand, member of the NCA, relating to matters I dealt with in answer to an earlier question.

Leave granted.

DUNCAN TASK FORCE

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about his ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: On page 5 of the ministerial statement the Attorney-General said:

There must continue to be a healthy and open debate in our community about what types of structures are most appropriate for combating organised crime and corruption.

When and where had the Attorney-General intended for that open and healthy debate to take place? On page 3 of his statement, he says:

During the Duncan task force investigations the NCA were informed of the nature of the issues under investigation. In particular, during the task force investigations, a representative of the National Crime Authority was present at an interview where similar allegations to those made by Allen, were made.

Does that indicate that, in fact, the Allen statement, as I referred to in my question, was not specifically referred to the NCA?

Referring to the accompanying *Hansard* that the Attorney-General distributed and referred to in his comments, on page 179 he is referring to material from Mr M. O'Shea in a series of articles in the *Advertiser* especially commencing on Tuesday 30 July. These were allegations made public for the first time more than 13 years after the tragic event, the event of the Duncan drowning. Further on, he says:

In the event, Mr O'Shea made a detailed statement to an Investigating Officer of the Attorney-General's Department on Friday 2 August 1985 at the offices of and in the presence of his solicitor.

I would not need to remind members that that is 4½ years ago. I ask the Attorney-General: as in his statement he indicated that he is now advised that the Commissioner of Police has said that this report should be completed and available for the Attorney-General's consideration in the next few weeks, does the Attorney-General believe that my question asked in this Chamber a few days ago has actually speeded up the date of the delivery of that report?

An honourable member: Come on!

The PRESIDENT: Any honourable member can call 'Question' at any time.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Can I have some protection in asking this question?

The PRESIDENT: Yes. The honourable member is on his feet.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: At page 180 of the same *Hansard* the report states:

The task force is presently studying and is resifting the massive amount of existing evidence as well as proceeding to make further inquiries. It is expected at this stage that its labours will not be finished before the expiration of another four weeks.

That indicates that great speed was being applied to this report. Further, the Attorney-General stated:

I also point out that Mr O'Shea has made various allegations of corrupt practices in respect of police officers formerly in the Vice Squad at material times. These allegations are quite unrelated to the circumstances of Dr Duncan's death. They are now the subject of intensive investigation by the Police Internal Investigation Branch.

I ask the Attorney-General: are the Allen and O'Shea allegations still the subject of investigations by the so-called Duncan task force or some other unit in the Internal Investigation Branch? Has there been a change in personnel on the task force? Will he find out who are the serving officers currently on the task force investigating these matters and provide that information to Parliament?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That was not a question without notice. That was a large number of disparate questions

without notice asked, in my view, in a form almost unprecedented in this Chamber. However, some of them I can answer; some others clearly I will have to take on notice. What I do emphasise, however, is that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan was being blatantly dishonest in the manner in which he asked this question a couple of days ago. Anyone who studies the *Hansard*, given the question the honourable member asked, will clearly have to come to the conclusion that the honourable member was being, as I said before, mischievous or dishonest in the way in which he asked the question. I challenge the media or any member to read the honourable member's question fairly and come to a judgement whether it was mischievous, if not dishonest. It clearly was. The honourable member made out—and the media took this up—that there was a report which alleged that all but three of the Vice Squad officers whenever (the honourable member did not mention a time) were corrupt. He gave the impression to the Parliament and public that there was such a report.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You could have asked the question in a proper way but you have your own agenda. What you wanted to do was get a little bit of media attention. The fact is that you have conned the media in this matter and I hope they recognise tonight that you have conned them, because there was no report and you knew that very well when you asked that question.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would ask the Attorney-General to address the Chair and not the honourable member.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: You haven't denied the substance of what he said, either.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I certainly have. It was not a report. It was a statement taken from Mr Allen during the course of an investigation, which has been on the public record, as I have said, since 1 August 1985.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: Four and a half years ago.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: A lot has happened in that 4½ years. Three police officers have been charged in connection with the death of Dr Duncan, as the honourable member knows. The last was only resolved in October 1988, only 18 months ago in any event, and there were matters within the terms of reference that had to be concluded. The fact is that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan could have referred to *Hansard* for the terms of reference and he could have checked with me, or he could have asked a question in Parliament; I do not deny his right to do that. But he should not ask it in a way which was completely misleading to the media and Parliament, as he did, knowing full well from his informant, almost certainly Mr Mick O'Shea, what the circumstances were.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: You are absolutely wrong.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, Mr O'Shea or Mr Allen, one of the two. With respect to the questions asked by the honourable member, I would imagine that we have been having a fairly open debate about this matter since really May 1988. Whether all that debate has been healthy, other people will have to judge. I suspect it has not all been healthy because some members and some sources in the media insist on spreading this information and rumours, peddling smear and innuendo about people. They have done so in the past and continue to do so at present in relation to this matter. To suggest that we have not been having a debate about it is absurd.

As the honourable member said, there is a reference in *Hansard* to an interview with Mr O'Shea on 7 August 1985, 4½ years ago. The honourable member will recall that the

principal aim of the task force was to look at new evidence to see whether any persons could be put on trial. Mr O'Shea was a key witness and, as it turned out, the officers put on trial were all acquitted: they were either not proceeded with or they were acquitted. Yet, Mr O'Shea was one of the key Crown witnesses in relation to that particular matter. So, the interview that occurred with Mr O'Shea may as well have touched on other matters relating to corruption—and I am sure that they probably did—which are still being investigated in relation to, I repeat, circumstances going back to 1972.

The honourable member says it was 4½ years ago, but in that time three police officers were charged and those proceedings were concluded only in October 1988 when they were acquitted. In relation to the question as to whether this has speeded up the inquiry, I doubt whether it has. I was aware that this task force had not concluded its work and was anxious to ensure that it did. It certainly was not something that had been lost, because the matter was—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have made requests through my department on this particular matter on a number of occasions. However, I can only trust the police in the task force to be going about their duties conscientiously in relation to this matter. Indeed, I am advised, that a piece of information relating to this matter only came to the attention of the police in recent times, just in the past few weeks, which required further inquiries to be made. I trust that that answers the questions—except those questions that I specifically will have to take on notice. I do so and I will bring back a reply.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 14 February. Page 139.)

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I support the motion and thank His Excellency for his address when opening the first session of this Forty-Seventh Parliament. For my part, the session marks a range of new responsibilities as shadow Minister of Transport, Tourism, the Arts and the Status of Women. I accept all these new responsibilities with enthusiasm, although I still have some misgivings about parting with my previous human services portfolios.

In respect of community welfare, I held that portfolio for the Liberal Party for some four years—perhaps four of the most demanding and often depressing years of my life. But there were rewards. During those years I developed a deep and lasting respect for the undervalued and unsung efforts of countless thousands of paid staff and volunteers working in the non-government sector. In fact, I applaud their collective diligence and drive in the face of overwhelming demands for their services and their kindness and understanding. I also applaud the fact that such workers rarely refuse to give up spreading support and goodwill notwithstanding the enormous financial handicaps under which most community service organisations in this State have been labouring for years.

Also, my encounters with so many needy individuals and families in the past four years have reinforced my determination to fight to rid our society of the proliferation of direct and indirect barriers that thwart men and women, and boys and girls, from exercising individual responsibility and improving their lot in life.

Whether such barriers be the current threshold on the level of income in relation to one's entitlement to a pension or the lack of child care options, or the absence of sufficient vocational courses, or part-time work options, or illiteracy, all such examples frustrate the ability of people to fulfil their potential. I would contend that all such barriers must be redressed by legislators in both our State and Federal Parliaments if we are to be able to say with conviction by the year 2000 that Australia is a nation that encourages its people to participate fully in society. This is not the case today. And so in the next 10 years all of us in this place and elsewhere have a lot of work to do to ensure that we realise this goal of full participation in our society.

In relation to my new portfolio responsibilities, I recognise that the areas of transport, tourism, the arts and the interests of women all have their own special demands. But this seemingly unusual grouping of portfolios also has many common, interdependent issues that link the group in a direct sense, and I am looking forward to pursuing this aspect of the portfolios.

For instance, there is a close relationship between improvements in road and rail systems and services and opportunities for enriched travelling experiences in the State. Also there is—or should be—a close relationship between the effective marketing of the arts and the choice of South Australia as a destination for tourists. Likewise, the promotion of tourism in South Australia has a direct bearing on our potential to generate new and rewarding employment opportunities for women.

Mr President, there are a host of themes and issues that I have been tempted to address this afternoon, including the need to market our State more effectively in tourism terms and the need to rejuvenate all forms of artistic endeavour in a drive to re-establish our former enviable status as a leader in the arts in this country. However, I have opted to confine my remarks to four issues in the transport portfolio:

1. The escalating deficit confronting the State Transport Authority;
2. The lack of resolve by the Government to implement the major recommendations of the Fielding Report (1989) into 'Public Transport in Metropolitan Adelaide in the 1990s';
3. The range of concerns arising from the Bannon Government's decision to introduce a 24-hour free travel scheme for primary and secondary students, including the impact on small private bus and coach operators; and
4. The paucity of funds directed to road construction, maintenance and safety measures in South Australia by both the Bannon and Hawke Governments.

First, I refer to the operating deficit, which last year amounted to an exorbitant \$118.9 million or \$2.29 million per week. Seven years ago the operating deficit was \$75 million, or \$1.44 million per week. While this situation is alarming, it should be noted that last year the actual cost to taxpayers of STA services—taking into account both the operating deficiency and the subsidies for concessional fares—was \$141.4 million, or \$2.72 million a week, an increase from \$85 million, or \$1.63 million per year in 1982-83.

The Hon. Peter Dunn: Shame!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes, I agree. The STA also faces other major funding and operational problems. Patronage is declining. Patronage last financial year was down 17 per cent compared with five years ago. At the same time, the net operating costs for bus, rail and tram services have increased.

Also, total borrowings have increased dramatically and so have the sums outlaid for increased interest costs. In 1988-89, total borrowings amounted to \$188 million, compared with \$76 million six years ago, with interest payments over that period increasing from \$12.56 million to \$32.5 million. Meanwhile, depreciation and amortisation costs on leases continue to escalate.

To round off this woeful financial scene, one has to keep in mind that only 10 per cent of South Australians use STA services and of that number some 60 per cent received concessional fares of some sort last year—with that proportion increasing in recent months due to the introduction of both concessional fares for all persons 60 years and over (not just age pensioners) and free 24-hour travel for primary and secondary students.

While my review of the STA's financial plight has of necessity been brief, it should nevertheless be apparent to any casual observer that the STA's operations require a thorough overhaul to ensure the efficient and sound delivery of public transport services in South Australia. Without such an overhaul of current operations, the current mess will be compounded, with increasing sums of taxpayers' funds being channelled into a public transport system which is catering for a declining number of people, and all other transport related needs in this State—whether they be road construction and road safety measures or the building of bicycle tracks or the conversion of buses to compressed natural gas—will continue to be starved of vital funding resources.

Over the past seven years, however, successive Ministers of Transport in the Bannon Government have shown no real desire to pursue such an overhaul—beyond the gesture of commissioning additional reports at further considerable cost to South Australian taxpayers.

I note that in May 1986 the Government appointed PA Management Consultants to conduct a review of the performance of the STA. The PA report was adopted by Cabinet in July 1986, with the STA required to implement the following recommendations:

- (a) the preparation of a business plan to include actions to lower the deficit, to increase productivity and revenue, to reduce overheads and to direct maximum funding to the preservation of service standards; and
- (b) an immediate \$10 million reduction in the deficit.

Subsequently, the business plan was prepared but it has never been acted upon, while the direction to implement an immediate \$10 million reduction in the deficit appears never to have been received by the STA—nor demanded by the Government—because in the 1987-88 financial year the operating deficit actually increased by \$8.5 million, from \$107 million to \$116 million, rather than a decrease of \$10 million, as recommended by PA Management Consultants and, apparently, endorsed by the Government in July 1986.

Later in 1986, the Government announced a further review of STA's operations, this time to establish the most cost effective public transport system suitable for operation in metropolitan Adelaide in the 1990s. Professor Peter Fielding, a world respected authority on transport services from the USA, was appointed to head this new review.

The Fielding report was released in March 1988 but, as with the earlier PA report, the Government has again failed to act on the major recommendations of this report—and in the process failed, in my view, both the consumers of STA services and the South Australian taxpayers at large. Yet, I suppose this negligence on the part of the Government should not come as a surprise—even to one as new as I am to the transport scene—because the Fielding report

seems to be sharing the same fate as most of the 84 reports into public transport that have been commissioned by various Governments over the past two decades.

I have sought the assistance of the Library to obtain a list of the names of all those 84 reports. I do not have that information to hand, but I will be referring to this matter at a later date and at that time will be seeking to name all those reports. In the meantime, the Fielding report is the second transport issue that I wish to canvass this afternoon. By Professor Fielding's own admission on page one of the Executive Summary of the report, his recommended changes to STA operations are 'moderate considering what is occurring in Europe and North America.'

Professor Fielding, in discharging his responsibility to identify alternatives that would permit the efficient delivery of public transportation in metropolitan Adelaide into the 1990s, did not recommend privatisation of the STA, the practice employed in the United Kingdom to transform the way in which transit services are delivered in that country. Rather, he recommended commercialisation of transport, embracing the more efficient use of private buses and taxis, coupled with improvements to transit efficiency by emphasising appropriate objectives and adopting measurements of performance. Such an approach would appear sensible and sound, as recent Government actions in relation to free travel for students suggest that at present there are no clear policy objectives guiding the manner in which the STA is required to operate.

To accomplish his objectives, Professor Fielding recommended a three-tiered organisational restructuring, involving Government, a new Metropolitan Transport Authority (MTA) and operators. He envisaged the MTA would be a fiscal control and planning agency rather than an operator. The Minister would appoint the MTA board members and direct them to organise an integrated network of transport using public transit, taxi and private bus operators. Subsequently, the MTA would determine the mode of services best suited to different areas and would both procure services from operators and monitor their performance in seven key dimensions.

The MTA would be responsible to Government for the improvement of public transport within financial guidelines, budget and policy directions determined by Government. In turn, the MTA would submit an annual budget request together with a five year business plan that outlined current needs, projected capital and operating requirements. The MTA would also be the recipient of all capital and operating assistance which it would then apply to establish facilities for joint use and to procure services by tender. Operators of such services—including a revamped STA—would own their own equipment and facilities.

As proposed by Professor Fielding, the current STA would be renamed the State Transit Agency. Management of the new STA would be relieved of policy responsibility and be required to adopt a commercial approach to service provision, emphasising services that they can operate efficiently and market effectively, with tenders sought for services that the STA chooses not to provide. Professor Fielding recommended a gradual process for the introduction of the 60 reforms that he proposed. However, he was uncompromising on the essential need for policy making and fiscal control to be separated from service provision. Equally, he was uncompromising on the need for greater efficiency in the delivery of public transportation, the introduction of a marketing orientation throughout the system and improvements in operating performance, especially labour efficiency. And he went on to warn:

The drift away from commercial performance has emphasised social and environmental objectives for transit resulting in the

neglect of operational efficiency and passenger satisfaction. If allowed to continue, the South Australian Government will have to adopt more drastic solutions than those recommended.

The more drastic solution that Professor Fielding envisaged was privatisation. Professor Fielding also warned:

Should the Government, for whatever reason, decide that the recommended changes cannot be achieved, then the quality of transit services will gradually decline while its cost to Government increases.

Notwithstanding these clear warnings by Professor Fielding, plus the moderate nature of his recommendations, this Government has failed to act on the central recommendations of the Fielding report. This failure, in my view and indeed in the view of the Liberal Party, is reprehensible and amounts to a dereliction of the Government's duty to govern this State in a responsible manner in the best interests of all South Australians. Yet, the Government has failed to act, knowing that its failure to do so is encouraging the steady decline in the quality of public transit services in the metropolitan area, and is inflaming the escalating cost of such services to Government and the taxpayer.

Also, at a time when it is necessary for the Government to contain the tax burden in this State and the Government itself is confronted with competing claims on scarce resources, it is illogical and irresponsible for the Bannan Government to pour an unchecked stream of general revenue into the STA to prop up practices that are acknowledged to be inefficient and services that are experiencing a declining demand. As an aside, I must admit that I despair about the future of the State, when one considers that in December last Premier Bannan extended the responsibilities of the Minister of Transport—the same Minister who is presiding over the financial mess in the STA—to include the finance portfolio.

The third transport issue to which I refer is the Government's promise in November last year to provide a 24 hour free public transport service to primary and secondary students and the introduction of this scheme on 30 January this year. In the context of the escalating operating deficit confronting the STA now and in the future, the introduction of this free student travel scheme must be considered to be a most irresponsible move. Certainly, it is a move that in any normal circumstances is hard to envisage ever being contemplated by a financially responsible Government, but then I concede that an election environment, with the Bannan Government facing the prospect of defeat at the polls, is not any normal circumstance.

The Government's election promise to introduce free student travel has all the hallmarks of an ill-considered panic move by the Government to shore up waning electoral support in the metropolitan area. This scheme is diametrically opposed to the whole thrust of the Fielding report, which pleaded for the adoption of a more commercially orientated approach for the operation of public transit services in South Australia, including a more realistic fare structure, particularly at peak hours of travel. In fact, the scheme aggravates rather than redresses Professor Fielding's concern about past neglect of operational inefficiencies and passenger satisfaction, and on this basis alone must be seen as a backward step at a time when enlightened action is required.

The Minister of Transport claimed during the election campaign that the scheme would cost approximately \$7 million. However, this \$7 million figure represents only revenue forgone in a financial year. When account is taken of both revenue forgone plus the accumulated impact on the operating deficit, I understand that the STA itself has forecast that the scheme could cost anywhere between \$20 million and \$25 million per year. This massive cost arises because the scheme compounds the major factor contrib-

uting to the STA's operating deficit (\$118.9 million in 1988-89), namely, the provision of services at peak hours, by requiring extra buses for free travel at peak hours. The Fielding report noted on page 42 that it costs STA 36 per cent more to provide an hour of bus services in the peak period than it does during the interpeak, yet this is not offset by higher revenues.

Also, the scheme does not require students to be issued with a ticket which can subsequently be validated. This oversight is an extraordinary omission, as it totally undermines the Government's rationale for installing, some two years ago, the Crouzet ticket validating system at an overall cost of some \$16 million. The Crouzet system is meant to help the STA gain vital information on passenger demand in order to plan and implement a more efficient and effective public transit system in the future. Students have comprised some 38 per cent of morning hour patrons—a figure that the STA has been able to determine accurately in the past because it has had access to information via the Crouzet ticket validating system. The STA has now been deprived of this important management and planning tool because of the manner in which the Government has introduced the free student travel scheme.

But, there are also many other controversial aspects of the Government's free student travel scheme. For example, the scheme is discriminatory, as the benefits extend only to students in the Adelaide metropolitan area plus students in six select regional cities, namely, Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge and Whyalla. Students living on the fringe of the Adelaide metropolitan area and in all other country areas miss out. This decision represents blatant discrimination against country kids and their families. I cannot believe that even this Labor Government could have stooped to such depths. Certainly, I fail to see how such a discriminatory action can be accommodated within the ambit of the Government's so-called social justice policy with its professed principles of access and equity.

With respect to private bus operators, the Government's free student travel scheme is also both discriminatory and at odds with the recommendations of the Fielding Report. The Government's decision to exclude private bus operators who previously carried student concession travellers has already threatened the viability of many small bus and coach operators who, in addition to losing their school runs, also stand to lose school charter business.

On Tuesday of this week I raised the concerns of the South Australian Bus and Coach Association in a question to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. The association had written to the Minister on 8 January outlining their alarm about the ramifications of the free student travel scheme on some 21 of their members, yet as of last Tuesday the Minister had not deemed the association's concerns to be sufficiently urgent to demand an immediate investigation. Some five weeks later she is still awaiting advice from her Department. In addition, I have also received a host of complaints from parents, regular commuters and STA bus operators about the introduction of the student travel scheme. These complaints range from the unlimited 24-hour nature of the scheme, to the influx of students now using the bus who would previously have walked the short distance to school, and the fact so many regular bus commuters have been unable to catch their normal service because the bus is so crowded with students who joined the service at or near the commencement of the journey.

Parents of students studying year 12 at TAFE colleges have also complained that their sons and daughters are not entitled to the free travel, unlike year 12 students at sec-

ondary schools. And yesterday I received a copy of correspondence to the Premier from Immanuel College, highlighting further grievances with the operation of the free transport scheme. The letter reads as follows:

Dear Mr Bannon,

On behalf of Immanuel College Council I have been requested to write to you and officially express our council's concern regarding the recent introduction of free travel on STA buses for South Australian students.

You will probably be aware that, contrary to the widely held belief that students attending private schools are drawn from the higher socio-economic groups, the majority of our students, in fact, come from working/middle-class families, a large percentage of whom are receiving degrees of Government grants, e.g., AusStudy and/or concessions granted by the school in cases of financial hardship.

College council has always accepted its responsibility to ensure that students are transported to the school as safely as possible but, because the school is located on the outer fringes of the metropolitan area, very few students are able to use STA services on a direct route. Therefore, the school has provided a bus service, which it heavily subsidises from college income.

Your Government's current policy of offering free transport to students has, of course, led many of our parents to consider changing to STA services. College council believes that this could be detrimental to the education of the children because of the longer travelling time required and will put greater pressure on the STA services. In fact, if all our students did change to STA services, a further five buses would need to be provided by the STA.

I remind members of my earlier comments about the inefficiency of the scheme in terms of compounding the operating deficit of the STA, because this scheme requires extra buses to be provided at peak hours of travel, and it is peak hour travel that is the main cause of the STA's operating deficit. At such hours of travel, the STA is not able to recoup revenue to cover the additional costs. The letter concludes:

College council therefore respectfully requests that your Government give consideration to extending the newly introduced concessions to all students in the form of a subsidy to schools in order that they may maintain their present arrangements, and thereby ensuring that our students are not disadvantaged. The subsidy could be incorporated in the current funding formula. We would add that our school is willing to continue its contribution to the cost of student transport. We look forward to your early favourable response to our request. Yours faithfully, Brian G. Robinson, Chairman, Emmanuel College Council.

On that note, I will conclude my remarks with respect to the student travel issue this afternoon, but I have no doubt that the issue will continue to brew for many months; in fact, it is an issue that may well haunt this and subsequent Governments for years to come.

The fourth and last transport issue I wish to canvass is that of funding for roads. I note that, in this morning's *Advertiser*, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry called on the Bannon and Hawke Governments to urgently inject \$1 billion into the State's road system or risk losing hundreds of millions of dollars in industry and development. While I have not received a copy of the chamber's submission, I suspect that its arguments are valid in respect of the future needs of manufacturing and industry in this State.

Certainly, I am aware of the dire need for an injection of funds for roads from the perspective of the tourism industry. Whether it be the South Coast Road on Kangaroo Island or the roads on Eyre Peninsula and in the Flinders Ranges region, sealed roads are most important if we in South Australia are to be able to offer tourists a more enriching experience when moving about the State. To date, the argument for more funds to be committed to roads in South Australia—indeed Australia wide—has focused on the Federal Government. In part, this focus is sound, for currently the Federal Government receives about 30c in tax for every litre of fuel sold, of which it is returning only 5.7c to funding for roads. If the Federal Government acted to direct an

additional 2c a litre received from the 30c a litre tax, an additional \$500 million could be provided each year to road improvements in Australia, with South Australia's additional share being about \$50 million.

I note with some pride that the Federal coalition has committed itself to such a course of action—a rise of 2c to 7.5c in the amount of revenue collected from fuel taxes being channelled into road funding. Meanwhile, the Hawke Government has wavered between deafening silence on the matter to offering the unacceptable suggestion of a further fuel impost of 1c, to be used for road funding purposes. While the Hawke Government continues to stall on this important matter, poor road conditions across Australia, including narrow and undivided roads (which is particularly the case in the eastern States but it is also relevant here), are contributing to 30 per cent of all accidents each year. However, all the odium regarding the decline in funds directed to roads in recent years cannot be levelled at the Hawke Government alone. The Bannon Government has also played its part in depriving South Australia of much needed road funds.

The State Government contribution to the Road Transport Fund is made up of two components: first, the petrol tax or fuel franchise tax and, secondly, collections after expenses from motor vehicle registrations and drivers licences. However, there has been a significant reduction in State funding to the Road Transport Fund in recent years, principally because of the decision by the Bannon Government to fix the amount transferred from fuel franchise tax collections at \$25.7 million and to divert surplus funds from these petrol tax collections to general revenue at a time when petrol tax collected each year has reached from \$25.7 million in 1982-83 to \$76.4 million in 1988-89, and a projected collection of \$79.5 million in 1989-90.

The percentage of petrol tax collected from South Australian motorists and allocated to the road transport fund has been reduced from 100 per cent in 1982-83 to approximately 32 per cent in 1989-90. Because of that vast reduction, in real terms, of State Government funding to roads in this State, I believe that the State Government shares a major responsibility with the Federal Government for the poor condition of so many of our roads in this State.

While most of the odium has been directed towards the Federal Government, I believe that this Government has recently been conveniently silent on this point but, as more people are made aware of the Bannon Government's neglect of road funding in this State over its past seven years in office, that situation will change. In this regard, during the last State election campaign the Liberal Party announced that it would seek to redress this past neglect by the Bannon Government and that we would increase the percentage of fuel franchise tax collections from 32 per cent last financial year to 50 per cent.

In conclusion, I would say that it is extremely important that this Government begins to address the major funding problems confronting the STA. By failing to do so, it is merely stalling the day when more drastic action will have to be taken. That is the prediction of Professor Fielding in his comprehensive report on public transport in metropolitan Adelaide in the 1990s. There is no question that, while the Government fails to act, it cannot cover up the fact that the general community is becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the STA services in this State and that is reflected in patronage figures.

At the same time, there is also resistance to increasing fare levels. A massive escalating operating deficit problem is also confronting the STA. I give every encouragement to this Government finally to find the resolve to address some

of these practices. As Professor Fielding indicated in his report, his recommendations are moderate, and I see little reason why they could not be introduced not only in the best interests of public transport but also of taxpayers dollars in this State.

By addressing Professor Fielding's report and introducing his major recommendations, the Government would then enable funds to be released from general revenue. Those funds now have to be poured into the STA to cover an inefficient, ineffective and increasingly unpopular State transport system, but they could be released for so many important transport purposes today. I cite the issues of road transport, conversion of buses from diesel to more fuel efficient operation such as natural gas, the building of bike-ways and even continuous rebates for bike helmets. So many things could be offered if the Government did not find itself in this straitjacket of having to pour more and more funds into the STA for decreasing returns.

In that light, I find it quite incredible that the Government saw fit during the last election campaign to offer the free transport system to primary and secondary schoolchildren and, in respect of the current troubles faced by the STA, I think the Government will live to rue the day that it did so. It may have helped it get back into Government, but in terms of managing the STA and finding funds for other transport needs in South Australia, the Government has handicapped itself to an enormous degree. I support the motion.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: This is the fourth occasion on which I have had the honour to participate in the Address in Reply debate and I believe—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It feels like more.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: You can't count, so you wouldn't know. I believe it would be entirely appropriate for me, as we enter the last decade of the second millennium AD, to look back at some of what has passed before and at what may well be in time to come. Before I do that, I want to pause for a moment and, to some extent, reflect on some changes in this Chamber. In particular, one notices that the only changes that have occurred in this place as a consequence of the last State election have not been in the composition of the membership here but, rather, in the composition of the leadership and Opposition shadow spokespersons who now adorn the Opposition front bench.

It would perhaps be more politically prudent for me to say nothing in respect of the foregoing but, unfortunately, my principles and sense of fair play will not allow me to do that. In respect of the internal goings-on in the Liberal Party relating to their elections both here and in another place, I do not believe I should be dealing with that matter in this speech but, if I may, I would like to pay a tribute to the former Leader of the Liberal Party in this place, Mr Martin Cameron. Whether or not Martin Cameron and I share the same philosophy (which obviously we do not), in my view, he was a man of considerable principle. If he so wished, he could have charmed a rabbit from its burrow and, of course, he had to work with a lot of rabbits. He had, and I think still has, a puckish sense of humour and at all times was prepared to fight hard for what he believed in.

As his record shows, whilst a member of this place, he was even prepared to differ with his own Party and, on one notable occasion, leave it and then join the newly constituted Liberal Movement, something for which he has apparently never been forgiven by some of his colleagues, even to this day. Having said that, I believe he was, and still is, an individual endowed with a rare form of political courage.

His passing at this time from the leadership of the Liberal Party may well mean that we may not see his likes again on the Opposition front bench but, again, only the passing of time will be the litmus paper to test the veracity or otherwise of that statement.

Turning to past events, if I may, I would like to say how it is my sad perception that we of the human race never ever seem to be capable of learning from our past mistakes at a rate fast enough to assist our forward welfare. This century we have seen two major global wars and a whole host of regional conflicts during the currency of which millions of lives were lost and tens of billions of the earth's wealth, both in the material and monetary sense, were squandered. Even to this day, we still do not have to look too closely to see an ongoing continuance of that folly. For instance, we see the Americans and the Russians engaged in a race to space and they are not by any means the only two nations engaged in that pursuit.

One can well reasonably ask: how much more wealth is being needlessly squandered by the duplication—even triplication and quadruplication—of that type of space research? How many of the world's starving poor could be housed and fed, if only the nations of this earth were to act as one, particularly in the matter of expensive research into space, medicine and agricultural research?

How much more quickly could the deserved end result of such research be achieved if only there was a coming together of the best scientific minds on a global basis? But having said all of that, Mr President, I believe there is a glimmer of hope for us all as we enter the last decade of this millenium. Who would have thought that we would be witnessing the events that are now under way in the Warsaw Pact nations? Who would have ever thought that the concepts of the European Economic Community, as they are seen by the political inhabitants of that area, would have started bearing the type of fruit which, if things go right, will be their lot by 1992?

Perestroika and Glasnost on the other hand is the brainchild of a very brave man, Mikhail Gorbachev. He has, in my view, very courageously been pushing through reforms on behalf of the Russian people, Russian industry and commerce, and Russian agriculture. Should he succeed, his course of action will have a profound effect on the welfare of not only our own people here in South Australia, but on people everywhere. These changes will, if they can achieve their full measure, in my view be of the order of the golden horde, the fall of Constantinople, and the battle of Waterloo with respect to shaping the future of the world. Such in my view is the magnitude of the Glasnost we are witnessing.

Glasnost, if allowed by all of the participants, can be an instrument for the first steps of the global unification of humanity, and in that respect will have the effect of making this earth of ours a more fulfilling place to live in for all of the human kind. I believe that, if we as a human race are to succeed in ascending the heights of humanity, we can only do so provided that we give ourselves the capacity to eradicate poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, and the distrust from amongst the minds of people of diverse ethnic backgrounds, cultural differences and colour. Failure to do so will, I fear, lead us, the inhabitants of this planet, into a doomsday position. If we as a global community wish to survive, there is no alternative but to understand that global algebraic equation. If we do not, the human race will be consigned to the scrap heap of history.

We here in South Australia and Australia have a role to play as people in Government. We must ensure that, with the advent of Perestroika and Glasnost, and with the advent of the closer coming together of the EEC as a more cohesive

economic entity, we and other nations outside of the Warsaw Pact and the EEC are not left out of what undoubtedly will become the united power blocs of the world. They are united both in respect to trade and technology, with the ability along with the United States and Japan's economic might to influence world markets and, therefore, the directions that the world will take in a politically futuristic formative sense.

I turn now to the question of why I, as a State member of the South Australian Parliament, should raise these matters, which for the most part are the domain of the Federal Government. Some member of this Chamber might say why should I or any other member of the State Houses of the Australian Parliaments talk on matters of global politics, when we after all should be dealing only with State issues and, in particular, those issues which on the surface have meaning for South Australia. I put this to members: the emergence of Glasnost; the coming together of the European Economic Community as a much stronger player in world economic terms; the emergence over the past decade of Japan as a world economic super power; and the latter day emergence of South Korea and Taiwan as modern industrial powers means that the game of global chess is no longer played the way it was, say, 10 years ago. I have no doubt that the changes we have witnessed over the past three or four years mean that we will see many more changes before a definite pattern of change emerges.

If we as members of the South Australian Parliament choose to ignore the evidence of our own eyes, then we do our people the greatest disservice in their history. Mr President, South Australians and Australians cannot afford to be left behind the eight ball in respect of all of these changes occurring. Failure on our part to ensure that we are involved is a sure recipe to bring into total decline our present living standards. We, as a community of nations, are living at a time which is surely a hinge of history. The emergence of Mikhail Gorbachev as President of USSR and the path that he is endeavouring to lead his people down perhaps represents the first real chance this world has had to obtain an enduring and meaningful peace. We, on our part, must not miss this chance—it may be the only one we will ever get. If we fumble the ball, the alternative relative to the well being of all humanity is too horrendous to contemplate.

I would like to conclude on that note, and I hope that I have given all members of this Parliament some food for thought with respect to that which lies ahead of us. If Gorbachev fails in Russia, then I think the world is almost certainly in a much worse position than it has been since 1939. It is my earnest hope that Gorbachev will not fail. It is my earnest hope that the leaders of the West will ensure and assist in ensuring the survival of Gorbachev and his allies in the Soviet Union. As I have said, it is a momentous moment in the history of the world, and I earnestly hope that those people who have heard me today will continue to think of how we can play a part and assist in ensuring that the world will be a much better place in which to live. We must lift the living standards of all the inhabitants of this earth, thus making it a much safer place for our children and our children's children to live in.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: It gives me great pleasure to make a contribution in this place in support of the Governor's speech and to accept his good wishes for a successful Parliament. It is just 12 months and one day since I first had the honour of representing the people of South Australia in this place and it has been a very fruitful 12 months as far as I am concerned. I have enjoyed the task and, as a member of the Legislative Council, I have been very for-

tunate to come into contact with many people who have given me this opportunity. At this stage I should refer to my now retired colleague, the Hon. Gavin Keneally, who was out of the country last year for some time on parliamentary duties. This gave me the opportunity to meet his constituents face to face. He provided me with the use of his offices and very able staff. I was given a first-hand insight into the problems facing the ordinary people of South Australia.

Also at this stage I would like to mention that I have had great support in the learning process to perhaps one day become a proficient politician and, without being condescending or frivolous in any way, I refer to my colleague, the Hon. Trevor Crothers, who, in effect, has taken me under his wing to some extent and has been very helpful in educating me in the ways of the Parliament. He has acquainted me with some of the pitfalls and some of the aggravations that one has to face from time to time. Trevor Crothers has the ability, in my view, to mix wit and wisdom which, in my humble estimation, is the true measure of an intellectual mind—and I say that without any frivolity whatsoever.

One of the most pleasing things for me, being a member of the Legislative Council, is the opportunity I have had to get around in South Australia, and I am continually impressed by country people. Honourable members would realise that, as a member from a country region, I have a parochial interest in this area. In my duties as a Legislative Councillor I have come into contact with many councils in large cities and in small cities. I have had the opportunity of working with people like Bill Jones and Denis Crisp in Port Pirie. Bill Jones has since retired and Denis Crisp is the new Mayor of Port Pirie.

The enthusiasm and dedication of local governments in South Australia never ceases to amaze me. I am continually impressed by the amount of dedication and the time that these people are prepared to put in to promote their communities, and sometimes facing great difficulties, not normally encountered to the same degree by councils in metropolitan areas. People like Eileen Ekblom at Whyalla, Tom Secker at Port Lincoln, King Pedlar and his council at Crystal Brook and Red Hill, and people like Margaret Evans from Berri in the Riverland have all impressed me with their honesty and dedication.

One of the other duties as a Legislative Councillor is the committee work that we are expected to do. That has given me the opportunity to meet the people who, in fact, look after the public estate in the pastoral lands. Their dedication is an indication to me that the pioneer spirit has not gone out of the Australian people. I was impressed by their dedication to their task. I believe that pastoralists are probably some of the most environmentally conscious people in South Australia.

One of the disturbing aspects encountered in my work as a Legislative Councillor was when I was part of the Aboriginal Health Select Committee, which also took me into parts of South Australia which I have never had the opportunity to see before. It is with some sadness that I note that, with the prorogation of Parliament, the Aboriginal Health Select Committee did fall over, to put it colloquially. It is my hope and earnest ambition that something can be done for the Aboriginal people in South Australia.

I was very impressed with the attitude and concern of many of the elders living in the Pitjantjatjara lands. They have great concern for the future of their people and I believe they deserve support. I am happy that we have a new Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in South Australia, Mike Rann, who is a young, enthusiastic and somewhat dynamic

politician. I am hopeful that members of the Select Committee on Aboriginal Health will have the opportunity to confer with Mike Rann and further expand on what opportunities can be made available for the Aboriginal people so that they can, in fact, lead a dignified existence and maintain some of their cultural heritage.

It has also been a pleasure for me to be part of a Government—and this relates to the Federal level as well—that has been a caring, cooperative, constructive and conciliatory Government which is prepared to sit down and talk issues through, not with confrontation but with preparation based on fact, so that the aspirations of all people within our community, that is, the traditional Labor supporters, business and the general community can be met.

These attributes apply to both State and Federal Governments. By displaying these sorts of attitudes it has been very pleasing for me to note that we, as members of the Labor Party in Government, have probably been able to achieve more of the goals that the Labor Party stands for. Both State and Federal Governments have been able to increase employment opportunities and provide equality of opportunity for people to reach their aspirations.

It is important that these caring aspects be so expanded. I believe that these two Labor Governments, State and Federal, have done much for the working class people in Australia. One of the achievements that makes me particularly proud to be a member of the ALP concerns job creation. For the first time, the Government has taken cognisance of the working poor of the country. One of the great contributions that this Labor Government has made is in relation to family assistance. The family assistance supplement has done much to alleviate the problems of single income families, in particular. It has provided those families with the means to give their Australian children the opportunity they deserve.

I should like to expand further on this attitude of cooperation. In my home town I have seen for many years great things come from a spirit of cooperation and conciliation and a willingness to sit down. In the past few years we have set up what is called the Port Pirie Development Committee, which has been subsidised by the South Australian Labor Government and \$600 000 is being expended to explore development possibilities. I have been impressed by the community's willingness to participate in discussion.

One of the things that is perhaps topical on a State basis concerns the situation at Marineland, and we have all been made aware of this through the media. As a new politician I was involved in some discussions on the re-siting of dolphins. What happened in Port Pirie was not the usual rhetoric, the flag waving and protests that have occurred, but there was a commitment by the community to give its best shot to a proposal which might have meant a home for the dolphins and an expansion of the tourism industry in Port Pirie.

The community of Port Pirie set about to put together a proper report, which was absolutely well researched and factual. It has been submitted at a cost, I might add, of \$15 000, which was made up from money provided by the development committee and private business in Port Pirie.

It is interesting to note that in the past Port Pirie has attracted a great deal of criticism about the environment there. I would encourage anybody who wants to find out about the environment in Port Pirie to read the report on the harbour that was put together by the Port Pirie Development Committee. It is worth noting that the professional findings show clearly that the bacteriological levels in the harbour at Port Pirie are much lower than for any port in South Australia.

The report provides a basis for future development in Port Pirie in that people who may have an interest in development on the seafront areas can now go to that very comprehensive document and satisfy any fears or concerns that they may have.

Reference has been made to events in Eastern Europe and Glasnost. It is interesting to note—and I will not expound further on those matters—that the world trend is to the ideals held dear by the Australian Labor Party; things like the right of assembly, the right to organise and the right to be represented. These ideals have been applauded by countries all over the world and by comments—

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: It is called Liberal democracy.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: As my colleague Dr Ritson has said, in the past Liberal Governments have, in fact, congratulated people such as Lech Walesa and Mikhail Gorbachev in supporting these ideals. Given this sort of congratulation for these initiatives and goals, I find a disturbing trend, which worries me very much as a member of Parliament trying to represent the community, in that people in this country who in the past have applauded these types of initiatives are now proposing in this coalition not to go down this track. They talk about smashing trade unions. They say that they want enterprise agreements. One sees them bleating in the daily newspapers that the free enterprise system is ideal. But, in fact, when freedom of choice and the free enterprise system are put into vogue—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much interjecting.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: —and there is a bit of enterprise bargaining, and the employer and employee reach a consensus agreement—an enterprise agreement, if you like—they squeal 'foul'. Members opposite, part of this coalition that is determined to catapult industrial relations back 100 years, are inconsistent. However, it is very unlikely they will be elected, and given the events of the past couple of days I feel even more confident that the voters of Australia

and, indeed, South Australia, will not be fooled by their shallow promises and their prediction of industrial confrontation. People will not fall for it and so I am much more comfortable.

I now refer to the matter of political pressure on particular groups. On the political front, people do not believe that there is any pressure on people in Australia, and definitely not in South Australia. In concluding my contribution, I pay a debt of gratitude to the dozens of people who support the Labor Party and who, indeed, supported me in my recent re-election. In many instances I was appalled when I went out amongst country people to hear of the amount of pressure put on people who may support one political Party or another and, in particular, in some areas supporters of the Australian Labor Party are ostracised by their community because of their political beliefs.

I want to thank sincerely all those people who do have the courage to stand up for the political system that they like (in some instances against the bully boy supporters of the Opposition). I thank those people who made their time available to go out and support the Australian Labor Party, their free choice in our political system. I thank them for their support of me and my colleagues in returning the Government to office. In my next term in Parliament I will ensure that I serve those people in country areas to the best of my ability as an individual politician in relation to any issue that may affect them. I support the motion and thank the Governor for his kind and encouraging words for the coming session.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.31 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 20 February at 2.15 p.m.