

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 23 February 1994

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. Peter Dunn)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The **Hon. R.D. LAWSON**: I bring up the third report 1994 of the Legislative Review Committee and move:

That the report be read.

Motion carried.

COMMONWEALTH-STATE RELATIONS

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services)**: I seek leave to table a copy of a ministerial statement on Commonwealth-State relations made by the Premier today in another place.

Leave granted.

QUESTION TIME

SCHOOL CLOSURES

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about school and TAFE closures.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER**: Members would be aware that school closures were a major issue for both Parties during the recent election campaign, following comments made by the Minister about schools with fewer than 300 students being considered for closure. The present Premier later gave an assurance that the Liberals in Government would not close schools simply as a cost cutting measure. During the election campaign Labor announced a four year freeze on school closures, unless a school community agreed to closure plans. Eighteen months' notice of any planned school or TAFE closure would ensure that students, parents, teachers, the local community and industry are fully consulted. An 18 month embargo would enable a local community to make plans for appropriate new arrangements in advance of a proposed school or TAFE campus closure. Will the Minister and his Government give a guarantee that no TAFE campus or school in South Australia will be closed without 18 months' written notice given to the local school or TAFE community?

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: I thank the shadow Minister for that question. First, the shadow Minister ought to know that I have no responsibility for TAFE closures; that part of the question will have to be referred to the Minister responsible for that (Hon. Bob Such), and I will undertake to refer that aspect of the question to him. I have responsibility only for schools. If one were to have believed the statements made by members of the shadow Minister's Party during the lead up to the last election campaign, by now—23 February 1994—about 80 or 90 schools would have been closed down around South Australia by the new Liberal Government. The fanciful notion that had been put about by the Leader of the Opposition and other members of his Party during the lead-up to the election campaign was that the Liberal Government was

going to rape and pillage schools in South Australia and close down 363 of them.

An honourable member interjecting:

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: Well, it was a disgraceful scare tactic engaged in by the shadow Minister and other members of his Party in the lead up to that election campaign. As the shadow Minister knows, he and other members of his Party reached the disgraceful stage of actually posting outside schools posters saying, 'This school will close under a Brown Government,' and we had the tragic situation of parents in tears going to the principal of a school and withdrawing their students from schools because they had been told that this school would close under a Liberal Government. We had principals complaining to the department, the former Minister of Education and me as shadow Minister for Education that allegations were being made by the Labor Party that their school was closing. They also complained that, as a result of that, students were being withdrawn from those schools by parents rightfully fearful of the outrageous claims that were being made by the shadow Minister for Education and the Hon. Mr Roberts in the papers, such as the *Port Pirie Recorder*, as he well knows. He was suggesting that 16 out of the 18 schools in the country regions were to close down. Under the fanciful proposition—

Members interjecting:

The **PRESIDENT**: Order!

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: Under the fanciful proposition that the shadow Minister for Education and the Hon. Mr Ron Roberts and other members were suggesting, we would hardly have had a school left in country South Australia. There would not have been a school left in hundreds of kilometres of country South Australia, because members of the Labor Party were running around, whenever they could, trying to scare parents and children witless that their school would be closed down by a Liberal Government; 363 schools were to be closed down. It seemed that I would have two rest days this year—Good Friday and Christmas Day, I suppose—when I was not closing down a school, but every day other than those days I was going to be closing down a school. That was the fanciful and bizarre proposition that the shadow Minister for Education, supporting the strategy and tactics of the Labor Party in the lead-up to the election, tried to have the parents and the community of South Australia believe.

The **Hon. Diana Laidlaw**: He's silent now.

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: He is very silent now, because he is quite embarrassed by the tactics that he and members of his Party supported in the lead-up to the election. Let us look at the more bizarre proposition.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: I will talk about whatever you want to talk about in relation to Port Pirie if you want to. You were suggesting that 16 out of the 18 schools in your area would be closed by a Liberal Government. Let us refer to the question from the shadow Minister. I was beginning to wonder whether he would be game enough to ask a question on this issue during this session of Parliament.

The honourable member obviously had nothing else to ask about, so he is going to trot this one out. The shadow Minister is suggesting that we ought to look at the Labor Party's policy; that is, that there would be no school closure if the local community and parents did not want it. So the former Premier and the present shadow Minister for Education are trotting out as a rational provision of education resources in South Australia that, if there is a school with 400 students and if, for whatever reason, the enrolments drop back to four or

five in a particular area and there is a school two kilometres down the track on a bus route to take the children there, or if the children could walk there, and the parents of those three children did not want their school to close, the Labor Party and a Labor Government would not close it.

That is a nonsense proposition for the shadow Minister to be putting forward in this place in relation to the sensible provision of education resources. That was the policy that the Labor Premier tried to put forward in the lead up to the election. It was a nonsense proposition, as he well knows, because over the past three or four years the Labor Government rationalised, amalgamated and closed more than 70 schools.

What do I find when I am the Minister and I ask the department what the former Government was doing in relation to ongoing discussions about rationalisation, amalgamation and closure? Time does not permit, so I will leave that for another day. But let me say in very short measure that there was considerable—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, I would love a supplementary to enable me to have another go at it. There was a considerable amount of activity going on by the Labor Government within the Education Department in relation to ongoing discussions about school closures, amalgamations and rationalisation. One of the first dockets that ended up on my desk was a decision taken by the previous Minister, with the support in this instance of local communities, for the closure of one small school not too far from the patch that the Hon. Ron Roberts seeks to represent.

There was no mention throughout the election campaign by the Hon. Ron Roberts or the previous Minister that the Government had already taken a decision to close that school and one or two other small schools in country areas. So, the sort of proposals that the shadow Minister for Education is putting before this Chamber in relation to some aspects of that question are nonsense.

In relation to the 18 months written notification of closure of schools, the answer is 'No'. There will not be 18 months written notification. Indeed, the Government of which the shadow Minister for Education was a member did not follow such a policy in relation to giving schools that it closed 18 months written notification.

However, I indicate that these decisions in relation to ongoing rationalisation will be taken after appropriate consultation with local communities. We will not be taking pre-emptive action. There will not be any pre-emptive strikes in relation to closing schools overnight or within the space of a week or so. There will be appropriate consultation with communities, parents, staff and other representatives of local communities. Only after appropriate consultation will the Government consider any proposition in relation to the rationalisation of schools.

TRANSPORT MANAGER

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: My question to the Minister for Transport relates to the dismissal of the General Manager of the STA. Did the Minister have the agreement of the Premier before directing the board of the State Transport Authority to dismiss the authority's General Manager, or did the Minister act unilaterally in taking that action?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I had the agreement of the Premier and Cabinet. I have also since then had support from unions for that action.

SELLICKS HILL CAVE

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, a question about the Sellicks Hill cave.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Yesterday in response to a question that I asked on 10 February, the Hon. Ms Laidlaw handed me a written reply to my question. As part of that reply, in discussing a review of the actions of the Department of Mines and Energy in imploding the cave at Sellicks Hill, the Minister indicated that the independent review commissioned by him and the Minister of Mines and Energy to establish the facts of the case would be made available at some later date. He indicated that there would be no process for public submissions or to have any kind of publicly available report. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Will the Minister take the report of the review to Cabinet and, if so, when?
2. Will the report be made public and, if not, why not?
3. When will the Minister make a decision about the future of the cave?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

STEAMRANGER

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about the SteamRanger tourist train.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I remind the Minister of an ultimatum given by the previous Government to the operators of SteamRanger Tours that they be out of their Dry Creek depot by April 1995 and that they will have to begin their Victor Harbor service from Mount Barker from 1995 because the train line will be changed from broad gauge to standard gauge to accommodate freight services as a result of National Rail taking over the service. SteamRanger Tours will be forced to rebuild its depot at Mount Barker at a cost of \$5 million, even though for an extra \$500 000 the Government could install a third rail between Adelaide and Mount Barker to enable SteamRanger to continue its present route. I also point out that SteamRanger is a successful tourism venture and is booked out every weekend that it operates. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Does the Government intend to go down the same path of the previous Government and force SteamRanger Tours to shift depots?
2. If so, what assistance and/or compensation will the Government offer SteamRanger operators for having to rebuild its depot at Mount Barker?
3. If it will not offer any assistance and/or compensation, why not?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I have had negotiations with SteamRanger for at least a year now on the matter of relocation. I have also explored the subject with Australian National, National Rail and relevant rail unions. Over that time I have been keen to see whether a possibility existed for a third rail option, and I have taken my advice principally from the unions concerned which have the safety interests in mind. They have informed me that they are now also of the opinion that the third rail option is not viable. This is so

because the heavier track required for National Rail in the standardisation of the line is such that the pins and supporting base would overlap the third rail and not allow the third rail to be secure on the sleeper. Those safety concerns have convinced the unions, Australian National, National Rail and the Government that this is not an option, even if money was available there for it. For this reason negotiations initiated by the former Government have been continued by the present Government on the relocation of SteamRanger to Mount Barker. It is not the ideal option because, in tourism terms, it would be preferable for SteamRanger to continue its successful services from the Adelaide Railway Station or Keswick. It is not an option for safety reasons and SteamRanger now accepts that fact.

We indicated in policy prior to the election that we would support SteamRanger's tourist rail operation and re-establish its base at Mount Barker, a move as we have indicated necessitated by the standardisation of the Adelaide to Melbourne line. I am aware that a submission is being prepared for Cabinet consideration on this matter. It will require some State funds, but we also believe it is necessary to have Federal funds because it is the Federal Government's initiative in terms of the standardisation of the line that is requiring the relocation of this successful rail venture. The Cabinet's submission will advocate a lobby to the Federal Government and that lobby I hope would have the united support of all members of Parliament.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts a question on the Adelaide Festival.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: On the weekend my wife and I travelled to Perth. On arrival at the Perth Airport, we were greeted by a most attractive banner 'Welcome to the Festival of Perth'. The cab driver wasted no time inquiring as to whether we were interstate visitors. On learning that we were from South Australia, he asked whether we would be interested in a brochure for the Festival of Perth, and outlined some of the attractions of the festival which has overlapping dates with the Adelaide Festival. Two other taxis in which we travelled also carried information about the Perth Festival.

On our return to the Adelaide Airport, it was noticeable that there was no welcoming banner or any information in the domestic terminal about the Adelaide Festival. The cab driver from the Adelaide Airport confirmed that he had no information about the Adelaide Festival, nor had he been offered any information. I have made inquiries into both these matters and have established that taxi drivers in Adelaide are not provided with any brochures or other information about the Adelaide Festival. Indeed it appears that this has not been the case in recent festivals.

This is surprising and most disappointing, in view of the fact that a comprehensive review of the taxi industry by a select committee of the Legislative Council in 1985 strongly advocated the use of taxi drivers as ambassadors for tourism and major events such as the festival. I am advised that the international terminal at Adelaide Airport does contain information about the Adelaide Festival and that festival flags are flying on the roadway out of the airport. The responsibility for the domestic terminal, however, does not rest with the Federal Airports Corporation but is the responsibility of the respective carriers.

South Australia calls itself 'The Festival State' and our festival has long been regarded as the pre-eminent festival in Australia, and is well recognised as one of the great international festivals. However, there is clearly now a festival war in Australia, with Victorian Premier Jeff Kennett aiming to make Melbourne the cultural centre of Australia, Queensland with money to burn in the arts, Sydney steadily winding up its festival, and Perth's persistence paying off with increased international and interstate visitors to its festival. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Does the Minister agree that taxi drivers can be excellent front line ambassadors for tourism and the arts in South Australia and, given that this did not occur under the previous Government, will she make urgent inquiries to see if there is a brochure on the 1994 Adelaide Festival program suitable for distribution by Adelaide taxi drivers?

2. Will the Minister make inquiries as to whether it is possible to have a banner welcoming visitors at the domestic terminal at the Adelaide Airport and also appropriate information about the Adelaide Festival for arriving airline passengers?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I thank the honourable member for his questions and I share his disappointment that, whether it be the taxi industry, the airport or the front line in terms of tourism, they have not embraced the festival in such a public fashion. It would certainly be my wish that this would happen spontaneously, rather than being required to happen in response to questions raised in this place. I will require it to happen by speaking both with the South Australian Taxi Association and with various radio cabs, which would be the best source of information.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What will happen if they do not do it?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I suspect they will do it because they are aware of their responsibilities to the tourism industry. I am just sorry that the work that I understood was being undertaken between the Tourism Commission and the taxi industry over the past year—and there has been a committee looking at this matter, set up by the former Government—has not in fact responded in providing the information to the Taxi Industry Association, and subsequently through to the taxicab owners and drivers. It is a great disappointment that it even requires such a committee to initiate this action because, as the honourable member mentioned, taxis are in the front line of the tourism industry. This was a matter canvassed extensively when the select committee addressed the issues in the taxi industry in 1985. The former Minister for Tourism was in fact the chair of that committee.

So, we have been well aware of the importance of the taxi industry to the tourism industry, and it is a great disappointment that it requires public debate of this sort in this place to achieve the actions necessary to support the festival. And it is necessary that we support the festival strongly because of the benefits it brings to the State, not only culturally but through business economically and socially, and it should be embraced by all in the community. That is why I will certainly follow up the honourable member's question, and I will also speak with Qantas and Australian National, because I am sure that they would like to cooperate in the manner that the honourable member has suggested.

GOVERNMENT MANDATES

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Leader of the Government in the Council (Hon. Rob Lucas), a keen student of Labor history, a question about Government mandates.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: The self-righteous and self-serving indignation from South Australian Liberals in relation to their perceived mandate appears to be increasing daily, if yesterday's question by the Liberal Party's junior parliamentary assistant to Mr Rumpole in the Legislative Council, the Hon. Mr Redford, is anything to go by. Mr President, as another keen student of Labor history, you would be aware that the Australian Labor Party's objective, as outlined in its Platform, Resolution and Rules, is, and I quote:

... the democratic socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange to the extent necessary to eliminate exploitation and other anti-social features in these fields.

This objective was placed in the Australian Labor Party's national platform in 1921 and is still in force. Members would know that the Australian Labor Party has won 10 Federal elections since 1921, and on each occasion could rightly claim a mandate from the people for the democratic socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange. Members would also be aware that the Federal Government announced plans in 1987 to introduce an identity card for Australians, which was to be called the Australia Card. This proposal was canvassed throughout 1986 and 1987, and the proposal was outlined by the Prime Minister, Bob Hawke, in his policy speech at the 1987 Federal election. Following this election, Mr President, the Federal Government attempted to implement its policy for the Australia Card, based on its mandate from the Australian people. This proposal was defeated on a technicality in the Australian Senate by the Liberal and Democrat members of that institution.

Mr President, you would be aware, as would all members, that the Prime Minister, Mr Keating, is a staunch republican. During the 1993 Federal election campaign the Prime Minister spoke extensively about his vision for a republican Australia. In fact, during his policy speech, delivered in Sydney on 24 February 1993, the Prime Minister spoke at length in support of Australia becoming a republic. Members would be well aware that the Federal Labor Government was returned to office in March 1993 with an increased majority. Given these facts, I address my questions to the Leader of the Government in the Council:

1. Will the Leader explain whether he supports the proposition that current and past Federal Labor Governments have a mandate to proceed with a democratic socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange?

2. Can the Leader explain why the Federal Labor Government's mandate, following the 1987 Federal election, to introduce the Australia Card was ignored by his colleagues in the Australian Senate?

3. Does he support the Federal Labor Government's push for the establishment of an Australian republic given its increased majority and subsequent mandate following the 1993 Federal election?

4. Will the Leader explain his and his Party's hypocrisy on the issue of mandates, given that his Party used the Federal Senate and State Upper Houses to ignore State and Federal Labor Governments' mandates over the past 102 years?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Much to my disappointment I have no responsibility for the Labor Party, its history and its performance in government. If the honourable member is prepared to give me the responsibility, I shall be happy to tackle a few of those issues. I would respond just in part to one or two of those issues. It is a bizarre notion in the first question from the honourable member to suggest that past Governments have a mandate for anything at the moment. The Labor Government is dead and buried in South Australia and what is in the Opposition's platform at the moment is now a matter of minute interest to the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: You can talk about the Federal Government, I concede that but, when one talks about mandates to act in relation to the democratic socialisation for past Governments, what is past is past and the Labor Party in South Australia at least for the not too distant future is dead and buried and will have to wait for further elections.

The Hon. Anne Levy: He's talking about the Federal Government.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The honourable member can defend her colleague as she will. I am just saying it is a bizarre notion of past Governments having mandates. Any sensible discussion about mandates would certainly distinguish between obscure provisions of Labor Party platforms, such as provisions that may have been there for donkey's years and about which half of the Hon. Mr Ron Roberts' colleagues would run from at 100 kilometres an hour if one tackled them over the issue.

As to the democratic socialisation provisions that he talks about, that is a matter for him to debate with his colleagues, whether his Government and previous Labor Governments in South Australia have headed down that particular path. There are some in our community who probably believe the Labor Government's performance on industry policy, finance and budgetary management probably indicates that it was heading, albeit unwittingly in some cases, down that particular path.

Any sensible discussion about mandates would distinguish between obscure provisions in the Labor Party platform and issues of consequence and public debate over a long period leading up to an election, where people finally decide on which Party they wish to govern a State or nation. Therefore, to compare an obscure provision, such as the one the Hon. Mr Roberts has referred to, and something such as the long-standing debate that we have had in the community about industrial relations policy in relation to all those related issues is a nonsense.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That's an indication of how little the Hon. Ron Roberts knows about the policies of the Liberal Party, and that was the import of the question that my colleague the Hon. Mr Redford was putting, at least in part, about how much the Democrats knew about the policies that have been publicly released. I put the same question to the Hon. Ron Roberts because the industrial relations policy was the first major policy released by the Liberal Party. It was released in June, a full six months before the election. It was publicly released—the final detail and not general detail—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The policy document was released in June—not the generality but the final policy. No changes were made to the policy document from June through to December last year. The industrial relations policy

document was out for all to see: for unions to discuss; for the Hon. Ron Roberts to consider, consult and discuss if he wanted to, for six months. In the lead up to that election no-one could claim that the industrial relations policy was not a matter for public debate, discussion and record. I would make the point to the Hon. Ron Roberts that he ought to distinguish between matters of substance, public record and debate, like that, and obscure provisions of the Labor Party platform that half his colleagues would not even wish to support publicly, anyway.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: Mr President, I desire to ask a supplementary question. The Minister claims the industrial relations policy of the Liberal Party was available for everyone to see.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: No explanation: ask the question.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: The Minister claimed the platform was available for everyone to see, but when were there negotiations with the United Trades and Labor Council, because it did not know what the policy was all about?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will not enter into any flippant discussion about what union leaders did or did not know about publicly released documents released by the Liberal Party in the lead up to the election. The honourable member well knows that the document was released six months prior to the election. There was discussion and debate and at times some criticism from elements of the union movement about aspects of the Liberal Party's industrial relations policy. It is not true to suggest that members of the union movement were unaware of that document having been released in June last year.

ARTS APPOINTMENT

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to direct two questions to the Minister for the Arts about a staff appointment in the Department for the Arts.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: First, in the light of the personal friendship between the Minister for the Arts and Ms Winnie Pelz, the newly appointed Chief Executive Officer of the Department for the Arts, why was the position not advertised? Secondly, why were normal Public Service procedures of open selection not applied to this appointment?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The position is a contract appointment at executive level and, as the honourable member would recall, if he wished to recall, the former Government also made decisions in terms of transfer and placement of various people in CEO positions.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Not from outside the service.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In terms of the Public Service, all members of this place would applaud the appointment of Ms Winnie Pelz to the position. She has earlier worked in the department, she has worked in private enterprise, she is a craftsperson of great repute and she has chaired the position—

The Hon. Anne Levy: Why didn't you advertise?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: As the honourable member knows, there is no need under the rules of executive appointment to advertise such a position.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Even though she is a friend of yours?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: She is a friend of mine and she is a friend of many members opposite. She is certainly highly respected Australia-wide in this field.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Justice has been done and has been seen to be done. Her appointment has been welcomed warmly and applauded in South Australia and across the nation. In fact, she has great personal integrity and that is well recognised.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Even though she's a personal friend of yours, you didn't advertise.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am not sure what you mean by a 'personal friend'. I would not have seen Ms Pelz for three years. I spoke to her—

The Hon. Barbara Wiese interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: A friend? You said—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You said; you were the one—

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: You accused me of being a personal friend.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: Is she a personal friend?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: She is a friend as she is a personal friend of members opposite, and I am well aware of that. Her appointment is welcomed and it has been well received. She will bring great credit to the arts in an area where we need to have much more status, sparkle and activity than has been the case in the past few years.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Mr President, I asked two questions and the second one remains unanswered; I ask it again as a supplementary question. Why were the normal Public Service procedures of open selection not applied to this appointment? I invite the Minister to address the question.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: It is a contract position.

TRANSPORT MANAGER

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about the dismissal of the General Manager of the STA. At which Cabinet meeting did the Premier and Cabinet give its approval for the Minister to instruct the STA board to dismiss the General Manager?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The meeting of Cabinet was prior to my writing to members of the board. I wrote to members of the board on Thursday 27th, so I assume it was the Monday before.

CRAIGBURN FARM

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, a question about Craighburn Farm.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I have had a number of concerned residents of the Blackwood area come to me in recent times concerned about Craighburn Farm and the lack of any action at this stage by the present Government. Before the December 1993 State election, the Liberal Party said it had committed about \$9 million to buy the second stage of the Mitcham Hills land for use as open space, although it had made earlier commitments. In August 1985, the then member for Davenport, Mr Dean Brown, said in a letter to local residents that he strongly supported the retention of Craighburn Farm as open space for general community use. He said in that letter:

This land should not be subdivided for housing development. Any land not required by Minda Incorporated [the land's owner] for

a farm should be purchased by the State Government over a number of years and then that land should become part of the second generation parklands of Adelaide.

In July 1992 Dean Brown, then Opposition Leader, said in a press release that the Liberal Party supported the retention of the whole of the Craighburn property, including the development of open space for recreation. He said at this time:

It is scandalous that the Government can go back on its environmental commitments and neglect the importance of recreational areas to the community.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: If you do not mind, I am asking the question.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You always accuse people of selective quoting.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: You have not let me finish; just be patient, Mr Lucas. He said that, if moves to develop the northern section of the property proceeded, the Liberal Party supported the retention of the balance as open space. I have been told that at a meeting earlier this month the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, John Oswald, told the Save Craighburn Committee that the Government could not afford the money required to buy the whole of Craighburn Farm, and he said that would cost about \$50 million. That figure is at odds with calculations for the cost of land. Minda Incorporated told the Parliament's Environment, Resources and Development Committee that stage 1 would cost between \$13 million and \$15 million for 82 hectares, and there is a balance of 62 hectares which the Government seems to think it can buy for \$9 million. Residents are concerned that the Government may be trying to talk up the price of the land so the public believes it cannot find the money to buy the land.

None of the people who have approached me have suggested that Minda should not be compensated. I have been told that the Mitcham council and the Mitcham Hills community, through the Craighburn Recreation Park Community Trust, are prepared to help buy the land to prevent a 25 per cent increase in population, which will present significant infrastructure problems, including traffic chaos, further stormwater pollution of the Sturt River and eventually the Patawalonga, and other infrastructure problems. Any decision on Craighburn must also be taken in the light of the Liberal Government's commitment to cleaning up our urban waterways, noting that the Craighburn site is directly adjacent to Sturt Creek, which flows into the Patawalonga. Therefore, the type of development that is allowed on that land is crucial.

It is noted and the ERD Committee noted that the small housing blocks were inappropriate—at least those small blocks that are currently being applied for—and could significantly increase the amount of run-off and therefore contamination problems. There is a growing feeling in the community that the Government should intervene to allow alternative options to be explored for the uses of the land. I understand that some people have put forward a number of alternative uses; in particular, I believe that a developer could be interested in developing a golf course; there is the possibility of development of a wildlife sanctuary; a private secondary school is currently looking for a campus site; and there is also pressure for lower density housing. These options may require some Government contribution, but relatively little. Unfortunately, the previous Government did nothing even to allow those alternatives to be explored. I therefore ask:

1. What is the Minister's estimate of the cost of acquiring the whole of the Craighburn Farm development?

2. What commitment is the Government making now, other than to stage 2?

3. Will the Government intervene to allow lower impact alternatives in relation to stage 1 to be explored—something which has not been allowed to happen so far?

4. Is this an issue like the Hindmarsh Island bridge, where the Opposition made all the right noises before the election but immediately after the election found excuses not to do anything?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: What a cheap crack at the end of the honourable member's question. I will call him 'honourable' because it is procedure; it is required of me. In terms of the Hindmarsh Island bridge, the honourable member knows well that this Government acted immediately to assess all the contractual and financial arrangements that are required for this bridge. We have explored that matter at some length, and it will be debated in this place again when the feasibility of building a link to Hindmarsh Island at the site of the barrage is received by the Government. In a lengthy Ministerial statement I have outlined that this Government and taxpayers generally have an obligation we have inherited from the former Government to build a bridge of some form. In terms of Craighburn Farm, I will refer those questions to the Minister and bring back a reply. As a golfer, although I do not get much time to play golf, the idea of a golf course at that site does have some appeal.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the Minister that a reflection that a member might not be honourable is an injurious reflection and is not acceptable in here. All members are honourable in here, and I ask all members to remember that.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for the Arts about the Festival of Arts.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I refer the Minister's attention to the article in today's *Advertiser* entitled 'Call for annual festival'. In that article the Deputy Opposition Leader and the former Minister responsible for the Grand Prix, Mr Mike Rann, called for the Festival of Arts to adopt the following changes: first, that it should be held annually or that we should consider that; secondly, that we need to have artistic directors appointed for at least two consecutive festivals; and, thirdly, that the Government needs to appoint a truly national board. He is reported as saying that he believed that the board's principal function should be fund raising, and further that the artistic director must have real and unfettered independence. He goes on to say that the restructured national board would have to be active and not a passive advisory board with a few big names thrown in for status. He also says that an active national board would have a better chance of obtaining Federal funds and corporate sponsorship than a parochial board with a club-like image.

In addition, the Festival director, Mr Christopher Hunt, is reported as saying that the Festival needs to be re-examined. I also note that the Liberal Party released policies prior to the election, noting that the bi-annual festival is under-exposed and its pre-eminence is under threat from interstate competition. It was further announced that, in partnership with the board of governors, the Adelaide Festival and the Fringe will

assess initiatives that must be taken to maximise the value of both festivals to the State and nation, including the merits of staging an annual festival and the appointment of corporate representatives from interstate to both boards. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Does the Minister have any comment concerning the relevant newspaper article?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Well, when Mr Rann steals policies.

2. What action has already been taken by the Minister to implement Liberal Party policy?

3. What effect does the loss of the Grand Prix have on the future of the Festival of Arts and the Adelaide Fringe?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I thank the honourable member for his question and appreciate his concern for the Festival and for the arts in general in this State.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I have forwarded to all members of Parliament, Federal and State, the brochure for the Festival asking them not only to consider booking tickets but also paying for those tickets. I am well aware that that initiative was well supported by Liberal members. I am not too sure about members opposite. The replies that I have received are to the effect that most members paid for their tickets well beforehand and did not need any urging from me. Also, many have booked for the Fringe program, which is a critical part of this Festival.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I agree with the Leader that perhaps the Hon. Ms Levy should be silent for a moment. I have explored the issue of an annual festival for some time with former and current members of the board of governors. There are mixed views on the subject. The board of governors has had a committee looking at future options for the Festival. Liberal policies, as the honourable member noted, indicated support for an investigation of this issue with the Government working with the board of governors and expanding the board of governors' current committee. I was keen to expand that assessment of the future of the Festival on the basis of the Government's very strong contribution, financially and in other senses, to the Festival each year. I believe that on that basis we should have a strong say in the future direction of the Festival, not only as to whether it is an annual Festival.

It is important that we should gain a much stronger national focus. The Festival and, I believe, the board of governors have been inward looking for too long. The Premier has written to various men and women around Australia who have an interest in the arts and links with business in the wider community inviting them to this Festival. We shall be canvassing the idea of a national board in association with this current Festival.

Various options have been considered for a national board, whether or not that board has an active or passive role. My view is that we cannot ask individuals of such stature to have a passive role and be involved in fund raising. If they are to be involved at all, they should have a say and a sense of ownership in the Festival, including the appointment of the Artistic Director, but not necessarily a hands on day-to-day role which could easily be undertaken by a smaller executive.

Those matters will be explored further as part of an undertaking in Liberal policy to develop a Festivals policy, because one of the problems that this Festival, the arts, culture and industry have in general is that the Festivals have not in the past been coordinated in terms of promotion and

marketing. They must be in future if we are to help our tourism industry strongly and help the arts to develop in this State. That Festivals policy, including the exploration of an annual Festival and national perspective, will be developed as part of an arts and cultural development plan task force which I announced a couple of weeks ago. In the meantime, I would add that there are other options—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Is this a ministerial statement?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: No; these are notes that I have written. Otherwise I would be more fluent and not have to mention things as an afterthought. In my talks with people about this option, it has been suggested that if we do not go to an annual Festival straightaway, for a variety of sound reasons, there may be options of having an annual writers week, an annual artists week and an annual Fringe and having a bigger Festival with a WOMAD in those alternate years.

That option has been suggested to me and it has merit. I believe that this issue of an annual Festival requires a great deal of thought regarding funding considerations, management and administration. I must say as an aside that it has always disappointed me that Governments in this State could establish a huge secretariat for the Grand Prix and pay people plenty, but the Festival had to share staff with the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and there has always been considerable pressure, overlap and difficulty in that arrangement.

MUSICA VIVA

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts a question about national boards.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Following the previous answer that the Minister gave to the Dorothy Dix question on the Festival, I note that Musica Viva Australia has set up a national board of 23 members, of whom only five are women, but it is noticeable that the only South Australian on the board, only one of 23, is Mr Kym Bonython. I am in no way critical of Mr Bonython, who was selected by the Tonkin Government to head our sesquicentenary celebrations and was not removed from that position by the incoming Bannon Government. However, it is well known that Mr Bonython's predominant musical interests lie in the area of jazz, which is not an area with which Musica Viva has been very concerned in recent years.

Of great concern to me is that the national board established by Musica Viva includes the Director of the Festival of Perth, the Director of the Festival of Sydney and the Artistic Director of the Melbourne International Festival, but there is no such representation from South Australia. I appreciate the Minister's comments regarding national boards, but will she take up those concerns with Musica Viva regarding South Australian representation on the national board for Musica Viva which plays such an important role in the musical life of this city?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will certainly pursue those issues. I noted that Musica Viva had established a national structure, and I understand its reasons for doing so. Essentially, that is why we are exploring the same structure for the Festival in South Australia. It is disappointing to me, as it is to the honourable member, that South Australia is so badly represented. I suppose it is a reflection on our status in the arts today. When we think of the Dunstan years and the high points then, supported later by the Tonkin years and the

many initiatives during that time, it is a sad reflection on the low ebb that we have reached in the arts that we have not been accepted at this national level for Musica Viva.

I nevertheless strongly believe that many South Australians could make a strong contribution in addition to Mr Bonython, who is a wonderful supporter of the arts but who no longer has some of the administrative input into policy and other matters that he once did. He could also be well supported by the contributions of other South Australians at this level.

The PRESIDENT: Call on the business of the day.

MINING

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I move:

1. That this Council recognises the significant public concern in relation to:

- a. a recent attempt to implode a cave at Sellicks Hill;
- b. massive leakage of water from tailings dams at Roxby Downs.

2. That the Standing Committee on Environment, Resources and Development be instructed to examine the above matters, make recommendations as to further actions and in particular comment on the desirability of the Department of Mines and Energy having prime responsibility for environmental matters in relation to mining operations.

This motion aims to pick up two issues that have been important in the public arena in recent months and give an opportunity for those to be explored by the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. I will look today at these two issues. It is not my intention to pass judgment too much in debating the matter. I wish to establish that issues of significance exist which deserve further attention, rather than trying to make a speech today that reaches a final conclusion on who did the right thing or the wrong thing.

The two issues that I wish to address relate to the attempt to implode a cave at Sellicks Hill on 10 December last year and a recently announced significant leakage of water from tailings dams at Roxby Downs. The first issue that I will address is that of the implosion of the cave.

The cave in question is on private property owned by Southern Quarries Pty Ltd and, as I understand it, it falls within the electorate of the Premier, the Hon. Dean Brown. I am told that a 200 year supply of material is available without touching the cavernous northern area of the quarry, although it is worth noting that the southern end has a heavy overburden resulting in fewer caves and an increase in the extraction costs. I am told that considerable material was stockpiled before the blast on 10 December.

The history in relation to this issue I understand goes back to September 1991, when the Cave Exploration Group of South Australia was approached by a consultant mining specialist acting on behalf of Southern Quarries Pty Ltd. He asked the Cave Exploration Group to explore and report back on a small cavern that had been broken into as a new deep bench was being cast at the Sellicks Hill quarry. It was quickly found that the cavern was only the start of a series of extremely well decorated chambers of much larger dimensions.

The Cave Exploration Group had a total of six trips into the cave over the following two months. During these months they surveyed approximately one kilometre of passages and

took photographs (which I have had the opportunity to see) and a video of the parts of the cave they had explored. The last of these trips was on 26 October 1991. Southern Quarries decided that it would not allow the cavers back in because of the problem of liability.

Most of 1992 and 1993 were spent by the cavers negotiating the issue of access, insurance and liability to allow resumption of exploration. The company also requested that the cavers not inform any persons of the existence of the cave. The cavers agreed to this request provided that assurances were given that the quarry management would take all steps necessary to ensure the cave's preservation, that access would continue in order to monitor the cave and that the cavers would give advice to management where appropriate.

It has since been learnt that the company used the issues of insurance and secrecy as a cover over a period of time to gather information on the location of the cave and set about its destruction—or at least this is the allegation being made to me. The cavers provided to the company a copy of the map they had made and a report on their exploration and spent time talking with the company's consulting geologist, Professor David Stapledon, over the location of the cave in relation to the quarry floor.

No access was granted to the cavers in 1992 and 1993. On 10 December 1993 the company attempted to implode the 'big room', as it was called by the cavers. I understand that the 'big room' measured 70 metres by 20 metres by 25 metres. The company stated that the reason it had chosen to blast was due to a requirement to maintain the safety of the quarry. The cavers found this reason untenable as the quarry owners had known about the existence of the 'big room' in late 1991 and had taken action not to drive over it for two years.

On 25 January the Department of Environment and Natural Resources informed the South Australian Speleological Council that on 27 and 28 January an inquiry into the facts would occur in Adelaide at the Fullarton Community Centre. The inquiry would be open only to those parties involved in the case, namely, the cavers, Southern Quarries and their consultants and the Department of Mines and Energy. Two independent assessors, Mr Ken Grimes, a geomorphologist, and Mr Adrian Moore, a rock engineer, were called in to review the material presented and advise the Minister on what should be done. The results of the inquiry are not currently known, although it has been suggested that the results could be released today or within the next couple of days.

Why is the cave important? According to the cavers, the Sellicks Hill quarry cave is in Cambrian limestone. It is older than that of the Naracoorte caves, which have been nominated for world heritage listing. The cave contains very rare—at least for Australia—aragonite crystal speleothems and windblown silt, which experts believe to have been deposited during the last ice age and may contain significant fossil material to complement that found in Naracoorte. The extent of the speleothems in the cave is also rare for South Australia, and the close proximity of the cave to the City of Adelaide makes it most suitable for development as a tourist destination.

The experience of speleologists in Australia and overseas is that when limestone is subjected to blasting it does not follow the models expounded for blasting impacts on rock. Limestone is by its nature spongy and has the capacity to absorb the impacts of a blast. At Mount Etna in Queensland, Central Queensland Cement blasted a cave and stated, as has Southern Quarries, that nothing is left. At Mount Etna

speleologists were able to get back into the cave and film it. They proved that little damage had occurred due to the blast. The situation at Sellicks Hill quarry cave is similar, and the only way to ascertain the impact of the blast and the significance of the cave is to obtain access back into it and carry out an independent scientific investigation.

I note that in an answer to a question yesterday, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw said:

The company, with the full knowledge and support of the Department of Mines and Energy, imploded a cavity under the main haulage road on 10 December 1993.

In case members have forgotten, that is precisely one day before the last State election. Some might suggest a strange coincidence. The more cynical might suggest it was timed so that the least notice would be taken because there really was not a Government in effect at that stage and, besides, everybody was sidetracked on the issue of the election itself. I note that the Minister also said in her answer:

It is regrettable that relevant officers of the Heritage Branch of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and the National Parks and Wildlife Service were not involved in assisting in the decision making process.

I think a lot of people would agree that that is regrettable. I do note that it appears that mining operations are the one lot of operations in South Australia in relation to environmental matters that are not subject either to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources or to the Environment Protection Agency. In this case, their responsibilities lie directly with the Department of Mines and Energy. I note that as a matter of concern and note that the Department of Mines and Energy chose not to inform the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, it appears, of its intentions. If I am wrong, I am quite happy to be advised of that fact.

All I wished to do at this stage was establish that there are claims that there was a significant cave that may or may not have been damaged. As to why it happened, that is a question I cannot answer now; I only have suspicions. As to whether or not they were successful in damaging the cave, we do not know. What should happen from now is still an open question. I think it is something that the ERD Committee can look at. It is a committee that has proven itself capable of treating such issues impartially in the past and I would expect it could do so again.

The second issue that I wish to refer to the ERD Committee concerns the recent reports of leakage of water from the tailings dams at Roxby Downs. I understand that up to five million cubic metres of water has leaked from the tailings dams at Roxby Downs. That in itself could be a cause for concern because of the fears that perhaps heavy metals or radioactive material may have moved with that water and presented a more dangerous situation. I do not know at this stage that a dangerous situation has in fact occurred. It may turn out that it has not. But there are some more fundamental questions to ask which do not relate to Roxby Downs itself but we can learn from the experience of what happened at Roxby Downs.

As I understand it, the tailings dams at Roxby Downs had no purpose built monitoring. There was nothing under the dams to intercept any leakage water. For instance, if they had used slot drains or tiled drains or something like that, any leakage through the floor of the dam could have been intercepted and immediately picked up. Instead, it appears that the leakage had been happening for quite some years. In fact, if we look at reports, there was a suspicion that some-

thing may have been happening but nobody was too sure why.

So, there was nothing constructed under the dam to intercept or monitor and nor were there any purpose placed interception wells anywhere around the tailings dams. The only wells they were using were holes drilled in the near vicinity for other purposes. When they started finding water in the bottom of some of those holes, they did not have the faintest idea why the water was there. In fact, they were suggesting for sometime that it was due to heavy rainfall events. There had been a couple of wet years and they thought that perhaps the water that was emerging in the bottom of these wells was due to that. That says something about the way the wells themselves were operating. Either they did not have a cover on them or they were allowing water to run directly into them or whatever. It was quite a bizarre claim to make when you realise what else was happening.

In the immediate vicinity of the mine, the groundwater level has dropped eight metres. If you go an equal distance from the mine in any direction other than in the direction of the tailings dam, the water level has dropped eight metres. It is a draw-down effect. Because the mine goes through the aquifer, obviously water will tend to run in it; they pump it away, but there is a draw-down, so the level adjacent to the mine goes down. However, adjacent to the tailings dam, it appears that the water level is now 10 metres higher than it was before. They have been talking in terms of a 10 metre rise, but when we consider that elsewhere there has been a draw-down of eight metres the water level is in fact 18 metres higher than it otherwise would have been. They were trying to say for some time that this might have been because they had a few wet years. What does that say about the standard of monitoring?

For some years they had been reporting that there seemed to be a bit more water there, but they did not know where it was coming from. They were a bit vague as to where it was coming from, but eventually it got to the point where they could no longer deny that there was a leak. They are now drilling purpose built monitoring bores around the dam which they are lining to particular depths so they can do proper monitoring. I ask the question: why, when the dam was built, did it not have structures beneath it and around it which would detect leakage if it occurred? That is bad design. People would go further. I know that Friends of the Earth, in material they have sent to me, say that the whole design of the dam was prone to leakage anyway. They were really reliant upon the clay that was *in situ* and they simply bulldozed a bit up at the sides over some sand walls they had built to create lining for the dam. It really was not a particularly well designed dam. They simply relied on the existing clay structures which were there and then tried to seal it off more by the way they ran the sediments into the dam. I will not go through explaining that procedure, but they hoped that that would seal it off more. The important thing is that it did not work.

I want to know why we can have such a badly designed dam, why we can have such a badly monitored dam, and why the warning signs could be ignored for so long. They are some important questions. The point to me at this stage is not whether or not a dangerous situation has arisen, although it would be nice to know—my suspicion at this stage is that it has not, in relation to the leak, anyway—but how these things could have gone so wrong. How confident can we be about other operations around the State which may be in more

sensitive areas? For instance, do we have an operation which is running over a watertable which is being used? This particular watertable is more saline than the sea, so it is not being used for any particular use other than wetting down roads in the area. However, if it had been over an artesian basin or if it had been near sensitive waterways, we could have had a greater problem. One only needs to look at the sorts of problems they have had in the Northern Territory with a couple of their mines where tailings dams have overflowed and found their way into the natural environment and created other problems.

So, without exploring the rights and wrongs, although there are some fairly obvious ones there, this is an issue of significance. It is one that deserves to be looked at. We should examine it and make recommendations as to further actions. The Department of Mines and Energy was the responsible department. We must ask ourselves the question as to whether or not it is right and proper that that particular department should be monitoring environmental aspects. I know of people working within the department who are absolutely horrified by the attitude within the department where it is largely that people who are concerned about the environment are a nuisance. There are many members in all Parties who believe that development and the environment in many cases can co-exist, but it does not help when people who are keen to get a development just deny that they can create other problems.

That is the mind fix in the Department of Mines and Energy. It has been noticeable in this place for a long time that whenever we debate legislation that affects mining, the Department of Mines and Energy has been very busy making sure that it maintains total control. It maintains control of environmental monitoring and it maintains control of occupational health and safety standards at Roxby Downs. I think it may be involved at Leigh Creek, which is another issue that has been raised in this place recently. I believe that it may have been failing in its duties because it has allowed one duty to get in the road of another. I may be wrong in relation to that but let us say that they have had two slip-ups in a period of about two months, and that is not good and it deserves attention, no matter what final findings or recommendations are made. Mr Acting President, I ask other members in the Chamber to support the motion.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS (OUTWORKERS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ANNE LEVY obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Relations Act (SA) 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is being introduced to provide minimum safety net provisions for workers who are currently excluded from the Industrial Commission, as they are not technically classed as employees, though it is patently obvious that they are in fact employees. The Bill seeks to have classified as employees those outworkers who perform clerical duties in their own homes, those who provide freelance journalistic services, those who undertake telephone promotion duties from their own homes on behalf of somebody else, and those who deliver promotional material on behalf of somebody else.

When classed as employees in the outworker definitions in the Industrial Relations Act these workers will have the right, should they so wish, to apply to the Industrial Commission for minimum award conditions to be set in law.

The workers referred to in these categories are predominantly, though not exclusively, women workers. These workers are often in a weak bargaining position and currently lack the protections enjoyed by other employees. All members of Parliament will have received complaints from individuals in these categories of employment who feel they are being exploited and who have no means of redress available to them.

Indeed, as a Minister last year I was frequently approached by members of the then Opposition on behalf of constituents of theirs—in particular, the member for Newland in another place vociferously demanded that protection be provided for her constituents who were being paid as little as \$2 an hour. Other members can cite examples of work being done and payment never being received, with the worker having no redress other than expensive litigation through the civil courts, which, of course, is beyond their means. It is to redress the potential for gross exploitation of these workers that this Bill is designed.

I have mentioned that the vast majority of these outworkers are women. The Australian Bureau of Statistics indicated that in 1989, 40 per cent of 266 000 people employed at home were clerical workers, nearly all of them women. Reports from the International Labour Organisation show how developments in computer based technology are leading to a proliferation of information handling work away from the office environment, and research has shown that this has the potential for exploitation that would not be tolerated by our industrial relations system at a regular workplace. Merely because the work has moved from commercial premises we should not tolerate exploitation and below minimum standard conditions.

I hardly need remind members that these days the two income family is more common than the one income family, that 54 per cent of women are in the work force (compared to 75 per cent of men) and that the great majority of mothers with young children are working either part-time or full-time. Many of these mothers wish to continue their paid work with caring for their children, and an increasing number do so by working from home. These are the ones who will be helped by this Bill, who will be classified as the employees that they in fact are, and so have access to the protection awarded to workers by the Industrial Commission.

While the Bill is gender neutral in its wording, it will not be gender neutral in its effects, like so much legislation passed by this Parliament. It is often assumed that an Act will be gender neutral in its effects because it does not relate specifically to either men or women, but this ignores the fact that particular legislation may have a much greater impact on one sex than the other. This Bill is certainly not gender neutral in its effects, as the exploited workers it seeks to protect are predominantly female. They are workers who deserve the protection and assistance which this Parliament has provided to others and should provide to them. I commend the Bill to the Council. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 6—Interpretation

Clause 2 relates to the definitions under the Act. The definition of 'employee' is to be amended to include any person engaged for personal reward to distribute various items by going from place to place, or by handing the items to passing members of the public, where the items are supplied free of charge.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 7—Outworkers

Clause 3 will include some new categories of persons as 'outworkers' under section 7 of the Act. The proposed new categories are people who provide clerical services, people who carry out various marketing activities by telephone, and people who perform a journalistic service or public relations service.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADELAIDE TO DARWIN RAILWAY LINE

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I move:

1. That recognising that the completion of the Adelaide to Darwin railway line is of prime importance to the prosperity of South Australia and the Northern Territory and that its completion enjoys the support of all political Parties—Liberal, Labor, and Democrat—the South Australian Parliament supports the setting up of a joint South Australian/Northern Territory Parliamentary Committee to promote all steps necessary to have the line completed as expeditiously as possible.

2. This Council respectfully requests the House of Assembly to support this measure and that the Presiding Officers approach the Presiding Officer of the Northern Territory Parliament with the aim of establishing the joint multi-Party committee and to arrange a secretariat to the committee.

In moving to establish a parliamentary committee jointly with the Northern Territory Parliament to work towards the completion of the Adelaide to Darwin railway, I seek not only the vote of all members in support of my motion but an active commitment by members to actually help get the railway built. In speaking to the motion, I do not intend to spend too much time detailing the many arguments in favour of the completion of the railway. Indeed, the completion of the project has enjoyed tripartisan support in this State for many years, but there is one central point of significance that I must stress and that is simply that this project may well be the single most important step we take this decade to boost our economy, to provide real jobs for our children and to boost our self confidence as South Australians and our belief in what we can achieve.

I acknowledge the promises made by the Premier, Mr Brown, to commit \$100 million of South Australian Government money for feasibility studies and to continue to make private representations to the Federal Government for more funding for the railway. I do not question the Government's sincerity in wanting this project to go ahead. As I have already said, the project has enjoyed tripartisan support in this State for some time. I simply wish to remind honourable members that such private representations have been made by South Australian Governments and other parties for most of this century, yet we still do not have this rail link, which was promised to us so many years ago.

Members will be aware that committees of inquiry have investigated the Adelaide to Darwin railway previously. I propose that this committee would act as a lobby, a lobby that develops and implements a strategy for the completion of the rail link and gains concrete funding commitments from the private sector and the Federal Government. Securing this funding is the next and most important step in the completion of this project. I believe a committee of the type I am proposing is the best way to achieve this next goal, since

commitments will not be subject to political whim and will not be broken in the event of a change in Government.

A few recent developments have made it imperative that South Australia get its act together quickly on the Darwin rail link and extinguish the perception that South Australia has been a squib State on the issue. First, during the Federal election campaign last year the Prime Minister, Mr Keating, argued, quite astoundingly, that the completion of the rail link would be of no benefit to South Australians. He said the link would operate in practice to join Darwin and Melbourne, so most of the benefits would flow to Victoria and that South Australia would miss out because few trains would stop in Adelaide and other Australian cities. We must not let the Federal Government continue its apathy towards the needs of South Australia.

Secondly, there are rival moves to establish a railway line through Queensland, linking the eastern seaboard to Darwin and bypassing South Australia. This could well mean that South Australia will miss out on this enormous opportunity, an opportunity which has been there for the grabbing for the best part of 100 years.

Finally, South Australia seems set for another difficult tussle for funding with the Federal Government. Given that the Federal Government is of a different political persuasion from that of the South Australia Government, it would be easy to dismiss claims for funding the railway on partisan grounds. A committee supported by two Parliaments would be much harder for the Federal Government to resist. I admit that the proposal is unique. Setting up a committee between two different Parliaments has not been done before, as far as I know, but that should not stop us. Only yesterday in the Address in Reply debate we were reminded of the motion 100 years ago that gave women the right to stand for Parliament. No Parliament anywhere in the world had done that before, yet the South Australian Parliament did not allow that to stop it.

In moving this motion, I ask members not to let history repeat itself and to recognise that the case for the railway has been proved and that no other tactics, no other committees or conferences have been successful in getting us this railway line which is legally and morally ours. I ask that we join together, not only in support of the motion but in an active commitment to finally complete this vital project, the Adelaide to Darwin railway.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA secured the adjournment of the debate.

**REAL PROPERTY (MISCELLANEOUS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Real Property Act 1886; and to make consequential amendments to the Strata Titles Act 1988. Read a first time.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal objects of this Bill are to amend the *Real Property Act 1886* to rationalise and streamline dealings with easements, the registration processes of land division under Part XIXAB of the Act and the strata titling of land under the *Strata Titles Act 1988*. To achieve this, the Bill adds a number or provisions to Part VIII of the Act dealing with easements, replaces Divisions I, II and IV of Part XIXAB of the Act and makes consequential amendments to the *Strata*

Titles Act 1988. The Bill also makes some minor procedural changes to a number of sections of the Act.

The Bill addresses two principal areas of concern. First, problems are often faced by land owners in the creation, variation and extinguishment of all types of easements. One of the amendments to the *Real Property Act 1886* proposed by this Bill (see section 90c) will enable a person to grant an easement to himself or herself. At present this is only possible in relation to an easement created as a condition of approval endorsed on a plan of division lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office after 12 September 1985 or a strata plan lodged after 1 September 1988. The main types of easement envisaged under the new provision will relate to rights-of-way, water supply and drainage.

The Bill also provides (see section 90b(1)) that any easement may, on application by the owner of the dominant or servient land, and with the consent of all other persons having a registered estate and interest in the land, be extinguished, varied in position or dimensions or have its appurtenance extended.

The Bill also provides (see section 90b(5)) that an easement can be extinguished or varied in position where it is proven to the satisfaction of the Registrar-General that the owner of the easement, or the owner of land subject to the easement, cannot be found, and that the use of the easement has been abandoned. This will help overcome difficulties faced by land owners who want an unused easement expunged from a certificate of title. This provision replaces existing section 90a of the principal Act.

The Bill also aims to prevent disputes arising between dominant and servient owners of easements by ensuring that the physical occupation of the easement on the ground and its registered position on a certificate of title coincide. Problems of this nature will not arise if the easement is surveyed at the time of its creation. The Bill gives authority to the Registrar-General to require a survey from a licensed surveyor when an easement is created or varied. This will ensure that the service provided by the easement has been located on the ground and is accurately fixed on the generating plan or, in the case of a proposed easement, its position has been fixed on the ground by the placement of survey marks.

This will assist a person engaged to construct the easement service on or in the ground in its correct position and the owners of the right to identify the position of the easement accurately. The provision is not intended to be applied to simple easements that may be located on or near a title or other surveyed cadastral boundary line, but rather to easements that are extensive and wind through the site unrelated to any boundary.

The existence of private rights of way over public streets has caused problems in the division or strata titling of land. The original intention of granting rights of way over streets in a plan of division (which did not vest in a council) was to restrict access to owners of land in that plan. These rights are extinguished on declaration of a public street under section 303 of the *Local Government Act 1934*, or when a public street is closed under the *Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991*. Some allotments after division are no longer contiguous with the streets over which they have rights and many owners are unaware of the existence of rights of way over public streets on their certificates of title.

As land is divided into more and more allotments or units of land, the number of land parcels that retain a private right over a public street increases. The Registrar-General has for

many years somewhat relieved those problems by not carrying them forward onto certificates of title generated by the division or strata titling of land, as they are considered to be a duplication of public rights over a street. Those rights of way still exist, however, in a partially cancelled certificate of title.

This Bill simply provides that a private right of way cannot exist over a public street or road (see section 90e). This provision will result in cost savings for the public and the Lands Titles Registration Office. There will also be a saving to councils, the owners of public streets. At present, when a need arises to extinguish private rights over public streets, the extinguishment requires a separate dealing to be transacted between the council and each dominant owner. The provision will also assist in the conversion of manual certificates of title to the Torrens Automated Titles System, TATS (computerised titles system) environment by allowing the cancellation of certificates of title left uncancelled because of a private right remaining as the balance of the land in that title.

The second principal area addressed by the Bill is that of land division. Currently, there are two legislative processes to be followed to enable the issue of separate certificates of title under the *Real Property Act 1886*. First, development approval must be gained under the *Development Act 1993* and, secondly, application must be made to the Registrar-General for the deposit of a plan of division in the Lands Titles Registration Office under Part XIXAB of the *Real Property Act*. The Bill seeks to replace Divisions I, II and IV of Part XIXAB incorporating a number of minor and major changes designed to streamline the plan deposit and associated registration processes.

The present Part requires application to be made to the Registrar-General for the deposit of a plan of division and, where conditions of approval apply, such as the creation, extinguishment or variation in position of easements and/or the transfer of land between adjacent land owners, those conditions can only be fulfilled by the production of separate instruments to be registered under the *Real Property Act 1886*. These conditions may involve the registration of a transfer of land between neighbours, the grant/extinguishment or variation of an easement or the discharge or variation in the security of a registered mortgage or encumbrance (including a Land Management or Heritage Agreement). All of these instruments cause extra expense and a likelihood for a delay in the registration process due to errors that frequently occur in the often complex property descriptions contained within them.

The Bill provides that, where there are such dealings, they occur by vesting automatically as required by the plan on its deposit in the Lands Titles Registration Office. The owners of registered estates and interests in the land must consent to the deposit of the plan in an accompanying application. The Bill also provides that the application for division and the plan together form a single instrument, whether there are necessary essential transactions or not, and will, by necessity, have the same order of priority of registration as an instrument under section 56 of the *Real Property Act*.

The new provisions will allow a plan of division to be lodged either with, or prior to, the application, depending on the wishes of parties to the application. This will allow any property settlement or advance of moneys by lending institutions, that may be required before deposit, to be made on an approved copy of the plan of division. This will

continue the current practices of the lending institutions and conveyancers.

At the present time, certificates of approval of the South Australian Planning Commission and a council and a Land Division certificate issued under the Development Act 1993 expire on the first anniversary of issue under the relevant Act but have an unlimited life once lodged with the Registrar-General under the Real Property Act. It is an unfortunate consequence that developers use this fact to make application to the Registrar-General and allow the application to sit for several years and use the Lands Titles Registration Office as a repository for proposed divisions to be finalised later at their convenience. This practice, although lawful, defeats the spirit of the present Part, the Development Act and the State Development Plan.

This Bill provides that, once lodged with the Registrar-General, a certificate under section 51 of the Development Act 1993 will expire under the Real Property Act on the first anniversary of the date of lodgement. The Bill also provides that the Registrar-General may extend the life of a certificate. It is intended that any such extension will only be given where there is some genuine reason that prevents an applicant from attending to requisitions to a plan or application once lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office due to circumstances beyond his or her control; for example, a legal impediment that cannot be resolved until probate is given or a court order is made.

The Bill inserts a schedule (the First Schedule) into the principal Act. Clause 1 of this schedule provides a means to rid the Torrens Register of unwanted plans of resubdivision filed or deposited in the Lands Titles Registration Office prior to the commencement of the present Part XIXAB, namely, 4 November 1982. Where any land is the subject of a plan of resubdivision pursuant to the Planning and Development Act 1966 or any previous Act, and the plan is subject to a condition of approval that remains unfulfilled in respect of all or some of the allotments created by the plan, the Registrar-General may give the owner at least two months to fulfil the condition.

If the condition is not fulfilled in the time given, the Registrar-General may cancel the plan or the relevant part of it. A plan of this type will prevent the owner from dealing with the land unless the condition is fulfilled or a fresh plan of division is made to cancel the condition. Clause 1(2) of the first schedule enables a land owner who wishes to deal with his or her land to request withdrawal of a plan of resubdivision at any time. This provision will save that owner considerable expense in cancelling the effect of the plan by submitting a new proposal by way of fresh land division.

A further matter addressed by the Bill concerns a large number of existing applications for the deposit of a plan of division that are held unapproved and undeposited by the Lands Titles Registration Office. These applications have outstanding requisitions, relating to inconsistencies and errors in the application or plan, forwarded by the Registrar-General to the lodging party for their attention, and remain unattended. Many of these plans have been lodged on the principle that certificates of approval have an unlimited life once lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office. It is believed that many applications in this category have been lodged with deliberate errors and left in the Land Titles Registration Office unattended in order to thwart possible changes to the Development Plan.

It is therefore proposed to clear these applications from the system by providing that a Certificate of Approval issued

under the Planning Act 1982 or a Land Division Certificate issued under section 51 of the Development Act 1993 will expire on the second anniversary of the commencement of this Part unless the Registrar-General consents to an extension to that time (see clause 2(2) of the first schedule). Extension will only be given where it is shown that any delay to attendance of requisitions of the Lands Titles Registration Office has been prevented by a circumstance beyond the control of the land owner. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 33—Procedure under second class

This clause amends section 33 of the principal Act. That section requires that notice of an application to bring land under the *Real Property Act 1886* must be published four times in the *Gazette* if the land is not subject to a mortgage or encumbrance or, if the land is subject to a mortgage or encumbrance, the mortgagee or encumbrancee has joined in or consented to the application. The Registrar-General is of the view that four publications of the notice is excessive and that one would be sufficient in these circumstances. The amendment reduces the number of times the notice must be published from four to one.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 89—Short form of describing right-of-way

Section 89 of the principal Act provides a "short form" relating to rights-of-way that can be used in the drafting of an instrument and will have the effect of the longer form contained in the fifth schedule of the Act. In some instruments the first two words of the short form, namely "together with" are not appropriate and the purpose of this clause is to remove those words. If they are needed they can be added without any detriment to the meaning of the long form.

Clause 5: Substitution of s. 90a

This clause replaces section 90a of the principal Act with five new sections all dealing with easements. New section 90a provides for the application of the following four sections. Section 90b provides for the variation and extinguishment of easements. Subsection (2) requires that the proprietors of the dominant and servient land and all persons who have or claim an interest in that land must agree with the proposal. Subsections (3), (4) and (5) spell out circumstances in which that agreement can be dispensed with. Under subsection (3) the Registrar-General can dispense with the consent of a person whose interest will not be detrimentally affected. Subsection (4) is one example of this. Because of subsequent subdivisions it sometimes happens that easement rights cannot be exercised because the dominant land is separated from the servient land by intervening land. Subsection (5) has been discussed in my general comments on the Bill. Subsections (6), (7) and (8) form a bracket of provisions dealing with a problem that arises if dominant land is transferred without the easement. Such a transfer leaves the easement unattached with no-one able to exercise rights under it. These three subsections solve this problem. The purpose of subsection (9) is to require planning approval before an easement that was originally created to satisfy the requirements of a planning authority can be varied or extinguished. Sections 90c, 90d and 90e have already been discussed.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 100—New certificate to purchaser and balance certificate to registered proprietor

This clause amends section 100 of the principal Act. Section 100 requires the Registrar-General to keep cancelled or partially cancelled certificates of title. Members of the public frequently request that such certificates be given to them because of their interest in the history of the land concerned. This amendment removes from the section the requirement that the Registrar-General must keep the certificate and consequently the Registrar-General will be able to give such a certificate to an interested person under section 220(10).

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 141—Procedure for foreclosure applications

This clause amends section 141 of the principal Act which requires a notice offering land for sale to be published in the *Government Gazette* on four occasions before a foreclosure order can be made. Once again the Registrar-General considers this to be excessive and the amendment reduced the number of times the notice must be published to one.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 220—Powers of Registrar-General
This clause makes a number of amendments to section 220 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) amends paragraph (9) of the section by giving the Registrar-General a discretion as to the public notice to be given of the intended registration of an instrument without production of the duplicate certificate of title. Paragraph (b) amends paragraph (10) by giving the Registrar-General the option of delivering a superseded document to an appropriate person. At the moment the Registrar-General's only option is to destroy the document. Paragraph (c) makes a consequential change to paragraph (10).

Clause 9: Substitution of Divisions I, II and IV of Part XIXAB
This clause replaces Divisions I, II and IV of Part XIXAB of the principal Act. New Division I is largely the same as the old Division. Subsections (1) and (2) of section 223b have been changed and a new subsection (3) added. These changes are to cater for the fact that some certificates of title include a part allotment in which case the various allotments in the certificate can be dealt with separately so long as the part allotment remains contiguous with one of them. New subsection (3) provides for those cases where a part allotment is included in a certificate but is not contiguous with the full allotments in the certificate. The definition of "allotment" has been deleted from old subsection (7) in consequence of these changes.

Section 223d is similar to the existing provision. New subsection (10) is a corollary of section 223e. That section provides that where a plan of division or an application states that an estate or interest is vested or is discharged or extinguished that estate or interest will be vested or discharged or extinguished on deposit of the plan without the need to register a supplementary instrument. The purpose of section 223d(10) is to ensure that the requirements of the *Real Property Act* as to instruments that register that kind of dealing (for instance a transfer) are complied with if land is transferred by means of deposit of a plan of division. The purpose of section 223e(3) is to limit the use of plans of division for vesting land.

Sections 223f and 223g are similar to existing provisions. Subsection (6) of section 223f is new and is a "tidying up" provision. Where an easement is appurtenant to land part of which becomes a road or street there is usually no point in the easement remaining appurtenant to the road or street. This subsection provides that it ceases to be appurtenant unless the plan states that it will remain appurtenant. The width of the easement for electricity purposes in section 223g(3) has been extended from 4 to 10 metres. Four metres has been found to be too narrow.

Section 223h provides for consent to plans of division and section 223i ensures that a plan of division that effects a number of transactions will be regarded as constituting a number of separate instruments for the purpose of stamp duty.

Division III replaces existing Division IV with a couple of additional provisions. New subsection (3) of section 223j requires the consent of certain persons to the amalgamation of allotments. Where a mortgagee or encumbrancee has a mortgage or encumbrance over only one of the allotments to be amalgamated it is important that he or she consents because the amalgamation will affect the power of sale under the mortgage or encumbrance. New subsection (5) provides for a method by which the appurtenance of an easement can be extended to the whole of the amalgamated land.

Clause 10: Repeal of section 223lm to 223lo
This clause repeals sections 223lm (see clause 4 of the first schedule inserted by clause 11 of the Bill), 223ln (see new section 223lg) and section 223lo (see new section 223le).

Clause 11: Insertion of first schedule
This clause inserts certain transitional provisions as the first schedule to the principal Act. Clause 3 of the schedule is the transitional equivalent of new section 223lf(6). The other provisions of the schedule have already been discussed.

Clause 12: Amendment of fifth schedule
This clause makes an amendment to the fifth schedule that is consequent on the amendment to section 89 made by clause 4 of the Bill.

The schedule makes consequential amendments to the *Strata Titles Act 1988*.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 22 February. Page 113.)

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and thank Her Excellency the Governor for her opening address to this Forty-Eighth Parliament. In doing so I reaffirm my allegiance to the Queen of Australia and to her representative, Her Excellency the Governor.

I wish also to extend my condolences to the families of the late Hon. Jessie Cooper and the late Hon. John Burdett. Although I had met her, I did not know Mrs Cooper well. However, the Hon. John Burdett served in this place with my father for a number of years and for a short time with me. When I entered Parliament in August last year, Mr Burdett assured me that his office door would always be open to me, and that proved to be the case. He had the knack of explaining quite complex legal matters in layman's terms, and I am grateful to have had his assistance for much too short a time. I extend my sympathy to his wife Jean and family.

I would also like to express my deep sorrow at the news I received today of the death of Mr Grant Oldfield in an air accident. Mr Oldfield comes from Cowarie Station on the Birdsville Track. Many will remember that his cousin Kevin was killed in similar circumstances in late 1992. Indeed, Kevin's widow Mary and Grant's now widow Sharon are close personal friends and have supported each other over a number of years and through a number of trials. As you, Mr President, know, the people of the North are a special breed, typified no more by anyone I know than the Oldfields, who have lived on the Birdsville Track for several generations and who have been true caretakers of the land. I have no doubt this tragedy will have devastated the people of the area. I extend my deep sympathy to Grant's widow Sharon and to their young family and also to the people of that isolated community.

It is a great pleasure for me to be delivering this Address in Reply speech under a new Liberal Government—the first Liberal Government for 11 years and only the second in 20 years. I wish publicly to congratulate Dean Brown and his team on their huge success, but I would also like to take a little time to thank the unsung heroes: the rank and file Party members who have worked so hard for so long towards this win, and the unsuccessful candidates—the people who stood and those who campaigned in safe Labor seats—and who must be feeling quite disheartened now.

However, it is the efforts of these people which are largely responsible for seeing the election of the Hon. Angus Redford from No. 6 on our ticket and very nearly seeing the election of Penny Reader-Harris at No. 7. Had that happened, it would have created history. To steal from a now famous quote, 'This was a victory for the true believers,' and I thank them all.

Having won the election, the time for euphoria is over and we must now get down to the task of governing. We have inherited not only an exorbitant debt but also a general malaise. For too long people have had rights instead of responsibilities; for too long people have grappled with and eventually succumbed to unemployment; and for too long small business, investors and employers have been stifled by red tape and an overbearing, over-large Government bureaucracy. It is our responsibility now to take the blinkers off and allow people to get on with the job.

That the people of South Australia have been eagerly waiting for the opportunity to do just that—get on with the job—is evidenced by the fact that 1 500 inquiries were made

to the Department of Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development in the first four weeks after the release of our new jobs package. I believe that inquiries have continued at a similar rate.

It is exciting and challenging to realise that we are part of a new era, and our first task is to change perceptions in the electorate, to encourage people to produce, to help themselves and to help others. I look forward to playing my part in working for the new Brown Liberal Government.

An area of concern for me, Mr President, is the population drain from rural Australia. You, Sir, may have read the article 'Farewell to the Heartland' by Julian Cribb in the *Australian* magazine of 12 February. In this article he quotes some disturbing figures. A survey of population trends by Coopers & Lybrand in 1990-91 shows 240 of Australia's 849 shires and municipalities as losing population, and of these 88 per cent were in rural areas. Between them they lost 900 residents in 1990-91 alone, and this is a slide which has been continuing since the mid-1970s.

Cribb names the Yorke and Eyre Peninsulas and the Mid North of South Australia as areas of concern, and I concur with his statements. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics census, the population on Eyre Peninsula declined from 33 644 in 1986 to 31 968 in 1992. Cribb says:

For the outback and rural shires the drift has all the drama of water eroding a stone—10 or 20 people a year, just two or three families.

But the drift continues and the long-term implications are enormous. In fact, since the mid-1960s, the rural work force has declined by more than 103 000, and, as an example, tractor sales have fallen from more than 22 000 a year in the mid-1970s to just 6 000 a year in the early 1990s. Again, I quote:

The main explanation for the economic decline of the bush is generally accepted as being Government decisions to subsidise employment and protect industries in capital cities at the expense of rural Australia. Farmers have always coped with drought, flood and world market upheaval, but, by imposing higher costs and lower incomes on them, successive Governments caused the progressive erosion of competitiveness and profitability among farm industries.

Professor Michael Taylor of the University of Western Australia says:

I think we are sending a message to the world that we are not interested in inhabiting most of our country. After nearly 200 years of deliberate Government policy of trying to populate it, now, in the name of nationalism and internationalism, we are encouraging the population to pull out. For all the wrong reasons, we are undoing everything the nation has stood for over two centuries. We are making it a country without a heart.

In my maiden speech I spoke of the diversification going on in rural areas and of the determination of those left to maintain the infrastructure that still exists in those areas. However, for every farmer who goes, it is widely perceived that the flow-on effect is to lose three other people. The implications of any further collapse of population are quite horrendous in social and economic terms and, indeed, in terms of land care and sustainability. Professor Taylor says that some Western Australian wheatbelt farms are at a 'point of social dislocation', and I have no reason to presume there is any difference in South Australia. It is heartening, therefore, to know that the South Australian Government has recognised the potential for catastrophe in these figures and is making a deliberate effort towards regional development. The need to maintain the family farm was also acknowledged in both the Liberal Party's primary industries policy and in Her Excellency's speech.

I have been delighted with the early efforts made by the Minister for Industry to stimulate economic growth in regional areas, with the move by the Minister for Tourism to increase efficiencies and encourage outback tourism, and with the announcement by the Minister for Health that no hospital in a rural area will be closed.

The belief in the bush is that at last we have some people in power with some understanding of the issues. Rural and regional South Australia have great faith in our new Government, and I am sure that we will not let them down. However, no State Government can right the wrongs of a blinkered and uncaring Federal Government. I hope that common sense will prevail and we will see a bipartisan approach to the matters of rural survival and regional development.

In this International Year of the Family it is interesting to read that the Federal Opposition is looking at family friendly taxation options and that the Australian Family Association has launched a petition calling for \$130 a week homemakers' payment. The present Federal Government has announced a \$61 per week tax rebate to mothers who have two children in registered child-care, but a means-tested rise of \$2.88 per week in the home child-care rebating system to mothers who stay at home to care for their own children.

I do not espouse the theory that all mothers should stay at home, nor do I agree with the system that was in place when I worked in a bank many years ago where women's employment was terminated as soon as they were married. However, I do believe that parents, whether male or female, should be given some choice as to who raises their children. Many women, and an increasing number of men, know the humiliation of being regarded as somehow incompetent if they are 'just a housewife', yet there can be no more important profession than preparing the next generation to be responsible, caring adults.

Surely anyone who has stayed at home to raise children and who has also become the housekeeper, chauffeur, first-aid attendant, bookkeeper, gardener and the 1001 other things required must be insulted to hear that they do not work. Many of these people, because they do unpaid work, are also the core of our voluntary system and do numerous hours of community work.

Clearly, the system we have now is discriminatory and must be addressed. We must acknowledge the value of unpaid work and we must certainly acknowledge the value of families in both dollar and human terms. For many years we have fought for the right of women to join the paid work force but, in so doing, I ask whether we have forgotten the right of women to stay at home and raise their families. Certainly our Federal Government has shown a clear financial bias to double income families whose children are placed in registered child-care. No allowance, however, is made for those in private child-care. I quote Senator Nick Minchin in the *Sunday Mail* when he stated:

This whole extravagant mess should be replaced with a universal child tax credit or benefit so that we are putting the purchasing power in the hands of mothers who have young children and leaving them with the choice of whether they use that purchasing power to enable them to choose to look after their children themselves or not.

I heartily agree.

It is a great honour for me to be part of an ever-increasing group of women members serving in the Parliament in the Centenary Year of Women's Suffrage and I congratulate that committee on its work and the events it has organised so far. It is the time also to acknowledge the work of those early men and women who secured women's suffrage in this State and

who made South Australia the first democracy in the world where women could stand for Parliament.

I was interested to find an early photograph of my paternal grandmother, Caroline Maude Wescombe, as a very young woman in the official election photograph of David McKenzie, member for Flinders in 1899, just five years after women's suffrage. There is little doubt that my interest in politics and that of my family is inherited from her. I am proud to say that my family is still involved with the electorate of Flinders, and I take this opportunity to welcome Liz Penfold as a Lower House colleague. It saddens me somewhat, however, to realise that after five generations of continuous residence on Eyre Peninsula it is most unlikely that my grandchildren will be there in the future.

On a personal note, Mr President, the next matter has been largely pre-empted by a question from the Hon. George Weatherill yesterday, but I will continue to speak about it. Most members know that I live a long distance from Parliament House and that my only electorate office is in this building. When I am down here I often work quite long hours—often to 9 p.m. or 10 p.m.—to compensate for the time that I spend at home. In the last week I have witnessed on two occasions an unruly group of people, obviously under the influence of alcohol, obstructing pedestrians, drinking, asking for money and generally making a nuisance of themselves between this building and the Old Parliament House building. Fortunately, I was waiting for private transport, as I would not have felt comfortable walking to the railway station through these people to catch either a bus or taxi.

North Terrace is a main tourist boulevard. People walk up and down it to get to their accommodation, to restaurants and to visit the Casino. They have the right to do so without being accosted. I say this in no way as an indictment of our Police Force, which I know is often overworked as it is, and I know also that it is not the only trouble spot in our city. However, I wonder whether some bright lighting onto the footpath may not at least discourage this behaviour.

This session promises to be an interesting one when we debate some contentious issues, among them voluntary voting and the Mabo legislation. I prefer to save my comments on those matters until the debates, but I will say that I believe that any legislation which sets one group of Australians against another and any legislation that denies democracy cannot be just.

Finally, Mr President, I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as Presiding Officer of this Legislative Council and thank you for your friendship and guidance during the few months that I shared an office with you. I also welcome my colleagues, the Hons. Robert Lawson, Angus Redford and Sandra Kanck to this place. I look forward to working productively with them for the betterment of South Australia.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I support the motion and in so doing extend my condolences to the families of the Hon. Jessie Cooper and the Hon. John Burdett. I did not have the pleasure of working with the Hon. Jessie Cooper, but over the past eight years that I have been in the Parliament John Burdett was in this Chamber. John was one of the people in this Chamber for whom I held respect above almost all others. While it may be fair to say that John and I must have had some philosophical difference, I had great admiration for him as a man of great integrity and as a man who I believe held this Chamber in the highest regard. It is indeed a sad loss

to this Chamber and a sad loss to those who knew him. He was held in high regard by all who knew him, despite some philosophical differences from time to time.

As we commence a new session under a new Government we are waiting to see where South Australia is now to be taken. It is a matter on which I would like to speculate and offer some opinion. I will not speculate on what the Government will or will not do, but rather pass an opinion on matters that I believe can and should be done in South Australia if we are to have the bright future for which we all hope.

No doubt the State has some significant difficulties, but I for one would not want to be living anywhere else. The State has a lot going for it. The challenge for us is like that facing the person eating a donut: to look at the donut and not look at the hole. We need to focus on the opportunities and to make the most of them. As we seek to rebuild our economy and to maintain the special attributes that this State has, we must realise that those attributes can be the foundation for that rebuilding. Relative to other places we have a society that is fair, an environment that is clean and a political system that is democratic. I use the term 'relative' because in each of these three areas we still have room for improvement. However, relative to anywhere else we have a place that is fairly special. Because our society is fair, it is stable and safe. Also, we have education levels that are good.

Because our environment is clean, it is a healthy place to live in, healthy in body and healthy in mind. Because our political system is democratic, again that builds the stability into our society which is so important. I will perhaps return to each of those three matters later on and make some suggestions as to where I believe the improvements can be made, but note that I think they are three strengths of our society and they are strengths which can offer us particular opportunities in the economic area if we are to talk about future growth. I must underline that, when I talk about growth, I am always talking about growth which is in the long term sustainable, both environmentally and socially.

The areas I would identify as being significant opportunities in South Australia are the areas of education, high technology, tourism and the service industry. They are areas where we have hardly scratched the surface in terms of opportunity. Whilst identifying those, there is no implied neglect of our primary industries or the value adding of its products, nor an implied neglect of our secondary manufacturing sector. I will look briefly at each of those opportunities and make some comments about them as to where I think we should be heading and what it is that perhaps we can do to make the most of the existing opportunities.

I have a personal vision of Adelaide as an education city. We have already a good education system overall, and there are some good examples of what else we could be doing. If we look at the Waite Institute, it is one of the pre-eminent agricultural teaching tertiary institutions in the world. It now, I believe, has more post-graduate students than undergraduate students and is aiming for many more. It is an area of great excellence and is attracting many students to this State. Outside of our traditional educational institutions, there is an air training school at Parafield which is training pilots from overseas. There are many pilots from airlines of Indonesia, from Merpati and Garuda, and probably at least another half a dozen international airlines from Asia and Europe are now sending their pilots to this school for training, and it may be generating as much as \$50 million a year in the South Australian economy. I underline here that those two examples are examples of where we are bringing in many students

already and where they are making a contribution to our economy, and I would like to believe we are ultimately making a contribution to the countries where they come from, in that they are returning with an education which will be applicable to the economic growth of their own countries.

We have many advantages in Adelaide if we wish to become an education city. We have a good existing standard of education. By world standards, it is a cheap city to live in. It is an accessible city. It is easy to move around in. It is a safe city by western standards, and the fact that we are an English speaking country is also an advantage because that is really now the world's major trading language. In January last year I had the opportunity to visit Indonesia. While I was there I spoke with a number of people. I visited a number of education institutions there that were interested in working more closely with South Australian institutions. I met with a number of families whose children were approaching tertiary age. They knew little about Adelaide, but when I discussed with them what Adelaide had to offer, they were extremely interested. I know that at least one of those families, perhaps a second one now, has sent their children here. All I did was underline the advantages that I believe Adelaide has.

What I have become aware of is that the promotion of South Australian education overseas is extremely disjointed. Each university and sometimes even departments within universities are out promoting themselves. We have what was the TAFE, now the training institutes. We have the air training school, for instance. Many of these are each doing their own promotion. I would not say that I would discourage that, but I do believe that there is a case to be made for a coordination between these groups, particularly in promoting Adelaide itself as a place to which it is worth sending your children for further education, and perhaps even beyond Adelaide. For instance, Whyalla also has courses which would be relevant to some overseas students. I only mention Adelaide as that is where most of the tertiary education in South Australia is currently offered.

I believe there is an excellent opportunity there and it is up to us to make sure that there is adequate promotion. I think the Government may need to intervene in other ways, if we start bringing in large numbers of students, to make sure we can continue to provide relatively cheap accommodation. I would make the point that, as I sought to attract these extra students to Adelaide, they should not be taking places at the expense of our own children. What we are looking at is full fee paying students, paying either directly themselves or by way of some Commonwealth aid which is given to some countries; so they are paying for the infrastructure and the education they are receiving, either directly or by way of foreign aid. The opportunities are enormous. I know that in Indonesia, for instance, there is simply neither the quantity nor the quality of course offerings at this stage in terms of student places to meet the need which currently exists, and Indonesia as an example simply does not have the capacity to do all the education and training that its rapidly growing economy requires. There is the first opportunity.

I would marry that to the next opportunity which has been talked about from time to time in South Australia, and that is the area of high tech. We have a few examples in South Australia. The Submarine Corporation has been the most high profile of them, but for a long time we have led in weapons research, although I would like to see us not involved so much in that. At least our prior involvement with that has developed a very high technical expertise in the electronic

fields and the applicabilities of that can be very wide. Of course, solar optical is an industry which grew from a very small base in South Australia and it is an example of the sort of thing we might want to promote. The advantages we have in this area are the fact that we do have a good education system, that there is already a base in some areas—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: That is not what Mr Lucas has been telling us for the past five years.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I think Mr Lucas has a lot to answer for in terms of scaring people away from the State system. As a former teacher and also as a parent with children still in the system, I have been greatly dismayed by that, but I will not continue with that at the moment. We do have a good education system, but I would add that it is on the barest of bones at the moment. I would hope that the excuses we are now hearing, the 'Gee, we did not realise it was this bad' routine, do not become a reason for cutbacks, because there is no fat there. Aside from the good education system, right through from pre-school to tertiary, it is a city which I think is attractive to live in, and should be capable of being promoted to people for that reason, but I will touch on that again a little later.

What we need to do is what the Japanese have been very good at, and that is trying to pick winners and finding ways of stimulating those winners. I believe there are some things that can be done relatively cheaply. For example, it was only in the past two days that an article in the *Advertiser* referred to the fact that prices for renewable energy have diminished so rapidly that it is already competitive in isolated communities, and within five years they expect it to be so in most communities.

If you think that will be an area of significant growth in the future then, indeed, why not target it? I would ask why we should not consider spending money to create chairs in universities in these target areas. Why not a chair in renewable energy; a chair that would coordinate some work that is already happening and stimulate others? We do have a Professor Matthews at Flinders University working in this area. There was also someone at the University of Adelaide who has now left the State, but it is an area where there will be obvious growth, and perhaps we could pick that as one of the winners.

Quite clearly architecture and urban design is another area that is about to undergo quite significant change. We are giving some stimulus to it via the MFP, although at this stage in a rather disjointed fashion. But let us go back to basics, back to the education system, and create a chair in innovative architecture. It is an idea I floated at the time of the last election. I was contacted by two universities that said they were extremely interested in pursuing that as a possibility. It is an area which will be a growth area in the future and, again, will we be smart enough to grab it, or at least put ourselves as one of those in the forefront, or is it something which we will leave to somebody else?

In relation to urban water management, for example, the Government at the moment is talking about tackling the problems of the Patawalonga. We have exactly the same problems with the Torrens River, and in fact with most of the rivers on the Adelaide Plains and at Noarlunga. It is not a problem unique to Adelaide; it is not a problem unique to South Australia. I looked at the rivers in Jakarta when I visited there last year. They were so heavily polluted that they were literally bubbling from the activity of whatever was in there, and it was just not the fish. It is a worldwide problem. Again, we can be producing something that does not just

solve our problems. We can, of course, produce saleable technologies and methodologies to sell interstate and overseas.

The final area I would identify concerns tourism research. An institute which could look at the real potential in South Australia could offer us significant opportunities. Aside from stimulation within education itself there are other areas where we have real opportunities, if only we care to pursue them. An obvious area is computer data processing. At present the large banks and insurance companies are putting their computer data processing into the heart of Melbourne and Sydney. We should be able to kill those cities in this area.

Computer data processing is not location sensitive. You can put it wherever you want to, because these days as long as it is on the end of a piece of wire, or even on the end of a radio link, you can communicate back to anybody who needs the information. It makes no sense to me that the banks and insurance companies at this stage are using Melbourne and Sydney, where the rentals they would be paying per square metre would be significantly higher than in South Australia, and where the staff who work in those places would have to be paid a significantly higher package to attract them because the housing they want to live in would be twice as expensive and the golf club they want to join would be probably two or three times as expensive and two or three times less accessible.

People who work in those sorts of fields are often very interested in quality of life. Adelaide can make the most of its quality of life and seek to encourage industries, such as computer data processing, to relocate, and perhaps we need to provide some incentives to get it started. We are talking about offering some taxation relief to new secondary industry coming to South Australia, but I would look very carefully at the tertiary industry, like computer data processing, and be looking to offer them packages to get them to come. My suspicion and belief is that, once a couple of companies have done it and found just how attractive South Australia is, it would set a pattern. Nevertheless, I think we should be looking to provide incentives there. We do have everything to offer that Melbourne and Sydney have in that area; in fact we have a lot more to offer than they have.

In the area of tourism, the largest growing sector of the tourist market in the world is eco and cultural tourism. If South Australia is to succeed in tourism those really are where our strengths are likely to lie. We will not build marinas that will compete with the marinas of Queensland. Our climate is not the same; why would a person come to South Australia? They will come to see the Outback, to see our particular form of wilderness, and that is attractive to a sector of the market. They may come to see Adelaide itself, which at this stage has managed to maintain a fair amount of its charm. They may come to see the wine districts. Generally speaking, though, our eco and cultural system is very poorly developed.

We have done a couple of good things. I point out one particular example: the development of Seal Bay is one of the great pluses in recent times where we have managed to develop an area so that it is accessible to tourists. It can be used by a large number of tourists, but while they are visiting the place they do not destroy it. The sea lions are not being interfered with. The sea lions will continue to visit Seal Bay and people will continue to visit to see them. We must always be very aware that as we develop this tourism market we do not destroy the very thing that people come to see. We very nearly did that with Wilpena.

We can compare what the Northern Territory did with Uluru, where they insisted that the development be out of the line of sight of Uluru, so that when people climbed the rock all they saw around them, largely, was the wilderness vista itself. With the decision to place the Wilpena development on the face of the ABC Range, which directly fronted St Mary's Peak—which is climbed by about half the people who go there—the first thing they would have seen as they looked down from St Mary's Peak would have been this wonderful vista of a tourist development. Before you even got into the environmental arguments it was a really stupid thing to do.

People come to Australia not to climb a mountain and gaze down on a tourist resort; they come to Australia—at least the people who go to the Flinders Ranges—to climb a mountain and to gaze around and see other mountains, the trees and, hopefully, see a kangaroo bounce between them. It was just sheer and utter stupidity. With the location of Tandanya, one of the many attractions of Kangaroo Island is the amount of vegetation, and so they choose a site which is totally vegetated, yet within 400 metres of the site there is farmland which could have been used just as easily. We have to be very careful as we develop our tourism market that we do not destroy what people come to see.

In the area of cultural tourism it is the same. If we really want people to come and look at Adelaide we have to look after the Northern Terrace precinct; we have to look after most of the precincts within the metropolitan area. One of the magic things about Adelaide is its coastline. I am not sure what kind of fool would want to build a marina in the middle of the sandy beaches. First, from a tourism viewpoint, if you want to see marinas you can see them anywhere else, and there are plenty of them in South Australia, and that is before you again enter the environmental arguments and the stupidity of building anything on an active sandy beach. Ask the people at Port MacDonnell what they think about building structures on active sandy beaches. The port of Port MacDonnell is being destroyed by the stupidity of Governments in years past, and one would think that a lesson would have been learnt from that, and I hope the lesson has been learnt.

The question is: what can we do to give further stimulation, aside from being very sensitive about the way we develop our tourism? There are many opportunities in country areas that people already living there would take up but perhaps they are not experienced in running small businesses or tourism businesses. We should be using the institutes of vocational education throughout South Australia to be offering courses. In collaboration with the Small Business Corporation we could structure courses to give people the necessary knowledge of how to go about running a small business in our tourist industry, and there are massive opportunities.

In Tasmania one of the most successful operations involves farm and cottage stays. Already we have a significant industry in South Australia, but the potential has been barely scratched and a multitude of other smaller industries could be run. In the area of specialised tours, I know of the odd individual running tours on Kangaroo Island or in the River Murray area, but at this stage it is very hit and miss and we could be offering assistance to make sure that these activities are done more professionally. If businesses are locally owned, the dollars remain in our community and the multiplier effect works. That is something we do not necessarily get from the larger, usually overseas owned,

developments that give people jobs making beds, and that is the major return.

The next obvious area of opportunity is the service industry and again, in regard to hi-tech, I touched on the area of data processing, but there are many other areas where we can be successful. Perhaps if there is one area where the previous Government and South Australia has been successful, it is in the service area, the selling of know-how, particularly via SAGRIC, one of South Australia's largely unsung success stories. Already we have been selling a great deal of know-how into overseas markets, everything from our lands title system and aerial survey work, etc. As far as possible we should be looking to attract more of those sorts of companies into South Australia and Adelaide's advantages, which I have talked about previously in terms of just being a good place to live, can be attractive for people looking for a base from which to run their operations.

The final area on which I will focus in terms of areas of opportunity relates to South Australia's agriculture and horticulture in particular where we just have not maximised our potential. Perhaps one exception now is our wine industry which, at long last, is taking off. We have enormous advantages. We have large amounts of suitable land in the River Murray area, in the Adelaide Hills and in the South-East with sufficient water availability to increase significantly our horticultural production. We should be looking at changing what we are growing. Too often we are producing relatively low value crops when there are higher value options available. One of the difficulties we have at this stage is that so many of the people on the land are simply under-capitalised to take advantage of the opportunities.

The other major area of difficulty relates to infrastructure. The runway at Adelaide Airport is too short to cope with a fully laden jet, but full loads are necessary for many horticultural crops, and I have not touched on other opportunities such as aquaculture produce. That needs to be a priority of the Government, as well as looking at other transport infrastructure in the regions. We should be looking at some sort of system whereby produce can be taken quickly from the Riverland or the South-East and brought to Adelaide Airport or whatever terminal we are using. Most produce needs to be refrigerated and kept refrigerated and the Government should give that area further consideration as a means of facilitating further horticultural development for exports. Our opportunities are large, and that was something I saw during my visit to Indonesia. Indonesia has a great deal of interest in buying more horticultural produce. It has a rapidly developing economy with a growing middle class looking for a wider range of produce. Its people are most interested in buying the sorts of produce that we put out in South Australia.

The Government in the long run should consider, in coordination with the Federal Government, looking at rural reconstruction and the question of infrastructure. Rural reconstruction will get some capital flow into some of these areas. The net benefits for the State and the nation will more than repay any short-term expenditures. I believe our broadacre farmers have too narrow a choice now in terms of what they can produce. That has been part of the problem in the past couple of years. On Eyre Peninsula farmers have the choice between sheep or wheat, but they usually produce both. On Kangaroo Island it is sheep or sheep and, while we spend a great deal of money in research constantly upgrading our varieties of wheat and other grains, I do not believe that we have put sufficient effort at looking at alternative crops that could be grown in South Australia.

For instance, I recall Professor Woolhouse referring to dry land rape on one occasion as an example of a crop that should be grown in some of the dry parts of South Australia. Obviously, if our farmers have more planting options they are in a better position to ride out price declines in specific commodities. As I said, recently many farmers have been trapped between wool and wheat production, and that has not left them with a good choice. It would be good if all farmers had the choice of some farmers on northern Yorke Peninsula, who can crop beans, peas, vetches and various other crops as alternatives, and there is at least some capacity to vary acreage and composition of plantings from year to year.

If the Government wanted to help agriculture, a good start would involve research into alternative plantings, which would be extremely beneficial. When we look at the fairness of our society, the cleanness of our environment and our political system we rate well by world standards but in each of these areas the balance is always very delicate and I hope that the new Government realises that those three features that make us so special are the strengths upon which the future of the State depends. We must make sure that we defend those features.

Only yesterday on the front page of the *Advertiser* an article looked at the increased disparity in wealth in South Australia and the increasing number of people relying on food parcels and other forms of assistance. We cannot afford for any extended period to have large numbers of people living in despair and being treated as societal lepers. We have to be careful that the education system of which we have been proud so long does not slip. I attended a parent/teacher night at my children's school on Monday.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Good teachers?

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Good teachers, but the budgetary process in the school is getting so tight that each individual teacher—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: More than 400 students?

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: The smallest class has 28 students.

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Well, I rest my case. That was not the point I was going to make. The teachers at that school have now each been given an individual budget from which they have to supply the needs of their students. The budgetary process has got down as tight as that. In that classroom they decided not to have diaries this year, because when they balanced them up against other things the class needed they were scratched off. This year the children do not have quite a few of the things they had last year because the teacher said that, within her budget, she could not afford to buy them for the students. That is how tight the budgets are getting. Not only are we at the point where schools have individual budgets which are becoming increasingly restrictive, but also within that, as they struggle to make the budget balance, every individual teacher is being budgeted. I made the point that there is no fat to cut; that is the point matters have come to.

There are things which the teachers would like to give students, such as a diary, but which they are not giving them at present, because they cannot stretch their budget as far as that. Education really is hanging by a thread now. As the Government seeks to balance the budget and starts mouthing off 'Gee, we didn't realise things were so bad' routines and promising tax cuts and various other things, it must realise the fundamental importance of education. It really is not a matter of maintaining what we have, because the education system

has to some extent lived on borrowed time because of under-expenditure in the area of capital equipment. So, it is not a matter of maintaining the line. The standard of the line is being maintained because of the commitment of the teachers, but the teachers cannot maintain it with deteriorating capital infrastructure.

I hope the Government realises that what makes and will make Adelaide so attractive for many of the industries I talked about is in part that it is a fair, safe city that for the most part feels good to be in. But there are already signs of breakdown and the cost of maintaining that fairness is justified on social and ultimately probably economic grounds, for many reasons. Compared with many other cities, Adelaide is a good environment, but the Patawalonga has been ranked as one of the most disgraceful marine coastal areas in Australia. The Torrens River is no better. Consider other waterways around Adelaide. The Gulf St Vincent itself is still dying; seagrasses are in recess; mangroves are being choked by sea lettuce; the prawn fishery is in collapse; and the list goes on.

The Gulf St Vincent is in serious trouble, and we can only hope that some of the promised moves to stop the water from sewage treatment works entering the gulf come quickly. We hope that ceases and that there is a genuine attempt to tackle stormwater problems, but if the Government is not willing to tackle Craighburn Farm and the density and style of development on a site directly adjacent to Sturt Creek, which runs into the Patawalonga, one would have to wonder just how seriously the Government will tackle the problem. It is no good putting in a trash rack that catches all the big lumps if all the little lumps get through. It is the little lumps that are really causing the problems. It is not the dog but the dog's faeces that are the real problem in the Patawalonga and elsewhere, and we have to realise that.

The Government must be very careful that it does not repeat the mistakes of the previous Government in the way it goes about facilitating development. It needs to realise that one of the biggest failures of the previous Government was the Premier's Special Projects Unit. It created many of the problems for the Government, not just politically but in other senses as well. The whole perception of failed development was as much as anything created by this group of people who were chasing a lot of ideas which in many cases were lunatic or which in some cases had some potential if only they had opened up their minds to see what was the real problem. I have discussed this problem on other occasions but I will not take it further today, other than to note that Premier Dean Brown has now appointed a person to facilitate special projects.

I have taken an opportunity to speak with the man and in that short meeting I was very impressed with what he had to say, but I hope he does not become the head of a special projects unit *per se* which seeks to take upon itself to decide what is right and wrong and ignore warning signs. The Special Projects Unit ignored economic and environmental warnings and in many ways tried to start some projects that should never have got up; others did have a chance of getting up if only they had been located elsewhere, for instance, Tandanya and Wilpena, or if they had been in a different form, for example, the Mount Lofty development—perhaps without the cable car, it would have happened.

I hope the Government re-evaluates the Development Act. I know it is only a fairly recent piece of legislation which the present Government, then in Opposition, largely supported. But I do not believe that the principal weaknesses within that

old Planning Act were rectified when the Development Act was passed, and I believe that we are in danger of having the same unnecessary confrontation between developers and environmentalists—a confrontation I have argued on a number of other occasions is eminently avoidable if the processes are right. If the Government adopts a crash-through approach, it is adopting the same approach as the old Special Projects Unit tried to encourage former Premiers to have, and they will tell you that politically that becomes a problem and does not solve either economic or environmental problems in the long term.

Finally, I want to look at the political system, and I will do this very briefly. The third strength of our State is that we are largely a democratic State. It causes me concern that the Government has chosen to try to diminish that by pushing for voluntary voting. I believe that is an anti-democratic move. We will get a chance to argue that again later, but the Government should be looking as much as possible to increase democracy in our State. That means ensuring that things like freedom of information work; it means expanding whistle blower legislation, which I believe at this stage has not gone far enough. I believe it means making Government as open as you can; it means involving citizens. If we do have an educated community, we cannot expect them to accept being treated as fools. If others have noticed as I have that the electorate is increasingly impatient of politicians, it is because they are not willing to be treated as fools any longer. They want to be involved, and they will not tolerate mock consultation. They will not tolerate politicians telling them one thing and doing another.

If there is anything that could undermine our democratic system in the long run it could be a total loss of faith by the citizens themselves in the people who pretend to represent them. So, I do have a great deal of confidence in what South Australia can become. The present Government has not flagged clearly exactly where it will take us. At this stage it has the benefit of everybody's doubt to a greater or lesser extent, and I only hope that that benefit of the doubt it has been given so far will not be let down. I support the motion.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition):

In my speech on the Address in Reply to Her Excellency's opening of Parliament I wish to examine the question of promoting ethical standards in the community. Just recently we have seen issues related to this debate canvassed in the *Advertiser*; criticism of current methods of policing from Chief Superintendent Pawelski and the response from Police Commissioner David Hunt; and the correspondent in the *Advertiser* calling for 'this Government to bring back authority, discipline and respect' (Dudley Burton on 12 February 1994), as if that is something a Government can do or has a prime responsibility to do. The Major Government in the United Kingdom last October launched a back-to-basics campaign, emphasising traditional values in parental responsibility, traditional education and getting tough with criminals, which then became unstuck because of a series of sex-related incidents among conservative MPs.

To me, these simple calls mask a complexity of factors which, if not understood, will mean that the debate about ethics and reinforcing values will go nowhere. Very little is achieved by slogans, even if they appeal superficially to populist notions of how all the perceived wrongs of modern society can be put right. Slogans such as 'back to basics' (which is also being used by the new Government here in the education field) seem to me to be particularly inane and

inappropriate in a society which will and must change. But it is a debate that cannot be ignored by politicians of the left, even if much of the rhetoric comes from the right. To do that will ignore genuine concerns and a real need to understand the place of ethical values in our society.

Partly as a result of the excesses of the 1980s in the corporate and financial areas, we have seen considerable attention given to the development of codes of ethics in various walks of life. Corporate ethics have been promoted by the former Chairman of the National Companies and Securities Commission, Mr Henry Bosch, to try to fill in the gaps in the law, and a booklet entitled *Corporate Practices and Conduct* has been produced by leading business organisations; codes of conduct have been developed in South Australia and elsewhere for police and public servants; many industry associations are developing codes of conduct to guide their members in what is considered good practice for that industry; the professions (particularly law and medicine) have long had codes of ethics, although the public confidence in them is often questioned; the Media Alliance (formerly the Australian Journalists Association) is reviewing its code of ethics; and some Parliaments are looking at codes of conduct for members of Parliament.

This discussion about ethics in particular sections of the community needs to be broadened into a debate about ethics generally. Over the past few years in my ministerial capacity I have addressed a number of these issues. In particular, I dealt with this issue at a National Institute of Accountants seminar on corporate ethics on 5 November last year. It was a speech delivered from notes which, with some additions, I felt might inform debate in this area through the potentially wider audience of Parliament.

We should not compartmentalise discussions about ethics. If we do, we run the risk of narrowing the focus of an issue of universal concern. No doubt we can talk of corporate ethics, professional ethics, business ethics and the ethical dilemmas in politics, and it is no doubt worthy to draw up the sorts of codes to which I have referred.

However, ethics is about how we live our lives generally. Corporate ethics, for instance, is part of a general issue to which we give insufficient attention in the community generally, in public and community organisations and in schools (both public and private).

One has to consider only the simple definitions of ethics to recognise the scope of the discussion. In the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, ethics is 'moral philosophy', the branch of philosophy that is concerned with what is morally good and bad, right and wrong. In the *Shorter Oxford Dictionary* ethics is defined as relating to morals, treating of moral questions, or the science of morals, the rules of conduct recognised in certain limited departments of human life, and the science of human duty in its widest extent including, besides ethics proper, the science of law, whether civil, political or international. Ethics then is about morals in the broadest sense of the word, issues of right and wrong, good and evil. In other words, it is about the fundamental underpinnings of our society.

So, while it is legitimate to talk about what might be in particular codes of ethics, I suggest we need to discuss some of the broader issues. This is not always easy because, when talking about rights and duties and moral questions, the answers are not always clear-cut. Often there are conflicting views about what is right and wrong.

We have given attention to corporate ethics in the light of the excesses of the 1980s, but if we give attention to this only

in times of crisis, what happens when the next boom occurs? Unless basic core ethical values are continually confronted, debated and entrenched in society, we will repeat the mistakes and unacceptable conduct of the past. The history of economic booms and busts over the last 200 years hardly gives us confidence that we do as a society learn from previous experience.

Of course, there will always be some who behave unethically. The question arises of what we do about them. If the law is broken, then a person can be prosecuted; but if there is a breach of an ethical code, what is the sanction? If there is no sanction, how do you get people to comply?

Given that we can consider corporate and other ethical codes only in the context of society as a whole, a number of questions are raised. What are our core values, and do we agree on them? Do they change? How do we determine them—that is, how do we determine what ought to happen in particular circumstances? What mechanisms do we have for doing this and for enforcing those rules? Are such codes more than platitudes? I suggest that they may be seen by some members of the community as no more than platitudes—as a sop to keep the public happy.

This cynicism will be reinforced unless ethics is seen as something which is not compartmentalised but is about standards, values and ethics in society generally. This involves the family, schools, community organisations and, of course, Parliament and Government.

Moral philosophy is an academic discipline going back to the time of the Greeks. It is one of the hallmarks of civilisation that these issues are debated and discussed, and codes of behaviour and laws developed from the principles involved. The question is whether we should popularise these issues much more than has happened hitherto, particularly given the increasingly secular nature of modern society. They should, in my view, be an essential part of school curricula from primary school onwards.

There are a number of issues to examine, the first of which is as follows:

Return to traditional values? Has there, in fact, been a decline in traditional standards, as is commonly alleged? Many argue that discipline has been eroded in modern times and that, if only we could return to some golden age of traditional values, our ethical and moral problems would be solved. I suggest that there has never been such a golden age.

Religions—Christianity and others—have been a civilising influence on human affairs, but they have also fuelled some horrendous conflicts in history. One has only to look at the situation in Northern Ireland today, or the communal strife in modern-day India. Adherence to religious belief is not, therefore, a sure-fire quick-fix solution to ethical dilemmas.

What are the traditional values to which we want to return? For instance, 200 years ago slavery was common. There were harsh and cruel punishments for minor transgressions of the law such as transportation for life for poaching, and cruel and harsh punishments were meted out in relation to many other offences. Women were discriminated against, racial prejudice was widespread, religious bigotry fuelled wars and also fuelled discrimination in our own Australian community. If you were of the Roman Catholic religion 30 or 40 years ago, then often you were a second-class citizen. Religious bigotry was much more commonplace in South Australian society in the past.

There was also colonialism—dominance of one country over many others, often by force of arms. The recent High

Court decision in the Mabo case raises important ethical issues related to the colonisation of Australia. It is inconceivable in today's climate, with its emphasis on human rights and national freedom and sovereignty, that the colonisation process could occur today as it did in many countries during the last century and earlier.

The reality is that the values of today in many respects are better than those traditional values to which I have referred. Even in this century we have seen two world wars among nations of supposedly superior values and the horrors of Nazi Germany. In Australia we now have a less violent society than existed in the last century.

When talking about ethics, I cannot accept that by a return to traditional values all ethical problems would be solved and all the problems of modern society would be removed. The reality is that many traditional values are, and should be, abhorred in our contemporary society.

The real trick is to build on the positive values of the past which have been developed and refined over centuries, with new values adapted to our rapidly changing society. In this respect, it is important to identify the core values about which we can all agree.

But even doing this is not easy. The recent encyclical, *Veritas Splendor*, from Pope John Paul II raised the question of the moral principle against artificial contraception—one deeply held and propounded by the Vatican. Against this there is the crisis of overpopulation and the pressure on the world environment—an issue with which the Hon. Ms Kanck dealt in her Address in Reply speech. No doubt to Ms Kanck the crisis of overpopulation confronts the world with an ethical dilemma much greater than that spoken about by Pope John Paul.

The abortion debate is also an area where it is impossible to agree about core values. To Catholics, abortion is murder because of the status which is given to the foetus. However, this is not the view of the great majority of the community. Accordingly, it is impossible to get a law which satisfies the different moral or ethical positions taken in the community.

What we need to develop, then, are values about which there is common agreement, but also values that are practical—values that we can actually live by and that are not so ideal that no reasonable person can live up to them.

Institutions of authority: The next issue that I wish to examine is the role of our institutions of authority. This is very much related to the question of discipline which is often raised in community debate. The reality is that the traditional institutions of our society—whether they be the church, the family, Parliament, the courts or the monarchy—attract less automatic acceptance of that authority than previously occurred. There are a number of reasons for this. The community is better educated and less likely to accept the simple or fundamentalist Christian concepts than previously. This is related to a decline in religious adherence.

Next, there is a greater knowledge of and more scrutiny from the media and others of the traditional institutions. The golden age of family harmony has been shattered by revelations of violence within the family. Likewise, there is much greater scrutiny of the actions of public figures in Government, Parliament and the judiciary. What would have been overlooked in the past is now often constructed into a major scandal.

Also, young people are less hypocritical than previously, and less tolerant of what appears to be hypocritical positions taken by institutions of authority. For instance, with the monarchy there is concern about the talk of moral principles

when they are not practised. We also see this in the alcohol/drugs debate. Many young people see it as a hypocritical to have criminal penalties relating to marijuana use but official endorsement of alcohol consumption.

The reality is that we can no longer rely on values to be handed down from institutions of society and automatically accepted. Respect for institutions and values has to be earned.

The Role of the law: This is central to the consideration of corporate as well as any other ethics. We all know that there is a distinction between the law and morality. The law does not seek to cover all aspects of moral or ethical behaviour. Indeed, there has been a tendency for the law to withdraw from areas of personal morality. In Western society, adultery is no longer an offence, although it still is under Islamic law.

Homosexual relations between consenting adults has been decriminalised and attempting to commit suicide is no longer a criminal offence. Most would agree that there is an area of ethical behaviour not touched by the strict letter of the law. This raises the question of how we enforce these values and standards as they are not covered by the law.

In the area of corporate law, this raises the question of the debate between the supporters of strict, so-called black letter law compared with those who support general principles only being enshrined in legislation. In this context, unless certain standards are agreed to in business and adhered to, there will be more black letter law. A vicious circle then operates. Black letter law is too technical, over-regulates and stifles initiative, so we deregulate and make the law simpler.

This enables people greater freedom; they behave in a way that the community finds unacceptable—as many did in the 1980s—so there is a move to go back to black letter law. The question here is whether the development of corporate ethics can break that vicious cycle. The Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs—the Cooney committee—in its report on company directors' duties, said:

Ethical conduct is the best guarantee of decent corporate life; peer pressure makes for proper behaviour. The Legislature need only provide criminal and civil sanctions when ethical standards are low or when they are not met.

We see the same dilemma in tax law. Tax evasion is clearly illegal. Tax avoidance is legal but often considered immoral or unethical, depending on whether one takes a legalistic, black letter law view of the situation. Accountants and lawyers are paid enormous amounts of money to devise ways of getting around the law or the intention of the law. How, then, can you say that there is a zone of ethical business behaviour which goes beyond what is laid down by the letter of the law? Some would argue that in dealing with taxation law there is no such zone of ethical behaviour and this is a familiar debate in this community, at least among lawyers.

Is anything that you can get away with under black letter law in the tax area not only legal but also ethically right? That is the debate. That is why the ethics of professional people (such as lawyers and accountants) are also important. The problems of opinion shopping, the problems of auditors trying to please their clients because they are paid by them, are matters for debate.

Peer pressure to enforce ethical standards: It is often said—and indeed that is what Senator Cooney says in the foregoing quote—that peer pressure makes for proper behaviour. Well, can peer pressure make for proper behaviour? I suggest not always, because often we are reluctant to exert that pressure. 'He's a good bloke; he sails close to the wind but is not illegal; there but for the grace of God go I;

that will undermine the reputation of the profession, therefore we've got to cover it up—we can't have that get out': they are the sort of things that go through people's minds when they have to exert peer pressure. Or, 'I won't get his business, he'll go somewhere else'.

Now in politics, interestingly enough, there is constant peer pressure. In fact, it is institutionalised. In our adversarial system the Opposition is constantly applying pressure to the Government, questioning what it is doing. That in itself has its own dangers, which I do not intend to debate today. But, in politics, peer pressure is institutionalised and that is generally a good thing.

At the other end of the spectrum is the media, in which there is virtually no peer pressure at all—anyone can be a journalist. You do not have to be a member of the Media Alliance. No effective disciplinary measures or peer pressures can be applied to journalists. In one case recently, a journalist came up against the Code of Ethics of the Australian Journalists Association and was fined \$200. Some 2½ years later it had never been collected and he remained a member in good standing. So, that is the other end of the scale.

The professions, I suggest, fall somewhere in between on this question of peer pressure. You try to apply peer pressure. Whether it works all the time is a question mark that has to be addressed in this debate, because those professions rely on ethical codes of conduct to control the professional behaviour of their members.

The 1980s—Unique to Australia? What happened in the 1980s was not confined to Australia; it happened all around the world. In the United States, the savings and loans collapses, the BCCI case; in the United Kingdom, the collapse of the Maxwell financial empire. So, it is not something that we have on our own, although almost certainly it did not do our international reputation any good. But, wherever it is, it seems to me that what went with it was a herd mentality, that is, no-one wanted to be left out of what was going on. There was a quid to be made if you were a businessman, a good story to get if you were a journalist, so let us get on, no matter what are the ethical problems. There is a vote to be won, so let us win that vote no matter what ethical problems there might be in that respect.

The important point here to reflect on is that what went on in our institutions during the 1980s to some extent reflected what society wanted. Australians are known for their traditional cynicism. Well, that left us. Sometimes we overdo that scepticism, particularly when we want to cut down the tall poppies in society. But, despite the general attitude that Australians are known to have (that cynical attitude to high fliers), we actually did not apply that cynicism to the high fliers of the 1980s. We basked in the supposed success of the entrepreneurs and wanted to be a part of it.

And now, of course, it is all the fault of the politicians. That again is another issue that I will not address at present. There was the basking in Alan Bond's success with the America's Cup. I remember Christopher Skase coming here to Adelaide to a large business dinner organised by none other than the *Advertiser*. He was fawned over by the business establishment in South Australia. He gave a speech and people asked him, very deferentially, of course, questions about what were the solutions to Adelaide's problems.

Adelaide, of course, always has problems, even in the middle of a boom. He gave a few banal answers that even I could have improved on.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Were you there?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes. But that was the atmosphere.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Invited or pay?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I certainly didn't pay. Tim Marcus Clark built up an enormous reputation in South Australia. That was not just something promoted by the Government; it was promoted by the whole community and the media. The *Advertiser* thought he was a great asset to our State, particularly when he put together the REMM deal and stimulated the development debate (the *Advertiser* Editorial, 31 August 1988). So, in a sense, there was a herd mentality. Everyone wanted to be part of the action. I do not think I can describe it better than by just referring to what Henry Bosch had to say in a recent speech, 'Reputation and Business Ethics', as follows:

The greed and recklessness of a few should not surprise us. But two things should surprise and disturb us. First, the Australian community magnified the paper entrepreneurs and caused them to grow.

Bankers lent, investors rushed to contribute their savings, the media, politicians and the public adulated them and elevated them to the status of folk heroes. National honours were bestowed and financial success was praised without any question being asked about how it had been achieved.

When some of these 'heroes' went overseas in their company jets displaying extravagant lifestyles flowing with champagne and wild women, and when they launched takeover bids that offended the sense of fairness of their hosts, far too many Australians mindlessly chanted 'Come on Aussie, come on!' Many Australians, and particularly the media, behaved as though the paper entrepreneurs were the exemplars of Australian business. When they failed and their much vaunted success was shown to be a sham, it was hardly surprising that the foreigners gloated and that some of the condemnation rubbed off on those who had adulated them.

So indiscriminate adulation is the first thing that should surprise us and disturb us.

The community's reaction to these activities encouraged them, which emphasises again the importance of ethical consideration in the whole community. It was an uncharacteristic Australian reaction, but one which most of the community went along with, even applauded. We see the same phenomenon sometimes with populist politicians selling snake oil—simple solutions to complex problems. But I am pleased to say that generally Australians have not fallen for that populist approach to politics.

Ethics and schools: The assertions about lack of discipline, lack of religious values, lack of emphasis on community service spill over into the debate about education. It is argued that private schools emphasise values and discipline, State schools do not (G.G. Brookman of Springfield—*Advertiser* 15 January 1994). As a generalisation, this is clearly nonsense and is firmly refuted as it should be by the State sector (Peter B. Laing, Principal, Norwood Morialta High School, Magill, 27 January 1994).

A recent survey conducted in Victoria and reported in the Melbourne *Sunday Age* on 8 August 1993 would have to be of concern to those who assert that a simple return to discipline and religious values will resolve society's problems. The *Sunday Age* conducted a survey into the behaviour and attitudes of 700 senior school students in Victoria. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a table showing the results of that survey taken from the *Sunday Age*.

Leave granted.

HAVE YOU TAKEN ANYTHING FROM A SHOP WITHOUT PAYING IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS?								
	SEX		AGE			State	SCHOOL	
	M	F	-17	17	18+		Catholic	Private
Yes	28.2	17.3	30.5	21.0	17.9	20.8	33.3	28.0
No	71.5	82.1	68.6	78.7	81.3	78.8	68.7	72.0
No answer	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.3	0.8	0.4	-	-

IS IT OKAY TO CHEAT TO PASS EXAMS?								
	SEX		AGE			State	SCHOOL	
	M	F	-17	17	18+		Catholic	Private
Yes	20.3	8.7	16.1	12.9	13.8	12.0	19.5	30.0
No	78.4	91.3	83.9	86.6	84.6	87.2	80.5	70.0
No answer	1.4	-	-	0.5	1.6	0.8	-	-

IS CHEATING COMMON AT YOUR SCHOOL?								
	SEX		AGE			State	SCHOOL	
	M	F	-17	17	18+		Catholic	Private
Yes	77.7	70.1	82.2	71.9	69.1	74.4	82.8	70.0
No	20.6	27.1	15.3	25.8	27.6	22.7	16.1	28.0
No answer	1.7	2.8	2.5	2.3	3.3	2.9	1.1	2.0

HOW OFTEN DO YOU LIE/CHEAT AT SCHOOL?								
	SEX		AGE			State	SCHOOL	
	M	F	-17	17	18+		Catholic	Private
Often	43.0	44.4	50.0	40.8	51.2	42.0	56.3	52.0
Sometimes	55.3	54.7	49.2	58.0	48.0	57.1	42.5	46.0
Never	1.0	0.6	-	1.0	0.8	0.4	-	2.0
No answer	0.7	0.3	0.8	0.3	-	0.4	1.1	-

HOW OFTEN DO PEOPLE LIE/CHEAT AT WORK?								
	SEX		AGE			State	SCHOOL	
	M	F	-17	17	18+		Catholic	Private
Often	15.1	15.9	17.8	14.7	16.3	13.9	19.5	22.0
Sometimes	80.8	81.0	78.8	81.3	82.1	82.4	79.3	72.0
Never	3.8	3.1	3.4	4.1	0.8	3.6	1.1	6.0
No answer	0.3	-	-	-	0.8	0.2	-	-

IF YOU FOUND A WALLET WITH MONEY IN IT WOULD YOU... ?								
	SEX		AGE			State	SCHOOL	
	M	F	-17	17	18+		Catholic	Private
Give to police	49.8	70.7	59.3	61.8	64.2	65.3	44.8	46.0
Advertise it	8.2	10.3	11.9	8.4	9.8	8.2	14.9	10.0
Keep it	39.9	16.2	27.1	26.8	25.2	24.4	37.9	42.0
No answer	2.1	2.8	1.7	3.0	0.8	2.1	2.3	2.0

HAVE YOU EVER CHEATED IN EXAMS OR TESTS?								
	SEX		AGE			State	SCHOOL	
	M	F	-17	17	18+		Catholic	Private
Often	7.9	1.7	5.9	3.8	5.7	3.8	4.6	14.0
Sometimes	44.0	38.8	47.5	40.5	33.3	39.5	50.6	50.0
Never	47.8	58.9	46.6	55.2	60.2	56.1	44.8	38.0
No answer	0.3	0.6	-	0.5	0.8	0.6	-	-

WOULD YOU ASK TO SEE ANSWERS TO A VCE EXAM IF A STUDENT HAD THEM?								
	SEX		AGE			State	SCHOOL	
	M	F	-17	17	18+		Catholic	Private
Yes	63.9	34.1	39.8	47.8	50.4	42.9	56.3	86.0
No	33.7	62.6	56.8	49.9	44.7	53.8	43.7	14.0

No answer	2.4	3.4	3.4	2.3	4.9	3.4	-	-
-----------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---

IS IT NECESSARY TO BE DISHONEST TO SURVIVE AT SCHOOL?								
	SEX		AGE			SCHOOL		
	M	F	-17	17	18+	State	Catholic	Private
Often	7.9	2.5	7.6	4.1	4.9	4.2	5.7	12.0
Sometimes	58.1	52.2	64.4	51.9	52.8	54.8	84.4	58.0
Never	34.0	45.0	28.0	43.8	42.3	40.8	29.9	30.0
No answer	-	0.3	-	0.3	-	0.2	-	-

HOW OFTEN DO BUSINESSMEN/WOMEN LIE/CHEAT?								
	SEX		AGE			SCHOOL		
	M	F	-17	17	18+	State	Catholic	Private
Often	31.6	29.1	25.4	31.1	32.5	30.0	36.8	28.0
Sometimes	64.9	65.9	69.5	64.3	64.2	66.2	57.5	68.0
Never	3.1	3.6	5.1	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.4	4.0
No answer	0.3	1.4	-	1.5	-	0.6	2.3	-

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In general, it showed that dishonesty had become an accepted part of life for many of the students. But the survey also threw some light on the debate about values in education. In contrast to popular notions, the tables show that in most areas of ethical behaviour surveyed, the private school students fared worse than the public school students. For example, more private school than public school students had taken something from a shop without paying; said it was okay to cheat to pass exams; said they lied or cheated at school; said they would keep a wallet with money in it if they found it; have cheated in exams or tests; and would ask to see answers to a Victorian Certificate of Education exam if a student had them.

While it would be too simplistic to draw conclusions from one survey, it surely must raise questions about the supposed importance of discipline and the teaching of religious values in promoting ethical standards. Perhaps the answer is simply that in some areas private school students' concepts of ethical behaviour are lower than the public school because of the pressure on them to succeed, a pressure exacerbated by the fact that parents have paid for their education and the school's financial position is related to their success.

Ethical issues in a rapidly changing society: We have all heard about future shock, rapid change in all aspects of the environment in which we live. We are all familiar with the incredibly dramatic changes that occurred in the financial system in the 1980s. But what is happening in the financial system and raising the sorts of ethical issues I have mentioned is also happening across the whole range of life: new technology, IVF, genetic engineering. The fact that technology can now keep people alive by artificial means for much longer than could occur in the past raises ethical questions which we debated here last session. That is just one example of changing circumstances in society caused by the increased sophistication of our technology.

We are now confronted with more complex environmental issues than we were 100 years ago. The international community is much more the global village. So, if acid rain falls in Germany, it is probably also falling on nearby neighbours. If a nuclear power station malfunctions, then it affects all neighbouring nations. If there is an oil spill in one nation, it can dramatically affect others. So, they are all issues that are new that we have to confront and to which we have to bring an ethical perspective.

In the area of management practices there are issues that need to be looked at. This demands a consideration of the ethics of what is right in contemporary society. The management practices of 30 or 40 years ago would no longer be acceptable. Employees demand participation—an option to have a say—in what is happening in their firm. There is no longer the automatic acceptance of the boss as being completely in charge. Modern management practices must take account of that situation.

There are many more women involved in the work force generally and entitled to equal rights within it. Just recently a woman I know left a very traditional Government department because, although she was very highly qualified with tertiary education and very skilled in her particular area of work, in that traditional environment she was still expected to get the cups of tea for the men—traditional values, but hardly appropriate to the twenty first century.

That is only a small example, but it is an example of changing attitudes that we have to confront and deal with. We have to deal with them by looking at ethical questions. In fact, every day we are faced with ethical dilemmas. We are faced with debates about 'Do the means justify the end?' I found the television documentary last Sunday on the ABC 'The Killer and the Candidate' compelling viewing, as it raised an ethical dilemma in politics. Ricky Rector was executed in Arkansas during Bill Clinton's Presidential election campaign and while Clinton was still Governor of Arkansas. The argument was whether Rector was mentally competent to have committed the offence. He had been found by the court not to be insane but there was a compelling case, because of his diminished mental capacity, for executive clemency to have been exercised by Governor Clinton. When Clinton was first elected Governor, he was opposed to the death penalty and commuted some 30 death sentences. He was defeated two years later, based on a strong law and order campaign from a Republican rival.

The Republican campaign of Bush against Dukakis in 1988 saw Dukakis destroyed in a law and order campaign, based on a prisoner who was released on parole and committed murders in the State of Massachusetts when Dukakis was Governor. Clinton and the Democrats knew in 1992 that they had to be tough on crime. Clinton demonstrated this by the execution of Rector during the campaign. Certainly that was an ethical dilemma in politics. Did the means justify the end?

The purists would no doubt condemn Clinton as selling out on his principles for political gain. The politicians' response is that he cannot be elected unless he responds to people's demands: that is democracy. This current example emphasises the point I am making, that ethics is about life. We are confronted by those dilemmas everyday. It is a mistake to try to compartmentalise ethics and discussion about them.

The key issue in this area of values and ethics is identifying and agreeing on our core values and applying those to our modern, complex society. This cannot be done by lamenting the loss of some classical age of correct ethical behaviour which probably never existed. It will not be done simply by calling for a return to traditional values or greater discipline. Slogans will not ensure adherence to Christian values or greater discipline. It is a matter of identifying traditional values which are fundamental and combining them with the positive values of modern Australia. It is a matter of recognising the importance of self-discipline and recognising that obedience to authority is not something which is automatically accepted—it has to be earned.

I dealt with this issue in the introduction to the South Australian Crime Prevention Strategy in a speech to a Crime Prevention Seminar on 28 October 1989 as follows:

Most Australians would still adhere to core values such as honesty, truthfulness, fairness in interpersonal relations, the importance of keeping promises, concern for one's neighbour, respect for persons and property, etc. Many of these core values are those which are reinforced by Christianity, but in our diverse, secular society we do not all rely on the Christian churches as the social institution to reinforce community values. Our challenge is to build structures within our changing community, to reinforce the core moral and ethical values about which the great majority of our citizens agree.

In summary, we need to identify core values, apply them to new situations and reinforce those values in the institutions of society. This is a process that must go on throughout all institutions in the community. In schools the study of ethics should become a regular part of school curricula.

To conclude, if there was a quick-fix solution to dealing with problems of crime, family breakdown, the perceived breakdown in community values and other features of modern western democratic industrialised societies, then presumably someone, somewhere, in this world would have found it. They have not.

These features of modern society exist irrespective of the ideology of Governments in power. They are not phenomena which are easily resolvable by Governments. Very conservative Governments in the United Kingdom (Thatcher and Major Governments) and in the United States of America (Reagan and Bush Governments) have been in power in the 1980s. Crime, which is often cited as a symptom of this decline in values and ethics, increased significantly in those countries, despite considerable rhetoric about traditional law and order. This should not be taken to mean that the Government and the community are helpless or should do nothing about these issues. But it does emphasise that the issues are complex and not amenable to resolution by simple one-line slogans.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and in so doing I would like to thank her Excellency the Governor of South Australia for her speech on the opening of Parliament. I pay a tribute to

Her Excellency for the way in which she is discharging her public duties and functions as the representative of Her Majesty the Queen, and I also thank Her Excellency on behalf of the many community groups for her enthusiastic dedication in the service of all South Australians.

I take this opportunity to express regret on the deaths of the Hon. John Burdett and the Hon. Jessie Cooper, and I extend my sincere heartfelt sympathy to their families. I offer my congratulations to you, Mr President, on your election to the high office as President of this Chamber, which I trust will be a long and rewarding experience for you. I wish to place on public record my appreciation for the work accomplished by the previous President of this Council, the Hon. Gordon Bruce, who served this Chamber with great fairness and neutrality. I also take this opportunity to congratulate the new members of Parliament and, in particular, the many Liberal members who have been elected to Parliament in this important year.

The Liberal victory on 11 December 1993 has provided the Liberal Government with an exceptional opportunity to rebuild the State's economy and enhance our growth potential through the implementation of microeconomic policies and reforms. It will be crucial for the Brown Liberal Government to give attention to the vast array of regulatory barriers which have affected our capacity to compete at an international level, where we are promoting goods and services. As a Government, we will need to assess our labour market and our domestic competition and prices, particularly in the public utility activities.

In addition, there are the so-called social regulations involving issues such as the environment, consumer protection and occupational health and safety. In most cases such regulations have, by distorting the structure of incentives facing producers and consumers, reduced the efficiency with which we use our resources and made our economy less responsive to adjustment pressures imposed on it by a rapidly changing world economy. One proposition asserts that in societies such as Australia, which have experienced long periods of stability, individuals and firms build up dense networks of special interest groups.

These in turn engage in lobbying behaviour to preserve the *status quo* by shielding their constituents from changes in the economic environment in which they operate. The outcome is an economy which lacks dynamics and is poorly placed on the supply side to respond to changed economic circumstances whether they be favourable or unfavourable. As a result, growth in output income and living standards are forgone. This diagnosis applies generally to South Australia, and says that the State's economic performance will continue to be mediocre until the State goes through some structural changes. It would be sensible to duplicate the lesson that a harsh experience might transmit with commonsense and realistic analysis of what our future might look like under a continuation of inappropriate policies, which were promoted by the previous Labor Administration and which were strongly criticised by the Arthur D. Little report. But we can no longer afford to sacrifice economic growth through inappropriate policies.

For most of the 1980s the South Australian economy under the Labor Administration has been characterised by too much spending relative to income. This has registered as a series of large current account deficits. To finance the State's deficits the Labor Administration utilised the access to foreign savings through SAFA in the form of debt or equity capital. As a result, the ratio of our State debt to GDP has

increased substantially and the debt servicing burden has increased from about 4 per cent of exports of goods and services to a figure nearly four times this percentage at the present time.

The dimensions of the microeconomic adjustment task have been the subject of considerable research in recent years. Put simply, the essence of the task at hand requires either reduced spending—and that is living standards—relative to our income, or increased income relative to our spending. Either way, this means ensuring that a higher proportion of our income is not consumed by us but is incorporated in goods and services that are exported overseas. The structural adjustment offered by the second option is more acceptable because it maintains better prospects for living standards. The crucial question then becomes one of what are the appropriate policies that need to be followed to ensure our growth potential is realised.

There are four basic paths whereby a higher rate of economic growth can be achieved, and they are as follows:

- through increased employment of existing factors of production, labour and capital (both physical and human) and land (including land-based natural resources such as forest and minerals);
- through increasing the supplies of factors of production for subsequent employment;
- through increased efficiency with which these factors are employed, that is, higher factor productivity and;
- by improving our export trade through value adding and by encouraging the rest of the world to increase the purchasing of our commodities which we sell to them relative to the goods which we buy from them.

As can be seen there is a good deal of interdependence between these proposals. For example, policies which increase the employment of labour and its rewards also increase its supply by raising the workplace participation rate. Similarly, policies which raise efficiency, higher factor productivity and flexibility also enhance the effectiveness of macroeconomic policy reforms in the pursuit of full employment.

Mr President, I intend to limit my speaking time to dealing with one of the four ways by which the Government can explore and achieve greater economic growth and that is through increased factor productivity. To the extent that we adopt better, that is, more efficient, ways of doing things, then the productivity of our land, labour and capital will increase. This adds growth potential in much the same way as it does an expansion in factor supplies.

It is now widely recognised that efficiency, factor productivity and hence economic growth are curtailed by most forms of economic regulation. Many regulations, whatever their original purpose and effect, are now easily recognised as hopelessly wasteful. Yet this removal has not been an easy matter for Governments to achieve. This is because even the most blatantly wasteful regulations have come to benefit some group or other.

There has been a much more inquisitive approach towards regulation in recent times. Despite the considerable progress towards reform, the Australian economy generally remains highly and inappropriately regulated, with over 40 per cent of economic activity still subject to a significant form of regulation. While there is a great variety of regulatory mechanisms, many of them share in common the distortion of the price incentives facing producers and consumers. Efficiency, growth and income are reduced by such arrangements through three streams.

First, there is the reduction in allocative efficiency—the composition of production between sectors. Too many resources are allocated to some sectors and not enough to others. Secondly, there is a lower technical efficiency at the firm level, with too many resources used per unit output. Thirdly, there is the lower dynamic efficiency, whereby the ability of the economy to adjust quickly to changing economic circumstances is reduced. Some of the main areas of regulation which affect costs can be identified as follows: regulation of international trade in goods and services; regulation of domestic competition in public utilities; regulation of the labour market; regulation of business practices; and social regulation.

I will speak briefly about the first two points. Barriers to international trade in both goods and services are widespread. The most significant, in terms of their costs to our economy, are barriers to competition from imported goods. These operate through numerous channels: import tariffs and quarantine restrictions, local content schemes, Government purchasing preferences and offset arrangements.

These instruments generally raise the price of domestic products and restrict the degree of price competition in the domestic market. In turn, higher product prices are passed around the economy through inter-industry cost and sales links. First round price increases lead to nominal wage adjustments and a higher overall cost structure for the economy. The result invariably is adverse for international competitiveness and hence our export performance.

The second item deals with our domestic competition. In the present circumstances public utilities dominate in the provision of transport services, communication services and in the supply of electricity, gas and water. Most of these utilities are protected by legislation prohibiting other supplies. Such protection is extensive. For example, competitive pressures on some State rail authorities are constrained by regulations prohibiting certain commodities being transported by road. Profits of such public utilities are generally regulated and cross-subsidised to provide uniform prices for basic services irrespective of the cost of the provision of the service.

In the past the Labor Government has used the argument which says that the market can be best served at the least cost by a single authority, but we all know that, without the discipline of price competition, there has been little incentive to contain costs or adopt the most efficient techniques to deliver and manage our public services. The result invariably is expensive manning and cost padding, the effects of which are simply passed on to users and taxpayers.

In the case of our railways substantial differences in technical standards and management systems between States continue to apply despite attempts to reduce the disparity. These differences seriously impede the efficiency of our interstate rail transport. In other areas, such as communications, technical developments involving the growth of substitutes are increasingly imposing market disciplines on the behaviour of these activities. This is leading to the continual reassessment within the institutions themselves of the value that their monopoly status offers them and the inhibitions imposed on them by pricing and cross-subsidisation controls.

By way of example, if we were to adopt internationally best practice techniques in the freight transport sector, cost savings of at least 25 per cent in coastal shipping, 35 per cent in waterfront costs, 20 per cent in bulk transport of grains and 50 per cent in coal freight rates could be achieved. In

addition, a more efficient operation of the Australia-wide railway freight system could improve labour productivity by 50 per cent, which is equivalent to a 30 per cent reduction in our rail freight costs.

I recognise that the impetus for reform must come from managers and workers at the enterprise level. Indeed, in some areas of our industries this is happening, but the Liberal Government can and should accelerate the process by removing much of the underlying regulatory structure governing the structure of unions, industrial relations and the conditions under which labour is made available to participate actively in the recovery of the State's economy and a better future for ourselves, our families and for our future generations. I commend the motion to the Council.

[Sitting suspended from 5.52 to 7.45 p.m.]

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I rise to support the motion again on this my fifth occasion and thank Her Excellency Dame Roma for the speech with which she opened Parliament. I take the opportunity tonight specifically to pay tribute to our colleague, the late Hon. John Burdett. I believe that in my five years here as a member of in this Parliament I came to know the Hon. John Burdett, as others have said before me, as a man of great integrity and honesty, a person on the other side of the Chamber in whom I always had confidence in seeking an opinion, in the assurance that the position that he espoused would be one of honesty and openness and without any playing of politics.

As I have stated in a tribute to John Burdett on another occasion, he was one of the last true believers in the Parliamentary system and the Legislative Council in particular. As I said on that occasion, he and the Hon. Dr Ritson were two of the persons who I believe were part of the tradition of the Legislative Council. On opening day they would invariably turn up in their morning suits, and it was not just a show: it was something they actually believed in. I pass on my condolences to John Burdett's widow and the rest of his family. I had no contact with the late Mrs Jessie Cooper; however, again I pass on my personal condolences to her surviving relatives.

My contribution will be reasonably short tonight. Since the election and the win by the Liberal Party in South Australia, it is clear that the Liberal Party has a mandate in a number of areas. I have been given some responsibilities in primary industries, industrial relations and rural affairs, and I make a couple of comments in respect of those issues. Coming from a rural area myself, I have become aware over the years of problems facing farmers. I have always enjoyed very good relations with the farming community. I have not always had the same happy relationship with some of the agri-politicians in the farming community; however, I find I am very comfortable talking with farmers and I am pleased to have that reciprocated by members of the farming community, who have expressed some confidence in me, albeit as a member of a Party for which they do not normally vote.

I intend to expand those relationships and to work with the farming community and the Minister for Primary Industries to try to improve the lot of farming communities. Having said that, I do add the qualification that, within the policy that has been espoused by the Liberal Party, provided there is no disfranchisement of any other members of the community, I am prepared to work cooperatively with the Minister for

Primary Industries to try to improve the lot of our primary producers.

This proposition is essential for people in country areas. There is no doubt that, when the farming community suffers hardship, all those people who live in rural communities in townships and so on suffer. The first people to feel a recession are obviously the farmers and, when they stop buying commodities, the first manifestation is that unemployment is created in those small towns and rural cities. Basically, as a member of the Labor Party, that is the constituency that I represent, although I do think that as members of the Legislative Council with a State responsibility we have to be broader in our perspective than looking only at natural constituencies. We have common interests, and we have to look at the global situation.

Industrial relations is an area in which I have spent about 30 years of my life working, and I look forward to working with my colleague in another place as the shadow Minister for Industrial Relations to ensure that working class people in South Australia do not pay the price for increases in other areas. We have talked today and there have been questions in the Council about mandates, and I am sure that debate will go on and on. In the spirit of industrial relations, I take the view that industrial relations and the laws relating to them have been built up over a long time. Most of them have been arbitrated, negotiated with the employees and agreed. I will have to be convinced that each regulation or law needs to be changed.

If it can be shown to me that there is something fundamentally wrong which disadvantages both parties—that is, if a change is required and it is not just something with which people would like not to have to comply because that would make their position in industry much more advantageous and they might make more money, or if it can clearly be shown that the employee will have a distinct advantage over the employer—I am prepared to consider those matters. My fundamental position on industrial relations laws in this State is that they have evolved over a period of about 100 years; they have been arbitrated and are in place. Unless I am convinced they have been broken I am not prepared to change them just on the whim of political ideology or to provide advantage for employers.

I have been given the responsibility for rural affairs by our Leader in another place. It is not a direct shadow ministry for a portfolio held by a member of the Liberal Party; I suppose it is somewhat the Bronwyn Bishop portfolio. It means I can deal with anything in any area as long as it happens in rural South Australia. Living in rural South Australia, I am aware of many of the concerns that are faced by South Australians living in country areas, and in particular the rundown in the provision of Government services. When we were in Government I made numerous submissions within the confines of the Party, expressing my concerns about the reductions in services and the provision of Government goods and services in country areas. During and prior to the election campaign I made it known to the then Premier, the Hon. Lynn Arnold, that, as far as this member of the Legislative Council was concerned, I had drawn a line in the sand on the reduction of services and the provision of Government offices for members living in rural areas.

I take the opportunity to reiterate that anybody who is talking about rationalisation of Government services and offices in country towns will have an argument with me. In particular, I have made submissions to previous Ministers in respect of the Pipelines Authority in Peterborough and was

given assurances by the Hon. John Klunder at the time that that facility would be maintained and expanded. That facility is crucial to the livelihood of Peterborough; the loss of 46 jobs in Peterborough will have a dramatic effect on a community of that size. In the campaign before the last election, the Liberal Party announced that it was its intention to put that facility on the market, and a letter was circulated to members in Peterborough stating that they would be given the opportunity to take up other positions in the Public Service.

Mr President, you will be aware, because of your activities in rural South Australia, that there are not too many Public Service jobs in Peterborough. There is also the added burden to those people who lose their jobs and have to shift to Adelaide that, whereas one can buy real estate in Peterborough fairly cheaply, in Adelaide one has to pay exorbitant prices.

Another issue on which I want to focus concerns the situation that has been aroused by allegations in the recent controversy surrounding Mr Ian Gilfillan. That has sharpened the focus on the working conditions of country members of the Legislative Council, particularly in relation to living away from home allowances.

Members of this Council, whilst representing the whole of the State, are allocated only one office within a cramped and overcrowded Parliament House with shared facilities, given a third of a secretary and no research staff, except for the Leader of the Opposition, who now has one research officer and one secretary. I submit that the situation is ludicrous and would not be tolerated by members of the House of Assembly from the metropolitan area, let alone country members. Yet the same living away from home allowances, which are capped, apply to members of both Houses living more than 75 kilometres from Adelaide.

Lower House members are provided with at least one office and a staff person with appropriate equipment, including computers, facsimiles and telephones. Some electorates, including the seat of Eyre, have the equivalent of two fully equipped offices with corresponding staff and an office facility, albeit modest, at Parliament House. Consequently, members of the Legislative Council living in country areas are required to be in Adelaide at least three or four days of most weeks and usually five days during a sitting week just to access their very limited shared resources. This problem is severely compounded when a member of the Legislative Council has shadow responsibilities. Not only is the member of the Legislative Council required to be away from his family and principal place of residence, but also he or she often cannot access the sparse resources because of the proper demands of their colleagues.

Last year the Hon. Peter Dunn, MLC, as he then was, and I—at that time the only two members of the Legislative Council living in country areas—applied to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee for facsimile machines to be provided at our homes to allow material to be forwarded to our principal place of residence. That request was rejected.

I have since purchased a facsimile machine out of my electorate allowance. However, I point out that the 47 members of the House of Assembly receive an electorate allowance on top of their facsimiles, telephone connections and so on. House of Assembly members also have the ability to transfer some of their telephone allowances to allow them to access mobile telephones.

Country members of the Legislative Council are forced to drive long distances and require reliable, comfortable and, by

definition, more expensive vehicles. We are often out of contact for a considerable time whilst travelling. For example, it takes me two and a half hours each way to attend Parliament House from Port Pirie. I propose that all country members of the Legislative Council who qualify under the 75-kilometre rule ought to be entitled to a fully equipped and staffed office. If this entitlement were to be taken up, the office must, in my view, be established within a five-kilometre radius of their principal place of residence. Country MLCs should also have the same telephone and postage entitlements in their offices as those enjoyed by our Lower House colleagues.

With respect to members of the Legislative Council, including Government back-benchers, it is clear that the same comparisons can apply, especially for the allocation of staff, although I accept the difficulty in physically housing additional staff in Parliament House at this time. However, I am sure that members would be prepared to endure short-term discomfort whilst the oft vaunted building program was undertaken.

In conclusion, I point out that the Government has a large legislative program, and this raises the question of research staff for Opposition members. In order to deal properly and expeditiously with legislation, I propose that one research officer be allocated to each shadow Minister. That principle was accepted for the Australian Democrats by the previous Government. It is a shame that it never applied equally to the Opposition at that time. However, I do not think it is unreasonable for every member of Parliament to have at least one staff person working for him.

I am sure that new members coming into this place, who have worked in business, would be absolutely appalled—and there are a couple of new members on the other side who fall into that category—to find the sort of working conditions that they found when they got here. I am sure that none of them had offices of the size or quality of those of some Opposition members. Indeed, the staffing arrangements would have been a complete shock to them. I commend this suggestion to the Treasurer and the Premier and hope that in future we shall see reasonable working conditions provided for members of the Legislative Council. I support the motion.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport): Mr President, I congratulate you on your appointment to your important position within the Legislative Council. I wish you and your wife, Heather, all the best for a very rewarding four years in this position. I have a great deal of respect for you and Mrs Dunn.

I thank Her Excellency for her contribution in opening this session of Parliament. It was a great thrill for me to sit on this side of the Chamber after many openings of the Parliament sitting on the Opposition benches.

I accept the responsibilities that have been entrusted to me. I am aware that a number of people have suggested that we can be arrogant and that we can do what we wish and when we want to do it because of the mandate received by the Liberal Party at the election. On the contrary, my response is that I find the whole situation quite humbling. I have met many people on the streets, on buses, at shopping centres and at parties who have indicated that they have always been Labor voters and that they changed their vote for the first time at the last election. I wonder how I could ever do that. I was born and bred a Liberal and I believe very strongly in the Liberal philosophy, no matter how badly or well the Party has performed at any time.

A number of these people told me that changing their vote was an agonising decision. I find that admission a great responsibility in terms of my honouring their expectations of the new Liberal Government. What they wanted from this Government was not only to discipline and shake up the Labor Party but also to re-establish South Australia as a State in which they could hold their head high and no longer have to apologise for being South Australians.

They also felt that we could provide for older people the security that they sought through their working life and that we could provide jobs for younger people. I have met many older women who always thought they would have their daughters or sons and their grandchildren with them as they grew older. Today they are very lonely because their children and/or grandchildren have gone interstate or overseas to work. I should like to think that this Liberal Government will play a part in bringing those young people back home to South Australia. One of my objectives is that we not only stem the tide of people who see their future outside this State but also that we bring South Australians back to this State.

We have a huge investment through education—primary school, secondary school, high school and university. We have invested money and time in young South Australians, but other States and countries are reaping the rewards of that investment. I think we must work extremely hard to stem that flow of young people and generally revitalise this State.

I will make one other comment in response to comments made by the Hon. Anne Levy yesterday towards the conclusion of her very long speech about the women's suffrage centenary. While I applaud her for addressing that subject at some length, I deplore the misrepresentation of a situation that occurred late last year with respect to the position of Chairperson of the Women's Suffrage Centenary Committee.

The Hon. Ms. Levy accused me of sacking Dr Jean Blackburn as Chair of that committee. She went on to say that Dr Blackburn was summarily dismissed for blatantly political reasons. She also said that she understood that Dr Blackburn was told that it was done quite blatantly for political reasons. She then suggested that, for no reason whatsoever, we dismissed Dr Blackburn. At no time did we dismiss or sack Dr Blackburn as we have so ruthlessly been accused of doing.

I sought to speak to Dr Blackburn in mid December. At that stage she indicated that she was leaving for Melbourne next morning and asked whether we could defer such a meeting. I arranged for her to meet the Premier and me on 28 December. That was not my preferred date, but Dr Blackburn had other family commitments. I accepted that that was quite a natural thing for her and many others over the Christmas period. I asked Dr Blackburn to accept the position of vice patron of the Women's Suffrage Centenary Committee. I did so for a variety of reasons, but I do not believe that it would serve any benefit to this place or to Dr Blackburn to canvass those matters.

However, I reassure honourable members, as I have reassured Dr Blackburn, that it was not for blatantly political reasons. It was quite necessary, from unsolicited discussions that I had had over the past year, that a need existed to broaden and strengthen the committee. Dr Blackburn conceded such in conversation with me about that matter. Initially, Dr Blackburn accepted the position of vice patron. I indicated that I would also be pleased for her to continue with the speaking engagements that she had earlier accepted in her capacity as Chair. I would never have done that, as Dr Blackburn knows, if I had sacked or summarily dismissed her for blatantly political reasons. I would not willingly have

accepted her proposal to continue with those speaking engagements had I found her such a threat or had I sought to dismiss her. The two do not make sense, and there is no reason for them to make sense as there is no basis for such allegations as made by the Hon. Ms Levy in this place yesterday.

It is a great pity that those allegations have been made and that this matter, because of those allegations, has had to be aired again this evening. Far from being blatantly political, the Government, unlike the former Government, has asked the Opposition to serve on the executive committee. The former executive committee under the earlier Government comprised the Chair (Dr Blackburn), the Deputy Chair appointed by the Government (Ms Mary Beasley), a representative of the Labor Party (Carolyn Pickles), and a representative of the National Council of Women (Ms Barbara Grealy). People on the executive as well as on the steering committee called on the former Government to ensure that there was not just one representative of one major Party on the executive committee. I heard those representations at the time and sympathised with them and, indeed, we have honoured them in government, because I believe there should be bipartisan support of the executive committee and over the whole membership of the steering committee, its agenda and general discussions.

For that reason Ms Jennifer Cashmore represents the Liberal Party on the executive committee and for that reason also I have asked Ms Carolyn Pickles to continue to serve on the executive committee to represent the Labor Party. I have also agreed, because of the Hon. Ms Pickles' other responsibilities as a shadow Minister resulting in her not having all the time that she would wish to serve on the steering committee, to readily accept her suggestion that Ms Colleen Hutchison, the former member for Stuart, represent the Labor Party on the steering committee and that her expenses be met by the steering committee and the taxpayers to enable her to serve in that capacity.

To suggest that we have been politically partisan or have acted with political motives is absolute nonsense and I refute it totally. I am sorry that the former Minister has sought to air this matter in that manner in this place as it adds a distasteful note to the year—a year which should not only celebrate for women and the community in general past achievements but should also look to greater achievements for women in the community at large in the future.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I thank Her Excellency for the address with which she opened the current session of Parliament and join with my colleagues in expressing my regret and extending my sympathy to the families of our former colleagues in this place, namely, the Hon. Jessie Cooper and the Hon. John Burdett. It is a poignant moment for me with respect to both members as indeed it was the Hon. Jessie Cooper's place that I took when I first entered the Legislative Council in July 1979.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper had served in the Legislative Council for 20 years, had had a distinguished career, being the first woman elected to the Parliament of South Australia, and was a woman of total integrity, of strong views and of principle. In fact, it was not uncharacteristic of her sometimes to be at odds with the Party position. Indeed, her last speech in the Legislative Council was on the controversial legislation introduced by the Labor Government of the day which sought to limit to no more than 15 per cent any shareholding in the publicly listed company of Santos. She crossed the floor

against her Party room position to support the legislation which limited that shareholding to 15 per cent. In fact, the legislation remains in force to this day.

I must say that I did not support her position at the time although, of course, I was not a member of Parliament, but I respected the views with which the Hon. Jessie Cooper put down her position, characteristically in a very brief fashion. She made the point in her final speech in the Council that:

This was a not an emotional matter nor an expression of nebulous principles. This is a matter of hard, cold facts, hard production, hard cash, and continuing liquid viability of one of the State's greatest assets.

So, she supported the Bill with amendments and opposed the Party room.

The Hon. John Burdett was a Legislative Councillor who also served 20 years in this place, and it was tragic to think that he died just days before the State election of December 1993, because amongst the Legislative Councillors he had worked as hard as anyone to ensure a Liberal victory, working tirelessly and selflessly in electorates in the northeast suburbs. As a member of the Tonkin Government, he had been one of the quiet achievers, and people who reflect on the three years under Premier Tonkin invariably make mention of the Hon. John Burdett's outstanding contribution as Minister for Community Welfare and Minister of Consumer Affairs. He was a kindly man, a man whose door was always open to colleagues and political foes alike, a person for whom the word 'integrity' had real meaning. To Jean, his widow, and to his family, I would express my deepest sympathy.

The Adelaide Festival of Arts is upon us and, characteristically, it attracts a large number of international and interstate visitors, as well as good local support from citizens of Adelaide and South Australia. The centre for the performing arts undoubtedly is the Adelaide Festival Centre, but the hub for the visual arts and many other festival programs is North Terrace. North Terrace has been described as Adelaide's major tourist icon. Since 1980, there has been a stream of committees looking at ways of ensuring this kilometre of culture has streetscaping and signage which is visitor friendly, and fully capitalises on the uniqueness of this cultural boulevard which is home to institutions which include the Art Gallery of South Australia, the South Australian Museum, the State Library, the Mortlock Library, the Migration Museum, the Archaeological Museum at the University of Adelaide, the Royal South Australian Society of Arts, the Performing Arts Collection, the Botanic Gardens, Ayers House, Old Parliament House Museum, Parliament House, Government House, Bonython Hall, the Police Museum, Artlab, the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia (SA Branch), and the Adelaide Casino.

In the very early Adelaide 1980s, Clemengers were commissioned at a cost of \$20 000 to develop a logo and a promotional plan for North Terrace. A North Terrace action group was formed. The Adelaide City Council, during the 1980s, has investigated the signage and streetscaping of North Terrace. Donald Horn headed an inquiry styled 'The North Terrace Cultural Precinct Study', which reported in 1992. The South Australian Department of Housing and Construction (SACON) and the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage were involved in this major study of North Terrace which, as I mentioned, was released two years ago.

There have been thousands of words written, and many committees and meetings to discuss North Terrace. But with just days to the opening of the 1994 Adelaide Festival of Arts, the signage and streetscaping of North Terrace remain

substandard, hick and totally unsatisfactory for a city that is the capital of the Festival State. I accept that in the letters to the Editor of the *Advertiser* this morning there was a letter from Ron Radford, Director of the Art Gallery of South Australia; Chris Anderson, Director of the South Australian Museum; and Frances Awcott, Director of the State Library of South Australia, talking about the North Terrace urban design project, and I accept all the words which they have written. They are valid points made by three very special people who, as leaders of those three institutions, have brought dynamism, energy and professionalism into the North Terrace cultural precinct. But what I am about to say nevertheless remains valid.

In 1980, the Edwards report recognised the enormous potential of North Terrace and called for '... a plan for the transformation of Adelaide's unique cultural and historical North Terrace complex into a public precinct with facilities for both education and entertainment. But what has happened in the 14 years since the Edwards report? We still have fading, ugly and misleading signage. In front of Government House, on the main intersection of Adelaide, there is a very tired, large brown and white sign which points to the Constitutional Museum which in fact was renamed Old Parliament House seven and a half years ago, in fact, on 24 August 1986. The sign also continues to arrow the Institute of Technology which, of course, for some years, has been the University of South Australia. The sign omits to mention three important visitor attractions, the Mortlock Library, the Migration Museum and the South Australian Police Museum.

I have raised this matter in Parliament and in public over the past few years—before the 1990 festival and again before the 1992 festival. The questions were asked of the Hon. Barbara Wiese in her capacity as Minister of Tourism. This criticism received considerable publicity at the time, but nothing has happened. Today, in front of Parliament House, there is a large lidless Sulo bin chained to a post. Is this the style that you expect to see in the Festival State? Walking eastwards, North Terrace is alive with Sulo bins. Is it beyond the wit of someone to use the artisans of the State to design aesthetic rubbish bins more in keeping with the culture of this wonderful precinct? Why not turn rubbish bins into art? Geoffrey Barns, surely, could do something which would make the rubbish bins more memorable along North Terrace than the ugly Sulo bins which adorn it presently.

There is a disappointing inconsistency in the signposting. For example, there is a green and white sign sitting uncomfortably on an ugly, rusty, grey pole on Kintore Avenue—North Terrace intersection, pointing to the Royal Society Gallery, the Migration Museum and the South Australian Police Museum. Graffiti adorns the hoardings covering the building works outside the Mortlock Library. Certainly the large green and gold information signs erected by the Adelaide City Council provide assistance to the North Terrace visitor, but even with these recently erected signs, there is an unexplainable inconsistency. Whereas the signs for the Art Gallery and the South Australian Museum clearly set down the opening hours, the sign outside the State Library simply states, 'Open daily', but neglects to advise what hours the library is open. The ugly, rusting grey poles can be seen the length of North Terrace. Certainly there have been some welcome improvements in streetscaping, but that is principally to the west of King William Street where plane trees have significantly improved the visual appearance of North Terrace.

What can you say to the following facts? In Sydney, they commenced building a tunnel under Sydney Harbour in January 1988 and completed it in August 1992, a major project involving hundreds of millions of dollars finished in little more than four and a half years. In Sydney, they commenced the Darling Harbour project in June 1985 and this project was finished in January 1988, after two and a half years. This houses the Powerhouse Museum, the Maritime Museum, numerous restaurants, a shopping complex, hotels, the Sydney Aquarium, wharfs and other visitor attractions. In Melbourne, after a long debate about the focus for the city, the Yarra has been discovered, albeit a tad muddy; the Flinders Park Tennis Centre, the Concert Hall and the Art Gallery are located close to the Yarra. The Southgate project—immediately adjacent to the Concert Hall—and the Art Gallery, commenced in September 1989, were completed in November 1993, in a little more than four years. This major project includes shops, restaurants and an international hotel. The complex is a great success, being well patronised by Melburnians and visitors.

In Brisbane, following the great success of the Brisbane Expo in the bicentennial year of 1988, the Expo site, located on the previously under-utilised land by the Brisbane River, has been redeveloped for apartment living and major tourist attractions, including restaurants, shops and science and environmental exhibits.

Mr President, Adelaide has become committee city: lots of talk, lots of meetings but little action. In the time that Sydney has built Darling Harbour and the Sydney Harbour tunnel, in the time that Melbourne has built an international tennis centre and the Southgate project, and in the time that Brisbane has redeveloped its Expo site, Adelaide has not even been able to spend a comparatively small amount of money on correct signposting and visitor friendly streetscaping for North Terrace, which is claimed to be its premier tourist attraction. I find this arrogance and indifference unacceptable.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I point out to the Hon. Ms Pickles that in raising these matters publicly on several occasions over many years I did so in the not unreasonable belief that basic matters such as accurate signposting would be attended to. I am alarmed to think that the Adelaide City Council and the State Government of the day just thumbed their noses at what was a very obvious and very sensible suggestion. After all, can Ms Pickles or any one of her

colleagues name another city of a million people anywhere in the world where the signposting on the city's major intersection has remained outrageously wrong in its accuracy and omissions for a period of seven and a half years?

It is high time that Adelaide stopped being committee city. North Terrace deserves better treatment. Adelaide is now at war to retain its reputation as the top festival city in Australia. As I mentioned this afternoon in my question, Premier Jeff Kennett of Victoria is committing money and energy to ensuring that Melbourne becomes the cultural centre of Australia. Anthony Steele, who masterminded many of Adelaide's successful earlier Festivals of Art, is the recently appointed director of the Sydney Festival. The Queensland Government is committing significant sums of money to upgrading the arts profile of Brisbane and major regional centres, recognising the nexus which exists between tourism and arts, and the economic benefits that invariably flow from that nexus.

Lastly, the Perth Festival, while smaller than Adelaide's, has attracted a growing band of support from interstate and international visitors. Some years ago I described North Terrace as 'a kilometre of culture'. It is an apt description given the concentration of cultural institutions along that boulevard. But the streetscaping, street furniture, rubbish bins, paving, light poles, street lighting, and signage are well short of international standards. If we talk about world best performance, if we talk about world standards in relation to manufacturing and the provision of service, we have to do it also when we come to talk about our arts, because otherwise it is simply not good enough.

In addition, visitors to North Terrace still have difficulty obtaining a comprehensive brochure, which adequately describes the treasures of the Terrace. Not so long ago an excellent brochure on North Terrace was produced but, in fact, it cost \$2 and was kept under the counter at the Tourism Centre. You had to know about it to be able to ask for it. If you were from Germany or Hong Kong the chances are that you didn't and you wouldn't.

Another matter to which I want to refer briefly is the comparative performance of the economies of Queensland and South Australia. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table, which I assure you, Mr President, is of a purely statistical nature—no graphs, no cartoons—and which sets out the employed persons by industry in Queensland and South Australia, and a measure of the movement in those numbers in the period May 1991 to November 1993.

Leave granted.

EMPLOYED PERSONS BY INDUSTRY, QUEENSLAND AND SOUTH AUSTRALIA

QUEENSLAND

INDUSTRY	MAY 1991 (^{'000} PERSONS)	NOV 1993 (^{'000} PERSONS)	INCREASE (^{'000} PERSONS)	INCREASE (%)
Manufacturing	140.3	175.1	34.9	24.8
Community Services	234.8	259.2	24.4	10.4
Construction	108.9	125.0	16.1	14.8
Public Administration and defence	54.3	65.6	11.3	20.8
Wholesale and Retail Trade	297.2	307.1	9.8	3.3
-Retail Trade	214.5	223.9	9.4	4.4
-Wholesale Trade	82.7	83.1	0.4	0.5

EMPLOYED PERSONS BY INDUSTRY, QUEENSLAND AND SOUTH AUSTRALIA				
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Other Services	81.3	86.9	5.6	6.9
Recreation, Personal and other services	110.6	114.1	3.6	3.2
Electricity, Gas and Water	11.7	13.8	2.1	17.6
Communication	17.8	17.1	-0.7	-4.1
Transport and Storage	75.3	73.2	-2.2	-2.9
Finance, Property and Business Services	142.5	137.1	-5.4	-3.8
Mining	23.0	16.4	-6.6	-28.5
TOTAL	1 297.7	1 390.5	92.8	7.2

SOUTH AUSTRALIA				
INDUSTRY	MAY 1991 (^{'000} PERSONS)	NOV 1993 (^{'000} PERSONS)	INCREASE (^{'000} PERSONS)	INCREASE (%)
Manufacturing	107.3	96.8	-10.5	-9.8
Community Services	132.9	150.4	17.5	13.2
Construction	39.2	40.6	1.4	3.6
Public Administration and Defence	23.4	20.0	-3.4	-14.6
Wholesale and Retail Trade	135.9	129.9	-6.0	-4.4
-Retail Trade	96.8	90.7	-6.1	-6.3
-Wholesale Trade	39.1	39.2	0.1	0.3
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Other Services	48.5	50.0	1.5	3.1
Recreation, Personal and Other Services	51.5	47.4	-4.0	-7.8
Electricity, Gas and Water	10.1	7.0	-3.0	-30.2
Communication	10.9	7.5	-3.4	-31.1
Transport and Storage	25.6	29.3	3.7	14.3
Finance, Property and Business Services	67.7	64.4	-3.3	-4.9
Mining	4.7	4.3	-0.4	-8.5
TOTAL	657.7	647.7	-10.0	-1.5

Source: ABS Labour Force Estimates Microfiche, Group B, Table E3

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: This table is devastating in what it reveals about economic performance in Queensland and, of course, what it also reveals about the dismal performance of the South Australian economy under a Labor Government for the two and a half years immediately before the last State election. These figures show that the number of employed persons in Queensland grew by 7.2 per cent in that period of time—from nearly 1.3 million to nearly 1.4 million people. In fact, the increase was 93 000 people employed in Queensland over a two and a half year period. As I said, an increase of 7.2 per cent. In that same time 10 000 jobs were lost in South Australia, a decrease from just under 660 000 to less than 650 000. That was a decrease of 10 000 people, which is a shrinkage in employment in South Australia of 1.5 per cent. Think about that. In two and a half years Queensland's employed population grew by 93 000; South Australia's population fell by 10 000. That is a turn around of over 100 000 people.

We boast about South Australia being a core State for manufacturing, but these figures reveal something which very few people have commented on publicly, and that is Queensland's emerging presence and emerging power as a force in manufacturing. Because in the two and a half year period, from May 1991 through to November 1993, the number of jobs in manufacturing in Queensland soared from 140 000 to over 175 000—an increase of nearly 25 per cent. We can compare that with the fall of nearly 10 per cent in the same period in manufacturing jobs in South Australia, from 107 000 in May 1991 to less than 97 000 in November 1993. Whereas Queensland had 31 per cent more people employed in manufacturing than South Australia as at May 1991, by November 1993 it had 81 per cent more people employed in manufacturing than South Australia. That is an extraordinary figure.

South Australia's population is roughly half that of Queensland. We have 1.45 million people compared with

Queensland's about 3.1 million people. By November 1993 Queensland had almost double the number of people employed in manufacturing than did South Australia. In other words, it is rapidly becoming a significant presence in manufacturing. Traditionally we had been one of the leading States in terms of the percentage of our work force employed in manufacturing. I know, from my reading and from my business contacts in Queensland, the number of new emerging companies, many relocating from other States in Australia, many expanding more quickly in Queensland than in other States and many coming in from offshore locating in Queensland, linked into Indonesia and countries north.

Queensland is going to be a mighty presence in manufacturing in Australia and also a formidable competitor against South Australia. Given the inherent geographical advantages, the shipping time to Asia, for example, which is an increasingly important market for Australia, and given the inherent economic advantages which exist, with no financial institutions duty and lower State taxation generally for businesses, the traditional rivalry which has existed between South Australia and Victoria for the title of manufacturing capital of Australia, particularly with regard to the traditional industries, such as the car industry and the white goods industry will, I think, in the future be overshadowed by the emergence of Queensland as a manufacturing force.

So, 25 per cent increase in manufacturing employment in two and a half years in Queensland; a shrinkage of 10 per cent in manufacturing jobs in South Australia. Looking at construction again we see a similar story: a 15 per cent increase in just two and a half years in the number of people employed in the construction industry in Queensland against a paltry 3.6 per cent increase in construction in South Australia. The wholesale and retail trade tell a similar story. In the retail trade in Queensland there was a 4.4 per cent increase in jobs compared with a fall of 6.3 per cent in retail jobs in South Australia.

Those figures tell a story that should be of concern to every South Australian irrespective of their political views. That data should be looked at by members of the Government because it shows an interesting trend in manufacturing that I think will continue. It will underpin the strength of Queensland, which traditionally has enjoyed prosperity in areas that we all recognise such as tourism, mining, and pastoral enterprises. Traditionally it has been more decentralised than any other Australian State with just 40 per cent of its population living in the capital city of Brisbane and 60 per cent in the regional cities and country areas. This compares starkly with the 72 per cent of South Australia's population that lives in Adelaide, with just 28 per cent living in regional cities and country areas.

The challenge is there for this Government to turn around the South Australian economy by making it more competitive and profitable for small businesses by opening the State for business, whether it be business already here, business interstate looking to relocate or business overseas. Finally, I would make a point that I made in previous speeches: the one point that must be recognised at all levels of government—one of the great issues that will undoubtedly affect all levels of government, Federal State and local—is the emergence of home business. It has an impact at local level in terms of council regulations and zoning, adjusting to allow the small home business, whether a computer or accounting business, or a dress designer or lawyer working one or two days at home and three days at the office. That is the fastest growing sector of the economy in Canada and the United States of

America. If we had decent figures from the Bureau of Statistics we would also see that that is true in South Australia. This Government is sensitive to the small business sector and recognises the importance of the small business sector, so I am confident that over the next four years South Australia's economic prosperity will be revived so that it will again become competitive with other Australian States.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I support the motion. I would like to pay a tribute in this Council to the Hon. Jessie Cooper, who was not a member of Parliament whom I knew well; I met her on a couple of occasions but, of course, her name will go down in history as one of the first two women to enter this Parliament.

I would also like to pay a tribute to the Hon. John Burdett. Several years ago John Burdett and I were members of a committee that took evidence on the difficult issue of child abuse. Coming from two different political perspectives one might expect that we might not always have the same views on issues, but we came to respect one another's views and differences, and I must say that I found him always to be very much a gentleman and to offer advice that was gratefully taken on many occasions. My sympathies go to the Hon. John Burdett's large family of which he was immensely proud. The South Australian Parliament will be the loser from his passing.

Also, I would like to note the contributions of my former colleagues who are no longer representing the people of South Australia following the recent State election. My Party has already acknowledged that this was a disastrous result for us and I believe that over time the people of this State will come to learn that it was also a disastrous result for them. It is always painful to lose friends and colleagues, and it is doubly painful when many of those colleagues have given years of service to the Parliament and made significant contributions to the enhancement of this State. I do not intend to single out any one person, but I will miss them all and I am sure my colleagues in this Chamber and on the other side will also miss them. I wish my former colleagues well in the future, although their future will be very different from what they might have planned over the next few years but, whatever it is, I hope it will be happy and successful.

My Party understands that it has the task ahead of it to regain the confidence of South Australians, but I believe that we will succeed in regaining that confidence and I am sure we will be aided and abetted by the Liberal Party when it begins to show its true colours. As a member of the shadow Executive I know that I have a great responsibility both to my Party and to the people of this State in ensuring that we have a strong Opposition. This is particularly important in this Council, where the Liberal Party does not have a mandate to run roughshod over the views of the Labor Opposition and of the Australian Democrats.

The Premier of this State believes that he does have a mandate to ignore the views of members of this Council, but I do not believe this to be so. It is clear that the people of this State did not vote a majority for the Liberal Party in this Chamber and I know that we will be a responsible Opposition; the Hon. Chris Sumner, Leader of the Labor Party in this Council, has already indicated that this is the case. We will carefully scrutinise legislation, amend it or oppose it very much as the Liberal Party has been doing over the years that I have been in Parliament since 1985.

From 1985 to 1989 it was clear that my Party had a mandate to govern this State, but I do not believe that a

mandate to govern automatically ensures that every piece of legislation goes through without amendment or opposition. Anyone who thinks that is silly indeed. There will be legislation that the Government will ram through the House of Assembly. It will be able to do that easily with the power of its majority, but it does not have a majority in this Council and we will have the democratic right to amend or oppose whatever we think fit, after careful consideration. This Chamber does consider legislation carefully. Members in another place are often unkind about what goes on here, but I believe the debates in this Chamber mainly reflect careful consideration of legislation. We may have differing views, but in the end every care and effort has been given to ensure that, in the main, legislation is passed; most of the legislation is passed through this Chamber quite easily.

Obviously, some pieces of legislation expose fundamental philosophic differences between the two or three Parties and they will have a bit of a rocky road. As I have said, we will act responsibly, but I can assure the Council that I believe that the people have given me the power to change legislation if I believe I can improve it, or oppose it if I believe it not to be in the best interests of democracy or in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

I would now touch on some of the areas for which I have been given responsibility in my shadow portfolio. First, I draw the attention of members to the *Advertiser* editorial of Saturday 5 February 1994. It is not often, especially of late, that I agree with the *Advertiser* editorials. I do not agree with the sentiments contained in this editorial entirely, but I must say that predominantly the editorial makes sensible comment about the importance of the environment, and I would like to quote some of the comments of that editorial, as follows:

A succession of international reports over the past few days has tipped the bucket on Australia's environmental record. The most damning of these surveys was by the London-based New Economics Foundation which selected 21 developed nations and tested them on 11 significant environmental issues. Australia showed up badly under the eco-microscope. It was the worst performer in one key sector, among the worst in a number of others and ranked a pathetic 18th out of 21 overall.

It was found, for instance, that Australians were top of the garbage heap, generating more municipal solid waste than even Americans who are usually seen as the champions in the throw-away league. And only Canada and the United States exceeded Australia's per capita carbon dioxide emissions which contribute largely to the greenhouse effect.

The editorial goes on to talk about some of the issues in South Australia which I think are very important environmental issues and on some of which, clearly, the Opposition will have fundamental differences of view from the Government. In the main, I intend to have a cooperative approach, particularly on the environment, but clearly if there is a fundamental difference of view I intend to voice it quite strongly. The *Advertiser* editorial goes on to state:

Environmental ministries ought to be among the most powerful and best funded in any Government. While the economy may seem the all-important short-term consideration, from now on the environment be the major long term concern.

It goes on to make a comment that only once has an Australian Federal Government had an environment Minister with any clout in Cabinet, and that was Senator Richardson. It also goes on to make some critical comments about the Hon. Mrs Kelly, and I must say I do not agree with them. She has been a very good environment Minister who has taken a keen interest in what goes on in South Australia and who will continue to do so.

So, the environment is a very important issue for all South Australians and for all Australians, if not for all people living

in the world today, because we have a responsibility to pass on to future generations a country that is clean and not polluted. I do not think we have done a terribly good job to date. I hope that in my time in this shadow portfolio area I have a productive relationship with the Hon. Mr Wotton, the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. I believe Mr Wotton has the environment at heart; it only remains to be seen whether or not he can persuade his Cabinet colleagues to support him on many issues that will come before him.

Another area for which I have shadow responsibility is the status of women. Clearly, I am delighted to have that shadow portfolio area in the centenary year of women's suffrage. I have been a member of the steering committee of the women's suffrage centenary and on the executive of many other subcommittees, on some of which I can no longer serve since I have taken on other duties. I must say I believe we will have a very successful year, and I would like to pay tribute to all those women on all the committees of the centenary of women's suffrage and also those women out there who have been working away in many areas trying to make this a very successful year. Of course, it is not just about celebrations. It is also about the politics of the issue, and the politics of the issue are about women taking their place in the world today. Those women 100 years ago believed that women had the right to vote and to take their place in the Parliaments of South Australia.

We were the first place in the world to give women the right to stand for Parliament. It took us 65 years to get the first one elected; nevertheless, we should go on trying. We have not done terribly well to date. I was pleased to note that the Hon. Ms Laidlaw will be moving in this place to set up a special committee to look at the role of women in Parliaments and some of the reasons why women are not represented in the Parliaments in Australia. I think I can give a fairly quick answer to that one initially, and that is that the major Parties have not put them there. It is as simple as that, and I believe it is something that both the major political Parties have to address. Neither one of us has done a terrific job in this area, and although obviously there are more women in this place than when Jessie Cooper was here it is not enough.

At this point I will quote the Prime Minister's recent comments, which are contained in a parliamentary research paper from the Department of the Parliamentary Library that was prepared for the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters—Women, Elections and Parliament. Mr Keating said:

This a country which prides itself on its democratic institutions, yet in the most important of those democratic institutions, the nation's Parliaments, men outnumber women seven to one, in the House of Representatives more than 10 to one. No doubt the aberration can be explained: but it can't be justified. There are reasons but we shouldn't call them excuses. The ruling body of the nation should be representative of the people it serves. At present it is not. Parliaments make laws for all the people and its composition should as far as possible reflect that. At present it does not. In fact, it has been calculated. . . that at the present rate of increase it would take another 60 years to achieve equal representation of men and women in the Commonwealth Parliament. In the meantime Australian democracy is the loser. . . It is less that women have a right to be there than we have a need for them to be there. . . Equal representation of women and men strengthens the legitimacy of our decision making process. More than that, it strengthens our capacity to make the right decisions.

The Hon. Mr Keating made that speech at the opening of a conference on Women, Power and the 21st Century in Melbourne on 3 December 1993. It is hoped that Mr Keating will use his considerable influence as the Leader of our Party

nationally to ensure that women take their rightful place in the Parliaments across Australia, not just in the Commonwealth Parliament, and that Mr Keating will support the aim of the Labor Party women at their conference in Brisbane two years ago who were trying to achieve half by the year 2000. I do not think that is too great a goal to aim at; I believe it is achievable, particularly in South Australia in the light of the vast raft of seats we are hoping to win at the next election.

I believe that this is something to which we must play close attention. This Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters was set up at the Federal level in May 1993 to inquire into and report on Women, Elections and Parliament, with particular reference to the reasons for the gender imbalance in the Australian Parliament; strategies for increasing the number and effectiveness of women in the political and electoral processes; and the effect of Parliamentary procedures and practices on women's aspirations to and participation in the Australian Parliament.

This paper looks at a number of issues which I think are of particular interest. In a 1991 survey of Parliaments in the world, the inter-parliamentary union shows that in 1991 women made up 11 per cent of the world's parliamentarians and men 89 per cent. They are using as a basis single or lower chambers of national Parliaments. They are not using the upper houses, because it has always been easier to elect women into upper houses, since they are generally elected on a list system. I suppose political Parties consider that it is a bit difficult to have an all-male list and that they will put a couple of us on the list to make it look good. I think it is probably fair to survey just the lower chambers rather than take the upper houses into consideration. They note many reasons for the gender imbalance and, as I indicated earlier, I think it has been true that over many years in the past—as long as I have been a member of my political Party—although we have tried to encourage women to enter the top echelons of the Party, this has often been quite difficult for many reasons, and it is in the top echelons that we need more women. I do not think there is any doubt about that now, and I believe we will be encouraging this.

Scandinavian countries do particularly well. Sweden has 33.5 per cent of women in its Parliament; the Netherlands, although not a Scandinavian country, has 29.3 per cent of women in its Parliament; Iceland has 23.8 per cent of women; and many other countries are either better or worse than we are, but we are not particularly brilliant.

There are many benefits from the increased participation of women. It is not just that it is our right to be there as we represent more than half the population, but women bring different strengths and skills to Parliament. Women look at things in a different way. Because it is a different way does not mean that it is any better or worse than the way in which men look at those matters; it is just different. I believe that difference is an attribute that we can bring to the Parliaments of Australia.

Many countries throughout the world have tried to redress this imbalance. Some have done so by rule changes within their Parties and other countries have done it by changes in their constitutions. I am not quite sure what will be the outcome of this inquiry that the Hon. Ms Laidlaw will set up, but I hope that she will also look at the reasons why it is generally more difficult for younger women, especially those of child rearing years, to go into Parliaments, particularly the Federal Parliament. If I were a young woman with young children and I wanted to go into Federal politics and I lived in Western Australia, I would have to think twice about doing

so because one would never see one's family. I do not believe we should have to make those choices all the time.

There are many reasons why we need to reform the Parliament. It is not just that we want more women: we need to reform the structures of the Parliament. Parliaments were designed for people who lived many years ago and who had quite different lifestyles. I believe it is now recognised that both genders wish to spend more time with their families. Late-night sittings of Parliament are absolutely ridiculous and we need to change them.

I notice that the Hon. Caroline Schaefer agrees. She comes from the country and will probably be away from her home for the whole week, and will be pleased to be able to get a good night's sleep on the last night so that she can get back early. I certainly support that.

It would seem to me that we could probably talk less—here I am defying my own logic—and get a whole lot more done quickly. The Federal Parliament is looking at ways of improving the actual sittings and timing of those sittings to try to accommodate some of these concerns, and I support that.

I therefore look forward to the Hon. Ms Laidlaw's setting up her committee. Opposition members will have to look at the wording involved, but I am sure that we will be prepared to support anything that will enhance the Parliament of this State, particularly if it can lead to half the representation in this place being women by the year 2000. I do not believe that is an unrealistic goal. It is one that I hope my Party will adopt, and it is certainly one for which I shall be pressing, as I know some of my colleagues, both male and female, will. I am sure that we will ultimately achieve that goal.

Another area for which I am pleased to have shadow responsibility is youth. To tie in the environment area with women and youth, it seems to me that both women and young people take the environment to their hearts. When I rang my sons to tell them that I had been elected to the shadow Cabinet and been given shadow portfolio areas, they asked me what I had. I reeled them off, feeling a bit tired when I did so. When I said 'Environment', they said, 'Mum, that is the most important one to have.' I believe that is true, because the environment is very precious to all Australians. Young people clearly believe that that is the most important issue, so I am very pleased to have responsibility for youth.

I note that the Hon. Mr. Such has made some positive comments about youth lately. He believes that the portrayal of youth in the media has been negative, and I agree with him. I think it is about time that we gave young people a bit of a go. Obviously, some young people are not necessarily everything that we would wish them to be, but who is? I think that some, not all, of that is something that young people grow out of over time. If only we can keep our young people on the straight and narrow during that difficult period when they are flexing their muscles and trying to gain some kind of independence from their parents and authority, which is a natural process, I think we should give them a bit of a go.

I hope that the media will try to give our young people a better portrayal than they are currently getting. Young people feel that the public have a view that they are all a bunch of hoodlums racing around the streets of Adelaide trying to take jogging shoes from one another and generally shooting up drugs, getting drunk and behaving in an outrageous manner. There is no doubt that a certain element of young people behave like that, but we should question why they are driven to behave in this manner rather than condemn them out of hand. So, it would be nice if at times we could read about the

good things that young people do instead of the more negative things.

I believe that we have a major challenge in South Australia to provide opportunities for all young people to participate fully in community life, to contribute to the development of this State and to be able to access services and facilities that they may require. In order to meet this challenge we must, as a priority, continue to address the issue of youth employment. In doing this, I believe we need to have some vision and creativity amongst our policy makers. We must shore up relations between all levels of government, industry, unions and youth representatives.

In a log of claims submitted to all major political Parties during the 1993 election campaign, the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia urged that a youth employment strategy be developed and implemented immediately. I believe there is potential to expand youth employment options—for example, by developing cooperative ventures on minor capital works projects, by greater cooperation between business and local communities in job creation programs, by the expansion of green jobs, by establishing an enterprise fund that will allocate small amounts of venture capital to young entrepreneurs, and by involving the voice of our young people on regional development boards and within the EDA. These are some of the ideas that could be implemented quite easily and have the support of youth representatives. All they require is a commitment by Government and cooperation and hard work by key interest groups. I believe it is important that youth should feel they have a future in this State.

One thing that has disturbed me greatly over the past 10 years has been the rise in youth unemployment. It hits many families and it is particularly distressing. It has certainly hit my family. I have seen members of my family unemployed for long periods of time, and it is very distressing to see it. I shall certainly be doing all that I can in a cooperative way to ensure that that can change.

If young people are not gainfully employed we will see a lost generation, and this can be very distressing because it affects all levels of the community. I do not believe that the solution to youth unemployment or any level of unemployment is the fault of any particular Government. Much of it is to do with the world economy, and it is very difficult for Governments, particularly State Governments, to seek ways to solve these problems overnight.

The Labor Government made very great efforts in trying to tackle the issue of youth unemployment, and it is very unfair when we are accused of not being caring in this area. I assure members that my former colleague, the Hon. Susan Lenahan, who was the Minister responsible in this area, had a young family herself and was keenly interested in ensuring that employment policies were put in place to try to do something to improve the plight of unemployed youth.

There are many ways in which the State Government can develop these policies, and I would certainly be very happy to discuss some of these issues with the Minister. That is not an unusual process. Probably we need to have a cooperative approach in this area as, after all, it is the future of all our families at stake and not simply one section of them. The Liberal Government was elected to represent all people—both Labor and Liberal voters—and clearly it has a responsibility to look at these issues.

I have touched on some of the areas very briefly and, due to the lateness of the hour and not wishing to go back on my previous statement that I believe late night sittings are

unproductive, I will have an opportunity later to go into more detail on some of the areas about which I feel strongly.

I return to my original remarks about whether or not a large majority gives the Government of the day a complete and utter mandate to rule and to ride roughshod over the views of what is a minority. If so, that certainly is not what a democratic election produces. The election for the Upper House is a democratic process. We have clearly seen the will of the people reflected in this Chamber, and this Chamber does not give the Liberal Party the right to ram through its legislation.

I therefore hope that we have heard the last of that word 'mandate', and I hope that the views of minority Parties which are represented in this Chamber by two people and the views of the Opposition are heard. Clearly it is the will of the people that they should be heard, and I assure members that for my own part they will be heard and heard very loudly indeed.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: In supporting the motion, I add my condolences to the family of the Hon. Jessie Cooper. I knew a little about the Hon. Jessie Cooper but I had not met the lady. She must have been a very strong personality to sit here with all these chauvinistic men for 20 years. When I used to go to the clubs in those days you could say that they were the good old days. Those days are no longer here, but I would get beaten over the head if I even mentioned them.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I would get it at home, let alone here. I did not know Jessie Cooper, but she must have been a terribly strong person to sit here for that length of time and being the only lady in this Chamber. I add my condolences to the family of a person that I regarded as a friend in this place—John Burdett. I was on committees with John for quite a few years. On the Subordinate Legislation Committee he was terribly helpful to all new members and did not ever lead one wrong. He was a very fair and honest person—very quiet but with much ability.

I also congratulate the Hon. Mr Lawson and the Hon. Mr Redford. I hope that they enjoy themselves here as much as I have over the years. In this Chamber we might get a bit excited with one another at different times but we seem to be able to leave it in the Chamber. We are friends when we go out—or close enough to it.

I would now like to join in the discussion about industrial relations as it was an area in which I was involved. Recently (surprise, surprise), the Hon. Graham Ingerson went to the Trades and Labor Council with the Premier to discuss his industrial relations portfolio. I asked a question on the subject today, as they have been going down there and trying to find out what many of these things mean.

The first thing that arose recently was the issue of signing up for membership every 12 months. In my opinion that is being bloody-minded and, if it is not accepted, the threat is that payroll deductions for the various companies will be stopped. South Australia has had a good relationship with the trade union movement over the years. We would have the best industrial relations in Australia, without a shadow of a doubt.

The trade unions do a lot for the workers. They teach them negotiation skills, as do management, and that, I suppose, is one of the reasons why we do not have a lot of industrial strife in Australia. They give free legal advice to people with a problem, and that is also very helpful to the people of South

Australia and to members of the trade union movement. They help workers with their personal industrial problems.

South Australia has a better record than any other State in Australia. However, we still see the stupidity whereby conservative Governments never seem to learn to work with the trade union movement rather than working against it all the time. They should have learnt by now that they can do this. It reminds me of the Bob Menzies' days with Reds under the bed. Their perception of unions is the same: that they are terrible people. If it were not for the trade union movement Poland would have gone down and been destroyed years ago. The Pope supported the trade union movement to save the country from some radical people who were trying to destroy it.

In New Zealand the Conservatives won government, as did members opposite, by a massive majority. It was said that there was no way that the Government would be removed for 20 years, but it did exactly the same thing. It went in and started sacking workers and had them on contract employment with three or four people bargaining for the one position and were prepared to work day and night with no cover from management. Those people were exploited by management.

What happened in that country? At the last election, which was four years later, the Conservatives won by two seats, which I think was quite incredible. Here we are talking today about the Liberals in South Australia winning by a massive majority, which they did—there is no argument about that—but they could also lose it in four years time by doing exactly the same thing as they are doing in New Zealand. They just have this idea that this is what they want to do: attack the trade union movement, the representatives of most of the workers in this country, which is quite incredible in my opinion.

According to what I have been told, commencing in a couple of months, they will be signing up members once every 12 months. I do not think that the people of South Australia, when they voted in this last election, voted to do away with their representatives or their trade union, but the Government seems to be hell-bent on trying to destroy the trade union movement. I know it will not be successful, and the reason it will not be successful is that the trade union movement finally grew up in this country some years ago when they started amalgamating the unions. In South Australia, if the Government wants large demonstrations and disputations in the industrial area, it will most certainly get it if it keeps continually attacking the trade union and the workers in this State.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I support the motion and thank Her Excellency for the speech with which she opened the Parliament. I would also like to take the opportunity to congratulate you, Mr President, on your election to your high office, and I look forward to working with you in your new capacity. I would like to take the opportunity as well to congratulate the three new members who have entered this place since the last election. I certainly wish them well with their parliamentary careers, and I hope they will be very challenging and also very rewarding.

It has saddened me very much to hear of the passing of the Hon. Jessie Cooper and the Hon. John Burdett since the last parliamentary session. I knew the Hon. Mrs Cooper only very slightly, but she has played a very important role, particularly in the history of women in the South Australian Parliament, and her place in history is assured, having been the very first woman elected to this place. I think it is particularly sad that

she passed away before the centenary of women's suffrage celebrations really got under way, because I am quite sure that she would have enjoyed watching the events of the year.

I have spoken previously in this place about the Hon. Mr Burdett, for whom I had very considerable respect, and I will not repeat the comments that I made towards the end of last session when Mr Burdett retired from this place, but I do think it is extremely sad that he did not have more time and better health for the period of his life that was left after he retired from Parliament. I join other members in extending my sympathies to the families of these two former members of the Legislative Council.

Whilst the election result was a source of considerable pleasure for some people in this place, for me and for my colleagues on this side of the House, it was devastating although not completely unexpected. One of the saddest aspects for me has been the loss of so many dedicated colleagues who were swept out of office by the tidal wave that engulfed us at the time of the last election. We certainly miss all of them very much. They were all people who worked very hard for the Labor Party and who worked very hard for the people whom they represented. I can only hope that they are now satisfactorily adjusting to life without Parliament and life without being a member of Parliament.

Other members have referred to the fact that this year is the centenary of women's suffrage in South Australia. The importance of the year cannot be underestimated because not only does it give us the opportunity to look back and remind ourselves of the history of the momentous decision to grant women the right to vote and the right to stand for Parliament, it also is a catalyst for looking forward, for highlighting the current status of women in our society, for making plans for the future, and for putting into effect now policies and ideas that will be of benefit to women and the community in general.

I am sure that members who have had the opportunity to look at the women's suffrage program for the year will agree that it is a very exciting program. It strikes a suitable balance between the celebrations of achievements of women in the past, historical re-enactments and so forth, as well as events that celebrate the talents and achievements of contemporary women. There is an excellent balance between events such as conferences and seminars, which will be serious and forward looking, providing strategies for improving women's lives and opportunities, and also events that will be purely fun.

I congratulate the members of the Women's Suffrage Centenary Committee for their exemplary efforts in putting together such an exciting program which embraces women from all parts of the State, as well as providing opportunities for women from all over Australia and the world to join us here in South Australia and to celebrate and plan for the future. I know from personal experience that the task of the committee has been a very difficult one. I was a member of the committee during the first few months of its existence until other duties precluded me from continuing, and I know how much effort there has been to mount this wide ranging program in a relatively short period of time. It is a credit to the committee and I hope that its members will have the time during the course of the year to enjoy some of the celebrations for which they have been responsible.

It has been interesting to watch the performance of the Government since it came to power in December last, and equally interesting to observe the media in action. I have been rather amused but also irritated by the fact that numerous

announcements by Government Ministers about issues that have been on the public agenda for years have been greeted as new and original thought by representatives of the media. Policies set in train by the former Government and now coming to fruition are announced by the Government with no acknowledgment of their source by either the Minister concerned or, with a few exceptions, the media reporting these events.

The list is enormous already, and my own area of portfolio responsibilities includes the announcement of a planning strategy for metropolitan Adelaide which, with the exception of changes involving the MFP, is Labor's plan; the strategy to preserve areas of the Southern Vales and better plan for the future in that region, which was Labor's plan; the commencement of police control and training of transit police working on public transport, also a Labor initiative; the installation of automatic ticket barriers at Adelaide Railway Station to attack the problem of fare evasion which was set in train by me as Minister of Transport Development. That is just to name a few issues that immediately came to mind. The list is much longer, and one wonders whether the Liberal Party in fact had any policies of its own in various areas of Government prior to the election.

They would certainly have been struggling for announcements during the past couple of months had it not been for the previous Labor Government's ongoing program. However, in other areas the Government is demonstrating some alarming tendencies. We are all aware of the large number of dedicated public servants, at various levels of the Public Service, who have been sacked or moved—in most cases simply because they worked for the previous Administration.

In the transport portfolio the Minister has shown particular arrogance and lack of sensitivity. Her callous dismissal of the General Manager of the STA, before she had even worked with him for a single day, and when he was on sick leave recovering from a very serious illness, is a prime example. When the full story is told, I believe, this episode will show that this Minister has a dangerous tendency to act first and think about the consequences later.

If ever there was an issue that demonstrated that very clearly it is her handling of the Hindmarsh Island bridge issue. Without thinking it through, she mounted an attack on the project last year, referring it to a parliamentary committee for examination without waiting for detailed answers to questions asked about the project. She carried on her campaign, enjoying the short-sighted, short-term political points she scored, right up until the State election campaign until suddenly the penny dropped. She suddenly realised that this was an issue that she would have to take responsibility for should her Party win Government and she become Minister. From that moment on she avoided the media wherever possible on the issue, as did her Leader, whose weakness within his own Party was amply demonstrated through this issue.

As members know, the now Premier is also the local member for the Goolwa and Hindmarsh Island area and, until his transport shadow Minister somehow took control of the Party Room on the issue, he had promised his support for the bridge to the Goolwa marina developers, only to renege on this promise later. He also indicated to a meeting of his local Liberal Party branch that personally he supported the bridge, but he could not say so because he was allowing himself to be dictated to by his colleagues.

So, the Liberal Party tried to have a bob each way on the bridge. On the one hand the then shadow Minister publicly

expressed opposition and on the other the Leader of the Liberal Party was privately expressing support and publicly indicating, during the election campaign, that any legitimate contract to build the bridge would have to be honoured. When offered the contract for his perusal prior to the election his silence was deathly. So, dishonestly the Liberal Party took its position on this issue into the election, falsely raising the hopes of locals who opposed the bridge that in Government the Liberal Party would stop it.

Since the election the Liberal Party has devised a complicated time and money wasting strategy to dig the Minister for Transport out of the hole she buried herself in last year by not thinking the issue through. We have had the Jacobs report, which confirmed what we all knew, and what I said publicly months ago, that the Government had entered into a contract, it was obliged to build the bridge, and that it could be subjected to litigation if it did not go ahead with the bridge. As if that time and money wasting was not enough, we now have the Minister extending the self-made agony by a further delay of eight weeks while she investigates an alternative route for the bridge, which has already been assessed and rejected on the grounds of cost, complexity and environmental concerns. The Minister has bungled this issue from beginning to end, and ultimately she will be so judged.

The same alarming lack of judgment is also emerging with respect to her contact with officers working within her portfolio. I am advised that she displays arrogance towards people whose support she will need, and she is surrounding herself with political cronies whose knowledge and currency on the issues of the day is now questionable. It is clear, for example, that the Minister has come to the transport portfolio with some preconceived and some very outdated views about the STA and its capacity to perform.

Many of her criticisms of the STA relate to times past. Strenuous efforts were made while she was in Opposition to make the STA out to be the most inefficient organisation in Australia, if not the universe. I suppose one has to acknowledge that scoring political points is part of the game of politics, but I think the Minister began to believe her own rhetoric, and has not taken due account of the significant change that has occurred culturally and in terms of the STA's operations during recent years. Too often she has taken counsel from people within the system who have been opposed to or disaffected as a result of change which was necessary and inevitable.

The Minister has spent the past two years, to my knowledge, running down Adelaide's public transport system and criticising personnel within the STA, who have been operating in very difficult circumstances as they worked with an expectation of shrinking budgets and increased service demand, and in an environment—not unique to Adelaide but common in other parts of Australia and the world—where public transport usage has been declining in favour of use of the private car.

The Minister has never acknowledged the significant efforts made by the former Government or the STA to accommodate and reconcile these competing factors in operating a public transport system in Adelaide. And neither has she acknowledged the excellent work done in the creation and use of internationally competitive technology in improving operational efficiencies and reducing costs, or the success of recent changes in STA services, which have begun to attack the patronage decline issue. There is no doubt that further changes to improve our public transport system are desirable, and the STA has not always been right.

The fear that many people have is that the Minister's approach to these issues will be to throw the baby out with the bath water; in other words, lose the best features of the current system in seeking reform. It will be incumbent on the Minister to allay the fears of people in our community who have expressed fears as to the extent of the changes proposed and, in particular, the effects of these changes on the STA and the level of services to the public. I will be pursuing these issues further during the forthcoming debate on the Passenger Transport Bill.

At this point it is perhaps appropriate to put on the record some facts relating to the STA and its performance. First, in terms of costs the STA has reduced its operating costs by almost 20 per cent since the mid-1980s. Over the same period ownership costs rose by 33 per cent, reflecting a number of issues, including a very significant capital investment program of some \$300 million over seven years embarked upon to modernise the system. During the same period and up to 1992-93 there was a 5.1 per cent improvement in the cost effectiveness indicator, which is passenger journeys per employee, and a 15.3 per cent improvement in the key efficiency indicator vehicle kilometres per employee.

On the matter of patronage, there is some evidence to suggest that the introduction of transit link services and other improvements by the previous Government during the past two years is beginning to show results in arresting the decline in patronage. A comparison of patronage during the last full financial year, that is for 1992-93, with the previous financial year showed the following: total patronage for that 12 month period decreased by seven per cent; bus patronage decreased by 9.3 per cent; train patronage increased by 8.7 per cent. By comparison, the patronage during the first six months of 1993, relative to that during the first six months of 1992, showed the following: total patronage decreased by only two per cent; bus patronage decreased by 5.3 per cent; and train patronage increased by 11.8 per cent.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: The previous six months referred to was in fact a strike period, and that was noted in the annual report as one of the reasons why patronage had increased for trains.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Let us follow on with the figures that have since come to light. The point I want to

make about the figures that I have just quoted is that there was only a two per cent reduction in patronage during the six months to the end of 1993 compared to the same six months the previous year, whereas there was a seven per cent decrease in patronage for the 12 months to the end of June 1993 compared with the previous 12 month period.

This shows that there has been a significant turnaround in the usage of public transport, a considerable part of which can be attributed to the introduction of transit link services. Even more interesting are the recently released calendar year figures for 1993 patronage which, although not directly comparable with the figures just quoted, nevertheless look promising for the STA. They show that for the full year 1993 compared with 1992 there was a total decline in patronage of only 1.3 per cent made up as follows: bus patronage declined by 4.9 per cent, train patronage increased by 16 per cent and tram patronage also increased by 13.8 per cent.

These results are extremely encouraging and especially so when we consider that a number of the transit link services introduced by the previous Government came into operation only towards the end of 1993. There has not yet been the opportunity to assess their success properly. I present this information to the Council because it is important that members are reminded that, notwithstanding that there are still improvements to be made to our public transport system, its current state looks nothing like the perilous picture painted by the Minister during the past couple of years. As I indicated earlier, these are issues that I will pursue further at another time. In the meantime, I support the motion.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ACTS INTERPRETATION (COMMENCEMENT PROCLAMATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.38 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 24 February at 2.15 p.m.