

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 24 February 1988

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

## PETITION: SHOP TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 553 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal to extend retail trading hours was presented by Mr Gregory.

Petition received.

## PETITION: WINDSOR BY-PASS

A petition signed by 266 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure a

southern and northern access to the township of Windsor from the proposed by-pass was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

## QUESTIONS

## APPRENTICESHIPS

In reply to **Mr S.J. BAKER** (24 September).

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: The following is an update of information given to the member for Mitcham during Estimates Committees. Commonwealth wide statistics, as agreed by COSTAC, are prepared on the basis that any registrations of indenture effected between 1 July and 31 August in any year which are in respect to the previous financial year are recorded as having been effected during that financial year. Therefore any figures prepared for the Estimates discussions are only preliminary and are indicated as such.

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN—APPRENTICES/TRAINEES IN TRAINING AS AT 30 JUNE OF YEAR SHOWN

Trade Group	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
Metals	5 045	4 855	4 539	4 070	3 771	3 474	3 627
Electrical	1 420	1 420	1 334	1 299	1 226	1 166	1 234
Building	1 314	1 127	1 006	1 083	1 217	1 355	1 526
Furniture	509	468	438	417	426	472	554
Printing	322	197	194	222	287	330	370
Vehicle	447	401	362	413	500	564	635
Ship and boat building	19	23	20	24	22	19	19
Food	798	768	685	681	783	837	1 028
Hairdressing	1 017	970	936	1 042	1 242	1 387	1 540
Other	157	363	313	285	416	562	703
Total	11 048	10 622	9 647	9 536	9 890	10 166	11 236**

\* Does not include trainees under Australian Traineeship System.

\*\* Gender share is: Male 9 526 (84.85%)  
Female 1 710 (15.2%)

Ship and boat building	4	—	4	0.0
Food	342	70	412	17.0
Hairdressing	86	401	487	82.3
Farming	200	8	208	3.8
Other	124	21	145	14.5
Totals	3 051	561	3 612	15.5

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WORKCOVER

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: In Question Time yesterday I gave an undertaking to bring back a response to a question raised by the member for Coles concerning the basis on which WorkCover raises its levies. The member for Coles specific query related to the inclusion by WorkCover of superannuation and long service payments in the base used by it for calculating the levy that employers are required to pay. The inclusion of these payments in the levy base was determined as a matter of policy by the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation Board. The inclusion of these payments by the corporation is consistent with the practice adopted by many private insurance companies when setting workers compensation premiums under the old system.

The inclusion of these payments is a means of ensuring that avoidance of premiums does not occur. By setting a levy on all forms of remuneration employers cannot avoid premiums by misallocating remuneration in their accounts between the various forms of remuneration. It also needs to be understood that if superannuation and long service leave payments were deleted from the levy base then aver-

age levy rates would have to be raised (so it would work out the same). A certain sum of money has to be raised to cover the costs of the system. If a narrower base is selected, the average rate that has to be set to collect this money has to be higher than if a wider base is selected. On balance, the board of the corporation considered that a broader base which included superannuation payments and long service leave payments was appropriate. Inclusion in the levy base of these payments does not in any way affect the amount of long service leave or superannuation to which employees are entitled.

The member for Coles' allusion to the collection of WorkCover levies from employers as being a tax on these payments in the hands of employees is complete and arrant nonsense. In the specific case referred to by the member for Coles, the company paid to a superannuation fund an amount of \$98 500 during November 1987 in relation to one employee. That employee was a working director of the company who retired during November 1987. The determination by the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation Board, referred to earlier, that payments made by employers to superannuation funds must be included in the remuneration base for calculating levies must be applied constantly to all employers. In this specific case the \$98 500 paid in November must be regarded as remuneration paid during the month and accordingly the levy has been calculated on that amount. The levy payable is \$4 432.50. The amount of levy in respect of the payment for long service leave paid to that employee had already been paid by the company at the time and was not charged as a result of the audit referred to by the member for Coles.

The member for Coles also raised a supplementary question on this matter with the Premier. In so far as accrued entitlements are concerned WorkCover has recently deter-

mined that, where such payments have been accrued wholly before the commencement of the new scheme and the employer has previously paid premiums on those accrued entitlements, then no levy is payable, or if it has been paid then the employer will be reimbursed. However, where a payment made since the commencement of WorkCover relates to remuneration accrued partially prior to WorkCover and partially since the introduction of WorkCover, regardless of the proportion, prior to or since, that payment in total is subject to a levy. As the full details of the specific case raised by the member for Coles are not known, I have instructed WorkCover to further investigate this case with the employer concerned.

### QUESTION TIME

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on questions I advise that questions that would otherwise be directed to the Premier will be taken by the Deputy Premier, and questions that would otherwise be directed to the Minister of Agriculture will be taken by the Minister of Labour.

### KINGSTON MARINA

**Mr OLSEN:** Can the Deputy Premier say why the Government has not revealed publicly that it committed itself to the sale of Crown land at an agreed valuation in a letter dated 1 December 1987 to Kingston Bay Pty Ltd to enable the development of a marina, associated facilities and housing at Kingston Park, and is the Government now facing legal action for the recovery of significant sums expended by the developers with the full encouragement of the Government over the past six months?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The developers have been involved in what I think one might call a leap of faith here.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** In September of last year the Government wrote to the developer and indicated a number of matters that would have to be addressed before the Government would give the green light to the preparation of the environmental impact statement or anything like that. Of course, this was to overcome the problems that arose in relation to the Jubilee Point development when a great deal of preliminary work was done by the developers before the Government made a decision for it not to proceed. In effect, we said to the developers, 'Don't be spending a lot of money. We will talk to you about our response on these matters before we will invite you to go into an environmental impact statement.' Obviously, it was implicit in that that we may well say at the end of that stage, 'We are not interested, go away.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The Leader is very impatient. I will be addressing every facet of the question that he has placed before us in my own time and in my own way. I will try not to be overlong in doing that. That was the position, and it was implicit in that position that we might—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Hayward.

**Mrs APPLEBY:** I understand that it is the practice of this Chamber for members to be referred to by their electorate and not by their name.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! In addition, the honourable member for Murray-Mallee was out of order in interjecting, in

any case, and I call him to order. The honourable Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Because of his behaviour in this Chamber the honourable member long ago forfeited the esteem in which I hold pretty well all his other colleagues. One of the things that was involved in that arrangement was the possibility that Crown land would be made available to the developers. Obviously, for everybody to get their signals right there had to be an investigation as to the price that they would pay to the whole of the community if that Crown land were to be made available. That proviso was always there and I defy anybody to find anything that would suggest that it was other than that.

The negotiations proceeded. The Valuer-General, as I understand it, put a valuation on that, and that was conveyed to the developers. At that stage if they wanted to make an assumption that simply because the valuation had been put on the land it meant that the Government was a willing seller, well that is okay and that is the conclusion that they could draw. However, it is not a soundly based conclusion. That is the position.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The honourable member does not understand that there is a distinction between agreeing to a price and agreeing to a sale. There is all the difference in the world between the two.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** He doesn't want to believe. The developers should never have been in any doubt of the fact that some time around about now the Government would be making a decision arising out of the preliminary work as to whether there was any point in the developers proceeding along the path that they wanted to go. We have made that decision, and nothing that was said during that time in any way should cast any shadow over the propriety of that decision.

### DISABILITY INFORMATION AND RESOURCE CENTRE

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Bragg does not have the call; the honourable member for Bright has.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I address my question to the Minister of Transport who represents the Minister of Health and Community Welfare in another place. Will he ask his colleague to ensure that a directory of incentives be prepared for distribution by the Disability Information and Resource Centre for circulation to employers to enable disabled people to make the transition more easily from sheltered workshops to open employment? I am informed that whilst sheltered workshops do an effective job in training many disadvantaged and disabled workers, the next step in the process is often found not to be so easy. I am particularly informed that many intellectually disabled workers find difficulty in making the transition to open employment. Also, I am informed that part of that problem arises because employers are unaware of the skills possessed by the workers and of the financial incentives available to those workers when seeking transition to open employment.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I congratulate the honourable member on bringing this matter to the attention of the House, and I will be pleased to ask my colleague in another

place to give close attention to it. My understanding is, as the honourable member pointed out in his explanation, that it is difficult for people to make the transition from sheltered workshops to open employment. It is also true, as the honourable member said, that many people who work in sheltered workshops have developed considerable skills that could be of advantage to employers should they know that those skills exist. I would be pleased to ask my colleague to investigate whether or not the establishment of a directory of incentives for employers would provide that valuable assistance to an important sector of the community in which the member for Bright so strongly believes and supports.

### SUPERANNUATION TAXES

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Does the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Treasurer, agree that a Federal Government proposal to tax at up to 15 per cent the investment income of superannuation funds would have a significant and detrimental effect on the benefits paid to contributors, and could require in the case of the South Australian superannuation fund a considerable increase in the State Government's contribution, consequently impacting on taxpayers and, if so, does the Government intend to oppose the Federal Government's proposal?

Yesterday the Premier seemed to know little of the Federal Treasury proposal to tax superannuation funds at up to 15 per cent, although there has been public reporting of that fact. He did, however, admit that such a tax would have 'a significant effect on the earnings power of the State fund.' Figures drawn up by the life insurance industry and reported today revealed that more than 300 000 workers in South Australia could lose almost one-third of their retirement benefits if such a plan proceeds. The industry predicts a loss of about \$76 000 for a worker paying \$1 000 a year into a superannuation fund over 25 years. In the case of the South Australian superannuation fund—which had net income from investments last financial year of—

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, it is my understanding that there is a Bill on the Notice Paper and currently before the House entitled the Superannuation Bill. It would seem to me that some of the matters being canvassed could be argued. The honourable Deputy Leader talked about the State fund, and that is what caused me to rise to ask your ruling on this matter.

**The SPEAKER:** The general subject matter of the question put by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not seem to cut directly across the Bill that is currently before the House. However, I caution him, as I have cautioned other members in recent days, that the purpose of a question is to obtain information, not to supply it. Questions therefore should be brief and ask directly the information sought. The member is at risk of straying into breach of the Standing Order which requires that the facts supplied must be supplied so far as only may be necessary to explain such question.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The facts I am supplying are illustrating the impact on the fund from the calculations we made of a 15 per cent tax. I have almost finished, and I will put the Minister out of his misery. In the case of the South Australian fund—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leave is withdrawn, because the Deputy Leader is clearly introducing comment. The honourable the Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** On a point of order, how long since responses to the effusions of members opposite have fallen into the class of comment? The comment ruling is in relation to—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has no intention of debating the matter with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I used my prerogative to withdraw leave: leave is withdrawn. The Deputy Leader will resume his seat.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am pretty slow; I am creaky in the joints.

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Leader is at risk of being named for contempt of the Chair. The honourable Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Page 2 of this afternoon's newspaper reminds me that a good deal of what the honourable member has just put to me was answered by the Premier yesterday, and page 1 reveals to me that the rest of what he is putting in fact comes from Mr Alexander Downer. I suggest that we should wait until there is a specific proposition before the Federal Treasury before we look at specific costings. It is very difficult to feed a whole lot of hot air into a computer.

### WINTER OATS

**Mr De LAINE:** Will the Minister of Labour, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, seek information concerning a new variety of winter oats which has been developed in Argentina? It was reported in the *Advertiser* of Friday 5 February 1988 that Argentina has developed a new variety of oats, commercially known as *millaquen inta* which has rapid early growth and lush green foliage. More importantly, as far as South Australia is concerned, it is drought resistant.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** This takes me back to the days when I knew all about these things. However, age and change of portfolio have limited my knowledge considerably. I am aware that South Australia has a very extensive oat breeding program of its own and a very successful one, indeed. Certainly, I will ask the Minister of Agriculture on his return from his unavoidable absence to have the question investigated to see whether there is anything in the report which could be to the advantage of South Australian primary producers.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I have no idea.

### VERDUN DEVELOPMENT

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** What action will the Minister of Water Resources take to ensure that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has sufficient resources to monitor adherence to a land management agreement for a tourist development in the Adelaide Hills so that it does not pollute metropolitan water supplies? Last December, the Planning Appeals Tribunal upheld a State Planning Commission decision to approve the development of a Dutch village near Verdun to comprise a full size windmill, motel units, a shop and parking. The Opposition does not question these decisions. In arriving at them, the commission and the tribunal received detailed submissions from the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

The Minister was also made aware of the serious concerns of his department. I refer, for example, to a minute to the Minister from his Chief Executive Officer, Mr Alexander, dated 15 September last year. Mr. Alexander wrote in that minute:

My department has consistently argued that the proposed development should be opposed because it is located in an area prone to frequent flooding and would increase the risk of pollution entering the Onkaparinga River through stormwater run-off and domestic waste discharge.

Other points made by Mr Alexander included:

If approved, it will create a most undesirable precedent for further development outside township boundaries in the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed, particularly as it is located on the Onkaparinga River floodplain.

Before his retirement, Mr Alexander's predecessor, Mr Keith Lewis, also made submissions to the Planning Commission on this proposal. In a letter to the Chairman of the commission dated 22 October 1986—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mawson.

**Ms LENEHAN:** On a point of order, is the honourable member quoting from a copy of an official document and, if so, would she table the docket?

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms LENEHAN:** I beg your pardon, Mr Speaker: I used the word 'document' instead of 'docket'.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. However, the Chair is disturbed by the amount of time taken by the honourable member for her explanation, which, to the Chair, gives the impression that it does exceed the number of facts which may be necessary to explain the question.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** If only shadow Ministers had access to dockets, the world would be—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has ruled on that point of order. The honourable member will wind up her remarks.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Mr Lewis stated that the project would in fact be contrary to Government policy. He stated:

The proposal is contrary to the Mount Lofty Ranges supplementary development plan which was introduced to reduce the risk of further water pollution entering Adelaide's water supply reservoirs.

He concluded:

As the proposal clearly contravenes written and publicised Government policy for development outside defined townships in the watershed I urge the commission to oppose the development application.

In pressing its view, the department also stated that, if the project did receive approval, it would require additional resources to monitor its impact to ensure that the project did not become a risk to metropolitan water supplies.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I thank the honourable member for her support for my department. The E&WS Department takes an extremely responsible attitude towards the protection of our water supplies. I notice also that she makes the point that the body that made that decision is an independent body and she is not criticising in any way the way in which the decision was arrived at.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** Who is 'she'?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The honourable member. So, in this case much advice is given to an independent body and that independent body has made a decision, and it is our job to ensure that all the conditions of that decision are adhered to. I assure the honourable member and the House that, when conditions are placed on such a planning approval as this, I would see it as being as strong as a statutory obligation and, as such, clearly resources will have to be made available to ensure that the monitoring effort is commensurate with any of the problems that have been identified.

## CHEMICALS IN WATER SUPPLY

**Mr FERGUSON:** Can the Minister of Water Resources explain what actions have been taken to reduce the quantity of pesticides and chemicals that are finding their way into the water supply? I have received correspondence from Ms Barbara Pearson, Secretary of the National Health Society Incorporated, in which, on behalf of the society, she expresses great concern about the increase in pesticides and chemicals that are finding their way into the water supply and allegedly destroying its quality.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There are two sorts of chemicals: you might call them 'good chemicals' and 'bad chemicals'. There are chemicals in the water supply because we put them there for a good reason. We are not putting in quite as many as we were prior to Friday of last week but that is another story. However, I guess that the honourable member is referring to those chemicals that find their way into the water supply as the result of agricultural and horticultural activity. I guess that this is a question that is as broad as it is long. Water supplies are drawn from the catchment area in the Adelaide Hills and from the Murray River. The necessary controls are really as diverse as are those two environments. Basically, through the Adelaide Hills review and through the plethora of controls already existing in the Adelaide Hills—

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** Hear, hear!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Well, if the member for Heysen believes that there are too many, I suggest that he is a little less than—

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable Deputy Leader about 'throw-away' lines, because he is verging on a 'throwing-out' one.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We seek a little consistency in this place. I was sat down for a throwaway line that embarrassed the Minister of Mines and Energy, whereas the Deputy Premier can go his hardest at throwaway lines. He has already had two or three before this one, yet he gets no remonstrance. Where is the equality of treatment in this place? That is my point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I am sure that an objective bystander would agree that there is no point of order. The honourable Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I apologise to you, Mr Speaker. There was a disorderly interjection from the other side that I should have ignored, but I am afraid that I fell from grace on this occasion. I shall say nothing more about the insensitivities of the member for Heysen to some of these problems. The Mount Lofty Ranges review and the controls already existing in those catchment areas are there for this very purpose: to ensure that pesticides and other chemicals do not enter the water stream. Also, all the work being done with the other States and the controls that exist in the Murray Valley are with a desire to do exactly that. Before people criticise the controls that we exercise (and it is easy to criticise controls), they should remember that such controls are put there for a good and proper purpose: that is, the security of the supply and the quality of the water to irrigators along the Murray River, and also the security and purity of the water supply to the Adelaide metropolitan area. Before we willy nilly run away from these controls, we must consider carefully the consequences of such abnegation of duty.

## VERDUN DEVELOPMENT

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Does the Minister for Environment and Planning consider that he was placed in a

conflict of interest position in relation to the tourist development referred to in the previous question? Documentation in relation to this development shows that on 8 September last year, the Planning Commission deferred a final decision pending the preparation of a detailed land management agreement between the Minister for Environment and Planning and the proponent. In response to this decision, the Deputy Premier, this time in his capacity as Minister of Water Resources, received submissions from the Chief Executive of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Mr Alexander. In a memorandum dated 15 September, Mr Alexander said the preparation of the agreement was 'most unsatisfactory from my point of view' because it was 'unlikely to guarantee a failsafe method of land and waste management'. The result was that as Minister for Environment and Planning the Deputy Premier was being asked to exercise certain powers under the Planning Act while, as Minister of Water Resources, he was being urged not to do so.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I know that comparisons are invidious or odious, but that is the best question I have heard this afternoon and perhaps for weeks. The honourable member is really on to something.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There is a dilemma here which relates not only to the fact that I hold the twin portfolios of Minister for Environment and Planning and Minister of Water Resources but also to the way the legislation operates within my portfolio of environment and planning. What the honourable member is talking about could equally apply, from time to time, purely within the environment and planning portfolio even if I had no other portfolio. I resolve the conflict by, first, ensuring that when advice is given by departmental officers of whatever department to a decision-making body in the development control field it must arise out of their professional expertise.

Whether or not I like it, whether or not I support it and whether or not as a person who has an amateurish background in science I agree with it, I must step back and say, 'You are the expert and, quite untrammelled by political considerations, you must put that advice before the authorities as laid down in the legislation.' The second way that I resolve the conflict is by not giving directions to decision-makers in the development control field (and the honourable member would know what I am talking about). I am talking about in some cases local government, in some cases the South Australian Planning Commission and in some cases the City of Adelaide Planning Commission.

The third point I make is that, on the other hand, I take a very central role in relation to general policy formulation. What I say to Mr Haines and the other people involved in these bodies—Mr Cook and others—is, 'That is where you have to determine what your decision will be, along with the technical advice that is coming forward.' It is not impossible that the Heritage Branch of my department could give advice arising out of its technical expertise which, on one view, may be at variance with the advice that comes from more general planners about, say, urban consolidation. Okay, that is a dilemma which is posed by the legislation. There is nothing much I can do about it because I cannot think of any legislative scheme that gets us out of it.

Even though there is a dilemma in a theoretical sense, in a practical sense it all works out pretty well. I think the honourable member, speaking from his experience as a former Minister of Water Resources, has isolated something. However, it is not something that is peculiar to the fact that I have these two particular portfolios. The dilemma

would exist if I had only the one portfolio, and it is at the very heart of the legislation.

### FILM CLASSIFICATION

**Mr DUGAN:** My question is addressed to the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General in another place. Is the Government giving any consideration to reviewing its methods of classifying films and videos? In the supplementary answers to the Estimates Committees, which appeared in *Hansard* recently, the criteria used by the Classification of Publications Board and the way that it exercised its discretion were set out. Notwithstanding that that system has applied for some time, there has been continuing community concern about the availability and appropriateness of some of these methods of classification, particularly in the area of violent sex and language.

There has been continuing concern on the part of the community, expressed most recently by the Australian Institute of Criminology, about the harmful effects of some videos and films circulating in the community. Last month there was a letter to the *Advertiser* by an M.C. Scott of Morphett Vale who suggested an alternative method of classifying videos which gave a rating of 1 to 9 for each of the areas of language, sex and violence, in order that the people viewing a film would know where it best fitted in. Earlier this month the television researcher for the South Australian Council for Children's Film and Television expressed the view in a *News* article that the existing Government regulations were too relaxed.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question; indeed, his interest in this area is well known. I will have the question referred to my colleague for his consideration.

### DEPORTATION

**Mr BECKER:** Will the Deputy Premier make representations to the Commonwealth Government to ensure that Rocco Sergi, the man whose evidence may be crucial in the prosecution of conspiracy charges involving four other men including a senior South Australian police officer, is not deported to Italy, as reported today, with the consequent prejudice to the administration of justice?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** As a matter of urgency I will take this up with the Attorney-General, who I believe may already be looking at it, to see what can be done.

### AGE DISCRIMINATION

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Will the Minister of State Development and Technology ensure that age discrimination against our senior section of the community is prioritised in investigations of age related discrimination being undertaken by the Discrimination Task Force established by the Minister? Recently, a most distressed constituent contacted me about the practice of selling investment packages by a prominent insurance finance company in this State. I will read from the content of her letter, which is self explanatory (I apologise for its length, as it comprises two or three paragraphs), and I will delete the name of the company at this stage while investigations take place. The letter states:

I send you this account of a telephone call I received on Thursday last, 21 January 1988, for your consideration. On answering my telephone on that day a lady introduced herself as a representative of a prominent company and asked me if I would

mind answering a question. On my agreement the question was given: 'What is the difference between an old person and an elderly person?'

I answered that I did not think that there was any difference, to which came the reply, 'Yes there is: an old person lives on the pension; an elderly person lives on investments.' Before I could make any reply she went on speaking in an attempt to interest me in an investment scheme which the said company was selling.

As I was becoming rather annoyed at the trend of this conversation I cut in with the remark that I was not interested in any investments. 'What, no investments at all?', came her reply. At this answer I very tersely said 'No', and ended the conversation. Thinking on this in the following half hour my annoyance turned to anger at such an attitude, especially as my husband and I receive a part pension and we know many other people who also live on a Government pension.

The letter is self explanatory and I ask the Minister to investigate—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the letter is self explanatory, the honourable member need not explain any further.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for her question. It has been clear over an extensive period that the honourable member has pursued this matter with great vigour and it is as a result of the representations she has made that we have in fact established a group under the auspices of the Office of Employment and Training to examine the incidence of discrimination related to age. I have read the minutes of the first meetings of that task force and I have asked that I be kept posted of the minutes of those meetings.

To date they have, first, been examining basic parameters of the problem and, secondly, they have started to meet with some community groups to try to assess what these groups which are relevant to this matter perceive to be the nature of the problem. As a result of that they are now proposing further work to examine how they can assess the more widespread community view with respect to age discrimination. They have not yet finally determined the best model for doing that and I am awaiting their further advice on that matter with some considerable interest.

As to the particular point raised by the honourable member with respect to the letter from her constituent, I now understand the context of the honourable member's introducing me to the same topic and yesterday I was asked exactly the same question: what is the difference between old versus elderly. I fell into the same trap and I have just seen the script repeated before me by the honourable member. There are related matters that should be referred to the Attorney-General in his capacity as Minister of Corporate Affairs. I will do so and when I receive further information from him I will keep the honourable member posted.

### MAJOR CRIME SQUAD

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I direct my question to the Deputy Premier as Minister of Emergency Services. As it was publicly alleged last evening that about a dozen senior police officers from the Major Crime Squad are to be transferred from their area of expertise, and because such action if correct will have a demoralising effect on the Police Force at a crucial time in its history, will the Minister advise the House of the current position with regard to this matter?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** No, I cannot. I have as yet received no report from the Commissioner on that matter. In any event, I would see a decision like that as being fully within his charter to undertake. He is the person responsible for delineation of resources in the Police Force. In another set of circumstances I can well imagine that any undue interest by me in that sort of matter might well bring cries of political interference. However, I have no doubt that the Commissioner will be reporting to me in due course. If the

facts are as the honourable member indicated I will have that opportunity to satisfy myself that the matter has proceeded quite properly, as I am sure it has.

### FLAGSTAFF, MARION AND SOUTH ROADS INTERSECTION

**Mr TYLER:** I direct my question to the Minister of Transport. Will he outline the details of roadworks planned as stage 2 to the intersection of Flagstaff, Marion and South Roads? In particular, will the Minister inform the House when it is planned that the works will take place and how these works will improve the flow of traffic from Flagstaff Road into South Road during the morning peak period? The House will be aware that in the past I have raised the concerns of my constituents about traffic flow along Flagstaff Road in the mornings. For instance, I am told that there is often a frustratingly long wait for vehicles turning right into South Road during this period. My constituents have, in the past, acknowledged the improvements to traffic flow following the completion of stage 1 of the works at this intersection. However, recently and particularly since the opening of Happy Valley Drive, my constituents are concerned that the waiting time is again unacceptably high on most mornings.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I acknowledge the diligence of the member for Fisher in representing the needs of his constituents in regard to Flagstaff Road—and not only his constituents but those people from outside his electorate who also use that road. I am able to advise the House about the planning that the Highways Department has for the intersection of Flagstaff and Marion Roads with South Road. However, I emphasise that in the two project stages of improving the traffic flow through that intersection, the first stage was directed to widening Flagstaff Road near the intersection and that had a dramatic effect on the traffic flow.

I take note of the honourable member's statement that he and his constituents feel that, because of the growth in his electorate and because of other road works that have been completed, the traffic is now building up once again. That is something that I am prepared to look at because the Highways Department would need to have figures to substantiate the assumptions of the honourable member's constituents. My advice is that the Flagstaff Hill Road part of the intersection is still operating satisfactorily. That might be a comparative thing, I do not know, and I will follow it through.

Insofar as South Road is concerned, a program of works will start later this year to build an additional lane on the southern side of the intersection. The carriageway will be widened from Brookside Road to join the existing right turn lane at Marion Road. Further, a modification of the median south of the intersection will enable south-bound traffic in the present right turn lane to continue straight through. Also, it is the intention of the Highways Department to impose a ban on right turns from this lane between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. on weekdays and the upgrading of the median opening opposite the Flagstaff Hotel will prevent vehicles turning through traffic lanes.

All of these proposals are designed to improve the flow of traffic through the intersection on South Road. I do not suspect that these roadworks will improve dramatically, if at all, the traffic flow from Flagstaff Hill into South Road or Marion Road. However, my advice is that currently the intersection is working effectively and will be improved with that additional lane. I will look at the matters the

honourable member has raised with regard to the growth in the build up of traffic on Flagstaff Hill Road and report to him on the plans that the Highways Department may be able to put in place to address this problem, if it is proven to be a problem.

### GLENELG FORESHORE DEVELOPMENT

**Mr OSWALD:** Can the Deputy Premier advise whether the Government has taken any further action in relation to a development on the Glenelg foreshore to replace the Jubilee Point proposal, other than monitoring plans being currently explored by the town planner who is advising the Glenelg council? In his announcement that the Government would not allow the Jubilee Point proposal to proceed, the Premier left open the possibility of some form of development on this area of the foreshore. I refer to his press release of 22 December which stated:

The Premier said further discussions would be held in the new year on how the issues raised by the study on the Jubilee Point proposal could be handled in the future.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** My understanding is that Government officers have had some discussions with Mr Harry Bechervaise who, I understand, has some contract arrangement with the Glenelg council to see just what possibilities there are for development in the general Glenelg foreshore area. I personally have not received any report arising from those discussions, nor would I have expected to at this stage. I am not aware that the Premier has received any report either.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am sorry, Mr Speaker, I am afraid I cannot satisfy the honourable Deputy Leader's inquisitiveness on this matter. All I can say is that the arrangement was that Mr Bechervaise had been hired to do this particular work. We were asked whether the Government would show an interest in it and provide what technical advice it might be able to give and, as I understand it, that is proceeding.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** In view of the honourable member's ambivalent attitude, to say the least, to the Jubilee Point project, I wonder whether he might unequivocally state his attitude to whatever else might happen down there.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### ADELAIDE FESTIVAL OUTDOORS PROGRAM

**Ms GAYLER:** Can the Premier provide details of the Adelaide Festival outdoors program, its accessibility to the public and, in particular, the range of events that low income families could take advantage of? Can he also provide any estimate of how many people are expected to attend the outdoor performances? Many of the Festival performances are quite expensive, but I understand that the outdoor program is aimed at the general public.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I thank the honourable member for her question. There is no doubt that the focus of the Festival is usually on the official program and the Fringe events attached to it, most of which require bookings, are held indoors and are part of a formal Festival program, the sort of thing one expects year by year, but a very exciting part of the Festival has been the growing importance and number of outdoor, open-air and free events which have helped spread the net, if you like, in terms of access to the Festival and also, I think, contribute greatly to the carnival

atmosphere and festive air that we can get around the city as a whole.

In other words, the Festival is conceived as something that can involve the whole of the community of the greater city of Adelaide and the State rather than just be concentrated on the particular theatrical and other offerings one traditionally associates with the Festival. In the case of this year, we actually see a massive expansion of that program. I am told that there are 262 outdoor performances, events, concerts and displays already programmed, all of which are free except for the opening night concert which I will mention in a moment. They include something like 2 600 performers, so one can see that, apart from the audiences they attract, the number of people—and which include local performers, more than 200 from interstate and some 60 or 70 or so from overseas—will all be part of this massive outdoor program.

So, apart from those participants, of course, who are significant in their numbers, one would expect to attract a very big audience indeed. During the last Festival two years ago something like 200 000 people attended the outdoor program, and that was a special program as part of the Jubilee 150 year. This year, expanded further, the outdoor program committee is expecting something like 400 000 people to be coming along, so it really will involve some massive events.

There are 21 separate venues ranging from city squares to open spaces in and around many areas, and even, I am told, some surprise locations which will be revealed during the course of the Festival. People might unexpectedly find on their doorstep a Festival event that they did not expect to see. The range of events is enormous. Apart from concerts, street theatre, busking and things of that nature, there are dancers; there is an aerial and aquatic festival on Sunday the 20th; there is a rock concert, and so on. In other words, there is an enormous range of things people can come in and take part in as family involved in the community. I mentioned the opening night—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** If the pleasure and enjoyment of some 400 000 people is irrelevant to the Opposition, if the fact that an expensive Festival program is making room for free performances, accessible to ordinary people, is irrelevant, then so is this question. I would suggest, along with the honourable member, that it is very relevant. The opening night is not free, but I suggest that the pricing is fairly reasonable, because attention has been paid to family tickets and discounts in accordance.

It will feature 250 dancers, a 200-voice choir, 50 percussionists, a variety of artists from the main Festival program, and a fantastic fireworks display. The star attraction will be Icehouse, the popular band, returning to Australia from a national US tour, so there is enormous value for the \$5 for adults, and \$3 for children price for that event. To conclude, Mr Speaker, yes: the Festival organisers have paid careful attention to outdoor events to ensure that there are free activities and mass participation in the Festival of Arts.

### MR SPENCER RIGNEY

**Mr LEWIS:** My question is directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction who is responsible for making a final decision in the case of Mr Spencer Rigney, of Narrung, who is facing eviction from his home of the past 14 years; when will a decision be made; and why did the Minister fail to attend a meeting arranged with Mr Rigney today for a time convenient to the Minister?

Mr Rigney has believed since 1973 that he was purchasing his Housing Trust home under the Aboriginal housing scheme. This belief was shared by the entire community of Narrung and has been supported by a former employee of the Department for Community Welfare, which initially had responsibility for the rental purchase scheme. However, due to missing paperwork, the Government is threatening to evict Mr Rigney. Late last year, the Minister promised to investigate the circumstances surrounding the Rigney case and he eventually said that a final decision would be made by the Aboriginal Housing Board. A meeting was convened for today with Mr Rigney, who was informed that the Minister would be present at 11 a.m.—a time agreed to by the Minister. However, the Minister did not attend today, and the Chairman of the Aboriginal Housing Board has now told Mr Rigney that his fate is to be determined by the Minister.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The press release that I put out earlier this year and the letter that I wrote to the member for Murray-Mallee were self-explanatory.

### GOVERNMENT HOUSE

**Mr RANN:** Will the Premier say whether arrangements can be made to open to the public the historic staterooms of Government House, Adelaide, in this our bicentenary year? During our 1986 Jubilee 150 celebrations, Government House arranged tours of its superb gardens, but not its ground floor staterooms, although I understand that one open day was arranged in 1987. I have been told by the Private Secretary to the Governor of Western Australia that Government House, Perth, arranges three open days each year and that the response to these from the public has been 'overwhelming'.

Government House, Canberra, also allows charities to arrange three or four open days each year, again with enormous success: 4 000 people went through in one wintry afternoon. Government House, Melbourne, has an arrangement with the National Trust to allow organised tours on several days each week and each year it also allows two general open days which have attracted 40 000 visitors on a single day. Special exhibitions of historic photographs and memorabilia are displayed on such occasions in Victoria and, to commemorate the bicentenary, four such open days are to be arranged in 1988. I have been told by staff members of each of those Governors and of the Governor-General that these open days have been conducted without incident.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I appreciate the question from the honourable member and I am pleased to say that in fact in this area His Excellency has already taken an initiative which the Government was pleased to support when, last year, apart from special occasion functions when many thousands of people are sometimes in the grounds of Government House, he began a program of access to the rooms of Government House under the auspices of the National Trust. I am told that on the first occasion, in November last year, about 800 people went through the gardens and the house. They were organised in small groups. One feature of our Government House is that, unlike some Government Houses in other States, it is not overly large in terms of staterooms. It is a residence for the Governor as well and that has tended to limit ready access because we cannot easily segregate the public areas from the private areas. So, obviously the Governor cannot give us open slather to access.

However, on the occasion to which I have referred, with small groups of people inside and outside at any one time,

extremely thorough tours were able to be given and were much appreciated by the hundreds who turned up. The response to that was so positive that the Governor has decided that he will do that again. Certainly, a similar function of that kind will be organised under the auspices of the National Trust. Also because a \$10 ticket is attached to it, fund raising will also be involved, and I guess that will be fairly welcome as proceeds will go to the National Trust. As to whether this can be extended further, I will certainly mention the honourable member's question to His Excellency to see what other plans he may have in mind. Certainly, Government House in its location is a magnificent asset to the city and obviously the more accessible it is to the public the better.

I think already we have seen a very fine visual improvement with the rebuilding of the wall along the western boundary of Government House. Obviously more plantings and vegetation are required, but already there is a more open aspect. Of course, the wall along the southern side has also been repaired and upgraded. So attention is being paid to the question of accessibility, and I know that His Excellency is very keen to encourage that. I will certainly refer the honourable member's points to him.

### MR SPENCER RIGNEY

**Mr MEIER:** Does the Minister of Housing and Construction intend to evict Mr Spencer Rigney from his house?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** That is a far more direct question and I am only too happy to respond. I think it is only fair to give the House a little of the history about this case. Certain sections of the media are in effect attempting to force not only the Government but the Aboriginal Housing Board and the South Australian Housing Trust to make a decision in regard to Mr Rigney—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I have made it perfectly clear that I will have the whole matter investigated. I have done that. Certain sections of the media have implied that Mr Rigney's case of ownership is valid, primarily because certain organisations—such as the Aboriginal Housing Board or the South Australian Housing Trust—have conveniently lost or misplaced documents pertaining to this matter. I have seen many documents relating to this case. We know that the matter was considered by the previous Government in response to a request from my colleague the present Minister of Lands.

**Mr Ingerson:** That was five years ago.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** No, that was during the Tonkin Administration. The only thing missing from all the dockets pertaining to this case is any comment by the previous Administration. If I was a cynic, I would say that as the previous Government went out of office it may have done a little prudent shredding. In regard to the documentation that I have received, the gentleman concerned made an application for rental accommodation—and he was given rental accommodation. Later, the gentleman concerned made an application for rental reduction—and he was given rental reduction. The title of the particular property is registered in the name of the South Australian Housing Trust. They are the facts that I have been able to establish. When I released a press statement to the effect that I was going to ask the Aboriginal Housing Board to make a decision, I asked that it be done in an amicable manner, and that still stands. For the information of the House, the press release stated that until a decision was made it would not be fair for the gentleman concerned to be evicted.



*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### SOUTHERN WATER SUPPLY

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister of Water Resources tell the House when chloramination of southern water supplies was discontinued, and what improvement in the water quality has been observed since that date? At a recent public meeting at the Noarlunga Centre I called on the Minister, on behalf of my constituents, to discontinue the addition of chloramine to water from the Myponga reservoir if it was considered to be exacerbating the water quality problems being experienced in the southern area. My constituents have requested detailed information about the improvement in water quality as monitored by the department.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The amonia was turned off, I think, last Friday week. Judging from the intensity of complaints, there appears to have been some improvement in water quality. This has been a rather curious affair, because it is clear that the effect of chloramination on the water supply has been strangely distributed in the south. There are some areas, including my street, which have had virtually no problems at all; and there are other areas which have had the worst problems that I have ever seen in relation to water supply with the water coming out virtually red. The suggestion is that almost certainly there has been a chemical reaction as a result of a buildup in the pipes of iron based chemicals which are a feature of the Myponga reservoir water supply. That is almost certainly why this problem has occurred in a way which is quite unprecedented since, as honourable members would know, chloramination of our water supply began quite a few years ago.

I caution the honourable member and her constituents and other people in the south that there is no guarantee that this is the end of the matter. I would imagine that some of the material that has been formed is still in the pipes and, with variations in temperature and therefore drawdown on water supplies, there may be some repetition, reducing in intensity as we move into the winter months. During winter there will be an intensive scrubbing and cleaning of pipes in the worst affected areas. I really cannot guarantee that there will be a cessation of the problem until that intensive program has been completed, which should be in time for next year's summer months.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Call on the business of the day.

### ABORIGINAL HERITAGE BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

### FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGY BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

### CORONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### STATE LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Lotteries Act 1966. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

**The SPEAKER:** Is leave granted?

**Mr Lewis:** No.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is not granted.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I thank the House for its courtesy! The purpose of this Bill is to prohibit the operation of commercial syndicates for lotto games. The prospect of large profits from lotto games has led to the growth of commercial syndicates. For a fee and often a proportion of any winnings, those persons collect money from a number of subscribers for the purchase of large systems entries. These syndicates are not always conducted with due business propriety and their practices may bring discredit upon the lotto competition. Therefore, they are potentially damaging to the good name of the Lotteries Commission and to the important contribution which the commission makes to the State budget. The proposed amendment would not interfere with social, workplace or family syndicates as these do not involve payments of a fee.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 19 (5) of the Act which makes it an offence to promote or take part in a syndicate for the purchase of a lottery ticket for fee or reward. The current provision exempts promoting or taking part in such a syndicate if the reward for doing so is a share in a prize won by the ticket. The amendment removes this exemption.

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

### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1988)

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Bill

The Federal Government established a National Road Freight Industry Inquiry to investigate all aspects of the Industry. One of the outcomes of the inquiry has been a decision that the speed limit differential between cars and heavy vehicles should be reduced. Such a reduction is thought to be not only advantageous to the industry but desirable from a road safety point of view as it should reduce overtaking, a major cause of road crashes. Following agreement in the Australian Transport Advisory Council (ATAC), the speed limit for heavy vehicles on the open road was increased from 80 km/h to 90 km/h from 1 January 1987, throughout

Australia. At the December 1987 meeting of ATAC it was agreed to increase the speed limit of heavy vehicles to 100 km/h throughout Australia as from 1 July 1988.

This latest agreement was reached after considering the results of a survey of truck crashes carried out by the Federal Office of Road Safety. The findings of that survey indicate that road safety was not adversely affected because of the earlier increase in the speed limit from 80 km/h to 90 km/h as it relates to trucks.

The speed limit for omnibuses in South Australia is currently 90 km/h. The control gear and braking characteristics of long distance coaches are now such that their operation at 100 km/h is as safe as, or safer than, the operation of trucks at the same speed. Accordingly, it is considered that an increase in the speed limit for omnibuses to 100 km/h should also not adversely affect road safety.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on 1 July 1988.

Clause 3 amends section 53 of the Road Traffic Act 1961, which fixes 90 km/h as the speed limit for vehicles the gross vehicle mass, or combination mass, of which exceeds four tonnes and for omnibuses and vehicles carrying more than eight persons. The clause amends the section to increase this limit to 100 km/h.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1988)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 February. Page 2983.)

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** Yesterday evening I commenced my remarks in response to this debate and felt it necessary to deal with a number of the points made in particular by the Leader of the Opposition in his contribution to the debate. In so doing, I think it is fair to say that we heard yet again a recitation of a negative, depressing and in many ways inaccurate list of statistics that were all calculated to give the most depressing and gloomy picture of the state of the South Australian economy.

Of course, our economy, as anyone in the community would tell us, has not been enjoying an easy time, particularly over the past 12 months or so. The Government has never attempted to hide that fact. For the past 12 months in particular, and I refer members to many statements that I have made, we have been forced to live within restraints dictated from outside, especially in terms of what the Commonwealth Government is prepared to provide to this State in terms of the situation in the national and international economy.

Surely we do not need to be reminded by the Leader of the Opposition that the Australian economy, along with most other economies of the world, has been subject to a massive funding restriction that in turn has been passed on to State and local governments, and South Australia has never been in the past, nor will it be in the future, immune or exempt from the effects of that sort of economic downturn. At least when we were in Opposition we had the grace to recognise that and to refer to it in dealing with the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I can provide a number of examples. What South Australia has to do first is to recognise in a responsible and realistic way the restraints that

shape our State economy and then try to ensure that we address them. For doing this, for behaving in a way that we believe best ensures the continuing growth and viability of this State there is absolutely no recognition or acknowledgement by the Opposition. All it can do is launch into a familiar pattern of highlighting everything that is negative about our economy, highlighting quite dishonestly using warped statistics and a selective use of comparisons. Members of the Opposition want to paint the blackest black picture, not an accurate or realistic picture of the problems in our economy, but the blackest picture possible and make South Australians believe that the future holds nothing but gloom and despair.

Their selective treatment does not include any of the statistics or facts that provide some balance to this picture; the facts which show, for instance, that the South Australian economy is being managed responsibly. There is no recognition that within our community there is a broad acceptance of the Government's management and a strong feeling that we can work together to overcome these problems. Of course, the Government does not expect the Opposition to support all our decisions on the economy, but at least we should be getting less than this overwhelming despondency, this determination to put the worst possible complexion on everything.

There are never any greys; there are certainly no highlights. The Opposition's single goal is to talk down the state of our economic management and, in turn, depress and alarm anyone who takes their analysis seriously. Just how misguided that analysis is, including this latest volume produced by the Leader of the Opposition, a tired and inaccurate compilation that has little validity, has been treated accordingly by the media, I am pleased to say. I will deal with some of that in detail a bit later.

However, the Opposition introducing that sort of document seems to have no other sense of direction, a vision blinkered by the deliberate use of those statistics, one which offers nothing for the future. That record, if it was going to be balanced should show, for instance, some impressive performances of the South Australian economy, particularly in comparison with other States in other times. For example, South Australia carries the second lowest burden of public debt; our inflation rate for the December quarter was the best result in the country.

Our level of taxes and charges is well below the national average; and an unprecedented commercial building program estimated that more than \$1 billion is under way in the City of Adelaide, meaning jobs and continuing growth for our economy. There are a number of other matters that are neglected, and I will expand on them in a minute. First, let me address the Opposition's misunderstanding of just how significant some of the major initiatives taken by this Government are to our economy, things that Opposition members dismiss as empty symbols that in themselves mean nothing.

Let me mention a few of those examples. What about the long and difficult negotiations that secured a major part in the construction site in regard to the submarine replacement program? We well remember the Leader of the Opposition's initial reaction to that decision: he was disappointed to have the biggest single defence contract awarded in Australia for decades; he was disappointed that South Australia had beaten all the other States as the construction site; he was disappointed that the contract will mean 2 000 jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars injected into this South Australian economy.

Apparently that is a symbol about which he has been disappointed. Then there is the other one, as indeed I have

heard from interjections, to label the Formula One Grand Prix as just a symbol. Members opposite groan. The Deputy Leader said that it was an empty gesture, some sort of circus that brought no benefit to South Australians. In fact, the Grand Prix has significant and widespread economic impact on this community. It is important, as is recognised outside South Australia, where most of the other States at various times have tried to get it. Indeed, as I will mention later, businessmen in this city are so concerned that they say they would be willing to put up money to keep it here. That is the empty gesture that it is! A major study has been made of the Grand Prix and its economic effects. I refer honourable members to the 1986 annual report where it stated:

Economists indicated that the 1985 event resulted in a \$40 million injection to the State's economy and the 1986 figure is thought to be at least equal if not greater. In terms of its international standing the Grand Prix is unsurpassed by an annual event in Australia.

Is this an empty gesture? Is this something we should not talk about? What do we hear from the Opposition? No recognition of that economic worth, just an attempt to write it off as some sort of circus or entertainment. To them it is an empty symbol. We well recall their handling of the Bill in the House when we were forced into conference by the Upper House and certain members of the Opposition insisted on taking us to the brink and even put that event at risk. So much for the empty symbol!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Talk to the Hon. Mr Griffin. Then—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Well, it hurts to be reminded of this because they want to embrace the symbol now. They do not like to be reminded of their initial attitude to it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Briggs is not to interject when he is out of his proper place. He should not interject at all.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** What about the next one—Roxby Downs?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I caution members on my left for their persistent interjecting. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I have constantly acknowledged the role of the previous Government in securing the Roxby Downs project. However, I have also said that this Government ensured that policies were changed that enabled it to occur following 1983. What about another favourite symbol, the ASER complex—the Casino, the hotel, the office building and the convention centre?

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The honourable member who interjects has done more to harm industrial relations on that project than any other single person, and he is proud of it. He thinks that that is marvellous. He loves to count the cost.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. There are several reasons why the amount of interjection taking place would be out of order under Standing Orders and under the practices of the House. I ask members to think how the current behaviour in the House would appear to an interested member of the public. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Leader of the Opposition at this time was trying to create some sort of positive image—a positive facade. However, he will not be so keen on promoting in future his man in the Upper House because

he has announced that he will try to get down to the Lower House to be a rival to the Leader of the Opposition. Fortunately for the Leader of the Opposition he can rest easy because my colleague, the member for Adelaide, will make quite sure that he does not get here. I would imagine that the Leader of the Opposition will be working very hard to ensure that the Hon. Mr Davis does not make it into this Chamber, and that is good news. Every month—

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I rise on a point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the honourable member for Davenport is about to make a point of order that the Premier should be addressing himself to the Supply Bill, I suggest to members on both sides that the internal political processes of both Parties are not matters that are dealt with in the Bill.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I say no more about the Hon. Mr Davis, except to say that with the connivance perhaps of the Leader of the Opposition, week by week, month by month, he attacks that project, issues misleading figures and generally tries to cast doubt on it. What an outrageous attitude to a project of enormous significance, one in fact which acted as the spur to the building boom that has developed in and around this city of Adelaide. So much for the empty symbols.

Unless we see a more reasoned and a more responsible approach to the economy from the Leader I doubt whether members opposite will ever be able to appreciate just what is happening in this State. The Leader of the Opposition, with his contribution yesterday, again confirmed that while he is very good at knocking, at putting down and casting out, he has absolutely nothing to put in its place. The carping criticism and the negative attack on the Government's record is fine; that is par for the course and I do not disagree that that is part of the role of the Opposition—to criticise and question the Government. However, to put nothing in its place and to have no sensible or positive alternatives is quite outrageous.

Here we are in February 1988 and still he has not quite got around to it. Let us look at some of the allegations made in the House in the context of this Supply debate by the Leader and at how distorted the statistics are. Statistics are very interesting things. The Leader of the Opposition's document can look impressive because it has contributions from various sources, dates and so on. I suggest that all honourable members look at the fine print when trying to analyse it. I do not have time today to go through all of the areas. Let me choose a few to indicate—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, I am prepared to deal with things like inflation, retail sales, employment growth and public sector employment—all of these are key areas that the Leader of the Opposition dealt with. Let me talk about inflation. Rather than concede the truth that the annual increase in Adelaide CPI was the lowest in Australia on the latest figures, the Opposition chooses to measure the change that occurred only in the past three months. That change was a decrease of .6 per cent. That is certainly not the best recorded in Australia in that three month period. However, the annual rate shows that South Australia is the equal best in Australia. That is not mentioned as a balancing factor.

In relation to retail sales the Leader of the Opposition claims that our sales performance is the worst in Australia and produces those figures. I do not dispute the selectivity of the figures. However, he was prepared to argue the case of inflation on a month-to-month basis and quickly switched to an annual basis when he wanted to look at retail sales.

For instance, if he had chosen the October to November months last year he would have seen the second best performance in Australia. Very interestingly on inflation he wants us to look at a monthly basis and on retail sales he wants us to look at an annual basis because he knows that if we did it the other way round it would not suit his case. The truth lies in between, as we all know.

I am not suggesting that the retail sector is enjoying a boom period or is performing well. I am certainly not doing that. I am simply pointing to the selective use of statistics which is quite dishonest. What about the question of the general employment growth? This is another good one. The Leader of the Opposition produces this figure of comparison by saying, 'I am going to look at the year to 31 January 1982 and compare that with the year to 31 January 1988.' The 1982 figure he chooses gives an answer that suits the picture. The percentage growth he points out in that year of 2.2 per cent is the second best in Australia at the time. It is very good and that is a contrast to our situation. One asks why this statistic has been calculated to January 1982. The Tonkin Government had another 11 months of office to run. Indeed, the effect of its last budget and economic policies were felt into 1983. Why not pick January 1983 as the measure?

The reason for that is that if that particular year had been chosen it would have shown no employment growth whatsoever. Employment actually fell by 4.6 per cent—the worst performance in Australia. So much for the figures that the Leader of the Opposition put forward. Incidentally, while our January 1988 growth figure was not by any means the best in Australia at least our employment grew. It grew by 1 per cent and over the period we have been in office we have seen average growth figures that have been very satisfactory. I will come to them in a minute.

Let us look at this vexed area of public sector employment. In September 1987 the Leader of the Opposition claimed that under this Government—during our time in office—13 000 new positions had been created in the public sector. However, in yesterday's document the Leader of the Opposition said it is now 6 500. Apparently there has been this massive reduction in the period of his last computation.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I did not hear him acknowledge the concept of full-time equivalents, not once, in any previous figures he has produced. It is interesting that he has discovered it now. Anyhow, the calculator batteries started to run down apparently and we have missed some 7 000 or so that were included in his figures last September. What sort of selective analysis of those figures he uses I will come to in a minute when I deal with employment as it really is in the public sector. That is just an example of the misleading and inaccurate way statistics have been used.

Let me turn to some of the statistics you will not hear, Mr Speaker, from the Leader of the Opposition, statistics that you will not read in his next volume of *The Boys Own Guide to Economics* which is shortly to come out. What is the best and most basic measure of growth in an economy, the global measure that is used all over the world? The answer is: what happens with gross domestic product or, in our case, the gross State product. In real terms in the year 1981-82, there was a decline in our gross State product of 2.9 per cent. In 1986-87 it showed a 1 per cent increase, so the South Australian economy was actually declining under the policies that the Leader of the Opposition advocates. It has consistently grown under Labor to show a 4 per cent turnaround.

I might add that, if we take the average of the five financial years of my Government, it is not a 2.9 per cent

decline, as in the last year of the Tonkin Government, but in fact a real terms increase of 4.75 per cent average in each of the five years that we have had. That is not too bad a record, and it is certainly not a statistic to be found in the mass of nonsense that the Leader of the Opposition has produced. I would like members opposite to compare that with their record. Let us look at taxes and charges and their contribution to the cost of living.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the House to order. Members on my left and members of the Government backbench have had their opportunity to contribute to this debate already. If there are specific points that they wish to introduce into the debate, they may indirectly do that in the grievance debate on this same Bill. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Some of us might have heard the Leader of the Opposition repeating one of these things he does *ad nauseam* about the contribution or the impact of State taxes and charges on the CPI in this State. That is very interesting, and I think there is something in this document about that. However, what it does not mention is that, if one takes the period from June 1980 to December 1982, taxes and charges in the period of the Tonkin Government contributed 14.1 per cent to CPI. From March 1983 to December 1987, this percentage dropped to only 7.9 per cent. Under the Liberals, the effect of taxes and charges on the CPI was 80 per cent higher than under us. So much for this argument!

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The ABS measure of taxes, fees—the lowest tax! We will come to that.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition has already made his contribution.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The ABS measure of fees, taxes and fines per capita certainly gives a different story to that of the Opposition Leader, who claims we are the high tax State. In 1982-83, tax per capita was \$433 in South Australia against the national average of \$586. By 1986-87, ours had risen to \$679 per capita, well below the national figure of \$820 per capita.

Much was made by the Leader of the Opposition concerning electricity charges. It is true that in the last five years electricity charges have increased by 55 per cent. There has been a significant increase, a large part of that early increase as a result of negotiations on gas prices made by the previous Government which in fact ripped us off. This Government had to pass legislation to do something about that, but that is another story. Although there was a total increase of 55 per cent over a five-year period, in the three years of the Tonkin Government the increase was 48 per cent. The average increase in the term of this Government has been 11 per cent over the whole term of the Government compared to 16 per cent average under the Tonkin Government. That is not a bad record! The real average increase is 3 per cent per annum under Labor compared with 4.4 per cent under the Liberals.

Incidentally, if one looks at the last two or three years when major efforts have been made and we struggled free of that gas price agreement and put a new one in its place—and my colleague negotiated all sorts of other changes in the structure of the Electricity Trust, including \$11 million injected in 1985—we have been able to reduce electricity tariffs in real terms by 16 per cent. Incidentally, on that \$11 million, the Leader of the Opposition says that that is just a one-off amount and it has made no contribution to tariffs. The fact is that it helped make possible a 2 per cent reduction in the tariff which is not a once only adjustment. That fed on, year by year, into the electricity price tariff

base which has meant that the subsequent increases, all lower than the CPI and built on to that lower base, have produced that large permanent benefit. So it is nonsense to talk about one-off effects.

Turning to inflation and the CPI, this is a good example of the efforts of the Opposition Leader to drag the most negative possible interpretation from the figures. I have already mentioned the fact that what you do not hear from the Leader of the Opposition is that we have had the lowest annual inflation rate in South Australia. That is simply ignored. That is simply left out of the documents that are concerned. I might add, incidentally, that inflation is an interesting statistic to look at. If the cost of living indicators are not rising in some sectors, that can well be an indication of stagnation in our economy.

Members have to be careful and, indeed, selective in their use of the CPI as an indicator of economic health. It may not always be the best thing to have the lowest CPI in the country. However, on an annual basis we have, and that ought to be put on the record.

Bankruptcies is another issue that has had a great deal of attention from the Opposition. Members opposite take whole figures and indicate that there is a high level of bankruptcies and so on. No-one disputes that. It is true, it is happening, and it is of considerable concern. But let us get that into perspective also if we are trying to compare different policies and different records. Members opposite might like to consider, for instance, that in the two years to June 1982 South Australia had 18.1 per cent of Australia's bankruptcies. In the two years to June 1987, our percentage has been 17.4. All that indicates in my view is that there are significant other factors in the performance of the economy that can affect those figures. However, the record ought to be put straight there, and again the record indicates no major change. Indeed, it is a marginally better comparative performance in South Australia than under the Tonkin Government.

The public sector employment figures are very interesting. This is where the calculator had its flips as far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, or he suddenly made the discovery of full-time equivalents in his computations. Between 1982-83 and 1986-87, there was an increase in the number of people listed as employed in statutory authorities which represented 5 073 full-time equivalents. The bulk of this increase, 4 087 of it, by far the largest proportion, was recorded in the Health Commission, and much of that increase, some thousands, was the result of a statistical change. For the first time, employees already on the public payroll, in the sense that they were employed in hospitals, were included in Health Commission figures: no new employees, no additions. The Leader of the Opposition smiles because he knows I have uncovered one of his greatly misleading statistics. I cannot remain parliamentary and say that it is a lie, but he knows very well that this is how he has misled people. These people were already employed in the system. For statistical purposes, they were added to the computation of public sector employees, and he refuses to make allowance for that fact, thus inflating the figure he wants to suggest we have recklessly increased.

Even taking into account that statistic, what about the residue of extra employees in our public health system. Most of them were extra nurses being employed in our hospitals to deliver a better service. I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition should be congratulating us on that, because day after day, including this morning, virtually no day goes by without his shadow Minister of Health demanding that we spend more and employ more in our public hospitals and our health system. He does that.

Why does not the Leader of the Opposition call him to order? Why does he not tell him to stop making those demands? We have been criticised for adding to the numbers on the public payroll. I say that we have added many hundreds of nurses to the public payroll, and the Leader of the Opposition says that it is—

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That is not true. There has been a reduction in the numbers employed in the Central Office of the Health Commission.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** There has been a reduction, and there has been an increase in the number of nurses and those in the hospitals. That is a fact. Where else has there been this increase? Again, the Leader of the Opposition likes to avoid an analysis of these figures because that does not suit his purpose. The State Bank and SGIC have also employed something like 700 or more in total who have been added to the payroll. Is he suggesting that that is a bad thing? Those extra jobs represent no drain whatsoever on the public purse; in fact, they are making money for the Government.

The State Bank has been returning higher profits and dividends to our State Government general revenue in the past two or three years, partly in consequence of employing extra people. The more people the State Bank employs, the better, I say. It is good for the economy. Would he criticise the ANZ Bank if a large increase in its business and its profits enabled it to employ more people? Of course not. It is because it is the State Bank, and selectively he wants to lock that in with figures that show some kind of irresponsibility.

Mr Speaker, they are the statutory authorities. I will not go on with the analysis, but one could actually pin it down even more. In the public sector proper there has been a change of 1 350 full-time equivalents. Again, let us analyse where they are. It is not a large amount over five years: 1 350. More than 800 of these have been in the area of justice agencies, police, prison officers and law court staff. I would have thought that if there was nothing else the Opposition had been talking about over the past few years it was the demands in law and order: 'We need more policing resources'. The member for Light concluded his contribution to this debate demanding more police resources in certain areas. Our prisons, straining and bulging, are in need of urgent capital works and staffing changes. All of those resources have been provided.

Our law courts, which are aimed at processing the cases and ensuring that we are dealing with these problems, again needed more staff. It is hypocrisy for the Opposition to denounce us for making employment increases in this area while at the same time demanding that law and order be of the highest priority. As I have shown with public statutory authorities, so in direct public sector employment—that is where our priorities have lain: in law and order and justice, those very areas where the public is demanding that something be done, areas that the Opposition berates us about, and areas that we are addressing.

So much for this question of priorities. What about, in this 1 350 I mentioned, the 433 extra full-time equivalent employees in the technical and further education system? Is that not essential to improving the standard of training for employment? Are there not always demands for new courses, for extra resources to our TAFE system? Four hundred and thirty three extra full-time equivalents: the Opposition should be praising us, congratulating us, but

no—that is gathered into a figure to denounce us for extra employment. The hypocrisy of it is quite staggering!

These increases in areas like that in the public sector have been matched, I might add, by very significant decreases in other administrative units; something like 1 130 full-time equivalents have actually gone from a number of other departments that have not been of such a high priority or where efficiencies have been achieved. In other words, we have been attempting to recycle employment into those areas of priority and need. Again, that is a cause for congratulation, not a cause for hypocritical attack.

Let me turn to the area of State finances. In real terms, our net debt has hardly changed since 1980. In fact, on a per capita basis it has declined. So much for saying that we are spending more, recklessly: our debt has in fact declined since 1980, when it was \$3 063 on a per capita basis. It is now \$2 873. Real net debt has declined steadily as a percentage of our gross State product from 23 per cent in 1983 to 19 per cent last year. That is not a bad achievement in the sort of economic climate in which we have been operating—a real decline in our net debt.

Among all the States, South Australia carries the second lowest burden of debt and one of the lowest rates of gross borrowing as a percentage of gross State product. The overall tax burden on South Australians is 5 per cent below the average applying across the six Australian States—hardly an indication of a high tax State, Mr Speaker. The document released by the Leader yesterday states that it is going to be a prelude to the announcement of Opposition policies to wrest our South Australia economy from the brink of disaster.

Members may recall last November, I think it was, the Leader of the Opposition releasing what is known as the Groucho Marx document. These were all sorts of statistics about our economy, a statement of the facts, definitive facts, and attached to it was the picture of the Leader of the Opposition which got the appellation by which the document is known. They were described as the herald of the Opposition economic policy. 'This is setting the record on the line,' he said. 'The next document will announce our policies.'

Well, we have now had a second document announced with an even bigger fanfare—Groucho Marx has been eliminated from the front cover: he is on the inside on this occasion. We have the facts there and the document is bigger, but are there any policies? No, indeed. No. 2 document has appeared, and still no policy; still a prelude; still a herald of what is going to be announced by the Opposition. Gloom and despair: no indication of how we might be rescued from this desperate situation. Anyone who is seriously prepared to consider the Opposition's argument must be wondering just what it is they are planning. Like their Federal counterparts they have nothing to present to the electorate, because they know basically that, within the constraints we have, we are getting it right. While the Leader and the other members opposite are pressing their doom-laden analysis, I am pleased to say that more objective analyses are being made of the South Australian economy and how it is being managed.

I refer, for instance, to some of the ratings assessments that have been made of the South Australian economy and its state—a very different picture from that given by those on the other side of the House. What about the survey of leading business operators made recently by the Price, Waterhouse Group? People surveyed predicted a strong growth in our State economy over the next five to 10 years and expressed confidence in the economic management of the State Government and its moves to revitalise the local

economy. They pointed out South Australia's advantages in wage and land costs over the other States and pointed out the Government's willingness to work with business in securing development for this State.

This is not our assessment or judgment: this was the survey of leading business operators in the South Australian economy. I have already mentioned that one of the interesting things was that this 'empty symbol', this 'gesture', the Grand Prix, was seen as so important by them that they were prepared to say that we ought to put in money to ensure that it goes nowhere else. I would like members, when they are assessing this document put out by the Leader of the Opposition and his analysis of our economy, to look at those objective assessments, at those analyses of just where we are, then judge for themselves.

The picture is not all good: the times are difficult. The State has some major problems: all those are acknowledged. There is no way we will overcome them by trying to paint the blackest possible picture; by trying to bring us down in every way possible; and by ensuring that whatever confidence there is in this economy can be completely destroyed by suggestions that there really is no future. That is what the Opposition is on about at the moment, and this Government will not accept it. The facts simply do not stand up to it, and I think that the public is awake to that as well.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of consideration of the Bill.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** The Premier may have been a good schoolboy debater and it may stand him in good stead to get up in this House and fulminate with a flow of words which, to the uninitiated, may be persuasive, but he cannot get around the facts. He cannot get around the facts which are indicated in the document which the Leader of the Opposition made public yesterday.

He cannot refute them, and they are a damning indictment of the record of his Government. The Premier talks about his days in Opposition and how he behaved then. When in Opposition, the Premier painted a picture of unmitigated doom and gloom, day in and day out in this forum and anywhere else where his voice would be listened to. Now the Premier has the nerve to come into this place and suggest that he behaved responsibly when Leader of the Opposition and indicated an alternative to the outstanding record of the Tonkin Government. However, what was his attitude then? Let me remind the Premier of some of the things that occurred during the life of the Tonkin Government. We had the international airport negotiated by that Government. That generated real wealth and opened up the tourist industry and export markets to create new wealth. Yet we hear no word of recognition from the Premier about that, even though it gave an enormous boost to the South Australian economy through increased export income and the generation of wealth.

What was Labor's attitude to Roxby Downs at that time? Labor members fought it tooth and nail. Indeed, the Minister of Mines and Energy said that the uranium would go into bombs. That was the attitude of Labor when in Opposition. Supportive with a real alternative policy—what nonsense! What was the attitude of Labor members to the Cooper Basin oil scheme, the biggest project that was up and running on the mainland in record time? Carping criticism that we were going too fast! We took a select committee to Whyalla to hear what the locals had to say and

the Labor Party put every possible impediment in our way and said we were going too fast. Responsible in Opposition—what garbage! It was unmitigated doom and gloom and a daily downgrading of the considerable achievements of the Tonkin Government.

What did the Labor Opposition say about the Hilton, the first international hotel in Adelaide? Labor members think that they are the first to get cranes on the skyline. Many people have congratulated us on the Hilton International. What did Labor members say about the redevelopment of the law courts from the gutted Moores Building? What did they say about the motel on South Terrace and about the record levels, still unsurpassed, of public housing and housing generally in this State during the time of the Tonkin Government? The Jubilee housing program that they are now lauding was launched by our Minister of Housing (Murray Hill). What did Labor members say about the record levels of housing? Not a peep. They said that the State was in dire straits. What did they say about Technology Park? Not a peep, although they are now happy to jump on that bandwagon and claim it as their own.

What did Labor members say about the O-Bahn busway? They did not like it, although it was less than half as expensive as the light rail system that they dreamed up. Those are but a few of our achievements (and the list goes on and on), showing how the Tonkin Government sought to create wealth. However, what do we get day in and day out? We get the symbols, including the Grand Prix and the submarine project.

The words I quoted yesterday were not mine. The Premier in his schoolboy debating style has got the half-truth down to a fine art, *par excellence*. The words that I quoted were those of a union leader. What is the Premier really doing about the level of employment in this State? What is he really doing about the fact that we have the highest level of poverty around Australia? Those are not the words of Goldsworthy; they are the words of a union leader talking about bread and circuses. They were his words, not mine.

What is the Premier doing about the record level of unemployment? In the days of the Tonkin Government the tears of the then Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy would be flowing about the tragedy of unemployment, especially youth unemployment. However, today we have the highest youth unemployment in the nation. Indeed, it is several percentage points higher than the average of the Commonwealth. The Federal Government stands condemned on its average of 19 per cent of young people unemployed, but what does the Premier say about South Australia with the highest level of youth unemployment, which is 22 per cent or 23 per cent and way ahead of the national average.

These are some of the indicators around which the schoolboy debater cannot find his way. These are the points that the exponent of the half-truth cannot answer. Let the Premier go to the man in the street. True, the Premier acknowledges that things are difficult, but we must make him acknowledge the fact that they are tougher than they need be because he has sat there with Labor in Government for five years. The facts indicate that clearly. The Premier comes in here with airy-fairy, unsourced statistics about the growth in the State's GDP, about the growth in overall production which he takes as the international indicator.

True, we have recently had good primary production years. Wool has been at a record price. I remind members that the contribution from primary industry to the national export income is about half. The increasing contribution being made by primary industry, which has made a major contribution since the foundation of this State, is not

acknowledged by Labor. We are told that this contribution from primary industry is the result of wonderful Government policies. What garbage! What has the Premier done to increase the value of the wool clip in South Australia? What has he done to increase wine production or to help the primary producer generally? Indeed, he has done his damndest to tax the primary producer and every other business in South Australia out of business. He has introduced a fancy new workers compensation scheme that he says will help, but just talk to the business people who pay the Government bills and who generate the wealth of the economy and one will see whether or not this Government has done anything to increase the overall level of production.

This Government has been the greatest retardant on growth in this State in areas where growth is important. It certainly has engendered growth in areas that are not important, but that has added to the cost of the public payroll and has inhibited those people who want to do something for South Australia. The Premier's speech was the usual schoolboy debating effort and he would probably have won top marks for it. You know: he is the sort of debater who gets up and argues that black is white just as a lawyer can. I have heard lawyers and the Premier is one of them. I have said here before that part of the skill of the lawyer is getting up and convincing jury members that a fellow who should be hanged is innocent, and in the end those jury members do not know right from wrong. I am allergic to lawyers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Griffin is a lawyer, but he is in the commercial field, not in the criminal field. Lawyers are so used to getting up in here and arguing that black is white. They mesmerise their audience and finish up believing it themselves. They say, 'All's well: black is white.' However, the facts are there. All the indicators point to the way this State has gone over the past five years. I am prepared to debate with the Premier the record of the Tonkin Government and to deal with the projects that that Government got up and running in order to generate real wealth in this State. I would compare those projects with what the Premier now gets up and talks about, and he would come a poor second.

Let a dispassionate observer consider the indicators and the economic record around Australia. Let us look past the schoolboy rhetoric, the debating skills, the bluster and the denigration and all the business that goes with this so-called refutation of the facts. The Premier does not have a feather to fly with when it comes to comparing the standard of living of the average South Australian with that of the average citizen in other States and overseas. Such a comparison indicates that his record is appalling.

No wonder the Premier looked a bit green around the gills last evening when he got up to reply in this debate. Indeed, I felt sorry for him. However, when he got going he let us have half-baked, half-truth rhetoric. I am not allowed to say that he was telling lies, because that would be against Standing Orders, but he was a long way down the track and I do not think that some of his statements were even half-truths. His line last evening has been continued today and has indicated clearly that the Government has no answer to the fact that the public out there know when they are better off or worse off and how far the packet goes. The day of reckoning is coming.

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright):** In rising to contribute to this debate I will pick up a few of the highlights in Government spending in the south-western suburbs during the past year and point to what I regard as some of the Government's

major successes in this area. The past two years have seen the opening of the Hallett Cove (R to 10) school at Hallett Cove, which is the second school in the district. That has taken an enormous amount of pressure off the Hallett Cove South Primary School. This is the first year that the school has had a secondary component. Notwithstanding the fact that only stage 1 has been completed, the school will serve a very valuable purpose in the community, and it is certainly running extremely smoothly.

On the subject of schools, the south-western suburbs has had more than its share of disasters this year. In fact, Seacombe High School was set alight some 48 hours ago, and last night possibly the same people struck at Mawson High School. On both occasions considerable damage was caused. It is a great credit to the Education Department that it has moved so quickly to redress some of the shortages in relation to facilities and space that have occurred at both schools. I understand from speaking to the principal of Mawson High School this morning that already moves are being made to provide temporary accommodation and to replace typewriters, computers and the like so that the courses offered by the school can continue.

Early this year someone torched the Brighton Primary School. It is of much regret that very few people are apprehended for these crimes. I wish to place on record a letter that I received today from the Chairperson of the Brighton Primary School council, Robert Graham, in which he points to the speed and efficacy of the department in addressing the problems faced by Brighton Primary School in the aftermath of that fire. In part, the letter states:

Thank you for your prompt offer to help following our fire in January. As it happened, we did not need to come to you since we had such a prompt and efficient response from both the Education Department and the Department of Housing and Construction. In particular, we are grateful for the capable, dedicated and effective action taken by Mr Bronte Treloar of the Southern Regional Office of the Education Department.

The letter goes on to say that the restoration process is proceeding extremely efficiently and to the satisfaction of teachers, staff and parents of Brighton Primary School. That little episode highlights the way in which the Education Department, despite massive resource problems in some areas, has been able to move resources to areas where they are most needed and most appreciated.

It is also a fact that in our area of the city there have been falling enrolments, and schools have participated in shared campus arrangements: Mawson High School shares some facilities with Brighton High School, and Seacombe High School participates in a dual campus arrangement with Dover High School. Given that the arrangements are in the early stages, they appear to be working extremely well. I think it does credit to the staff, administration, parents and students of both sets of schools that they have been able to make the arrangement work as well as they have. However, that has not been aided one jot by the fires that have occurred in the past 48 hours.

I also point to the acceptance and gratitude of the Hallett Cove community for the Hallett Cove Child Care Centre which has been constructed over the past couple of years. It is now working extremely efficiently in that it caters to the child-care needs of that community, and it appears to do it very well. Similarly, the kindergartens in the southern suburbs—again, despite falling enrolments—are working extremely well. Student numbers in many of the kindergartens are holding up, but in some cases the kindergartens are having to cope with fewer resources because there are fewer children. In any event, they run well and to the satisfaction of the community. The overwhelming impression that I receive from the committees of all kindergartens is that they

feel that they have been treated fairly by the Government and that they are aware of the problems associated with providing resources for kindergartens which have a diminishing population base. However, they point to the fact that the Children's Services Office has done a marvellous job in providing facilities for them and in servicing their needs.

On the subject of transport, which is another matter very dear to my heart, over the past year the Government has taken considerable steps towards making the transport arrangements on Lonsdale Road and the Brighton Road system flow more effectively. In the past month or thereabouts the Minister made a public commitment that a pedestrian crossing would be erected at the corner of Adams Road and Lonsdale Highway to enable members of the Hallett Cove community who attend the St Martin de Porres School at Sheidow Park to make their way in safety across Lonsdale Highway, which of course is a busy road carrying about 45 000 cars a day. The road has a speed limit of 100 km/h, and it is necessary to erect a pedestrian crossing there so that children can cross the road in safety. That will also have the ancillary benefit of allowing children from the Sheidow Park community to cross Lonsdale Highway to attend the Hallett Cove (R to 10) school which, as I mentioned earlier, is now taking secondary enrolments.

It has been a matter of some disappointment to me that I and others have not been able to persuade community groups and local councils to purchase a community bus to service these schools. However, in the event, I think the best possible solution was produced by the Minister, and I look forward to the erection of the pedestrian crossing so that children can cross the road in some degree of safety. Similarly, the need felt by the aged community of Seacliff Park and South Brighton to have a pedestrian crossing on the increasingly busy Seacombe Road has been met. They have received a guarantee that 'aged persons' signs will be erected in Seacliff Park to enable people to cross the road to visit the shopping centre. Again, that work is scheduled for the coming months or thereabouts, and it will be welcomed by the people of those two suburbs.

The increasing traffic density on Brighton Road has been met through the extension of the system of traffic islands on that road. While this proposal has met with objections from individuals who are disadvantaged by an extension of the system of islands, certainly the community as a whole has accepted the need to extend and, indeed, widen the system of traffic islands and make them reasonable refuges for people crossing the road. It is my perception that when the program is finished it will be well accepted by the community because people realise that, to have a degree of safety for pedestrians and a degree of freedom of movement of traffic, the islands are necessary.

In the context of traffic movement I pay credit to the Brighton council on the production of the second version of its traffic survey. As I understand it, the council is about to move into the area of protecting some residents from excessive traffic flow on sub-arterial roads. Indeed, it will open up other roads in such a way that the traffic can flow more freely. I commend the Brighton council on this initiative which I believe has been long overdue. I think the council has finally got it right to the extent that, again, most residents accept the need for those controls and in some cases restrictions on traffic movement.

The other aspect of the transport debate in Brighton relates to the third arterial road. Again, in the past 12 months the Minister has announced that the third arterial road will proceed at a certain date in the future. To that end the Highways Department has been buying properties in the Darlington area. While the saga has been around for the



better part of 20 years, it is my perception that the majority of people in the community accept the need for the road and accept the fact that some resumption of property is necessary. In fact, most people, when they wish to move, appear to be willing to sell their homes to the Highways Department. So, what could have been a quite messy operation appears to be proceeding very smoothly. Finally, I place on record my pleasure at the fact that we now have five 3 000 class locomotives operating from time to time on the Noarlunga line.

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

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** As a matter of practice, in an order to remain abreast of rural activities in South Australia and beyond, from time to time for many years I have traversed the agricultural, pastoral and outback regions. On Monday morning this week I went to the pastoral region of northern South Australia and the general Alice Springs area and did not return to Adelaide until after this debate commenced yesterday. Indeed, I did not come into the Chamber until after dinner last evening, when most of the second reading debate had concluded, but I have noted from the record and from discussions with my colleagues that the debate on this Supply Bill concentrated on the state of the economy and on the management of that economy or, more particularly, the Government's mismanagement of that economy.

In this supplementary debate, known as the 10 minute grievance debate prior to going into the Committee stage of the Bill, I intend, first, to acknowledge the land resource in the State as the true foundation of our economy and, secondly, to refer to the management of that land especially identifying the controls applicable to our rural land development, its management and the economic effects of recently adopted controls in particular. In relation to the former, since this State was settled there has been a significant part of it occupied by the private sector while remaining the property of the Crown.

That land has been referred to as the Crown lands of the State. The Crown Lands Act has provided the rules and conditions under which that land has been occupied, indeed, citing in the Act from time to time as amended of the method of management of those Crown lands. As far as freehold lands are concerned, other than in recent times, the management and control of those lands have been left to the discretion of the occupiers at large and, generally speaking, we owe them credit for their management over the generations.

Members will recall that under the Planning Act 1982, Part VII provided for land management, that is, as it applied to the environmental and related management factors, but it did not deal specifically with the vegetation clearance control that we currently have around us. Under that Planning Act 1982 there were regulations that provided for a form of vegetation retention and control of clearance where it was applicable. More latterly, on 7 November 1985, regulations under the new Native Vegetation Management Act 1985 were introduced and at the same time regulations under the previous Planning Act 1982 were repealed.

The situation has arisen where we have had a couple of years of practice under the new canopy of controls. In some cases it is fair to say that, given these new rules, the officers and the applicants and others involved in land clearance projects have prevented what might otherwise have been undesirable practices of development. However, generally speaking I am in a position to say that the whole exercise of vegetation clearance control has become a bit of a farce.

In fact, it is no longer working as was intended at the time that the Native Vegetation Management Act was introduced, nor as it was intended when the regulations under that Act came into force.

There is not a great deal of country left in the wetter regions of South Australia that is available for further development but, of the land available for further development, I believe it is appropriate to retain so much native vegetation as to preserve a remnant of the various flora and accordingly fauna species and bird as well as in the form of animal items, birds etc., but to prevent genuine primary producers and those interested in responsibly developing the land from proceeding with their programs, as has been the case in so many instances in the past few years is a retrograde step that must reflect on the viability of those producers and ultimately the economy of our State.

In common with a number of members on this side I have experienced the sort of petty behaviour that is being applied to this subject by officers of the Vegetation Clearance Unit in particular when they have been challenged on their decisions. I believe that the lack of understanding of the real subject is an embarrassment to us all. It has certainly become an economic jolt to those who are reliant on developing the land in order to make a living. There is no time in this debate to go into specific detail. Given today's opportunity, I wish to draw the Government's attention to one important anomaly that has arisen. Where applications are lodged by the owner of land or an agent acting on behalf of the owner and are rejected by the Vegetation Clearance Unit, there is a record within the Department of Environment and Planning of that action.

However, under the Act that I have cited there is no requirement, nor is there a requirement under the Real Property Act or the Land and Business Agents Act, to place on a register or on the title of land the particular encumbrances that have occurred. Therefore, the incoming purchaser of the land is not made aware, nor is that purchaser required to be made aware, of the refusal to develop the land or the portion of the land that is potentially to be his.

In these cases, of course, the intending purchaser should observe the *caveat emptor* factor, but hidden in the transaction and with no obligation on the agency whatsoever, the buyers can in sheer ignorance buy a pig in the bag. This has occurred in instances that have been drawn to my attention, and I hope that the rumoured amendments to the regulations under the Native Vegetation Management Act shortly to come into this Parliament will incorporate sufficient address to that subject to overcome this anomaly that I raise. I believe that just as unpaid rates, easements or other access or lack of access facts applicable to a title are required to be registered, so too should an official refusal to clear native vegetation and therefore positively drawn to the attention of the potential buyer be publicly recorded.

I recognise that there is a register of details in those instances where a heritage agreement has been entered into involving the Minister of Environment and Planning and a landowner, but where that heritage agreement has not been sought or sewn up, the other refusal of land clearance is an unknown factor to a potential buyer and one about which I believe buyers should fairly be warned.

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** In the few minutes available I will speak about the funding of public housing—a subject I mentioned in this House in 1981 when I was a brash young member. In that year an article appeared in the *National Times* about banks holding a lot of money in low interest accounts. I suggested that that money could be

used for funding housing, and that the person who put it into the fund could have the money returned with interest but not be charged tax. I remember that there was quite a reaction to this. The member for Hanson said it was illegal and that it could not be done. Since then an article in the *News* of 1 September 1987 stated that New South Wales was looking at such a project to build up to 2 000 homes and units following a State Government decision to raise millions of dollars selling 'granny bonds', and I think that I used that term in 1981.

The *National Times* of 20-26 September 1981 contained the front page of the article entitled 'The great granny grab' which appeared in the *National Times* of 19-25 September. Money held by banks in interest free and low interest bearing accounts, I understand, amounts to a great deal—something like \$6 billion. In December 1987 an article appeared in the *Australian Society* entitled 'Housing: what happened to the great Australian Dream?' Subtitled 'Dealing with the rental crisis', it details a joint venture by the New South Wales Rental Bond Board and the Department of Housing that is aimed at substantially increasing the supply of private rental housing for people on low to middle incomes. The idea was to raise something like \$50 million from the community. The article states:

Funds for the trust are to be raised through the issue of bonds which are unique among property trusts in providing tax free income as well as tax free capital gains.

This is what I was talking about in 1981. The researchers in the Parliamentary Library could not obtain information about this as they are overworked—and I will elaborate on that on another occasion. Obviously a project is under way in another State to raise money to fund public housing. To add to this situation the South Australian Housing Trust report of January 1988 entitled 'Housing for the community' in its introduction states:

There seems little doubt that over the next few years the need for more affordable secure rental housing will increase; the need for a range of current housing support programs will increase; and publicly provided funds for all forms of community housing programs will diminish. The State Government and the Housing Trust must formulate policies and programs which achieve the best achievable outcomes in a situation of a growing gap between needs and resources.

This document investigates different ways of funding public housing. I read it quickly and as yet have not analysed it. However, there seems to be a problem in public housing funding.

**Mr Rann:** What are the views of the candidates in Port Adelaide?

**Mr PETERSON:** That is an interesting interjection. I will digress for a moment if I may. I cannot understand why any Party would select a candidate who does not live in the Port Adelaide area. It is also amazing how the rumours start.

**An honourable member:** Where do you live?

**Mr PETERSON:** I live in my electorate of Semaphore and right in the heart of Port Adelaide. I cannot understand how any Party would have the effrontery to select a candidate from Brighton for the seat of Port Adelaide.

**Mr Olsen:** All the more reason for you to run for the seat.

**Mr PETERSON:** And give it an awful nudge, let me tell you. We will see what happens when nominations close tomorrow. Fancy putting up a candidate from Brighton! I saw the Liberal Party list of candidates in the paper the other day. I recognised that a couple of the names came from Port Adelaide.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** Poor old Bob. He tried. He did a good job while he was here but he is not here any more. What

about the office on the corner of Tapleys Hill and Old Port Roads? You have wasted your money.

**Mr Olsen:** Is that why the Labor Party tried to get the—

**Mr PETERSON:** It's office is in the wrong place, too. I have driven passed it a couple of times.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Robertson):** Order! It might help the tenor of debate if the honourable member came back to the subject at hand.

**Mr PETERSON:** This is a grievance debate and I thought I could speak on whatever I chose.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! It is my understanding that the House is participating but only one member is on his feet. Providing he remains within Standing Orders that will continue.

**Mr PETERSON:** I am the only one who is speaking. As long as I do not contravene any laws of propriety in the House I understand that I can cover any subject I like in this grievance debate. I understand that is right but stand to be corrected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The point I am trying to make is that provided the remarks are addressed through the Acting Speaker it is quite acceptable.

**Mr PETERSON:** I stand corrected and you are right. I accept your judgment on this. I return to what I was talking about. There is an undercurrent of feeling in Port Adelaide and I thought that the Opposition, both State and Federal, would have grasped that and made a worthwhile effort. The people of Port Adelaide deserve to be given a worthwhile choice. I think that the Opposition in this case has not given the people of Port Adelaide the respect they deserve. The Democrats have done the same—they have picked a candidate who does not live in the area, and that is not right for an area like Port Adelaide. I have lived in the area all my life and know some of the names of Liberal Party candidates.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** I am talking about the Opposition. Some are well known people, but they were not selected. I now return to the housing situation. In 1981 I suggested an interest bearing fund, tax free, for housing loans. Something like \$6 billion in savings banks around this country could be put into that sort of fund. New South Wales has done it.

*The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** Barry has gone. He tried, but he has gone. The article in the *Australian Society* of December 1986 details how to raise the money.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** I will respond to the Premier's remarks on the Supply debate. Clearly, you cannot defend the indefensible. The Premier was seeking to defend the economy of South Australia, but what he had to do, other than resorting to insult and half-truths during his contribution, was in fact to make an admission. It is the first time the Premier has made an admission that the economy of South Australia is in dire straits. The economy is faltering, and faltering badly. We saw a lot of grandstanding today by the Premier. There was no effective rebuttal whatsoever of the document released yesterday—none at all. We did not see that document dissected by the Premier. After having Treasury up all night and all this morning working overtime, I have no doubt, to find out all the reasons why the document was wrong, he could not.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** Exactly. All he had as a defence was to admit that things are bad; they are faltering—we do acknowledge that. That is the first time that the Premier has acknowledged or admitted that the economy in this State is faltering. The signs have been there for a couple of

years, clearly there, and we are seeing the real impact now reach out into the community and affect individuals. The Adelaide by-election had the result it did because people out there are hurting, and they are hurting because of the high level of taxes and charges that have been applied to them right across the board by Labor policies, both at Federal and State levels.

As predicted, the Premier got on to the submarines and the Grand Prix. When you have nothing else to talk about, when you cannot defend the economic position of the State, you resort to the subs and the Grand Prix. I just remind him, as it relates to the subs—and he has a very convenient memory—that we backed the Labor Party and every initiative that was taken by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in relation to that project. We supported the application on the submarine project every inch of the way. Even the member for Briggs has to acknowledge that. He cannot deny that. It was pretty desperate stuff by the Premier today, I might add, in selectively taking out one month's figures and saying, 'This month was all right,' but saying, 'You have only picked the down side. What about the October inflation figures?' He did not take the whole year figures; he took one month's figures.

The Premier talked about retail sales, but he forgot to acknowledge that the ABS—an independent Commonwealth Government body—released just yesterday some statistics on retail sales. But the Premier ignored that fact as he ignored many other facts today. Quoting from page 2, that bulletin states:

The trend growth (in retail sales) in South Australia has progressively declined from 1 per cent in June 1987 to minus 0.1 per cent in December 1987.

Indeed, it went further. Not only did our trend in retail sales go negative in December, but South Australia had the smallest increase in growth of sales in December 1987 compared to December 1986 of any State or Territory in Australia. The Premier, with his half-truths—to which we are becoming accustomed in this House—said there was a bit of light at the end of the tunnel concerning retail sales. The ABS figures of yesterday clearly put that into proper perspective. It is not the truth. Once again, that was misleading the House on the state of the economy and key economic indicators in South Australia.

*The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** He did not demonstrate during the course of his speech any rebuttal of the statistics that were included in the economic report released yesterday by the Opposition.

**Mr Lewis:** Why not?

**Mr OLSEN:** You cannot defend the indefensible. It is simply impossible to refute.

**Mr D.S. Baker:** What did he say about land tax?

**Mr OLSEN:** The Premier's response was deafening in its silence on land tax. He did not refer to land tax at all, as with a number of other statistics. The Premier says that the Opposition is putting up a bleak picture for the State's economy and for our future. Well, it damn well is bleak out there at the moment. The Government and the Premier are not prepared to acknowledge the state of the South Australian economy. The Premier and the Government will continue to sweep under the carpet the conditions prevailing in our economy because it suits them, and blame the circumstances on everybody and anyone else—shift it interstate or ship it offshore, as long as the responsibility and the blame do not come back squarely where they belong, on the Government whose policies for five years have brought about this massive decline in the economy of South Australia.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Led by the same person over that time.

**Mr OLSEN:** Led by the same person over that period of time. There has been consistent decline in the economy of South Australia, to the point that it is really starting to bite and hurt people in the community. It is about time we faced up to reality and the facts of the economy. If we could only face up to the facts and reality of the economy, identify that there is a problem, we might then start addressing what the solutions might be to the economic malaise of South Australia. But whilst we keep putting it under the carpet and ignoring it, we will not face the facts, and this Government will not face the reality that it has to change step, it has to change direction and implement different policies to give the economy a fair go.

The Premier referred to my use of figures in that economic report. He said it was selective. The ABS statistics—are they selective in quoting the state of the economy in South Australia *vis-a-vis* other States? I think not. Of course not! It is a Commonwealth Government authority, and I might add that the only other source for the figures contained in my statement was the budget papers of the Premier himself. So, the two sources for the statistics contained in my economic report were the Commonwealth Government ABS service and the budget papers tabled in this Parliament by the Premier.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** The ABS figures are good enough for the State Bank reports.

**Mr OLSEN:** Just on the State Bank report—that is interesting. The State Bank issues a quarterly report which has been noted for trying to engender some optimism. It is fair to say that it looks on the brighter side rather than the darker side, but the last quarterly summary of the State Bank was released but a few days ago. Let us look at what that had to say about the economy in South Australia. Let us see how that stacked up, backed up and supported the economic report released yesterday by the Liberal Party, clearly indicating it is a factual report about the economy in South Australia.

The bank's review of key indicators entitled 'State comparisons of economic activity' is found on page 37 of the report. It shows 13 historical trends over the last year in what the bank obviously believes to be key economic indicators. It shows that in South Australia we are last in labour force growth; last in retail sales growth; last in dwelling approvals; and last in female average weekly earnings growth; second last in employment growth; second last in new motor vehicle registrations; second last in full-time weekly earnings growth for males; second last in full-time weekly earnings growth for persons; second last in private new expenditure on plant and machinery growth; and second last in total new capital expenditure—that is, last or second last in 10 out of the 13 key historical economic indicators of the State Bank.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** The Premier says that we used figures with licence, that they did not stack up, and we had a lot of verbiage but no critical analysis of the figures contained in my economic report yesterday, and no detailed rebuttal. Here we have the State Bank no less, backing up what we said yesterday was the state of the South Australian economy. It is about time the reality of the state of the South Australian economy was acknowledged by this Government so that we can start planning more effectively for the future.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** I can understand why the member for Adelaide is a little testy. He has 12 months to go at a minimum and 18 months to two years at a maximum, so he should enjoy it while he can.

*Mr Rann interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** The silent member for Briggs comes in. The member for Briggs likes to make good of his interjections to this House to demonstrate his great capacity. He has been silent up to now. He has not had anything to interject on the rebuttal of the economic figures.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** Are we talking about the opinion poll drummed up by the Labor Party and selectively leaked to the *News*?

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OLSEN:** I would now like to return to a response to the Premier's speech earlier today. He conveniently ignored two pages of examples of the waste and inefficiencies of this Government running into tens of millions of dollars. When he says, 'Don't you want more nurses? Don't you want better law and order services?', yes, we have argued for that and will continue to argue for those services. They are essential services to be provided by Government. It is a responsibility of Government, and how do we pay for those services? I would suggest that one way we could start paying for those services is to cut out the waste and inefficiency in a series of projects that we have identified in the economic report.

Tens of millions of dollars have been frittered away. That money could help in providing the essential services in education, health, welfare and law and order. Certainly, we will continue to ask for those areas, because they are important and they are the Government's responsibility. Certainly, we will continue to highlight the inefficiencies and wastage of taxpayers' money under this Government. The bankruptcy figures have gone from some 710 four years ago to 1 444. The Premier says, 'Well, statistically it is still in the ball park.' It has gone from 710 to 1 444, and he is just saying that it is marginally better than it was four years ago. Who is he kidding? He really is out of touch with the electorate and what is happening in the community if that is the full extent of his response.

Yesterday and last week we had the Government saying that electricity tariffs have been reduced by this 16 per cent. At least the Premier admitted today that our plus 55 per cent is an accurate figure. He admitted in the House today that what we have been saying now for weeks is in fact right. On the subject of taxes and charges, it is clear that he avoided talking about public transport fares. He talked about the E&WS Department. There was no defence of the charges that have increased there. Let me just remind the House of the statistics we included yesterday. Since the election of this Government charges have risen at a much faster rate in Adelaide than has the average for the eight capital cities. They have gone up 50.6 per cent in Adelaide compared with 35 per cent in all the capitals. We have no defence, no rebuttal, no argument about that statistic, because it is irrefutable and the Premier and Government know it.

He has at least acknowledged today that electricity tariffs have increased by 55 per cent. The cost of public transport has increased by 70.4 per cent in Adelaide compared with 54.8 per cent of all State capitals—bigger increases than all the other State capitals on average. Is there any rebuttal of that figure today? No, it is ignored, once again. Let us move to the debt. I note that the Premier was deafening in his silence on the fact that \$341 million was borrowed this year to inject into the budget for expenditure purposes. That was ignored. He did not attempt to defend or rebut the fact that the true deficit this year, on his figures brought down in the budget papers, will be not \$14 million—which we now know is going to blow out—but the true deficit is \$355 million, and that is the same accounting base as is used by

the Commonwealth Government. That is a statement of fact. That is why the Premier has not sought today to challenge that figure for this year. He cannot challenge it, because it is fact.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Going into debt at \$1 million a day.

**Mr OLSEN:** Going into debt a million dollars a day. That million dollars a day, \$341 million a year, plus the \$14 million deficit, is just going to the recurrent side of the budget which means that the loan of \$341 million has to be paid off by someone at some time in the future. Is it any wonder that our interest bill has now gone up to \$575 million? I remind the Premier that it is becoming more expensive to service our loan. There was no comment on the fact that the interest bill is going up, that the debt servicing cost is going up to 16 per cent from 12 per cent five years ago as a recurrent spending outlay.

There has been a massive increase in the interest bill? No wonder we cannot provide the essential services that people are crying out for in the community, because of the massive interest bill we have to meet annually. Over the past year or two we have become accustomed to the misleading statements and the half truths of this Premier. Today we have had a barrage of grandstanding and verbiage that goes not to the substance of the problem; he does not attempt to defend his Government's position or the budget strategy that it has put in place. He totally ignored the land tax impact on small business. There has been a large growth in land tax, a 30 per cent increase in South Australia—146 per cent over the past five years compared with 10 per cent and nil growth in Victoria and New South Wales respectively.

Is it any wonder that small business is starting to become a cohesive force, starting to stand up and argue with this Government? When your back is to the wall you have no alternative but to speak up, and the back of small businesses is squarely to the wall at the moment. When the Premier says that the Labor Party needs to get back in touch with reality and with the issues in the community, I invite members opposite to visit small businesses in their electorates and ask how they are getting on, how their profits are getting on, how they are making ends meet to pay the wages of their staff, bearing in mind that small business is the largest employer in South Australia and in this country, and has the capacity to reduce the unemployment queues more than any other sector of industry. But is it getting a fair go? Of course it is not! Land tax rip-offs under this administration are a wealth tax in the guise of land tax. That is what it is: it is a wealth tax.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Ask what is preventing them putting on more employees.

**Mr OLSEN:** Small business? Small business cannot employ more people because it is simply struggling to keep up with the current wage bill. My office has been inundated, and I am sure other members' offices have been inundated, with people who have had to persevere with the extended trading hours on Saturday afternoon, the impost that is applying to some of the super-delis around the place, and the impact—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** It is extended trading hours, but not at any price. Let us get that into perspective. It is not at any price. It is interesting to hear the member for Albert Park. The honourable member stands up so little in this place that I had actually forgotten the name of his electorate. It is interesting that the Government and its backbench obviously have got into the ear of the Minister of Labour, because he is in full scale retreat. What other reason would there be for the Government to go before the Industrial Commis-

sion, with the unions saying, 'Let's withdraw this application for an increase so it can't be determined before Parliament considers the legislation again. Then we'll blame the Liberals when in fact we have withdrawn the conditions under which they could pass the legislation.'

The truth is that members opposite do not want the legislation passed. That is the truth of the matter, and well might members opposite laugh, because they know it is true: they do not want the extended trading legislation passed, so to make sure that it did not pass the Minister, with the unions, said, 'We'll withdraw the application so this matter can't be sorted out. If it can't be sorted out, then we know the Liberals can't vote for it, because they are in a very appropriate and diligent manner saying "Extended trading, yes, but not at any price". We are not going to inflict on the consumers of South Australia increases in their weekly grocery bill and the like. They are at the end of their tether out there now and cannot afford any further impost or increases'.

The economic report that I released yesterday clearly indicates that we have been prepared to be judicious in our use of figures in that we have compared annual figures, not selecting one month which is a good month and leaving out the other 11 months; not selective use of figures, but comparing on a year-on-year basis. As I pointed out earlier, the Premier's selective use of retail figures a little earlier in his speech ignored the figures that came out yesterday. Either his staff had not briefed him or, if they had, he chose to ignore those figures in his reply.

The economic statement released by the Liberal Party yesterday is a true and accurate reflection of the South Australian economy. It places into proper perspective the condition of our economy *vis-a-vis* that of other States in Australia. Only one final conclusion can be drawn from that analysis: South Australia is falling behind. This State needs turning around. The signs that have been there for two years are now becoming a reality. The bankruptcy figures, retail sales, employment figures, building approvals, population trends, motor vehicle registrations, new private capital expenditure: all these indicate that we are failing South Australians.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** We have been prepared to face the facts.

**Mr OLSEN:** We are putting those facts forward publicly in order to bring pressure on the Government to face the reality that it is going in the wrong direction and has been doing so for some years. The Government must stop, do a U-turn, rethink its policies, and go in a different direction. It must show real leadership for a change so that over the next 12 months we do not experience another increase in the level of bankruptcies, in the number of unemployed young people in the community, and in the unemployment queues. We must not experience a further decrease in building applications and in overtime worked.

One in four families is now classified as poor, and it is an indictment of this Government that we have placed so many families in that category. Is it any wonder that the community has reacted so negatively, so savagely and so concisely against the Labor Party through the ballot box? The Labor Party will, to its peril, ignore the warning signs and continue to sweep under the carpet the true condition of the South Australian economy. It is only by facing reality that we will get the solutions and the change of direction to give the economy of South Australia the boost that it needs.

South Australia is too good a State to be wasted on policies and economic directions such as these. It will take us too long to pull back from the hole into which this

Government is placing us. That is why we need to reappraise our position quickly and accurately and to bring home to this Government the reality of the position. The Opposition will not resile from its right, indeed its responsibility, to highlight the failings of this Government continually and consistently and to prod and push it into reality so that it will face the circumstances confronting South Australia. Only in that way can we build a better State for South Australians and that, after all, is the final and only objective of the Liberal Party.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I welcome the opportunity of speaking while the Leader of the Opposition is here today. Yesterday, I listened intently to his opening remarks and, if ever a person was caught out, it was the Leader. His lack of knowledge of industrial matters and of what takes place in the Industrial Commission showed up abysmally yesterday. In relation to the second tier increase of 4 per cent that has been applied for by the unions, the Leader said that the Government had caved in to the unions' request but that it had discriminated against certain groups including teachers. He went on to say that one should visit the Industrial Commission to see some of the agreements that had been registered officially, but he could not name even one organisation, and I am talking about the Leader and not about Little Boy Blue who runs behind calling to his boss. After all, the Leader is supposed to know what is happening in the community, yet he does not have a clue, nor has the member for Mitcham, on industrial matters.

The Leader's ignorance in this regard is abysmal. I must give credit where it is due and say that, when Dean Brown was in this House, at least he knew what was going on. He had some idea of how the trade union movement operated and how the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission and the State Industrial Commission worked. However, these fools opposite have little or no idea of what takes place in the Industrial Commission. If there were grounds for such a claim, why do not those unions lodge a claim with the commission and have it settled there? Members opposite do not want to address that question because they know that what we on this side say is true. For many years I have listened to figures concerning bankruptcies in this State and I share the concern of those people who go bankrupt because I have had a number of people in my electorate office over the years who have been concerned in this way.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** I wish that fool would shut up. I have referred some people to the Small Business Corporation for help and they have come back, set up in business, and operated successfully. Over the years when speaking to managers, especially at West Lakes Mall (and anyone knowing my electorate would know only too well of my activities among the 400 small business people in the district and the fact that I serve them damned well), I have been told that many people tell the management there that they want to set up in business. However, when asked what sort of business they have in mind, they admit that they do not know: they merely want to set up a business in the shopping centre. So these people are referred to the Small Business Corporation for advice.

Is it any wonder that some of those people who go into business have no idea what small business is all about? I refer to a statement made on the *Four Corners* television program in December 1986. Most members opposite would know about John Sprouster (General Manager of Nashua). He is probably one of the best business people in Australia and is behind a group known as 'Australia for Quality', the aim of which is to catapult Australia into the twentieth century. On that television program, he said:

Eighty-five per cent of all the problems in business can be directed to the senior management. As a matter of fact, when I speak to management groups I often say to the most senior man in the room, 'Eighty-five per cent of all the problems of your business are really sitting in this room with you.'

In reply to a question as to what was the biggest problem in Australian management today, Mr Sprouster said:

A lack of understanding of what really is required to achieve quality, productivity and competitiveness.

I would like to deal with this matter at greater length, but I wish to refer to a couple of matters concerning my electorate. Over the years, I have noticed within my electorate the need for traffic control measures and I believe that I have applied myself diligently and successfully to this issue since becoming a member in 1979. I notice the member for Bragg nodding his head in acknowledgment of that statement. I have received many allegations concerning heavy vehicles speeding down Tapleys Hill Road, on which over the years a number of deaths and injuries have occurred.

In fact, during the Christmas period 12 months ago a mate of mine, a fine gentleman, was knocked over outside the Hendon Hotel and he almost lost his life. I will not canvass the rights or wrongs of that accident, but it demonstrated a need in that area and, indeed, in the next couple of months a median strip will be installed on Tapleys Hill Road and a pedestrian crossing erected in front of the Acacia Court Nursing Home. I thank the Minister of Transport for making that possible, and I thank the Woodville Council for its cooperation.

Recently a business woman told me that while she was driving along Tapleys Hill Road a large semi-trailer towing an empty fuel tank tailgated her car at a speed of about 80 or 90 km/h. She was too scared to slow down for fear that the truck would smash into the rear of her vehicle. I know this woman quite well, and I believe she is a good, honest person who would not tell untruths.

I have noticed that many radar traps are used along this section of the road, and I believe that the large number of people caught speeding along Tapleys Hill Road over the years should have taught all motorists a lesson. In fact, perhaps signs should be erected at both ends of Tapleys Hill Road—for both north and south bound traffic—warning motorists about the number of drivers who have been caught speeding along this section of the road. I mention this because in Western Australia on the Mounts Bay Road around the Narrows Bridge a large sign has been erected showing how many motorists, as a percentage, have been caught speeding in that area during the previous week. I believe that an initiative such as that could remind motorists driving along Tapleys Hill Road that they could well be caught if they speed along this very busy stretch of road.

I ask the Minister to consider introducing this type of initiative on a trial basis. No-one likes to be caught speeding, including me. I have been caught a couple of times and have paid the penalty without complaint, although I have been embarrassed. I hope that the Minister will consider erecting this type of sign at both ends of Tapleys Hill Road, perhaps on a trial basis, for the stretch of Tapleys Hill Road from Trimmer Parade to, say, Old Port Road. I would be interested to see how motorists react to signs which show the number of motorists caught speeding along that road during the previous week. Perhaps we could include not only the percentage of motorists caught but also the number caught. I would welcome this type of initiative because road safety is important, and I believe that all members of the House would share that view. If this type of initiative were successful, I cannot see why it could not be expanded and used in other parts of South Australia.

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

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** Recently the member for Newland said that a preliminary plan of the proposed upgrading of Upper Sturt Road was being displayed at the Belair Recreation Park, and that statement was the subject of a motion I moved in this House. The House voted on that motion, but I will not reflect on that vote. I moved that the Minister should resign because he had told an untruth and had misled the House. Subsequently, the Minister of Transport made a statement which, in my view, was also misleading. I confirm that I have never asked that the Upper Sturt Road plan be held up until the legislation was changed. At one stage I used the word 'proclamation' in a speech in this House, but I should have said 'regulation'.

I am still quite happy if the proposed change to the Belair Recreation Park boundary is submitted to Parliament so that both Houses have an opportunity to decide whether they disagree or agree with the changes. However, I am not quite as happy with the proposal to change the Act. That has now gone through and the Act has been changed, although I do not believe that it has been gazetted. However, I believe that that is the way the Government intends to do it, as was mentioned by the Minister.

The member for Newland said that I knew that a plan was being displayed at the National Parks and Wildlife Office in the Belair Recreation Park. That is also an untruth because I did not know about it. I telephoned the Mitcham council, understanding that it had some role to play in this matter because the plan was on display at the park. I thought that it may have been on display at the council chambers and at the Blackwood Library, which is managed under the jurisdiction of the Mitcham council. However, I was told that the plan was not available at either of those venues. I then checked with the Highways Department and was told that the plan would not be available until the end of this month or into next month. However, the member for Newland, in the first instance when she spoke, gave a clear indication that the plan was available to be viewed at the Belair Recreation Park office. Subsequently, she asked that I apologise. She said that she had checked and had found that the plan was on display, that it was eight feet long and that the Minister had invited the Hills Roads Committee to view it. The member for Newland made that statement on 18 February following Question Time, which concludes at 3.15 p.m.

I then checked to see whether the plan was available. The mongrel part of this whole exercise—and I say that with every intent because this is quite scurrilous—is that the plan is not available for viewing by me or other members of the public. The letter from the Minister for Environment and Planning to the Hills Roads Committee, of which I am a member, is dated 15 February, which is the Monday before Thursday 18 February. The Secretary of the Hills Roads Committee did not receive the letter until the afternoon of 18 February when she returned home. So she received the letter after the member for Newland had made her statement. I first raised this matter and asked for details on 8 December 1987, and at no time since then has the plan been available for viewing, yet the member for Newland said in her statement that the Hills Roads Committee had been invited to view the plan. The letter did say that the plan may be viewed. I went to the park before I knew about that because I could not get the Secretary on the telephone.

I went to the park on 19 February and walked into the office because I thought the plan would be on display for

people to look at. However, the confounded thing was not there, so I asked where it was. I was told that it was in the park officers' meeting room. I walked into that room with another person and saw the plan (it appeared to be bigger than eight feet, but that is a minor point). When I then asked this person whether the public were permitted to enter the room we were in, he said, 'No, I've only been authorised to show it to staff.'

I said that I would not look at the plan in detail because it would be inappropriate and I did not want to put him in a difficult situation. I then walked out without looking at the plan in detail because it is quite large. I then asked the officer whether he was authorised to allow members of the Hills Roads Committee to view the plan, and he said, 'No, I don't have that authority.' I asked that question because I am a member of that committee. In fact, I set up the Hills Roads Committee, which has a councillor as its Chairman, and the Secretary is a lady who does great work for the community.

I thought I could look at it as a member of the Hills Roads Committee. Even then on the Friday neither the department nor the Minister had advised that I or any other member of the committee could look at it. Of course, the secretary may take the letter along now and ask to look at it or give it to other members of the committee to do so. The point I make is this: it is a scurrilous mongrel thing to try to get a Minister off the hook by misleading Parliament by bringing in other misleading information into the House because the intent of the member for Newland was to convince everyone, including the news media, that that plan was available at the Belair Recreation Park for the public to look at. That was a gross untruth.

It is still not available for the public to look at, and the report has not been made available either, yet this place is used for that purpose. In all sincerity, I thought that the member for Newland was saying something factual by indicating clearly that it was available to the public. When we look at the words we see it was very clever, because it was not available. It was very clear: she was saying that it was in the park offices opposite for display, but not to the public, but that was the intention to get over to everyone else. When I found that I was perhaps proven wrong, I immediately stood up in this place without hesitation and apologised to the honourable member.

How can one respect anyone who operates like that? It is the minders who are protecting this socialist Government from every misdemeanour it carries out regardless of the truth, honesty or integrity of Parliament or the Public Service. I hope that the more genuine members of the ALP understand the sort of respect that we should have for each other in this place regardless of our political philosophy, so that we can at least trust one another to be given a clear indication of what the trust is and not a pack of untruths to protect a colleague. That gets nowhere. The whole place could become a sham.

I want to pick up two other areas briefly. One is that we have a provision in this State that people cannot clear scrubland unless they get permission. I have had an instance related to me recently and I hope that members and conservationists consider the position of a person owning a substantial amount of scrubland who has no other rural interest and, because the person does not produce any crop from the land, the State Government levies land tax. What a sham! While we want to keep scrubland for young people and future generations, we will not let people clear it even when they apply.

True, part of this land has been cleared, but it is not cropped, I admit. The land covers 3 000 acres, yet the owner

is hit for land tax. What sort of attitude is that? The last point I wish to make is this: we cannot build split-level or two storey houses in the hills face zone, yet the Government will condone an investigation and encourage people to build a cable car over the hills face zone when there is a road which services Mount Lofty and on which a person could get to Mount Lofty as quickly by bus as they could by cable car. Yet the Government says to ordinary citizens that they cannot build a house yet it will give permission to millionaires to undertake this development.

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

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** In the time allocated this afternoon I would like to address my remarks to activities going on behind the scenes in Government departments. I will use two examples. First, I will start by referring to the office block that is part of the ASER development now being constructed at a starting figure of about \$10 million.

We had a controversy just before Christmas when the cladding on that building was going on and it turned out to be a horrific aluminium colour and justifiably there was a hue and cry about it. As the hue and cry developed the Premier waded in and sought information on it. To his surprise, he found that the Government had been notified in writing by the developers that they intended changing the colour. The Premier admitted to that, and we had an admission that the developers had also written to Dr Hopgood, who had passed over the letter to the Planning Commission and the city council.

What we have got is one of the most grotesque buildings ever seen on the Adelaide skyline. It is a damning indictment of any architectural talent. It is the most horrible building that I have ever seen constructed anywhere, yet we have it nestling in the centre of what is a \$250 million project which has tremendous architectural merit. This office block which the Government approved and which it is allowed to continue is a blight on the landscape of Adelaide and can only be called by future generations one of Bannons' barnacles.

It will be there for everyone to observe for the next 50 to 80 years before it is eventually torn down. What happens in the department? The Premier said we were told, but no one took any action. The people who would be required to take action are officers who are probably on a salary range between \$48 000 and \$72 000 a year. These people are still in their jobs. Nothing happens to these people who make these glaring errors that have the potential to cost the State millions of dollars to correct.

In this case it is \$4.2 million. That is the figure to have the building reclad. Nothing happens to those officers. However, if they were in the private sector they would be sacked, but this Government has not attempted to sack anyone in the Department of Environment and Planning or any of the planning areas over this outrageous mistake, yet the people of Adelaide have to contend with it. I hope that as time goes on that monument to the way the Government has operated becomes Bannons' barnacle on North Terrace, and quite rightly so, because that is the sort of odium that that sort of building deserves.

Even the architectural aesthetic design is absolutely awful. You have the small windows, the large aluminium cladding, which no one can say has any aesthetic beauty whatsoever, in the middle of what is the most wonderful international area with the Hyatt Hotel and the Convention Centre. It is a complete debacle, yet the Government rolls on as usual. The public servants stay in their Government cars and go to and from work on their \$60 000 to \$70 000 a year and no-one gets the sack.

The matter goes through as a press release by the Government saying, 'We are not prepared to do anything about it; end of issue.' The public expects more. It is the most outrageous attitude on the part of the Government to brush this one aside and try to let it go under the mat. We have a grotesque building out there. It is an eyesore in Adelaide. It will always remain an eyesore and at least we should have had the head on a platter of one or two of the public servants who made the mistake. That would have happened in the private sector. It does not happen in the Government sector and it is about time that these things started to occur.

The other matter that I would like to raise is topical, because it was announced at a public meeting last night at Brighton, that the Government is not going to proceed with the proposed marina at Kingston Park. I am not going to pass judgment on that or the Jubilee Point marina now. I had enough to say about Jubilee Point at the time. I want to talk about the principle of how long a Government allows developers in this State to carry on preparing, planning and spending money before it comes out and honestly says that it is going to stop the development. With Jubilee Point the message was loud and clear early in the piece from the community down there that I represent that the project was a non-goer, yet behind the scenes the Premier consistently said to the developers, 'Keep going, she'll be right, we'll push it through.' Now, \$2 million later on the part of Kinhill Stearns and the directors of that company, the Premier said, 'No, no project.'

The Premier had every opportunity 12 to 18 months earlier to say, 'We have looked at this project and we are not going to proceed.' However, playing politics, he kept on egging them on, saying, 'It will be all right; we will support it,' and then at the last minute he said, 'No'. The same thing happened with the Kingston Park development. During Question Time today we heard that the solicitors (Mellor, Gardner, Beamond and Page) had written to the Director-General pointing out that they have a letter dated 25 November 1987 from the Department of Environment and Planning addressed to their client indicating that the land for reclamation was offered for sale at a certain price, and that the developers had written back accepting that offer.

I think that that is a *prima facie* case that negotiations had been well advanced and that the Government would have been encouraging the developer. In hindsight, if we look at the dates we can see that it is about the time they were starting to get ready to pull the plug on Kinhill Stearns and shift it down the coast. I imagine that it saw it as an easy option. It knew that Glenelg was a difficult option and thought that it would cancel it, save face and get the other one up and running. All the dates fall into line.

We now find that, having decided to give the developers sufficient rope and having gone to the stage of pricing the land, with the developers writing back and saying that they will accept the offer, the Government then took it to the next stage and plans were drawn up. A plan of the marina appeared in this week's edition of the *Guardian Messenger* (dated 24 February) which is delivered to residents in Glenelg and Brighton. It states that public meetings were to be held in protest—all part of the process.

The Government stood fast until Cabinet met on Monday and, sniffing the winds of political change that are going across the metropolitan area, it chose to say, 'No'. That is within the right of the Government; it can sniff the political winds. I am a politician, I am not stupid. We know that it is clearing the decks for an early election. The Adelaide by-election made it patently obvious that the Labor Party is on the skids, and George Apap has not helped during the past few weeks in relation to the Australian Labor Party's

public perception. The Premier knows that he will have to go to the polls fairly soon if he is to have any voting base left in this State. We see a massive landslide far worse than in 1979. We know that that is the scenario building up in this State.

However, on Monday Cabinet said 'No'. What happens to those developers and the money that they have invested? Why did Cabinet not say 'No' in November? Why did Cabinet two years ago at Glenelg, when it knew it was not on, not say 'No', instead of egging the developers on? Developers will not come to this State under these circumstances; they will only come if they know that the Government is fair dinkum. They like to negotiate with people who are fair dinkum and they must know the ground rules. They cannot deal with a Government that does not work by ground rules.

The Bannon Government has demonstrated unequivocally in relation to these two projects that it does not work by or understand ground rules. A Government that does not work by ground rules will not attract development to this State. If we do not attract development we will not have jobs and prosperity.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Tyler):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Price.

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** In the time available to me I will speak about a matter that I have raised previously. If members get sick of hearing me talk about this matter they had better get used to it because I will be raising it time and time again until something is done about it. One of the most frustrating areas in my electorate concerns planning, especially in respect to the environment. Almost without exception the problems arise from a conflict between industry and residential housing because of the nature of the areas concerned and, to a greater extent, the period in which the areas originally evolved and developed.

Some of the problems are not the fault of the Government, local government or any individuals. It is a fact of life that most of these areas were originally developed under vastly different conditions and circumstances than what we have today. I know that it is easy to be wise after the event and look back and criticise the pioneering people who were responsible for the problems we have today. However, I do not intend to do that. On the contrary, I applaud them for their courage, dedication and hard work which they undertook for the betterment of their communities.

However, time, circumstances, education, awareness and a changing world have brought to us problems that could not have been foreseen many years ago. In the early days South Australians relied on trains, pushbikes or their own two legs to get them from their homes to where they worked. Factories, train lines, residential houses and so on were all built in close proximity to one another because of this fact of life. In areas like Port Adelaide, Rosewater and Queens-town people lived and worked their entire lives in small geographical areas. As the years passed many changes occurred, particularly to industry and the processes and techniques used by industries.

For instance, in the early days many factories that were set up near to houses had manufacturing and associated processes of low intensity with manufacturing operations creating very little pollution, whether that be noise, dust, fumes or whatever. Added to this, long hours were very rare. The factories never worked through the night, they just worked normal day hours and did not have the problem arising after hours. Today some of these factories are still manufacturing similar products but the production vol-



umes, automation, manufacturing techniques and chemicals used, and the fact that they have two and sometimes three shifts a day, are causing real problems for residents in the near vicinity.

Recently Governments have introduced and updated legislation and regulations in good faith to try to overcome the industrial pollution problems. Unfortunately, the advancement of technology and the rapid changing of manufacturing processes has been much faster than legislative change with the result that, in many cases, the problems are worse than before. I will cite an example or two in my electorate. One particular area of concern is to residents in Wingfield where the air and noise pollution is very bad. Visual pollution is another problem. However, people are prepared to put up with this because they like living in the area, have lived there for many years and in many cases before the factories were established in the area.

They are prepared to put up with visual pollution such as unsightly factories of iron, with large equipment and dumping areas. The owners of the factories have not done anything to try to ease the visual impact on surrounding residents, and this can include planting trees. They have left it as it is and have let the residents put up with the visual pollution.

People in the area are very patient and understanding in relation to the factories and are prepared to put up with noise during the day. However, this does not apply to noise during the night. Many factories not only make noise during the day but also between the hours of 10 p.m. or 11 p.m. and 7 a.m. the next morning. During these hours people are trying to get their rest. Most people have to work and children have to go to school. They need their rest. In many cases this much needed rest is denied the people because of the noise from the factories. Time and time again the Noise Abatement Branch has been contacted and has sent equipment down to measure the noise. On one occasion officers of the branch came down, checked the noise and said that it was 'just over' the maximum allowable.

So, nothing is done. Members of this House would be aware of our position or that of people in the community: if a vehicle is stopped by a police breathalyser unit and the driver's blood alcohol content is just over the allowable maximum of .08, he or she is charged. So should industry be charged if the noise level is over the allowable maximum. There is no consistency in the enforcement of the law.

Another problem in this area, because of pollution, is that the land was zoned general industry a long time after many of the houses in the area were established. Because the existing houses are then classified as prohibited use, the local council will not allow residents to improve their homes by building garages, carports, additions, and so on. Added to that, property valuations as established by Department of Lands valuers are coming down in this area while property values elsewhere, as we all know, are going up at an alarming rate. Therefore, people in this situation are trapped. They can either stay and put up with all the pollution, or they can sell up and move out. They cannot sell their places for a good price because others do not wish to live among factories. Therefore, they cannot get a fair value for their properties. If the owners of factories and industry in the area wish to buy these properties to expand their industrial premises, they base their offers to the residents on the Department of Lands valuation, which in many cases is less than half the cost of replacement.

Some homes in these areas, especially at Wingfield, are nicely set up, air conditioned, beautiful places, and people like living there. They do not want to shift but, if they are forced by pollution problems to shift they cannot afford to

sell their place to a factory owner wishing to expand, for instance, because they will get only half of what it is worth. They must then take out massive mortgages to replace their homes and often do not live long enough to repay them. It is a real problem, and something needs to be done. The Planning Act needs to be upgraded to cope with this situation.

I will not have time to deal with a couple of other matters, but reiterate that the legislation needs to be tightened to give the Department of Environment and Planning more teeth. There are examples of local councils, for instance, giving approval for general industrial operations to be put into areas zoned light industry. When talking recently to a senior person in the Department of Environment and Planning, I was horrified to find that it is quite okay for a local council to give approval for a general industrial use operation to go into a light industrial area. We have cases in the Port Adelaide area where large portions of land were originally zoned residential—

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** In the few minutes that I have in this grievance debate, I want to refer to two or three matters relating to concerns within my own electorate. At the outset, I must say that I am delighted that the Minister of Education is at the bench tonight, because the first matter that I want to refer to is very much in his court. In fact, the letter that I will read to the House is one that I have already forwarded to the Minister of Education, and I am aware that he has also received a separate and very positive letter from the Chairman of the Heathfield High School Council. For the past 12 months, I have had the opportunity to serve on that council and I have been most impressed with the depth in which the members of the council have been prepared to look into a number of issues. The letter refers to some of the concerns expressed over more recent times. It is signed by the Chairman of the School Council, Heathfield High School, and states:

Towards the end of last year when our new staffing for 1988 was coming through, a number of us at school became very concerned about several quite serious imbalances in the composition of our staff. We discussed these at a staff meeting and the issue was aired at the final school council meeting for the year. Since then a small subcommittee of the school council has met to discuss the implications of these difficulties and to suggest ways in which they could be remedied. This is the nature of the problem:

1. The extreme paucity of female teachers in the maths/science area.

For some years now we have had a slow decline in the number of women teaching in these faculty areas. In 1988 we have only one woman teaching science (only one class) and the same woman teaching three junior maths classes. We feel that having more women teaching maths and science would encourage more girls to see these subject areas as relevant to women's lives and careers. (As in many schools, girls are under-represented at Heathfield High School in the senior school in the physical sciences and pure maths areas and this seriously limits their career choices.)

That is a point that I strongly support. The letter continues:

The secondary staffing officer for Adelaide area tells us that our request for more women teachers in these subject areas could not be met because of the general shortage of female teachers in these subject areas and also because the current staffing policies of the Education Department inhibit the recruitment of any teachers not currently permanently employed in the system. Consequently the present situation is unlikely to be remedied in the next few years. (Incidentally our female/male staff ratio has dropped to 39.6/20.7, i.e. there are two men on the staff for every one woman.)

2. The level of opportunity for younger teachers to break into the system.

The majority of the Heathfield staff is aged between 35 and 45. In recent years, very few college or university exit students have been given permanent jobs. The option of starting your

teaching career as a contract teacher is now rapidly disappearing too, as more and more temporary vacancies (due to long service leave, accouchement leave, leave without pay, etc.) are being filled by permanent teachers taking short term positions. (This is another cause of discontent.) Consequently schools are missing out on well-qualified, enthusiastic, young teachers.

Ideally a school staff should be a balanced mix of sexes and age groups. This is no longer so and, as with the sex imbalance, is unlikely to become so over the next few years. By the 1990s most of our permanent teachers will be in their late 40s and 50s—not a good prospect for the future of school sport, outdoor education and other extra-curricular activities.

### 3. Teacher morale.

You may have read the two excellent articles on this topic which appeared in the *Adelaide Review* in the middle of last year.

I certainly recall those articles. He continues:

Behind the current industrial unrest is not merely a salary claim issue. Teachers are angry and frustrated at working in a system whose personnel policies are never explained to them (but where rumours of short-term tenure, work reports, and restructuring of promotion procedures and positions keep filtering through), and where there seems to be no planning to overcome anomalies such as I have mentioned above.

Then the letter refers to some practical suggestions of what can be done. This is where Heathfield High School Council is being very positive in its approach. The first suggestion is to free up the leave system. The letter states:

Obviously the Education Department has to restrict the number of staff taking paid long service leave, but there seems little reason in a time of teacher-excess to deny teachers unpaid leave. We recommend that periods of unpaid leave (for parenting, for overseas study, for travel purposes, for investigating other career options, etc.) be freely granted.

I emphasise the word 'freely'. The letter continues:

This would allow the Education Department to use their large pool of unemployed young (and/or female) teachers for contract work.

The second point they suggest that the Minister and department could seriously consider is to investigate how other countries have handled the problem of declining enrolments and teacher excess. The letter states:

Some Canadian provinces (for example) have a system whereby teachers can stretch four years' salary over a five year period and take every fifth year as paid leave.

I believe strongly that that is a concept the department could look at in this State. The third suggestion they have is to involve school councils and teachers in selecting suitable staff for their schools. The letter states:

This would be a complex (but very worthwhile) exercise. Schools could then help decide on the composition of their staff.

The Heathfield High School Council would like me, as their member, to air these issues on their behalf in this House. As I say, a letter has been sent to the Minister, and I will be looking forward to a positive reply from him. I strongly support the points that have been raised by the Chairman of the High School Council. As I said earlier, these are matters that have received considerable attention by the school council. Much thought has gone into the suggestions that have been put forward, and I hope that the Minister will give those points his full support. I will certainly be making independent representation to the Minister to ensure that that happens.

In the few minutes that I have left I would like to refer to one other matter, which relates to a decision made some time ago by the Minister for Environment and Planning to put out a working paper to request of local government its views on how it should be able to be involved in determining matters of local heritage significance, and also to determine whether it is possible for councils to obtain demolition control. I suggest that it is probably 18 months, and could be even more, since that discussion paper first came before councils and before interested parties.

I am very much aware of the concern that is being felt by councils in various parts of the State. I vividly recall

some of the problems that have occurred in the Unley council area and more recently in my own electorate in the Mount Barker area, where we have a number of buildings where we have been recognised by local authorities as being significant in regard to their heritage value but the council has had no way of having an input into the final decisions regarding those buildings. I urge the Minister, as I have on previous occasions, to make a decision in this regard and to do so as promptly as possible.

It is vitally important that local government have a say in what should happen with those buildings, and it is important that the Minister determine as a matter of urgency how that should happen. I ask the Minister for Environment and Planning to give that matter his urgent attention.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I want to raise one or two matters of concern to me in relation to my electorate and the country areas of South Australia. This grievance debate again gives us the opportunity to raise those very real problems which country people are facing with the difficulties of providing adequate education for their families. The real problem facing people in isolated communities is how to raise enough revenue to meet the costs of sending children for secondary education, either in the major regional centres or in the metropolitan area.

It is a matter which Governments, unfortunately, have not addressed for a long time. The first time the State Government really did anything about this was in 1980, when the Tonkin Government provided some assistance, but there is a clear responsibility on the State Government to do something to help those people provide adequate education for their children. I do not know whether any members opposite have taken the trouble to sit down and analyse the cost of sending a child for secondary education in Adelaide. The cost is quite horrendous. There is not only the cost of education but the cost of board and of travel to and from Adelaide. In many cases it is almost beyond the resources of those parents.

It always appears to me to be not only unfair but quite unjust that those children should be denied the opportunity of adequate education because their parents' employment forces them to live in the isolated parts of this State, and because they do not have the financial resources those children will be denied adequate education, which is so essential if they are to play a positive role in the future of the State. I have always believed that our young people are one of our greatest assets and, therefore, an adequate education should be available to all citizens. It should not just be those people who live within a radius of a few kilometres of the large country towns or of the capital.

I am pleased to see that the Minister of Education is in the House, and I hope that when the Government is framing the current State budget something will be done to alleviate this problem. I suggest to the Minister that a gradual increase in the isolated parents allowance is not only long overdue but absolutely essential if there is any form of justice.

I look forward to the Minister's examining the proposals that the Queensland Government has in place under which a parent in that State can receive up to about \$1 500 from the State Government. There is another suggestion which I would like the Minister to look at. In Alice Springs an excellent facility run by the Uniting Church, known as St Philip's, provides accommodation for secondary students from the isolated parts of the Northern Territory. The students attend the high school in Alice Springs—a very good institution—and that reduces the need to pay tuition fees, but the Northern Territory Government strongly financially supports that organisation. The students have excellent

grounds and facilities and have supervision to do their homework. That is another area which I would call upon the Minister to examine closely.

The next matter of concern to me relates to the future management and control of national parks. It is essential that there should be an understanding of the urgent need for the National Parks and Wildlife Service to be able to avail itself of the local management expertise of local communities. The experience with the fires at Mount Remarkable has indicated clearly to me that in future, if these events are to be minimised and the damage contained, there is an urgent need to consider the expertise available through the Country Fire Service, the local council, adjoining landholders and, in many cases, people who previously owned and managed some of these national parks.

In my view, that is essential. I am pleased to say that I believe the national parks are now far more amenable to the views of local communities, but it must be clearly understood that the first priority is to extinguish fires as soon as possible; the longer they burn the more difficult they will be to contain, with the likelihood that they will break out into open country on a massive front, in many cases causing tremendous damage to the local community. I hope that the Minister and his officers will look very closely at having people who are locally involved having some say in the management of these organisations.

I hope that, when the Government finally brings down the firearms legislation, it leaves completely behind it the emotional arguments that have been relied on in the current public discussion of this issue. The community at large does not seem to understand that whatever sort of law is passed it will not stop the criminal element from having firearms: it will only make life difficult for law-abiding citizens who have the right and the need to use firearms responsibly, whether gun club members, small bore or big bore shooters, combined shooters, field and game club members, graziers, or those engaged in the security industry.

There is a need to understand clearly that the individual, not the firearm, should be licensed, because it is the individual who causes the problem, not the firearms themselves. The greatest thing in this world is commonsense and anyone with experience knows that the suggested licensing of ammunition is ludicrous and without foundation. After all, ammunition is not numbered, although there may normally be despatch numbers on the boxes. Bearing in mind that people purchase ammunition elsewhere and that they have self-loading equipment, the Minister should use commonsense in this matter.

Already, the value of unlicensed firearms has increased greatly because of the foreshadowed legislation. The last thing in the world we want is people owning unregistered firearms. In New Zealand, the former legislation has been repealed and the individual is now licensed. As a pro firearm person who owns and uses firearms, I believe that people should be responsible. If people misuse firearms, the law should descend on them very heavily. People who hold up banks should go to gaol for at least a minimum period. That would solve the problem. I now give way to my colleague the member for Hanson.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I appreciate the generosity of the member for Eyre, who is giving me some of his time so that I may attend a function in my electorate this evening. I am most concerned about increased poverty in the community and about the hard-nosed attitude of a Government that is gradually losing the confidence of the people. The *Sunday Mail* of 21 February 1988 contains an article headed 'Poor loved king of the West End: eccentric MP who served turkeys to city dwellers', which states:

Albert Augustine Edwards, Adelaide's notorious king of the West End would be in his element in Wright Street today. A most apt memorial will be opened in his honour by the Lord Mayor (Mr Condous). It is a housing complex for the elderly built as a Jubilee 150 joint venture by the Adelaide City Council and the South Australian Housing Trust.

The disappointing feature is that the Opposition was not invited to be represented at that opening, even though the Jubilee 150 project was part of our housing policy years ago to build units in the city. Although the project is a joint venture between the City Council and the Housing Trust, the Housing Trust, for some unknown reason, does not consider the Opposition. Indeed, when new units were recently opened in Henley Beach, the Opposition was not invited to that opening either, but I hope that by now the trust is waking up to what is going on.

This interesting article refers to the aims, work, life and style of Bert Edwards who, in 1950, bought his first city hotel, the Duke of Brunswick. At that time, my grandparents owned the Seven Stars Hotel and I well remember my parents and aunts talking about Bert Edwards and the good that he was doing for the community. Bert Edwards is quoted as saying, after his election to State Parliament in 1917 as member for Adelaide:

There are hundreds of people in Adelaide who never have a joint of meat in their house in a week.

Tragically, that situation has not improved; if anything it is worse today. Indeed, not hundreds but thousands of young families, aged families, and disabled and disadvantaged families do not have a roast, side, or joint of meat in their refrigerator. That is an indictment of the Government of the day. No Government should allow the economy to deteriorate to such a degree as has happened in South Australia over the past five years.

This afternoon we heard the bleatings of the Premier as he sought to discredit the well researched and well presented document from the Leader of the Opposition on the South Australian economy. Much as I loathe criticising what is happening in South Australia, because I am a loyal and true South Australian, I believe that we must be cautious in preparing and planning for the future. It was ironic that this afternoon we heard about an Aborigine (Spencer Rigney) being hard done by as a result of actions of the Government and the Aboriginal Housing Division. Mr Rigney's property was acquired by the Housing Trust, as I understand from a search of the title, on 21 September 1973, and on 20 December 1973 it was transferred to the Minister of Community Welfare when that Minister assumed responsibility for Aborigines in South Australia.

That Minister (Len King) could not transfer his responsibilities for Aborigines quickly enough to the Commonwealth Government. Then the Housing Trust acquired the property again on 19 November 1976. I well remember in those days, and even previously, that one could acquire a house from the trust through the rental-purchase scheme. From talking with people associated with Mr Rigney, I do not doubt that he and the community believed, as I believe, that he wished to be involved in the rental-purchase scheme. It galls me to think that this person doubled his rent payment believing that he was making a contribution to the rental-purchase scheme and that he is now being denied his just rights.

There is no hard decision here for the Minister to make. There has been a bungle within the Department of Community Welfare, the Aborigines department and the Housing Trust when the trust assumed the responsibility for Aboriginal housing. It would be easy with the clumsy docket system that is used in Government departments for Mr Rigney's papers to have been mislaid or misplaced. Perhaps

a social worker or do-gooder got hold of them and, with good intentions, placed the matter in the too-hard basket. Possibly, with the transfer and swapping round of Government departments the documents have been either mislaid or lost.

So, poor Mr Rigney has been left out on a limb. The Government and the Minister should allow Mr Rigney to remain in that property for the rest of his natural life, and I would have no argument about that because he has earned the title and should be allowed to remain there until he dies. Then, the property could return to the State. The way in which this poor man has been harassed and his family treated, as well as the unfortunate passing of his wife at an early age as a result of this business, has meant that Mr Rigney does not enjoy good health. I hope that he is blessed with better health, but I fear that he cannot last much longer.

So, I appeal to the Government and to the Minister, on compassionate grounds, to allow Mr Rigney to remain in that property for the rest of his natural life. It is something that we in this Parliament, and certainly the Government, can do. It will not cause economic hardship for the Housing Trust or the Government. At least, if we can make someone's life happier in these difficult times, here is an opportunity for the Minister to do just that. It was disappointing that the Minister would not meet Mr Rigney and his representative today. That was poor manners and showed very little respect to a good old Aussie battler.

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

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** During this grievance debate on supply, which is generally considered to be free ranging, I refer once more to the problems for people living in seaside councils as far as the maintenance of the foreshore area is concerned. In my last speech on this subject, I referred to the number of visitors who frequent the beach. The two beaches of Henley and Grange which I represent are very popular with day visitors.

**Mr Peterson:** What about Semaphore?

**Mr FERGUSON:** I concede the remark from the member for Semaphore: the beach at Semaphore is also very popular and also has a problem in relation to maintenance. One of the attractive things about Adelaide as a tourism destination is the fact that non-polluted and safe beaches are available within six kilometres of the city. One of my study tours overseas included beachside suburbs, and I found that in some areas of Europe, for example, the beaches have been so polluted by the passing trade and oil spillage that they are very unsavoury indeed. So the nearby metropolitan beaches are of extreme importance to Adelaide and they cannot and should not be separated as a responsibility from the whole of the metropolitan area.

The problem of maintenance of the beachfronts is now rising to the surface once more because of the State's budgetary situation. It is most unfair that those people who live along the coastal areas, including the people of Semaphore, should be bearing a disproportionate cost of the maintenance of the beachfront which after all, to all intents and purposes, is a national park. I believe that this situation was looked at when the Coast Protection Board was created. The Coast Protection Board legislation seems to be a mechanism for providing beachside councils with the necessary financial support for the maintenance and management of the beachfronts. The original proposition was that there would be a cost sharing arrangement between the State Government and metropolitan beaches for maintenance and management, and that appears to have been a correct decision.

An argument has been put to me that not only the beachfront people are in this situation but the majority of people

in the metropolitan area, including the Adelaide City Council area. However, I would argue that the Adelaide City Council has found various ways and means of taxing people who come to the city: for example, by way of parking stations and parking fees. So very few people escape the taxation powers of the Adelaide City Council. This is not to say that I am in any way reflecting on the facilities that the Adelaide City Council has provided for people who visit the city. It has had the opportunity to gain revenue from these people, but that same opportunity is not so readily available to the beachside councils.

So we have this situation which is now recurring. I understand that budget cuts have been applied to the Coast Protection Board, so we are returning once more to a situation where the burden of maintenance and management of the metropolitan beaches is actually falling on the ratepayers of the beachside councils. I believe that this is most unfair. The burden of providing a playground for the rest of the metropolitan area is falling disproportionately on the shoulders of a few. I have no particular quarrel with any of the beachside councils, but generally speaking their rates are higher than those for people living in areas immediately behind them, in the hinterland. The benefits are no greater for the ratepayers of beachside councils than for other councils. Certainly in some cases a large amount of the budgets of beachside councils is being spent on maintenance of the foreshore. I hope that this situation can be looked at in future budgets and that the disproportionate amount of money being contributed by people in the seaside councils can be rectified.

One area of beach maintenance that I would like to see looked at is the problem of beach cleaning. It seems logical to me that beach cleaning machines could be shared by metropolitan beach councils and that the problem of beach cleaning, which is a major issue, should be taken care of on a cooperative basis by several councils; and the Coast Protection Board could invest in beach cleaning machines. Experimentation has been going on with the introduction of beach cleaning machines, and I understand that the Glenelg council is continuing investigations and experiments with them. I understand that there have been certain exhibitions for the benefit of seaside council representatives with the possibility of machines being imported from America to take care of beach cleaning operations.

I am a member of a volunteer organisation which cleans beaches on a roster basis, and I pay tribute to all voluntary organisations carrying on this activity. The problem is, however, that the volume of visitors to the beach makes it almost impossible for the volunteers to keep up with the work. Most of the volunteer work takes place on the weekends and, if there is, say, a hot Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday, then for part of the week the beach is littered with rubbish and it is very difficult to control.

I would like to briefly mention the problems that confront beachside suburbs in relation to vandalism. On Thursday 14 January 1988, the *Advertiser* reported that the Henley and Grange council had a \$20 000 budget allocation to repair damage caused by vandals. This money was put aside for the current financial year but, at the end of January, it had already been used. Vandalism is an ongoing problem in a beachside area, but it certainly heightened during the summer holiday period, and this year it has been heightened considerably because of the extremely warm weather which occurred early in the season.

Vandalism has occurred to the changing sheds and to the fences; the foreshore fences have been smashed and ripped up and used as fuel for fires on the beach; broken glass has been strewn on the roads and footpaths; automatic watering

equipment has been damaged; and lights have been smashed. Apparently someone used sledgehammers to do this. An incredible amount of vandalism is occurring. Beach behaviour has also tended to be very disturbing. I pay tribute to the police from the Henley Beach police station for their additional beach patrols during the summer.

It is a very great pity that police have to be used, primarily to stamp out anti-social behaviour. Some of our old-fashioned values seem to be going, but the introduction of police patrols, both plain clothes and uniformed police on a regular basis over the summer months in the Henley Beach area has certainly improved the behaviour down there.

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

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** Yesterday in the *Port Lincoln Times* an article 'No funds for dive chamber' appeared and it was the first notice that any member of the diving community, be it the abalone community or the Port Lincoln community generally, had that the Government intended to renege on the undertaking that a portable hyperbaric unit would be used at Port Lincoln. In November it was widely reported that the hyperbaric unit had arrived in Adelaide and was bound for the West Coast after trials at the Royal Adelaide Hospital's Hyperbaric Unit.

The status of the chamber, which was imported with Port Lincoln in mind, was further confused when the Director of the Hyperbaric Unit, Dr Des Gorman, said earlier this year that the unit still was earmarked for the West Coast. However, yesterday the people of the West Coast were to find that the chamber is no longer to be moved to Port Lincoln. We need to look carefully at just what is meant by this and what price the Government is prepared to pay to place people at risk. An editorial in yesterday's *Port Lincoln Times* 'What price the diver' states:

The State Government today tells us that it knocked back moves for funds to finance a Port Lincoln-based recompression chamber to service the West Coast's million-dollar abalone industry when it met in budget deliberations last September. In refusing a recompression chamber for Port Lincoln is the Government denying the abalone industry a fair deal while putting the long-term health of divers at risk?

Bends draws an embarrassing public glare and professional divers, unless suffering severely, may tend to consider it insufficient to seek medical transfer by air and the resultant ballyho and loss of time. How many have 'toughed it out' and waited for the symptoms to pass, compounding minor injury which could eventually force them, prematurely, from their profession? And how many would seek treatment, even for minor niggling bends, if the facility were here and treatment could be received without fuss or delay?

If the Government is really questioning the need for a chamber here, then it is ignoring its own principles for other services provided, ranging from child to elderly care. Premier John Bannon is eagerly attempting to encourage overseas and interstate industries to South Australia and is offering subsidies, relocation allowances and other incentives. The contribution abalone divers make to the State's economy is significant. It is just as significant that the issue has been let to simmer for 15 months with some Government sources contending divers do not want a chamber because no application has been lodged. The last was rejected in September thereby being swept from departmental memory.

The local hospital cannot afford to fund the unit. Medical sources state it would have to be provided with separate funding to include payment of specialist staff. The question now is, what are the costs of treating divers locally compared with flying them in mercy dashes half way across the State? What, too, is the value of the abalone fishery and the health of its divers?

I believe that that editorial sums up the views of many people, and there is this interesting article in the same paper on the same half page that needs to be mentioned. Headed '“Miracle” saves diver' the report goes on to state:

Port Lincoln diver . . . is back home after suffering a severe case of bends off Eucla on Friday. But [the diver] and his wife

yesterday preferred not to speak about his 'miracle' recovery or the air-dash from Victoria which saved his life.

The diver was air-lifted from Eucla in a portable recompression chamber by the National Safety Council after suffering the bends while diving on a Lukin wreck about 70 km from the Nullarbor outpost.

A spokesman for St John Ambulance in Adelaide said the diver was transported to Eucla in the Lukin clipper Karina G before being transported to the NSC aircraft about seven hours after the bends attack.

The spokesman said the diver had been known to be diving to 62 metres and had suffered the bends after losing his waist belt and surfacing too quickly.

He said it was believed the diver had been unconscious when he reached the surface.

It was reported the diver had been attacked by leatherjacket fish when he reached the surface.

The issue really in question is whether the Government has an obligation through its health services to the diving industry. The point needs to be made that this recompression chamber is in this State at no cost to the South Australian Government: it is here on a trial basis for 12 months. It was to be tested initially at the Adelaide Hyperbaric Unit and then transported to Port Lincoln to serve divers and other people. There are a number of other ailments from which people suffer that can be treated successfully in such a unit.

I am given to understand that there is a lot of difference between the various quotes for transport of the unit to Port Lincoln. A bare bones estimate by Dr Gorman was about \$8 000 to transport the unit from Adelaide to Port Lincoln. If that is the case, the Government has a lot to answer for. On the other hand, the Health Commission is saying that it will cost \$500 000 for the transport and subsequent purchase price. That may or may not be the case, but there is no doubt that that unit was destined for Port Lincoln where the greatest potential need is likely to be.

I have seen and heard of many cases of the bends. It is a matter that worries me greatly. I am concerned that South Australia will have a death caused by the bends. We already have people with permanent and cumulative injuries that have arisen through exceeding the diving limits. They have suffered the bends and were unable to get the appropriate medical treatment. Furthermore, it is obviously a case of lack of common sense that, if a person is suffering from the bends, if he is put in an aircraft and taken to Adelaide, obviously, the higher the altitude, the less the atmospheric pressure and the greater the implication in regard to decompression.

I can only say that the Government has made a very silly mistake in not pursuing this. I trust that it will re-examine its priorities. The recompression chamber at this stage is at no cost to the Government. The only cost is to transport it to see whether it should be set up. There may be costs after the 12 months time, and there is the on-going situation of whether the recompression chamber should be purchased and left on site. Perhaps that is what is frightening the Government. Certainly, I hope that this silly mistake does not turn out to be a fatal mistake, but I believe that could well be the case.

I would now like to turn to several other aspects, but one in particular relating to the WorkCover levy. I have had this situation raised with me and I have mentioned it to the Minister of Labour today. However, I would like to put it on record because there are many farmers who are in a similar position and who pay employees or share farmer on a wage and share basis and they are at a loss about how this matter can be resolved. I am personally involved and I can declare some pecuniary interest in this matter. WorkCover was unable to explain how one should apportion the levy paid in a wage share situation.

In my case I pay \$100 a week to a sharefarmer and 15 per cent gross of the proceeds of the property. Therefore, the income of that person fluctuates from year to year. As everyone knows, the bulk of that income comes in the December-January period. WorkCover could not explain how it should be done. It initially said that we should pay the levy on \$100 a week and that it would sort the rest out later. I do not know what would have happened if an accident had occurred in the intervening period and WorkCover had claimed that he was only covered for \$100 a week.

I was unable to obtain a reply over the phone, despite a promise that an officer would ring back with a reply. I subsequently wrote to WorkCover seeking answers to the questions that I required. I now find that WorkCover is saying that if the sharefarmer gets the bulk of his income during one month he has to be levied at 4.5 per cent during the month of December or whichever month he gets that income. That might sound all right in the first instance; however, the moneys that are received during the December-January period are, for all intents and purposes, averaged over a 12 month period. WorkCover over the first financial year is working over a nine month period, and there is obviously an anomaly in that.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I first take up the comments that were made today by the Premier. He said that when in Opposition not once did he criticise and that he was always full of congratulations and support. Before I came into this place I remember the mirage in the desert. What do they call it today—Roxby Downs. Who is supporting it? Not the Premier who said it was a mirage in the desert! He is running around saying what a great development it is—and of course, it is. It was a Liberal Party initiative and thanks to the Liberal Party it is operating at this time. What about criticism of the O-Bahn? If one goes back and looks at *Hansard* one will find the same thing. What about the Hilton Hotel? As soon as that came on line it was Don Dunstan's favourite deal, not something done by David Tonkin. What about the international airport? Members opposite said that it was a tin shed. It was a marvellous innovation for the Liberal Government and the Premier spent considerable time knocking it. What about the law courts?

When one looks at the debates that the Premier has put before the House as they relate to economic matters it shows the Premier doing nothing but carping. Yet, he has the gall to get up in this place and say that he has not criticised when in Opposition. That is absolute nonsense. He then goes on and talks about what a marvellous thing this submarine project is—and it is a marvellous project. However, do not talk about it today in relation to the economic problems of the past five years and say that because of the future submarine project our past five years of economic management has been a disaster. It is a future project for South Australia, and we support it.

The Premier today talked about the Grand Prix. In the *South Australia Great* magazine in December last year he said that \$50 million came to the benefit of small business in this State because of the Grand Prix. Shortly a question on notice will ask where that \$50 million has gone—not about the economic pipe dream or the economist's dream of where it is. The question will ask, what small businesses have benefited from that \$50 million? We will ask for it to be laid out so that the people in this State can see it and see what economic benefit it is to the State. Let us see the facts and figures.

What about the ASER project? What is its real cost to the South Australian taxpayer? How much is the superan-

uation trust putting in? How much are we going to have to fund the superannuation trust in the future to pick up the debt? What is the lease-back arrangement? Who will pay for all the debts? It is a magnificent development, but what about coming clean and telling us the true costs. Today the Premier talked about taxes and charges. He said, 'We really have not put the taxes and charges up very much.' However, he forgot to talk about one specific item—land tax. I know that the member for Albert Park, who is smiling over there, would know full well that every small business in his area is hurting over the land tax deal. What are they doing about it? It is a wealth tax.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** Don't worry about our policy. You will get that at the time of the next election. It will be set out clearly and we will lay down exactly what we are going to do. There will be no problems in that area. Today the Premier talked about interest rates and our debt. In the past five years we have gone from paying 45c in every taxation dollar collected to 58c in every taxation dollar collected for interest—13c more in every single dollar. No member opposite has ever been in business. There is one exception; I think the member for Hayward is the only one who knows anything about it, as the rest of Labor Party members are on the take all the time; they do nothing but take all the time. The reality is—

**An honourable member:** What about your policy?

**Mr INGERSON:** Don't worry about it. The reality is that this Government has taken to the cleaners the small business sector in our State, and it is doing nothing about trying to solve the problems. When we look at the economy of South Australia there is no doubt that it is falling behind. We are in an interesting situation. Employment growth, building approvals, inflation, and calculable overtime are the worst on record. The Premier talked about retail sales. What would he know about it? All of the comments he has made in this House are grandstanding. His advisers at the Treasury have advised him about retail sales. Why does he not go to the grass roots and find out from the retailers exactly what is going on?

I am involved in retail and know the figures. Of course, the member for Hayward would know that too. If she talked to her old employer she would know that his retail sales cannot match inflation, and that applies throughout the retail trade, which is slugged on a daily basis in relation to land tax, electricity and so on. This Government is taking the small business sector to the cleaners.

I put some questions to the Premier or to the Minister of Transport, whoever would like to answer. When is the *Island Seaway* going to be fixed? When is the air-conditioning that went foul three months ago going to be fixed? When will the sale of the *Troubridge* go through? We have 24 hour security on the *Troubridge*. Who is paying for it—the mug taxpayer and nobody else. You have not sold it, there is no contract of sale. When are you going to come clean and tell us what is going on?

It is disgraceful that it has taken three months to fix up a vessel that is supposedly costing \$21 million. Why? Is it too hard? Are there too many problems or is it going to cost too much? Surely it is about time to come clean. What about the disgraceful situation of having no marina policy? Let us look at the projects that have been knocked back in the past few weeks. In the marginal seat of Bright the Kingston marina was knocked back yesterday. In the marginal seat of Tea Tree Gully there exists an environmental issue. What are we doing about that? Yesterday in the marginal seat of Adelaide the Government interfered with the city council's plans about the Bank of New South Wales.

What is going on in development in this State? Every development that will be put forward in marginal seats will be knocked back by the Government. The history is there. All members opposite are doing is playing politics. On radio this morning the member for Bright said—and I heard him so eloquently say it—that perhaps because he had a marginal seat the problem of the Kingston marina was fixed up. He said that on Radio 5DN this morning. Perhaps I did not quote him word for word, but it is near enough.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Bright.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I seek your direction, Sir. The honourable member is misquoting ferociously. Do you wish me to put that as a personal explanation tomorrow?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member may make a personal explanation if he believes it is appropriate. The honourable member for Bragg.

**Mr INGERSON:** It is time we had a marina policy from this Government that set out clearly where we can put marinas, so that the developers of this State and the boating industry will know where we can have safe harbours. What do we have? Every time a development is suggested, it gets knocked back, some of them rightly, but the boating industry needs to know where it is going; the developers need to know where they are going; and all this Government does is lead business and developers down the garden path, causing them to spend huge sums of money while nothing happens.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the next contribution is received with a little less unruliness on the part of members. The honourable member for Chaffey.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** Recently the Deputy Premier announced that the long awaited Woolpunda Salinity Interception Scheme would go ahead and that he had reached agreement with the Eastern States for the funding of that project. That interception scheme was identified back in the time of the Tonkin Government, which let to consultants a contract which identified that it was the most cost beneficial interception scheme that could be implemented on the Murray-Darling system.

Of course, we are delighted that that project will go ahead. However, at what cost will it go ahead? What was the trade-off that the Deputy Premier entered into with the Eastern States to get them to come to the party and provide a share of the funding? That is of great concern to South Australians, because once you enter into an agreement on a principle where the Eastern States can put highly saline drainage water back into the Murray system as a trade-off for their providing funds to assist in the capital works of a major salinity interception scheme in South Australia, where does that all end? How does one control the amount of salinity and tonnage of salt that will be introduced into the total system in the Eastern States?

The Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council Salinity and Drainage Strategy (Draft) 1987 indicates the schemes that will reduce salinity in the Murray River and those schemes that will contribute to it. The draft strategy indicates the shape of the program in terms of Murray River salinity effects and the salinity effect of carrying out the various capital works: the Menindee Lakes and Lake Victoria interception schemes would reduce the salinity by 35EC units; salt interception schemes would reduce it a further 80EC units; the land management schemes that would reduce Murray River salinity by 28EC units; and the

land management schemes that would increase the river salinity by plus 30EC units. So, the schemes identified would reduce the overall salinity at Morgan by 113EC units. If we look more closely at the schemes, the schemes which will actually reduce salinity include Woolpunda, with a reduction of 40EC units; Waikerie, 16 units; Mallee Cliffs, 7 units; Chowilla, 11 units; Mildura/Merbein/Buronga, 6 units; Sunraysia Drainage, 4 units; and Lindsay River, 7 units, giving a total of 91 units.

The schemes which will actually increase salinity include Shepparton at plus 13 units, Campaspe, plus 1; Wakool/Tullakool/Deniboote, plus 11; Berriquin/Denimein, plus 10; and Berriquin Phase A, plus 4, giving a total of 39EC units. So, the identified trade-off is some 39EC units.

**Mr Lewis:** EC unit being electro-conductivity units.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** That is right. However, I am advised that the present Buronga interception scheme, the one operating at the moment, is not working, so what guarantee do we have that the expanded scheme will work any better? Of course, if it does not, there will be an increase immediately above the 39 that has been identified in the draft report. Also, it is probable that the Nangiloc drainage will go straight back into the river, and this will further increase that 39EC units. The potential input from the Shepparton area is much greater than the 13EC units indicated in the report. So, one must ask what happens when and if the up-river States exceed the allocated EC unit input from any district.

I have identified that the Woolpunda scheme will reduce the salinity in South Australia at Morgan by 40EC units. We have identified 39EC units of additional input in the Eastern States without the other input that I have indicated could easily occur. So, the net benefit of Woolpunda is immediately reduced. Of the interception schemes, only Woolpunda is at the planning stage to permit an almost immediate start. The up-river States would easily find their 39EC units of input to balance the amount removed before the next interception scheme can be planned and funded. All Riverland areas upstream of Woolpunda—and the Woolpunda scheme that I have identified and that the Minister has announced, would reduce salinity by 40EC units—and Sunraysia could suffer at least a 39EC unit rise before any benefits are obtained.

The agreement that the Deputy Premier has entered into with the Eastern States must mean that the salinity level for Riverland users and people in the Sunraysia area will increase. That is an appalling situation to have adopted and accepted in principle, because no one ever knows just where it will end. So, what is the program for the plus and minus works? That is what we want the Deputy Premier to identify. How long before the Riverland gets any advantage? Is there any fall-back position if it is found that more salt is coming into the system from the Eastern States than was budgeted for? Finally, what pressure can we exert on the up-river States if they dump more salt than their allocation under the agreement?

It would appear that the Deputy Premier has virtually created a situation of allowing the Eastern States to put salinity into the river system with little chance of controlling the amount they will put in. How on earth could we allow ourselves to get into that situation? As I said earlier, the only scheme that is ready to be put into operation is the Woolpunda scheme. That has been in the development stage since 1982 and it has taken the Government ever since it took office in 1982 to actually get to the stage where tenders can be called for the work to be undertaken. However, the input from the Eastern States would almost equal or could exceed the benefits of Woolpunda, and certainly there is no

way to read the situation other than that those people above the Woolpunda scheme and principally in the Riverland of South Australia will receive significantly higher levels of salinity than currently occurs in that area. So, unless the Deputy Premier can give us a very clear indication of the benefits his negotiations have achieved for South Australia, we have certainly gone backwards as far as solving the salinity problems in the river in South Australia is concerned.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I appreciate the fact that a few more members have come into the Chamber, because the issue I am going to speak about tonight concerns the extortion, in my opinion, involving workplace registration. Members of this House would be well aware that workplace registration has hit businesses since late last year, and members would recall passing the legislation well over a year ago. I know that that debate was cut short by the Government, which was not prepared to debate the issue in this place beyond 6 o'clock. We had not got very far at all on the Bill, and that was a disgrace.

I remember that various points of order were raised after that. Now it is hitting the people who are to be affected by it: the ordinary small businessmen, small employers in the work force as well as the larger people. Late last year most, if not all of them, would have received a most impersonal document addressed, in the case I cite, to a professional person, a small business person in my electorate. Headed 'To the occupier' and undated, the letter states:

The Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986 will be operative from 30 November 1987. This Act requires the occupier of a prescribed workplace to register that workplace with the Director of the Department of Labour.

It went on to state in the last paragraph:

The occupier of any prescribed workplace that requires registration and fails to register is liable to a penalty of up to \$5 000. The constituent who brought this to my attention asked me, 'Am I supposed to treat this with any seriousness, or not?' I can understand that, because most of us would be well aware of logs of claims that have been served upon employers by groups such as the AMWSU and other unions, demanding outrageous items such as one hour's morning tea, minimum wage of \$1 000 per day, many months of holidays during the year, and the normal procedure is to throw them in the bin, even though they say:

If you do not reply in the affirmative to this letter within seven days you will be liable . . .

under such and such an Act. This letter from the South Australian Department of Labour—

**Mr Lewis:** They are ambit claims.

**Mr MEIER:** They are ambit claims—exactly. This letter is very similar to an ambit claim and puts a \$5 000 penalty at the end. My constituent said that he read it as an extortion note. It contained no date of origin and it stated threats. It was demanding money by an unknown person or persons. At the end it bore an illegible signature under the heading of 'A/Director, Department of Labour', but no-one knew who that person might be. So it was \$5 000 if you do not register. Included with the letter was a workplace registration form. It is very interesting that under the 'Important notes' that form stated:

An occupier who fails to register a prescribed workplace is liable to a fine of up to a maximum of \$1 000.

Hello, hello! We have a discrepancy here. The original letter refers to a penalty of up to \$5 000 and the form mentions a fine of up to \$1 000. I can well imagine any employer

throwing it in the bin and saying, 'This is a big joke', because there is no logic, for a start. They get their facts and figures mixed up. That is well understood.

Additionally, it stated that if fees are overdue 14 days or more an additional fee of \$10 or 10 per cent of the amount owing, whichever is the greater, will be charged for each month overdue. My constituent does not remember exactly when he got this letter, but he thinks that it was the beginning of November. He brought it to my attention in January, and I realised that he was supposed to have been registered from 30 November. So, with December and January he had a minimum of a \$20 fine on top of the requirement for a \$25 registration fee—just one more example of how the Government is determined to tax the people silly.

On behalf of my constituent I rang the telephone number shown on the letter from the South Australian Department of Labour, and asked whether it was a true letter or someone was sending up the Department of Labour. I was informed that it was, in fact, a genuine letter. I asked why was it simply addressed to the occupier, very impersonal, and I forget the explanation on that.

I also asked why there was not any date. Again, the explanation was not forthcoming. I then said, 'So my constituent has the choice of not registering and facing a \$5 000 or a \$1 000 fine, depending on which subclause you read, and he obviously will have to pay the two lots of \$10 late registration fee,' and the answer was, 'No, we won't impose the late registration fee.' I said, 'That is very good: that is a positive statement. Why are you not imposing the \$10 per month late registration fee?'

The person said, 'Well, we have concentrated mainly on the metropolitan area businesses and we want to see them registered as soon as possible. Then we will be extending to the country with a greater effort.' In fact, I was informed that those who had not registered would be receiving another letter in mid-February. I have not checked whether my constituent received another letter. Apparently, people were to be given at least another month or so before the fine system would come in. So, it seems that the threats in the letter are not real threats. I wonder, therefore, whether or not the extortion note, the liability of up to \$5 000, is real. We are chopping and changing in midstream. Whatever the case, I referred it back to my constituent and said, 'I'm sorry, but under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act there is very little that we as an Opposition can do, because the Government passed the legislation just over a year ago and now it is trying to enforce it.'

This was just before the Adelaide by-election. I can well understand why my constituent was not at all impressed. In fact, I think it very much firmed his view that it is time that the Labor Government went, and the Adelaide by-election showed that a majority of people think exactly the same way. It will only be a matter of course, it would appear at this stage, unless some untruths are told, that the New South Wales election will go the same way. So, my constituent has filled out the work registration form—or filled it out to some extent. As he said, the form contains some ambiguous statements. He referred in particular to the fact that under 'Work registration place' we have 'Nature of business (deli, hotel, factory).'

He told me that he could not fill it out because the nature of his business did not fit into one of those categories. I said, 'Good on you. If they don't make themselves clear, why bother to cooperate in that respect.' It has all been poorly presented and the Government seems determined to get itself out of office with this sort of extortion note from its own Department of Labour.



It would appear that occurrences such as drunk driving, assault, fraud or theft will attract a much smaller penalty than will the employer who does not register. The employer is the one who will receive a whack around the ears—the one who will receive a fine up to \$5 000. Further, the employers will also be responsible for the psychological well being of their workers. How will the Government train all the employers to detect the psychological condition of their employees? How will the employers assess the psychological well being of their employees? It will be virtually impossible. How can one tell whether an employee is suffering from stress, mental trauma, or a personality crisis? This Government has become completely unrealistic in this area as in so many other areas. The Liberal Party endorses worker safety but not this stupid policy.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** My purpose this evening is to bring to the attention of the House certain matters that have been of grave concern to me for a considerable time. It is important to raise such matters in the House if all other avenues of communication with a Minister and his or her officers have failed. First, I wish to underline a problem that has been raised by the member for Chaffey. I am concerned about the trade-offs under the terms of the agreements now made by the Deputy Premier, who is responsible for negotiating the arrangements with the Eastern States upstream of South Australia in the Murray-Darling system. We shall be in trouble as a consequence of those decisions and I ask members to consider the plight of the constituents that I represent at the end of the river system, especially around Lake Albert where before the Woolpunda scheme brings about any reduction in salinity entering the river from South Australian sources, the Minister currently responsible in the Murray River negotiations has already agreed to allow an increase in salinity to flow into the South Australia's river system, especially from Victoria and also from New South Wales.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** That will depend on the precipitation in parts of the catchment but, in average terms over all, one may contemplate a convoy of semitrailers moving from Hay Street in Sydney to Rundle Street in Adelaide, at the maximum permissible speed for bogie-drive triple-axle semitrailers carrying the maximum load in their tippers and moving at a safety interval between them of about 100ft or 120ft. That convoy, stretching from Sydney to Adelaide, will give some idea of the quantity of salt that comes into South Australia across the border every year. That will give members some idea of the seriousness of the problem confronting us.

We have reducing flows in the river with increasing salinity levels, and consequently the risk of EC units of our water increasing to the point where it is even more dangerous and detrimental not only to public health but also to the viability of irrigation in the Lower Murray areas than it is at present under the terms of the arrangements made by this Minister.

The next matter to which I will advert concerns the problem created in the Department of Environment and Planning in respect of native vegetation clearance legislation. The Minister has often assured the House in respect of farmers whose prospective viability has been destroyed because of the effect of the native vegetation clearance controls. That is, their properties would be purchased by the Vegetation Clearance Authority and then, according to the authority's judgment, the land already cleared might be offered for sale. However, when farmers find themselves in these circumstances (and indeed it has been established that

their proven long-term viability has been utterly destroyed by the impact of the legislation), they have offered their farms to the authority, and the Department of Environment and Planning has replied saying simply, 'We have no money.' So, the poor sods have to beg.

In this regard I refer to the case of Neville Kinnear and his family who own a property west of Keith toward the coast. After seven years of frustration (indeed, negotiations began before the native vegetation clearance regulations were introduced, because they wanted to negotiate a heritage agreement) and since the introduction of the legislation, they have continued to try to resolve the problem confronting them from the impact of the legislation on their lives. Consequently, they have lived like paupers yet now, when agreement has finally been reached that the native vegetation clearance control regulations have destroyed their long-term viability, they are told they must stay there and go on paying \$100 a day in interest.

Is that fair or compassionate? They have less than \$40 a week to live on in their household. That is what they are ordered to do. There is no way that they can get out of it. No-one will buy their place and the Government has told them that they cannot clear any more of their property.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes, it will buy the property, but when? The Government says, 'We don't know. We've got no money.' That is compassion, I want to know what the Government's definition of compassion really is. The same thing has happened to the Parker family in the Northern Mallee—not at Keith, but farther north. That family will leave South Australia as soon as it can get some money, and it will take anything that represents a reasonable offer. The family does not owe anyone any money, so it is not stung by an interest bill. However, the family cannot do anything on the farm that would generate a reasonable income, because the area cleared is so small and the family can clear no more land. Whereas it had contracts for the supply of firewood that could otherwise have been harvested from the land if the land were cleared, the family cannot clear it.

This problem emanates directly from the irresponsibility of the Minister. It has nothing to do with the authority. The authority has made its judgment according to its responsibilities within the framework of the legislation and the Chairman (Mr Stephen Hains) has acted with absolute impeccability. It is the bloody-minded pig-headed Government that refuses to meet their reasonable requests for a payout and acquisition of these properties which the Government has nonetheless agreed to acquire.

I now refer to another stupid decision of the Government which says that it has no money with which to do anything yet displays so much rigidity within the framework of the regulations in determining how money is allocated. Along the Pinnaroo line, three schools agreed to form a cluster for the better education of their year 11 and 12 students. These schools are at Pinnaroo on the eastern end; Geranium on the western end; and Lameroo in the centre. As it has turned out, numbers at all three schools have fallen in recent times as a consequence of the impact of policies that have led to the depopulation of the Mallee area. Notwithstanding that, it is necessary to take year 11 and 12 students from the Geranium Area School to Lameroo to undertake studies where teachers are qualified to provide such studies.

As one of those teachers (part time on contract) came from Geranium, it was possible to take the bus that carried those students from Geranium to Lameroo, leave it there for the day and bring it back at night, leaving it at Mrs Marg Redden's home. She drove the bus and she was a teacher. Staff hours have now been reduced and her contract

position has been knocked off to the extent that it is necessary to drive the bus from Geranium to Lameroo in the morning to get the children to school, and then drive it back to Lameroo so that the person who drives the bus can do their day's work. In the afternoon the bus must be driven to Lameroo to collect the children and return them to Geranium.

The overall cost of doing that happens to be greater than the cost of paying Mrs Redden's salary and allowing her to drive the bus to Lameroo and back to Geranium again in the evening. However, the Education Department says that the money that goes into the bucket for transport cannot be transferred to staff positions. So not only are children denied the professional skill that Mrs Redden would be able to contribute to the teaching staff at Lameroo but also the people concerned suffer the indignity of incurring higher expense in the provision of education to all those children, anyway. How stupid can you be!

The same thing is happening right now with our hospitals in relation to the kind of rationalisation being advocated by the Minister of Health in the name of economies of scale and in the name of the efficient delivery of health care which will have precisely the same effect. If patients are treated in the manner being advocated by the Minister of Health, it could result in each patient costing the taxpayer more, because they will be transferred to the central regional hospital at Murray Bridge from the hospitals where they would otherwise have been treated throughout the Mallee region. That would not occur if they are allowed to remain in their own communities with their relatives. How stupid can you be!

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

**Mr GREGORY (Florey):** I rise to say a few words about what I think is an expressed deficiency of the Liberal Party in Opposition and in Government.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** The member for Mitcham either has had a chance to speak or will do so later. I would appreciate it if he would abide by Standing Orders and wait until he is given the call, or simply keep quiet if he has already had the call. Once again the Liberal Opposition has expressed its attachment to the parliamentary system, it has not changed at all and, what is more, it does not want to see any change even though change is beneficial and would bring Australia up to the same parliamentary standard as applies in Great Britain. I refer to the Commonwealth Government proposal to amend the Constitution. Many proposals have come from the eminent persons examining the Constitution, but I refer particularly to one which I hope Lionel Bowen will recommend to a referendum, that is, to remove the power of the Governor-General to dismiss an elected Government.

The Leader of the Liberal Party in this State and those in other States have opposed this suggestion. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition in this State has said, 'The proposed referendum to reduce the powers of the Queen and the Governor-General are another step towards making Australia a republic.' This power to dismiss an elected Government is not exercised by the Queen in Great Britain. A Queen or King of Great Britain has never exercised that power in that country—Parliament has always been supreme.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** The member for Victoria says, 'Of course they would not.' That is precisely the ossified thinking that we get from Liberals in this country in respect of the supremacy of Parliament. They want to continue to tug the

forelock to someone in another country. They seem to forget that the Queen of Australia is also the Queen of Great Britain. They want to confer powers on her greater than she has in the United Kingdom.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** The farmer from Victoria is always on bended knee. I suppose that if he had watched James Pilger's program on Channel 2 the other night he would have agreed with Sir Robert Menzies' poem. In the days of Sir Robert Menzies I was a young person: I am pleased that I am no longer young, and I am also pleased that Sir Robert Menzies is no longer around, because his policies took away from Australian people the right to be free, and to be proud and say, 'We are Australians.' Members opposite seem to forget that in 1986, 85 years after the birth of this country as a nation, when we confederated the disparate States of Australia, an Act of Westminster allowed only Australia to make laws affecting the Parliaments of Australia. Previously they had to be passed by the United Kingdom, and it took all that time for this change to be made—and it was a Labor Party initiative. If the Liberal Party had been on the ball, it would have introduced this initiative a long time ago. In fact, it was an initiative of Gough Whitlam which was later dropped by Fraser.

I can understand the Liberal Party's wanting these powers to reside in the Governor or the Governor-General, because they have been exercised only to dismiss lawfully elected Labor Governments—once in New South Wales in the 1930s, and again in 1975 to dismiss a Federal Labor Government. The Liberal Party exhibits an attitude which denigrates Australia when it says that Australians cannot elect a Government that can be trusted, that we need to have somebody else around who knows a bit better, and it is better if it is someone from another country. We have seen that attitude exhibited in this House from time to time.

However, we have not seen a better exhibition of that attitude than when the member for Chaffey did not deny an accusation from the Premier with respect to an admission the honourable member made on a morning talk-back radio program when he said that the *Island Seaway* should not have been designed in Australia but should have been purchased off-the-shelf in another country. That attitude denies Australians the right to design and build. We have listened to the baloney from members opposite—

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** The member for Mitcham keeps on talking. He has had his chance, or he will get it soon. That attitude of the Liberal Party is denying Australians the right to do anything in this country, to develop skills to become an independent country and to say with pride, 'I am an Australian. This is an Australian product made by Australians and it is a good product.' For example, I refer to the shipbuilding industry which was operating here when Fraser came to power. I remember when Fraser decided to withdraw the subsidy to build two ships at Whyalla and two in Newcastle.

I am not suggesting that the methods used at that time were the best available in shipbuilding. In fact, one of our brothers who worked in the shipyard at Whyalla had spent 10 years in Sweden and he said that Whyalla was using technology which had been forgotten about in Sweden, and that Sweden was losing the edge of the technology. The subsidy to build four ships for the ANL Line was removed because they could be built more cheaply in Japan: the money was cheaper in Japan and, therefore, they could be built at less cost to the Australian taxpayer. However, four years after that decision those four ships had cost Australia

more than if they had been built here at double the subsidy. Further, the workers employed paid virtually no income tax. However, the decision also meant that people skilled in shipbuilding in this country could not contribute to our economy and the manufacturing industry.

Members opposite are critical of the *Island Seaway*, which was built at Port Adelaide. Do they think that we would have had the submarine contract if Eglo Engineering had not built the *Island Seaway*? Do they think that Eglo would be building four naval survey vessels if it had not built the *Island Seaway*? Members opposite do not understand, and they exhibit a lack of information and knowledge. You have to seed some money to get money back. I would have thought that the member for Victoria, being the great businessman that he is, would understand that you must put out some money to get some back. Once again, it is this business of denigrating anything that is made in Australia.

I believe that the decision taken by our Federal Government will be instrumental in turning around the vehicle building industry so that we will have a viable one in Australia. It is a decision that has also given a rebirth to shipbuilding skills. By the time we finish building these six submarines, and possibly more, the skills that have been developed in electronics, in the systems used to drive the vessels, in the optics used in the periscopes, in the control systems of the weapons and the signalling systems we will have a body of workers in this State with high skills. They may not all be in South Australia, but they will be in Australia.

They have the same skills that will be used in building the frigates. If it was up to the Liberal Party, we would have been buying the submarines from someone elsewhere, just as they ordered the Oberon class and just as they ordered some of the ships that are now arriving in the Australian navy, and we have the spectacle of these ships being tested in a harbour elsewhere in the world when our workers could have built those ships here.

I believe that every time we build a product in this country we give pride to Australian workers. We need to have that pride in ourselves. We need pride in our own products and in our ability to make political decisions on our own behalf. We should be like other major countries in the world where the elected Government governs until it is not elected and not dismissed by some person who is not elected by anyone at all. That is what John Olsen said; he was concerned about reducing the power of the Queen. He wanted to keep more power with the Queen of Australia than she has in the country that she comes from, Great Britain. It is a shame that the Opposition behaves like that and they ought to be condemned.

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

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** I can assure the House that when we have speakers like the member for Florey, one can understand why this State is in such an economic malaise. His economic knowledge of course is absolutely bereft. I might say that I am proud of my British heritage and I am proud that we have the Westminster system of parliamentary democracy in this country. I am glad that we still have our roots with Great Britain, and I hope we will have the Queen of Australia for many years to come. I hope that the Governor-General will have the power to exercise his authority if we have a Government that is as bad as the Whitlam Government was when it was in power. I congratulate the Governor-General on looking after democracy in this country.

However, I am not here tonight to speak about that. I am here to make a few pertinent comments on the perform-

ance of the Treasurer today. I must say that I would not have the temerity or discourtesy to comment on the Premier and Treasurer in any personal way. What I am commenting on is the performance of the Treasurer of South Australia today when he got up in this House to rebut the arguments and speeches by members on this side in the Supply debate over the past 24 hours. The remarks and comments that were presented to the House were factual statements; they set forth the actual financial positions of this State and it was not only a matter of comparing the situation with what happened four or five years ago. It made comparisons with what happened in other States, and that was a useful comparison. Other areas dealt with taxes and charges, there was a good section on land tax and a very good section on the mismanagement of the South Australian economy, as well as a section on debt.

The Treasurer picked out isolated points about what happened in the comparison, how we really should not be comparing a month in 1982 such as February but that it must be done in March, or that it must be done at some other time. Not once did he rebut one of the facts given to him in the speeches from this side of the House or in the documents presented. The Treasurer of this State is overseeing a budget of nearly \$4 000 million and his performance today showed that he really has not the first clue about economic management of this State.

It is starting to show in our economic performance. It does not matter how he says that we are really not as bad as New South Wales and that we are just a little better than Tasmania—this State is in a mess and it is in a mess because of the mismanagement of the Treasurer and the Ministers in his Government. It is that mismanagement of those Ministers that is costing this State millions of dollars because they have not the ability to manage the portfolios with which they are entrusted. Let us examine the deficit for a start.

The Treasurer said that we have a deficit of only \$14 million, and he has claimed that time and time again. That is not correct. We have a cash deficit of \$14 million but, in fact, we have had to borrow an extra \$340 million in this State in the past 12 months to prop up our budget, so our total deficit for the year, including capital costs, is some \$350 million.

It is interesting to see what the Loan Council said in talking about the deficit. The Loan Council last year placed severe restrictions on new State Government borrowings. The last Auditor-General's Report outlined how Mr Bannon's Government circumvented those instructions by using SGIC as a vehicle to borrow \$85 million over and above the Loan Council guidelines. By doing that and by increasing the debt, we now have a debt in South Australia of \$4 000 million, and it is rising.

There must be a reason for that, a reason why South Australia keeps getting further into debt. I believe it is because we do not have the people of the calibre who know enough about economic and fiscal management. What happens in portfolios of course is that the Premier and Treasurer says that we have to have cuts, and each Minister says, 'Why don't we have a 10 per cent cut in a certain portfolio?' We on this side were berated this afternoon by the Treasurer for saying that we continually want more nurses in hospitals and so he asks how he can cut his budget when we carry on like that.

The problem is that the Government has not got the ability not to cut at the point of service and instead cut at the bureaucracy at the top. This is what happens every time if Ministers are not in control of their portfolios. If they go to their departmental heads every morning and say, 'Excuse

me, what can I do today as Minister?', of course they will tell you, but they will protect all the jobs of the fat cats at the top, but they will soon cut 10 per cent off the budget. They will cut it down at the point of service delivery, which is what is happening in health, the Police Force, and one can go on and on.

A damaging document has been released from the portfolio of the Minister of Housing which tells us how the Housing Trust is going to cut maintenance on trust houses. We will have another bureaucracy built up on top that will work out how to cut down further at the point of service delivery. That happens when we have people who have not the ability or the economic training to say to their departmental heads, 'This is where you have to cut, and the cuts have to start at the top.' If Ministers can get sufficient cuts at the top, there is no need to decrease the service, but it happens over and over again.

When we come to the mismanagement of the South Australian economy there are a couple of very blatant areas that I should highlight. Unfortunately, the two worst ones are from the one Minister, the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Forests. First, referring to SATCO, the House will remember that the South Australian Timber Corporation purchased Wincorp, a New Zealand entity. In the heads of agreement of which I have a copy, it clearly states that the balance sheets of both companies shall be audited at September 1985 and that that will be the basis of the agreement. The South Australian Timber Corporation paid \$13 million for Wincorp, it has now total debts in the South Australian Timber Corporation of \$37 million, most of which has been borrowed from SAFA.

It went on to purchase this entity without having the balance sheets audited. That is a travesty when taxpayers' money is involved. Fancy not having the balance sheets audited when you make a purchase. This illustrates that the Government has no business experience whatsoever. What happened? For 18 months the Auditor-General kept bringing this to the notice of the Minister and all of a sudden there was a scatter, three quick inquiries and reports which stated, 'You made a terrible mistake. You forgot to make sure the balance sheets were audited and it has cost the State \$13 million of taxpayers' money.' Now legal action is taking place, 18 months after the event. How can Ministers run their portfolios like that?

Let us look at the *Island Seaway* situation. It took the fast track and it was designed and built as it went. During the Estimates Committees we asked to have the overruns presented to us, but I received them some two months later. Of course, it went over budget by about \$6 million. Let us look at some of the things that went over budget—a payment to Eglo for losses arising from the delay in the issue of the final drawings. The Department of Marine and Harbors could not even get the drawings, which the member for Florey said you could not buy from another nation, to Eglo on time—and remember that Eglo had been given the contract without tendering. A penalty of some \$380 000 was incurred for that mistake. The total overruns to 22 September were some \$3 million of taxpayers' money. We can go on and on.

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

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** In this grievance debate I will briefly address the performance of the Premier in this House today. From his performance he is a mere shadow of himself. He has been told to stay in the background for so long that he is having trouble identifying who he is and where he is.

*Ms Lenehan interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The member for Mawson interjects and says that he has a 77 per cent popularity rating. I was going to make a brief contribution but it may be longer. Having stayed in the background for so long he is incapable of performing in the way he was once capable of. We know that his minders say, 'Stay out of the limelight. On all the hard issues don't you get up front.' I noticed that two or three times last year he transgressed. For instance, he strongly supported the marijuana changes and I wondered why he had not been left in the background. Perhaps he figured that he would get the youth vote.

In the past two weeks questions addressed to the Premier have continually been passed down the line. The only questions he has answered are ones that directly affect his portfolio and ones relating to superannuation. There is a good reason for shifting the others down the line—because he does not want and has never wanted to be associated with the performance of the Government. Last night we discussed what the Premier in his speech was going to say and, believe it or not, he fell within our predictions. We said that he would start off by talking about submarines and Grand Prix. What happened—he talked about them. In relation to submarines—

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** He was going to talk about the Leader's false figures.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** He was going to talk about the Leader's false figures, and he had great difficulty.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** There were no false figures.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** There were no false figures, as my colleague suggests. I will tackle the submarine and Grand Prix issues because it reflects the difficulty that the State finds itself in. If the Premier is going to depend on submarines and Grand Prix to get the State right, then we have a great difficulty on our hands. Everybody knows that most of the initiatives to get the Grand Prix were started during the Liberal era and taken up very effectively by the Premier. What has happened since then? If this event had been held in America they would be making \$10 million or \$20 million instead of still taking money out of the public purse. When taxpayers are paying for the Grand Prix it is not a success. The Premier talks about \$40 million being injected into the economy, and I say, 'Hear, hear!', but that should not occur at the expense of taxpayers. The State should be benefiting because we should be making a profit. It is mismanagement if the people in charge of the Grand Prix cannot run it at a profit after three years.

Let us talk about submarines. Let us be clear that this Party has been strongly supportive of the Government's efforts to get the contract here. We wanted more of the contract to be awarded here. Statements have been made that we will construct the shell and be involved in some of the electronics and guidance systems, but we believe that South Australia has a greater capacity and that more could have come to this State. So that we do not get into an argument about what is fair and not fair, let us say that the Premier has done well and that we have got our fair share.

Previously I have made statements to this House and said, 'This is a great opportunity for South Australia to show what it can do. If we got 20 per cent let us do that 20 per cent well. Let us show the rest of Australia and the rest of the world that this State can really perform.' However, I said if we did it badly then we would be viewed accordingly. Already before the contract is under way we have this demarcation dispute. Mr Owens wants a slice of the action. The painters and dockers—and I do not know the Secretary of that union now—

**Mr Peterson:** The concrete boots brigade.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The concrete boots brigade wants part of the action to ensure that it can slow the project down and get as much money out of it as possible. Of course, Mr Carslake has also indicated that he would like to be involved. We know that on the record of this State that if any of these unions become involved in that project it might as well not start. Because the Government has got into bed with these scurrilous unions and allowed them to run riot in this State there is the distinct prospect that the Premier will say, 'Make a deal. For goodness sake don't disrupt things before the next election. We will worry about the ramifications after that.'

There is a distinct possibility that the Premier, through the Minister of Labour, will say to the metal unions and others with a prior right to build the submarines, 'How about letting these people in because otherwise we will have industrial disruption.' I believe we have to sort it out now. I do not believe that we will get what we want if we allow these unions on site.

Due to the continual efforts of the Premier to distance himself from hard decisions and to bring the unions—and I mean hard edged unions—in this State under control, it is an absolute disgrace. There is the submarine and the Grand Prix—successes but failures in ways that distress me. I take up points made by the Premier. He actually addressed one or two items in his speech. He said that the Liberal Opposition has been unfair and that we are going through difficult times. That was the first time he actually admitted that his leadership was not very good. He quoted the State's gross domestic product. I do not know where he got the figure for that because when I tried to get information out of the Australian Bureau of Statistics I was informed that that information had only been produced since 1985-86. The Premier has cooked his books again. That was one of the arguments—that the State GDP had performed a little better than the general indications.

But we do not know where he got his figures, because those figures do not exist. He talked yesterday about electricity, and said that we have had a 16 per cent real reduction, but today he admitted that it has been a 55 per cent escalation. Obviously, he has admitted that he has misled the Parliament.

He talked about increases in State taxes and he said, 'We are doing pretty well in South Australia. We went up from \$433 to \$679 per head taxation during our period of Government. Of course, the national average has gone up from \$586 to \$820.' I say to any member who has any mathematical knowledge at all that, if you compare the increases, you will find that the gap is closing, and that the escalation in South Australia is far greater than the rest of Australia on average. But the Premier is saying, 'We are not that badly off.' The gap is closing with the inability to have the resources that come from many of the mining sectors and other royalty areas. We do not want that gap closed: we want it widened, because this State, for a variety of reasons, has not the capacity to pay those sorts of increases.

He spent some time fiddling around with inflation. He probably did not really understand what he was saying. I agree that inflation is a very variable thing. Sometimes it goes up, and sometimes it goes down. What he should have said is that it was good that the Liberals are honest enough to include the figures there because it was part of the 13 indicators. We know that some of those indicators will change and some—very few, I might add—actually show that this State is doing better, but the overall trend has been set in concrete.

On bankruptcies, he said, 'We are not too bad. We have only set record levels, but we are not too bad.' That was

our Premier. He has spent so much time in the dark and so much time in the shadows protected by his minions that he is incapable of understanding the problems facing this State, and it is about time this State replaced its Premier.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** Tonight I would like to expose the Government's hypocrisy and political expediency in relation to South Australia's coastal waters and the coasts of this State, in particular, the metropolitan foreshore. Last night we had an example of *ad hoc* decision making and political expediency at its worst when the hapless member for Bright, who faces certain defeat at the next election, was permitted by his colleagues to make an announcement in, one might say, the jaws of defeat at the angry hands of thousands of his constituents, who were outraged at the proposal before the Government for a housing development and marina at Kingston Bay and Marino.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Yes, I was at the meeting when the member for Bright made his announcement. I heard prior to the announcement much disturbed conversation and comment about the manner in which the Government and the member for Bright had handled this issue. There is no denying that the meeting warmly welcomed the Government's decision not to make Crown land available for the purpose of marina development. That is a decision which I believe everyone in South Australia who is concerned about our metropolitan foreshore and about the environment of our coastal region would welcome. I certainly welcome it.

What needs to be exposed is the Government's hypocrisy in making that decision and the manner in which it led developers down the garden path, not for the first or second time but many times over, to the point where developers in this State and beyond have lost confidence in the capacity of the Bannon Government to make up its mind about anything. Tonight, the Minister for Environment and Planning had the hide to go on national television and urge developers to keep on putting up proposals—not to be discouraged, in other words, by what has happened to so many developments in South Australia which have been enticed and encouraged by the Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I have made my position on this abundantly clear. I said that Crown land at Kingston should never have been sold. However, how can the Deputy Premier come to developers and say, 'Come on, keep coming up with the proposals; we welcome them. We will give you a fair deal', when he knows full well that, as recently as December last year, his department sent a letter to the developers (Kingston Bay Pty Ltd) in which his departmental officers confirmed the purchase price of the land which the Government was prepared to sell; confirmed the price for the payment of compensation which the Government was requesting for the transfer of Crown land; and addressed a series of other issues which the Government had agreed upon with the developers prior to the sale of that land? In the light of such a letter, the developers wrote to the Government in the following terms:

Accordingly, agreement on the sale and purchase of the land has been reached.

This letter is signed by S.W. Henry and is addressed to the Director-General of the Department of Environment and Planning. It is on the letterhead of Mellor, Gardner Beaumont and Page, barristers and solicitors. I repeat that the lawyers acting for Kingston Bay Pty Ltd believed that agreement on the sale and purchase of the land had been reached.

Similarly, the proponents of the Jubilee Point project had every reason to believe that the Government was with them in their efforts to establish a marina and housing development at Glenelg.

On each occasion, the Government clearly indicated that it would give the developers every assistance and in fact departmental officers had indicated on this occasion that they believed that Kingston Park was the only location on that stretch of coast which was appropriate for a marina. We could look at the merits of the case and acknowledge that in this particular instance it would have been a quite undue intrusion into the amenity of the area, and it also would have been, on the limited material available, an environmentally unsound intrusion as well. That is not the point at issue. The point at issue is the Government's attitude to development until it gets too politically hot to handle.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** They strung them along.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** They strung the developers along. Then they pulled the rug out from underneath them at virtually the eleventh hour for the sake of political expediency. That kind of attitude is absolutely untenable. At last night's meeting, the Chairman, Mr Robin Smith, said:

If the sale of this Crown land is approved by the Bannan Government, it will not only deprive South Australians of unrestricted access to one of the most attractive beauty spots on our metropolitan coast; it will set a dangerous precedent for the commercialisation of other sections of the foreshore.

Yet, that is precisely what the Government had in mind, and the Opposition has documented evidence to prove it. The point was made that, unlike our parklands and national parks, our beaches have no special laws to protect them from entrepreneurial governments and private developers.

Despite the Government's *ad hoc* decision in relation to the Marino project, there is still no policy. This Government is absolutely devoid of any policy in relation to the metropolitan foreshore or to the protection of our coast. The fact is that South Australia's coastal waters, because of the existence of the three peninsulas, are unique in Australia for their scenic qualities and for the sailing opportunities which they afford. In this State, there are 43 000 registered boats, excluding pure sail boats—and I believe that figure would be possibly in excess of 45 000 by now, because that figure is three years old—and it includes 500 houseboats on the Murray River and a small but significant and growing number of charter boats for tourism purposes. That is from the recreational boating point of view.

From an environmental, geological and geographical point of view, the South Australian coast is unique in many respects. The east coast of the Gulf of St Vincent, from Port Wakefield down as far as the Murray Mouth and indeed beyond to the Coorong, is unique in its geological forms and in fact attracts scholars and geologists from all over the world, because it represents in microcosm almost all the forms of coastal land form that can be found anywhere.

It includes, of course, the international geological monument at Hallett Cove. In short, our coastline is unique. It has not received the attention that it deserves, either from the community in general or governments in particular, and it has certainly not benefited from the conservation measures which it merits in terms of its unique nature. As one goes further south down the Fleurieu Peninsula, the dune formations, cliffs and escarpments are superb in a scenic sense and unusual and unique in an environmental sense yet, despite more than 20 years in government, this Government has developed no firm policy in relation to our coastal waters.

At the same time, the Liberal Party, prior to the 1975 election, presented a highly detailed policy in regard to recreational boating, and undertook to establish a 10 year boating facility development plan to be implemented in two five year phases. The goal of the plan was to establish South Australia as a prime recreational boating location for our own community and for interstate and international visitors. We determined our priorities in consultation with the boating industry and the other relevant organisations in the development of this policy.

We undertook to commence the boating facility development plan with a review of all previous and present Government policies on recreational boating. This Government has had three years with an excellent policy in front of it—because it had none of its own—and it has done nothing. All it has done is establish a Marina Assessment Advisory Committee.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** Quite rightly, my colleagues have referred to the deplorable action of the Premier last evening in criticising the Opposition, more particularly criticising the information which has been put into place by the honourable Leader, and the Leader very quickly asked the Premier to indicate where the figures were wrong. The Premier last evening said:

I will address some of the material that was put in by the Leader of the Opposition: figures and facts that are misleading and, in some cases, downright dishonest.

He was going to provide the proof this afternoon. What happened? It was a real powder puff effort with no retraction of any of the figures that were put in the document circulated yesterday by the Leader and used by the Leader in the debate yesterday. We have a situation where the Premier sought, as late as this afternoon, to use the figures for one month against the average of the figure for five years to try to prop up his action. He also attacked other members, claiming that they were constantly clamouring for additional services, that is, the expenditure of funds. He went on in his—

*Ms Lenehan interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am glad that the honourable member said that. He accused the member for Light of asking for additional expenditure. What he did not say was that the member for Light requested the Government, as do many other members when they stand on this side, to get its priorities right. Instead of putting \$37 million down the gurgler with the timber activity, it is required to put that money into productive effort, not into pie-in-the-sky activities.

The member for Light last evening prefaced the remarks—and it is on the record to be seen—by saying that it was necessary to redirect the priorities to the advantage of the workers of this State who happen to be in the employ of the Government. That would be responsible action, particularly for a Government which has been instrumental in bringing into existence the health, safety and welfare requirements, although the Government itself is not prepared to provide that backup and those improved circumstances for its own membership.

I want to take the balance of time that I have to talk of one or two of the things in the community which are causing me concern. The member for Victoria was speaking relative to the delivery of service in the medical field, and one would have to ask, 'What service?' It would appear that service to the community or to the patient in other than emergency circumstances is very suspect. That is no reflection

tion upon the medical team or the nurses: it is a reflection upon the system under which they have to work.

Members opposite should go to the Blyth District Hospital and ask the people who have worked for years to maintain that facility in their midst what they think of having been offered four emergency beds to operate between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Members should go into other areas. I mentioned on the very first day of this parliamentary session on 6 August—and it is there on the *Hansard* record at pages 37 to 38—the problem of a person, dying with cancer, who was sent home to Gawler in the back of a small vehicle, and collapsed in the back of that vehicle. It took three people to get him out of the vehicle, and 10 days later he was unfortunately not with us.

It is quite probable that he would have died in that period of time anyway, but it certainly did not dignify his passing and the fact that he was refused a proper return to the Gawler hospital by ambulance, having been brought down to the Royal Adelaide by ambulance, did not help. What about the situation of another lady? She is 78 years of age, dying of cancer of the liver; in the Lyell McEwin Hospital for diagnostic purposes for just over two weeks; deteriorating in health but told that she could return to the Hutchinson Hospital, Gawler—and this but two weeks ago—to be close to her friends and relatives.

She was told she could go by ambulance but would have to wait until an ambulance called at the Lyell McEwin Hospital from the Gawler area delivering a patient, and then they would back-load her to the Hutchinson Hospital, Gawler—a distance of some 12 miles. Quite unbeknown to the rest of her family—because no-one bothered to let the family know that she was still there waiting—the lady was eventually transferred from the Lyell McEwin Hospital to the Hutchinson Hospital, Gawler, sitting up in the front seat of a taxi, with no medical support or help, having deteriorated quite rapidly during the two weeks that she had been in hospital, and that poor lady—a person whom I held very dear—passed on within six days.

**Ms Lenehan:** Are you taking that up with the Minister?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am glad that the honourable member asked that. Is it worthwhile taking it up with the Minister when the Minister stands up in another place and ridicules the member for Light for having the temerity to raise the subject? Where is the delivery of service to the public in the health field? Members opposite should go and tell the people who are on the waiting lists that they are getting a delivery of service from this combined Federal and State Government.

The other matter that I wish to mention briefly impacts on many communities and, unfortunately, on most aged people in those communities. I refer to the fact that emergency houses have been allocated in Housing Trust areas in the middle of existing stable tenancies where people have lived for up to 35 years. At Salisbury North, a 17-year-old boy has been given an emergency house. His father lives in a house at Brompton. At the emergency premises, the 17-year-old has taken in a 19-year-old male, and two 13-year-old girls are there for most if not all of the night.

These people have had the police called to them regularly day by day. Living opposite the premises is an 80-year-old woman dying of cancer. Only yesterday a family that had lived in a home adjacent to this property for the past 29 years was moved out by the Housing Trust because it could be seen that that family's welfare would be affected by the pressures of the activities of the residents of the emergency house as well as the activities of two large Alsatian dogs, one of which had seriously harassed a neighbouring 5-year-old child. The police had been called in two or three times

a day, yet the 17-year-old boy is still in possession of the emergency house.

Admittedly, the boy needs housing as do many other people, but not at the expense of the dignity and well-being of the people who have resided in the area for many years. This is an area of activity that is causing concern to many people in the community and I raise it on behalf of those people living adjacent to the emergency house to which I have referred. They cannot sleep because of the noise emanating from the property, which flares up again three minutes after the police have left.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Premier indicated that the 8.5 per cent increase was higher than the norm of recent times. Can the Premier say how that figure was fixed? An increase of 1 per cent represents a sizeable sum in the overall expenditure.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The starting point is the outlay over the previous six months. Then we try to predict a margin to supply the needs that may arise during the coming period. I do not pretend that this method is enormously scientific. Indeed, it must always be an approximation. Obviously, the figure provided must be adequate because members would not appreciate being summoned back prematurely. The honourable member should not place too much significance on this figure. The amount of supply, which is a rounded figure, is based on what has already been paid and what we believe will be the outcome with a margin for the next six months.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The figure is greater than the publicly nominated inflation rate for the Australian scene. Has the Premier information available as recently as last Friday that would suggest that the inflation figure of 6.5 per cent to 6.8 per cent for 1988 will be held or is there an anticipated increase or decrease?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** At present, the Commonwealth Government is fairly confident that the Treasury estimates will hold, although in some areas we may do better. For instance, the general growth figure may be higher than predicted. It is on target despite the share market fallout. The effects of that have not been apparent, but we are now starting to feel some of the effects.

For instance, the switch from stocks and shares into property has created considerable activity in the property market throughout Australia, including South Australia. That is one facet of the reaction to the share market downturn which in a sense has not been unwelcome because it has enabled fairly sluggish property values to get on the move again. However, the inflation figure is very much on target and the figures given us at EPAC show that that figure could be achieved. Indeed, we should see a further lowering of inflation over the next 12 months.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: KINGSTON PARK MARINA

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Earlier this evening, I believed myself to have been misrepresented by the member for Bragg when

the honourable member referred to a radio interview on the subject of the Kingston Park marina which was played on Adelaide radio this morning. I have not been able to obtain a direct transcript of the conversation, but I was asked whether the fact that Bright was a marginal seat had played a part in the Government's decision. My answer was that, although Bright was most certainly a marginal seat and although the Government obviously listened to its marginal members, it was neither a fair nor reasonable conclusion to draw. I said that the decision was a policy decision intended to resolve a problem that had been foisted on the Government and a decision intended to avoid similar land use conflicts along the South Australian coastline in future. I cannot say how my comments were edited but, if the impression created bore any relationship to the comments allegedly heard by the member for Bragg, I can only suggest that the editing was very selective.

### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour):** I move:

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

Motion carried.

### SUPERANNUATION BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 17 February. Page 2840.)

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I understand that the legislation will come into operation on 1 July. Is that still the position?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Interpretation.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 3, lines 6 and 7—Leave out subparagraph (iv) and substitute:

- (iv) employed by a Minister (except a press secretary, research assistant or personal assistant);
- (iva) employed by the Chief Executive Officer of a Public Service Administrative Unit on a weekly, daily or hourly basis.

I think the amendment is fairly obvious. There is some concern about ministerial appointees, either Labor or Liberal depending on the Government in power. There are normally salary loadings for those people who, in many respects, are in short term employment. These people are often employed because of their skills. Sometimes they are drawn from the Public Service, and this amendment would not stop them from continuing in the scheme if they are already participating. However, if they are not already in the scheme it would be inappropriate for them to participate, on the basis of the loadings and benefits they receive. That is the position that has been laid down. We do not believe it is appropriate to make these benefits available to those people.

Given that this is a package, I point out that there are powers under the legislation to allow the Minister to add contributory points to individuals that they believe are of merit. We do not want that merit to flow to people who are ministerial appointees, although there may be people in other areas who deserve them.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I reject the amendment. While taking the point made by the honourable member, I point out that it will be taken care of in a later amendment.

Amendment negated.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I move:

Page 3, line 19—Leave out 'Minister of the Crown' and insert 'authority, body or person'.

Unfortunately, Parliament has been overlooked. It has been brought to my attention that it is necessary to specify exactly who employs the employees of Parliament. In fact, they are employed by the Speaker in this place and the President in another place. It was a technical error when I was drafting the Bill and absolutely no offence was meant to the Speaker or the President.

Amendment carried.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** This is the interpretation clause in which definitions are set out. I have some concerns about the definition of 'employee', because it is somewhat different from the definition suggested by the Agars committee. Item 12 of the committee's report recommends that those eligible for immediate membership should include all full-time permanent employees; all part-time employees who work at least 40 per cent of the hours of a comparable employee and not less than 15 hours per week; all full-time temporary employees where the contract of employment is for a minimum of 12 months; and all part-time temporary employees where the contract of employment is for a minimum of 12 months or at least 40 per cent of the hours of a comparable full-time employee and not less than 15 hours per week.

The report then goes on to talk about the Further Education Act and the Children's Services Act. There are very good reasons why those exclusions were mentioned by the Agars committee. The Agars committee said three things, the first being that as many people as possible who are eligible should be allowed to participate in the scheme, particularly those who are employed on a permanent full-time or part-time basis. It also said that those people working on a casual basis and those people who are uncertain about their tenure should be subjected to a 12 month rule. While I do not think it is appropriate to go through the exercise of amending the entire Bill along these lines, I ask the Minister why these recommendations were not adhered to so that the definition is kept tight enough and we avoid administrative difficulties in relation to people who are in the Public Service one minute and out the next. The future of those people is quite uncertain.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** We disagreed with the Agars committee. We thought that it was unduly restrictive, if not discriminatory. In relation to casuals, it is necessary to allow 12 months to obtain a picture of their earnings. We believe that everyone else who works for the Public Service should be entitled to join the fund. We believe that the concept of 40 per cent is very old fashioned. Frankly, the Government simply disagreed.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I refer to the definition of 'eligible child' as follows:

... in relation to a deceased contributor means a child—  
(a) who is—

- (i) a child of the contributor;
- or
- (ii) a child in relation to whom the contributor had assumed parental responsibilities and who was cared for and maintained, wholly or in part, by the contributor up to the date of the contributor's death;

Who will make the determination?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The board.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** It seems to me that further on in the Bill we find one of the most important interpretations, that is, 'extrapolated contribution points', and I refer to clause 24 (4).

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! We are taking the clauses *seriatim*. The honourable member must confine his questions



to this clause. If he has a query about something that occurs later, he can pick it up when we reach it.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** And then return to clause 4?

**The CHAIRMAN:** No, the honourable member can only come back to this clause if he wishes to recommit.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Extrapolated contribution points are a large part of working out superannuation. Does the Minister think that 'extrapolated contribution points' should have been defined in the interpretation clause, which explains everything else very well and very clearly?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am advised by people who have assisted me in drafting this Bill that the arrangements have been made and that the positioning of the definitions and what occurs later is totally appropriate.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The Opposition is not satisfied with the definition of 'invalidity', but there are subsequent clauses where the Government's intention is made clearer. The Government should have made the invalidity provision clearer because this is the start of the legislation; it sets the scene for the legislation. It is a very loose definition and can encompass anyone who claims he is not capable of working anymore. A new set of words should have been chosen, but I will leave it for the Minister to think about during the passage of the Bill between this place and another place.

Another area of concern is the definition of 'spouse' including 'putative spouse'. The Minister will remember that in the 1983 amendment it specified that a person had to be married, and that the marriage could have been in one of two forms: a person who was married throughout the period of receipt of the pension or a person who was married for five years after the person had left the service and was in receipt of a pension. This definition brings in a putative spouse. The Opposition is not going to deny the right of people who have a legitimate living arrangement which is now recognised under many of the statutes in this country, but it does cause conflict in the case of eligibility between the old scheme and the new scheme. Rules under the old scheme were tight.

Under the new scheme, because of the lump sum arrangement, they will be less tight. This new situation applies to the old scheme equally, which means that putative spouses who were previously excluded are now included in the old scheme, and I would like the Minister to explain the situation. It was not competent for the Opposition to put in two definitions of 'putative spouse', but I believe it was important that the Government maintained what was declared in 1983. My next question relates to the definition of 'salary'. Does paragraph (c) exclude penalty rates?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The answer to the last question is 'Yes'. It does exclude penalty rates. As to the question of *de facto* spouses, I am advised that, in effect, this provision will work exactly the same as under the old scheme, although the words are different. There will be no difference. As to the first point, I cannot remember what it is, but I can remember my answer: if the honourable member thought it was so important, why did he not move an amendment?

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I refer to the definition of 'employee'. Can the Minister give an example of how an employee can mean an employer?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am not sure that the member for Victoria is reading it correctly. Line 43 refers to 'employed by—' and then lists several employers. The Bill permits the fund to make an arrangement with another group of employees who want to have their superannuation administered by this scheme. I refer to the Parliamentary

Superannuation Fund or perhaps an approach from SGIC or the like if they want us to do this job for them.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Functions of the Board.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** In the second reading debate I indicated that I would be asking a number of questions as a result of the recommendations of the Agars committee. Recommendation No. 3 suggested that the Government establish a data base detailing the extent of superannuation coverage in the public sector. Recommendation No. 48 suggested that the enhancement of the South Australian Superannuation Board's computer system proceed as quickly as possible. Recommendation No. 55 recommends that the Government establish a superannuation policy and management unit which shall be independent from the Public Actuary's Office and Treasury and be located in the Department of Premier and Cabinet. Obviously there is a change of roles here. Can the Minister comment on those three recommendations?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I have accepted them, and they are in the process of being established.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—'The Board's membership.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 5, after line 28—Insert subclause as follows:

(1a) A person is not eligible for appointment as a member of the board unless that person has appropriate professional qualifications and experience conforming with the requirements of the regulations.

These words reflect our wish that we should not have anyone on the board merely for the sake of being there and that we should have people who are skilled and competent in the area of superannuation management. I will go on later about what the composition of the trust should be. It is important at every stage where we have statutory authorities and boards established that we get the best expertise available and that we do not salt them with people who have allegiance to Governments, whether they be Liberal or Labor. This Chamber has been advised on a number of occasions of where we think inappropriate people have been appointed to boards and commissions.

If persons are to be appointed, if they have that expertise, I do not think that the Liberal Opposition will get too concerned about their affiliations. However, we have seen on a number of occasions in the past that that has not been the case. We have seen these boards become a resting place for former politicians and people affiliated with the Australian Labor Party. We do not believe that that is appropriate. The best expertise should be available.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I oppose the amendment; it is totally unnecessary. Anyone appointed to a board has an obligation to act in accordance with the Act and we have no fears about anyone who will be appointed to the board.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I do not accept that, but obviously it is not an issue over which we will divide. It may well be an issue that is decided in another place. Certainly, if we are going to have statutory authorities, boards, commissions or whatever, they should have a prerequisite in their rules that should require that the people who serve on those boards are appropriate, that they are not a means of giving someone a handout in retirement or as a favour. We believe that the amendment is competent and while we will not insist on it by division we will certainly insist on it by the voices.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—'The trust's membership.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 7, lines 4 to 6—Leave out paragraph (b) and insert:

(b) one member elected by the contributors;

(ba) one member appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the South Australian Government Superannuation Federation.

I will only move my first amendment on file as the others are consequential on the first one passing. I do not believe that the UTLC should be represented on the trust which has some half a billion dollars at its disposal. I go back to my remarks that I made previously about the competence, and the incompetence, if you like, of certain appointees from the trade union movement who are placed on boards simply to satisfy the demands of the trade union movement. It comes as no surprise that the Opposition strongly opposes the representation of the UTLC on the trust.

I bring to the attention of the House recommendation No. 57 of the Agars committee. I ask the Minister why he departed from it. It states:

The committee recommends the following membership of the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust:

- An independent Chairman appointed by the Governor for a fixed term but not being the Public Actuary, Chairman of the South Australian Superannuation Board or Chief Executive of Sasfit.
- Three representatives appointed by the Governor from a list of nominees put forward by contributor and pensioner groups.

Indeed, we have provided for that proposition. Instead of 'three' we are suggesting 'one' and one from the South Australian Government Superannuation Federation. The recommendation continues:

- Three persons with appropriate skills and expertise appointed by the Governor on the Treasurer's recommendation.

I know that the Minister praised the Agars committee for its fine performance in putting forward this document. We strongly oppose the inclusion of the UTLC as a listed member. It may be that a member of the Public Service Association is appointed to the trust as a matter of merit, because there is a great deal of scope in the guidelines for such a person to be appointed. The Minister has two nominations and he might deem it desirable that one of those persons, despite our opposition, shall be a representative of the PSA or, indeed, the UTLC. We have opposed these propositions in the past and do not believe that they should be placed in legislation in this State. They will be removed from all legislation when a Liberal Government comes to power. We believe that the current provisions should be opposed and replaced with the amendments that we have put forward.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I oppose the amendment. As the member for Mitcham said, I have heaped praise on the Agars committee and its subsequent report, and I am happy to do so again this evening. That does not mean that the Government agrees with every word of it. I am quite sure that the Opposition does not agree with every word of it either, and there is nothing peculiar about that. We do not believe that what the member for Mitcham is proposing is appropriate. We have no difficulty with suggesting that people from the UTLC be involved as trustees of the superannuation trust. I think that, almost without exception, the people paying superannuation will be affiliated to the UTLC. It seems to me to be perfectly appropriate that it be involved. In relation to elections, this House is a living witness to the view that elections do not necessarily bring forward the most qualified people. I want to appoint qualified people to this trust, and I feel that with the advice that is available to me and with my knowledge of the people and their capabilities. I am happy to trust my judgment in this area. So, we have just a very plain disagreement with the member for Mitcham and we will reject his amendment.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** While the Minister may be willing to trust his judgment, I would certainly be the last person to trust his judgment, given his performance since he has become Minister. It is a matter of principle and we will be dividing on the issue.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I do not want this Committee to deteriorate. I remind members that they must not reflect on other members.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (15)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker (teller), and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Gunn, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, and Wotton.

Noes (25)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Blevins (teller), Crafter, De Laine, Dui-gan, M.J. Evans, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, Slater, Trainer, and Tyler.

Pairs—Aye—Mr Becker. No—Mr Mayes.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Clause 14 passed.

Clause 15—'Staff of the Trust.'

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Committee will come to order, please. Would those members who do not wish to participate in the Committee discussion sit down until they receive the call. Would the honourable member for Eyre either move out of the Chamber or take a seat. Would the honourable Leader take a seat, please.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** What is envisaged with the staff of the trust? There are other provisions within the Bill for assistants and I note that the Minister said he was going to have a special unit set up within his department to deal with superannuation policy, which was an answer to a previous question. Can the Minister tell me what staff will be employed by the trust?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** This relates to the staff of the trust—special advisers, accountants, whatever. It has nothing to do with what I mentioned previously, the Superannuation Policy Management Unit.

Clause passed.

Clause 16 passed.

Clause 17—'The Fund.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 8, after line 29—Insert subclause as follows:

(7) The valuation must be made by a person with appropriate professional qualifications and experience conforming with the requirements of the regulation.

My reason for moving this amendment is obvious. It is really a matter of tidying up the Act to ensure that the person doing the valuation is the appropriate person to do so. I would have thought that it was the job of the Public Actuary to do this. It may well be the job of a qualified auditor or a qualified actuary, but we should have—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the Committee to come to order. The Chair is being fairly tolerant, but it is very hard to hear the member who is speaking. I want this Committee to be run in a right and proper way. The honourable member for Mitcham.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I originally intended to move that it be done by a qualified actuary, but there may be other people who have similar expertise, so I wish to ensure that the fund is indeed valued, and each division is valued, by a person competent to do so.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I reject the amendment, as it is unnecessary. Clause 17 (6) provides quite clearly:

A valuation of each division of the Fund (including the investments in which it is invested) will be made as at the end of each financial year.

Further on in the Bill, for example in clause 20 (3), it is stated:

The Auditor-General may at any time, and must at least once in each year, audit the accounts of the fund.

I am not quite sure what higher authority we can have than the Auditor-General auditing the accounts of the fund. I appreciate the point the honourable member is making, but I feel it is more than covered.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** There is quite a distinction between clause 20, which requires the Auditor-General to oversee what is actually going on in the fund, and my amendment, which provides that it cannot be any Tom, Dick or Harry (or Harriette) that undertakes the valuation of the fund; it has to be undertaken by a person who is competent to do so. I imagine it would be a person coming in from outside, whether it be a person from the public or private arena, who shall have the responsibility of coming up with what are the funds and what is their valuation. It is very important, because we are not just dealing—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Would the honourable member for Alexandra take a seat, please.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** It is important, because we are not just dealing with Treasury notes and bonds here. We are talking about assets that have variable valuations. Indeed, I will be asking the Minister shortly what is his valuation on ASER. It is important that we have qualified people to do it, not just anyone who is not qualified to do it. The auditor can look at the competence of those accounts. He may well have to bring in a valuer if he or she does not believe that the accounts are being competently valued or that the assets have not been properly valued. The Opposition does insist on this amendment. It is a competent amendment. It attempts to ensure that the valuation of the fund and everything that goes into it—whether it be cash in the bank, shopping centres on the ground (of which the fund has a number) investment in ASER or investment in shares—is undertaken properly and adequately by the most competent individuals available. The Opposition believes that it is a very important amendment and asks the Minister to reconsider his position.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Before the auditor will certify that the accounts of the trust are correct, he has to be satisfied that the assets are valued in a proper manner. So, the auditor, if he or she has any doubts whatsoever about the quality of the valuation that has been done, obviously cannot certify that everything is okay. So, implicit in having the Auditor-General audit the fund is that the Auditor-General has to be satisfied that the valuations or methods of valuation are correct.

Amendment negatived.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** The fund was closed in 1986. What has happened to those people who wanted to join the fund after that time? Have they been allowed to join the old fund?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Whilst the fund was closed, we did allow new people to join the old fund on the basis that, when the new fund was established, they would be transferred. They did have the protection of superannuation under the old scheme, albeit not on an ongoing basis for obvious reasons, or we would not have been changing the old scheme.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** The people who joined the old scheme knew full well that they would be moved into the new scheme, and that was a condition of joining?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** They knew full well.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I mentioned in my second reading speech that I would be asking some questions about the status of the fund.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I would ask the Committee to come to order. I can hardly hear the speaker. Would the member for Hartley please lower the volume of his conversation. Would the Committee come to order.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Can the Minister supply details of the yearly projections of the Government's liability under the existing scheme?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Under the present Act there is an obligation for the actuary to do those calculations every three years. He is in the process of doing them now, and those figures ought to be available within the next six months.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Can the Minister tell me whether anyone who joined the scheme since 1986 when it was officially closed has had pay-outs under that old scheme?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** No.

**Mr LEWIS:** Is the Minister telling the House that there have been no pay-outs in relation to anyone who died or left the Public Service since the old scheme was closed but who, at some subsequent time to its being closed, were nonetheless given superannuation cover? Is he saying categorically that not one individual who has either died or been compelled to resign from the Public Service has, therefore, been paid benefits either through their estate or as individuals no longer able to work?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** That was a much more verbose repetition of the question asked by the member for Victoria. The answer still is, 'To our knowledge, no.'

**Mr LEWIS:** That is a bit different from the first answer given. Will the Minister undertake to the Committee to examine whether anyone has been paid out since that time where those people joined the old scheme after it had closed pending the establishment of the scheme proposed in this Bill and have now claimed against a scheme of superannuation? If that has happened, will he undertake to find out on how many occasions and in what way claims against the superannuation scheme have been dealt with?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** My advice is still 'No'—for the third time—but in order to move on to something else I will have a thorough search of the whole scheme undertaken to see whether anyone has escaped our notice.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I am disturbed that we do not have details of the projected costs of the existing scheme and how it will impact over the next five to ten years. I am sure that the Parliament should have been provided with that advice as the Agars committee recommended it should be. I believe that when this Bill was brought before the Parliament it was incumbent upon the Minister to have had some work done on that, even if only approximations were arrived at. The next question, of course, is should the new scheme be taken up by 90 per cent of employees, if there should be a very strong demand for participation in the new scheme, has the Minister any estimates of what the participation will mean not only in terms of today but in 20 years? I would like to know what it will cost the budget.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The honourable member would be aware that anything would merely be speculation. I suppose the best indication we have is the experience in New South Wales where a very similar scheme has been established, and it appears that the takeup rate there is only 30 per cent. I very much hope that the takeup rate here will be far higher than that because, whilst I do not believe in the scheme being compulsory, I believe that it is to the advantage of our employees to be in the scheme, and we

will make a great deal of effort to get as many people to join as possible.

I think that the most optimistic projections we have, which are not really projections but guesses, are that 60 per cent of eligible employees will join. However, that has not been the experience in New South Wales. On top of this we have a decision of the Arbitration Commission which gives a 3 per cent payroll benefit to employees at no cost to them. I fear that many employees will be satisfied with that and hope that the Arbitration Commission in future adds to it periodically so that they have, in effect, a super-annuation scheme for themselves to which they do not pay at all. I think it would be very shortsighted, but my experience with workers is that that is likely to happen. So anything we give will merely be guesses.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Judging from the New South Wales experience of a 30 per cent takeup and given that I understand that 40 per cent of males and very few females are in the existing scheme, on the basis of a 30 per cent takeup of the new scheme over and above the number of people who are already in the old scheme, what would be the impact in 20 years? These calculations can be done simply, because there are already assumptions about real costs. Can we have some real indication by the time the legislation is introduced in the other place, as to the impact in 20 years?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I shall have those projections made available to members on the basis of a 30 per cent take-up rate.

Clause passed.

Clause 18—'Contributor's accounts in the Fund.'

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I move:

Page 9, lines 10 and 11—Leave out 'in proportion to the amount then standing to the credit of each account' and insert 'on an equitable basis having regard to the amount then standing to the credit of the account, the rate and extent of any increase or diminution of the balance of the account over the financial year and any other relevant factor'.

This amendment corrects a technical error in the Bill and will ensure that interest is distributed equitably to members' accounts. This was obviously intended and is obviously highly desirable.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The Opposition does not support the amendment, because it creates more problems. I can understand the Minister saying that the mean average contribution will be used, but he said 'equitably', which means different things to different people. If it means 'to the standing of each person's account according to the criteria laid down', I should have no difficulty with it. However, as soon as we start to talk about equitable, we can get into a difficult discussion on what is equitable in terms of whether people on lower incomes should then get more contribution points or more money in the system than those people on higher incomes.

I do not believe that the addition of those words helps the legislation. I know what the Minister is trying to achieve, but his aim could be achieved by other wording. By taking the figure in an account at the end of the period, the correct amount may not be credited because of violent fluctuations during the year. There are top-up provisions in the Bill enabling one to move between 1½ per cent and 9 per cent. So, if a person paid 1½ per cent at the beginning of the year but 9 per cent at the end of the year, it would be financially inequitable for that person to be credited with his or her share of funds at the end of the year, because the mean average would be much lower than that of other accounts in the fund. Knowing that my opposition to this amendment will not succeed, I ask the Minister to choose another set of words that would reflect his wishes but leave no doubt as to what is intended.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I take the point, but I believe that my wording is appropriate. The honourable member and I are on the same track as to what is desirable, and the wording of my amendment is aimed at achieving what both the honourable member and I want. I shall have the honourable member's remarks examined so that later he may be given a detailed explanation of why the wording of my amendment is appropriate.

Amendment carried.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 9, after line 16—Insert subclause as follows:

(5a) Where the Board acts under subsection (5), full details of the action must be included in the Board's report for the relevant financial year.

Under the amendment the board must say what is happening to its reserves when it is trying to smooth out fluctuations.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 19—'Investment of the Fund.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I have a number of questions. We know that the trust possesses assets worth over \$550 million. My questions relate to the equity standing of the fund in million dollar terms. Was the fund affected by the stock market crash last year? How much money, if any, has been paid to meet the ASER commitment? What is the current value of that investment?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am advised that the reduction in the value of the fund due to the stock market crash is 1 per cent. I think I should recommend to some members of the Committee that they take advice from the people who administer the fund. I believe that the rest of the information sought by the honourable member has been tabled in this Chamber on previous occasions. The annual report is available for the honourable member's perusal and edification.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I am very pleased and absolutely amazed that we lost only \$5.5 million. Unfortunately, the Minister did not tell me how much we invested in the first place.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Only \$9 million was invested.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** My other question related to ASER. I understand that there should be information within the trust in relation to its standing at the moment.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I understand that that information was made available during the Estimates Committees, and I think it was supplied by Mr Weiss. He was very proud of the investment made by the trust in the ASER project. From memory, Mr Weiss said that when they made that investment they expected a 20 per cent return. However, they now calculate that they will receive a 30 per cent return on the money invested. I repeat: that is from memory after reading the *Hansard* record of the Estimates Committees. I have no further information. After reading *Hansard*, I believe SASFIT made a particularly profitable investment, and the Committee should congratulate it.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I asked a very simple question. I want to know how much money has been invested to date. I have not yet received a response. The Estimates Committees met back in September. I understand that all of the \$100 million has not been handed over. I am fascinated by the Minister's response. He said that it was a wonderful return. The original investment was \$50 million, but I understand that it now has to be \$100 million because of the cost overrun. I cannot understand that when you double the input you can increase your output by 50 per cent. I think there is something very wrong with the mathematics of some of our so-called geniuses. I understand that with this type of development there is a seven year lead time before

people break even. So it appears that we have broken all records. We are going to have an immediate return of 30 per cent on our investment. I am absolutely fascinated with that because it breaks every record in the world. If the Minister cannot answer the question, I shall be pleased if the information can be made available before the Bill reaches the other place.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I have nothing further to add. I think the question was dealt with extensively during the Estimates Committees. I assume that the member for Mitcham was on that Committee but, if not, I think the Leader of the Opposition made a brief appearance and asked questions about this project. If the return is 30 per cent—whether it is on \$50 million, \$100 million or whatever the member for Mitcham has dreamed up—it is a very good investment. I think that SASFIT's investment advisers should hire themselves out to some of the so-called high flying entrepreneurs in this country because over the past few months they have certainly shown that they are not capable of producing a return of 30 per cent.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I did not have the benefit of being at the Estimates Committees, so I seek some clarification. I understand from the conversation between the Minister and the member for Mitcham that there is something like \$500 million plus in the fund which has been invested. I understand from the Minister's response that something less than \$9 million was invested in stocks and shares in listed companies at the time of the share market crash, which amounts to 1.75 per cent. I believe that that is lower than any other private fund in Australia or the world. The Minister has said that less than 1.75 per cent was invested in stocks and shares. Where was the rest of the money invested? Clause 19 refers to 'real property' and 'property'. What is the difference between the two and what are the trust's investments? I ask the Minister to draw on all his economic knowledge so that he can give all the details pertaining to the investment that is returning 30 per cent. It may be that private funds would like to get into that sort of investment and I am sure that honourable members would like to, too, including you, Mr Chairman, because I know that you are also in the share market business.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** SASFIT produces an annual report. I can only suggest that the honourable member go to the library where I am sure it will be produced within 15 seconds. The honourable member can then go through it and I am sure he will find the answers to his questions. In relation to the 30 per cent return, I am simply repeating (and I stress that this is from memory) what I read in *Hansard*. Mr Weiss, who is the Chairman of SASFIT, told the Estimates Committee that he anticipated a 30 per cent return on the SASFIT funds invested in the ASER project.

If the member for Victoria wants to play in the league of the \$50 million or \$100 million investment, as the member for Mitcham seems to think it is, I am sure Kumagi or some of the other property developers will be only too happy to assist him to invest his funds. As it is out of my league, I cannot help him any further. As everyone knows, real property is an interest in land, and property, as everyone also knows, is an interest in anything.

**Mr LEWIS:** Can the Minister give an undertaking that at some future time he will provide the Committee with information to verify the statement that he has just made that seems to be either astronomical or rabbitlike. Where ASER is concerned, we know that there has been an escalation in the commitment of the Superannuation Fund to that project. If it has escalated to about \$100 million and if we are getting 30 per cent on that, it is about \$600 000 a week in profit to the trust from its investment, nearly

\$90 000 a day. How many units are available for rent? What are they charging for car parking to get such a return? I do not know how the Minister could possibly put to Parliament that that is the likely return to the fund on its investment. It is incredible. Will the Minister undertake to check those figures to assist the Committee to better understand what is going on or whether someone, albeit through sincere juvenile ignorance, is guilty of misleading Parliament or whether there has been some conspiracy to obtain such considerable revenue from the people who use the place to enable the profit generated to provide that yield on the capital investment?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I refer the honourable member to the *Hansard* report of the Estimates Committee. Clause passed.

Clause 20 passed.

Clause 21—'Reports.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The Agars report deals with accountability and reporting in items 62 to 65. Members can read those recommendations if they wish. I seek an undertaking from the Minister that the recommendations will be included where appropriate.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** That is standard procedure, and there are no queries; yes.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 10, after line 18—After paragraph (b) of subsection (4) insert '(and the report must be submitted to the Minister within 12 months after the end of the relevant triennium)'.  
When the triennial report is produced, the amendment will require it to be within the hands of the Minister within 12 months. We decided to give it a fair time because it is a complicated matter, but we believe a time should be fixed and we suggest 12 months. It is competent for the report to be finished in that period.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I oppose the amendment, not because what the member for Mitcham is proposing is not highly desirable, but it depends whether we have a Public Actuary. One problem was that we did not have a Public Actuary for six months last year. He got a better offer, did his sums and went elsewhere. While every endeavour will be made to do that, we cannot guarantee it if the resource is not there. We do not want to be tied down to that. It is highly desirable and almost without exception that provision will be complied with, even though it is not contained in the legislation.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I oppose the amendment, not because what the member for Mitcham is proposing is not highly desirable, but it depends whether we have a Public Actuary. One problem was that we did not have a Public Actuary for six months last year. He got a better offer, did his sums and went elsewhere. While every endeavour will be made to do that, we cannot guarantee it if the resource is not there. We do not want to be tied down to that. It is highly desirable and almost without exception that provision will be complied with, even though it is not contained in the legislation.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 22—'Entry of contributors to the scheme.'

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I move:

Page 10, lines 36 to 38—Leave out subclause (6) and substitute:

(6) If an applicant—

(a) is a member of some other superannuation scheme funded wholly or in part by the applicant's employer;

or

(b) receives an allowance or salary loading related to superannuation,

the board will, unless there is good reason to the contrary, reject the application.

The question of ministerial assistants and the possibility of double-dipping was dealt with earlier. When a component of salary compensates for not being eligible to join the scheme, we want to make it perfectly clear that such people are not eligible for the scheme, so that they are not getting both the loading on their salary and being able to join the scheme. I thank the member for Mitcham for drawing this matter to our attention.

Amendment carried.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 10, lines 39 and 40—Leave out 'may defer consideration of the application' and insert 'cannot accept the application'.

The amendment relates to casuals.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The Government accepts the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 23—'Contribution rates.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 11, line 17—Leave out 'two months' and substitute '30 days'.

If the contribution rate can be changed only once a year, people should have the maximum facility to change it. The Minister has recommended two months. Any administrative system with any decent computer should be able to make the change within hours. Therefore, 30 days is more than adequate and we do not need two months.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I disagree. I think that two months is the appropriate time and I reject the amendment. Amendment negated.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** From reading subclause (5) it appears that it may be possible for a person on compensation to get benefits on his salary while paying a contribution that is less than the full salary. Is that possible under this subclause?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** If a person's benefit is based on salary and he is on workers compensation, then the benefit will be reduced because his the salary is lower than normal because of the workers compensation.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** In part, subclause (5) provides:

... of the contributor is less than the salary that the contributor would have received if not incapacitated, the board may allow a proportionate reduction in the amount of the contributions for that period.

Does that mean that he can pay a reduced contribution but still receive the full benefits, in other words, the full contribution points?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Yes.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Subclause (6) (b) provides:

If leave without pay is taken for a continuous period exceeding two weeks, no contribution is payable in respect of that period unless the contributor elects to contribute and the election is approved by the board ...

What is meant by 'continuous period'?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The common meaning of the word 'continuous'.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I think that subclause (6) (b) leaves itself open, given that people can take special leave and work in the private sector under different arrangements. There are anomalies on catch-up provisions that could be invoked in this situation. Does the Minister see any scope for those people who do not take one or two years off for a holiday, maternity leave or whatever, but work in another situation where they will be placed in an advantageous position under this provision?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** We have a general policy in relation to this and any other matter, that we only grant leave without pay on the basis that if it costs the employer—us—anything then that will be recouped from the employee; otherwise we do not grant leave without pay. It is entirely at our discretion. Obviously, we are not going to grant leave without pay that will cost us anything.

**Mr LEWIS:** Following the line of questioning taken by the member for Victoria about subclause (6) (b), I ask the Minister to make some inquiry of his advisers, if necessary, so that he can explain why he considers it fair that a person who ticks off, leaves or goes away—whatever term one would like to use—for a period exceeding two weeks, maybe for 11 months and two weeks, to do another job and then returns for a week and goes again, albeit from the South Australian Public Service to a position where he has been seconded to in the service of a Federal Minister perhaps, can continue to accrue benefits in spite of the fact that he

has not been working or made a personal contribution to the fund? In fact, somebody could leave the Public Service for almost a year and, in circumstances where the Government agrees to advise the board to do so, for more than a year, and work on a Federal Minister's staff for three years and then go back to the Public Service without affecting his superannuation benefits which have remained active all that time. That is how I understand the provision. If the Minister understands it as I do, could he say why it is in that form? Alternatively, if he understands it in some other way please disabuse me of my misunderstanding and explain how it is impossible for somebody to leave the Public Service as a matter of convenience and return some time later with all the accrued benefits.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** That was explained previously. If somebody wishes to take leave without pay it will be at no cost to us as an employer or we do not grant leave without pay. If somebody wants to stay in the superannuation scheme, pay the appropriate premium and have the benefits from the State accruing to them during that period of 12 months where they go for whatever purpose (for example, to work for another employer) then the other employer has to pay to us the employer contribution. It is absolutely at no cost to the State or the individual will not get leave without pay. Leave without pay is entirely at our discretion. We do not give it if it is going to cost us anything.

**Mr LEWIS:** I now understand that it is possible for somebody having once got into the Public Service and the scheme, to leave the Public Service and, if they can get the kind of approval—which would not be difficult if one had friends in high places—contemplated in this subclause, go and work somewhere else for the next 10 or 15 years but continue to enjoy the contribution from the State taxpayer just because they get their employer to pay into the South Australian Government Superannuation Fund.

At the end of the day, twice as much as has been contributed by that person's employer is paid by the State taxpayers to the benefit of that person who was given a long period of time, such as leave without pay, from the Public Service. However long that may be, whether it is a month, a year or several years, that is a very bad principle. I do not see why this State's taxpayers should have to contribute to the superannuation benefits of somebody who is not serving the State's taxpayers.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am sorry that I cannot make the member for Murray-Mallee understand. The position is that there cannot be any cost to the taxpayer. The cost of benefits accruing to that person who is on leave in the public sector has to be paid, if they are to continue accruing any benefits, by somebody other than the South Australian taxpayers or they are suspended from the scheme. It is as simple as that. There cannot be a cost to the South Australian taxpayer.

The benefits that will be paid eventually have to be given by a third party to the State of South Australia at the time the person is on leave and continuing to accrue credits in the superannuation scheme. That money has to be paid in.

Clause passed.

Clause 24 passed.

Clause 25—'Attribution of additional contribution points and contribution months.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I move:

Page 2, after line 47—Insert subclause as follows:

(3) Where the Minister acts under this section, full particulars of the action taken by the Minister must be included in the board's report for the relevant financial year.

I ask that this amendment be accepted by the Committee for a very important reason. Clause 25 allows the Minister to add contribution points to a person's existing contribu-

tion. I am not sure whether this provision should remain in the legislation anyway, for some very sound reasons. It allows a Minister to make a discretionary payment which may or may not be subject to taxation, depending on the laws of the land on the day, which will be classed as a golden handshake. As the clause reads presently, it provides:

- (1) The Minister may, in appropriate cases—  
 (a) attribute additional contribution points to a contributor;  
 (b) attribute additional contribution months to a contributor.

By both means, either by the service provision or the points provision, the Minister is doing two things. He is loading the amount of contribution credit in the system to a particular employee and, secondly, he is ensuring that the employer component is also doubly loaded for that same impost. I have some severe reservations whether a superannuation scheme should be used in such a way. I believe that if the Government wishes to have a contract with a person to pay a very high fee for services, he or she should not be doing it through a back door method.

The contract terms should be publicly disclosed, and if a person of extraordinary ability is deserving of \$200 000 per year—and there are many people in this world who are in that position—then so be it. But I do not believe that we should either be hiding it or using it as a less taxable item by allowing this provision. The problem is that it can be open to gross abuse, and the Liberal Opposition decided on its best advice not to reject the amendment but to make the Minister accountable for any action in which he should indulge where this section is particularly affected.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** It is not making the Minister accountable; the Minister is accountable, anyway. What the amendment of the member for Mitcham is attempting to do is make these arrangements public, and as regards the reservations that the member for Mitcham has about the practice at all, I just point out that every day in the private sector arrangements such as this are made. They are perfectly within the law, and obviously the State Government would also act within the law. The fact that it is an everyday occurrence in the private sector means that when the State Government goes into the marketplace to try to attract a particular individual to work in the public sector, there is some straight competition from firms in the private sector.

The Government must start constructing salary packages in a way that is similar to those of the private sector; otherwise it will not get the individuals concerned. It is a free labour market. I am sure that the member for Mitcham would not want it any other way. If the Government were to say to some individuals that it would make their salary package public and put it on the front page, where it would inevitably end up, the Government would not get that individual. That means that the South Australian Government is handicapped when it goes out into the marketplace to attract people to work in the public sector.

For those reasons I reject the amendment of the member for Mitcham, although I point out that a provision such as this is used very rarely. The Minister must be made aware of the cost of what is proposed, and that is also in the Act, so nothing underhanded is done. If the Government is to compete in the marketplace for the type of people that the member for Mitcham knows are needed in the public sector, it must meet the market force.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I reject the Minister's argument. I read a report in the paper that Mr Bond would pay some extraordinary amount to retain some of his more competent employees. I am not sure how competent they were but there was a large amount of featherbedding. I cannot imagine how anyone could deserve \$5 million in one year. Certainly if such a person had been on contract and it was

1 per cent of what he or she meant to the company that person could be deserving of a \$5 million payout.

Those facts will be made public and those extraordinary payments will bear scrutiny at the annual general meeting of shareholders. However, there is no scrutiny of this scheme, which is unlike the private sector schemes under which some very large and, in my judgment, quite unwarranted payments have been made, but I am hardly the best person to judge. Shareholders have the ability at a company's annual general meeting to question payments to directors or employees. That is one of their rights, just as the shareholders of this State—the taxpayers—have a right to know where their money is being spent. If the Minister wishes to make a payment, the shareholders of this State have a right to know how and where that money is being paid.

I reject the Minister's argument that the facts should remain hidden. If the State wishes to employ someone on a contract for \$200 000 or \$300 000, on occasion I would say that it is an excellent proposition because the State would get some of the better material in this world of ours. To get the best material available, one must pay the going market price. I have met individuals who make more in a week than we as politicians make in a year. That does not prevent the Minister from employing those people, but the facts should be made known. It may well mean that other people with extraordinary expertise can follow that line if the appropriate price is paid. It should not remain hidden. There should be some checks and balances. It is important that these matters are revealed, and that there be no underhand payments, because it has implications: people will share in the benefits of the fund beyond their contributions, and ultimately the taxpayer will have to pay a bigger bill.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am not unsympathetic to the arguments put forward by the member for Mitcham. It is, in fact, the practice now whenever this occurs and the board, in its annual report, publicises that fact. The difficulty I have with the amendment is that it says 'full particulars'. 'Full particulars' includes the name of the individual whereas the practice at the moment, which will continue into the future, is that where such an arrangement has been made it is publicised in the board's annual report, but the names of the individuals are not published. That is the difficulty I have with the member for Mitcham's amendment, and that is why I must reject it.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** If ever there was a clause which is open to abuse, it is this one, and I support what the member for Mitcham has said. There is no doubt that it provides the power for the Minister to confer benefits on any person who comes in to be employed by the Government. I reject the Minister's assertion that what happens in private enterprise is somehow different. If it is a public company, that has to be declared and it can be questioned by the shareholders. However, if it is a private company I accept that that does not have to be. Unfortunately, this State is a public company and the taxpayers are the people to whom we and this Parliament must answer. I think that this clause is very dangerous, and I support the amendment. However, I would like the Minister to outline what he sees as appropriate cases.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** There is nothing new in this provision; it already applies. We already make these arrangements—infrequently, but they are made. I am sure that they have been made by previous Governments. I am not sure whether any such arrangements were made between 1979 and 1982, but I have such an inquiring mind that I will check overnight. As regards the private sector, I understand that the Federal Government tried to legislate in relation to directors' fees and remuneration which is paid

to some of the high fliers in the private sector, and there was a terrible fuss about it. It was said that it was a gross invasion of privacy, and the legislation was watered down to a considerable degree.

All the high fliers in the private sector approached the members of the Liberal Party and told them just who was boss around the place and, of course, the legislation was severely amended so that it would not be possible to identify individuals and the salary packages paid to them. The best that the Federal Government could get was some kind of aggregation of director's fees, not identifying fees paid to all directors of a particular company, what individual directors got, or what they received in superannuation.

So the Liberal Party is being a little inconsistent. In particular, what the member for Victoria says is just plain incorrect. The position in the private sector is very different. I am saying that the board will report that such an arrangement has been made. It always has reported that such an arrangement has been made. What we do not want is to disclose the names of the individuals who are in receipt of these benefits.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Can the Minister point to the relevant section in the old Act and where it applies?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I do not have the old Act with me, but I will respond to the honourable member tomorrow.

Amendment negatived: clause passed.

Clause 26—'Application of this Part.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I believe it is competent for me now to talk about full funding of the scheme because it is not possible to raise this matter as a separate amendment. My last amendment listed for consideration deals with the Treasury's making allowance for the Government's contribution as a separately identifiable amount upon which moneys will be earned to cover the two for one contribution by the Government. Because I have been told that I cannot move that amendment, because the clause involves monetary consideration, I now canvass the proposition of full funding of the scheme.

Recommendation 2, item 1, of the report of the Agars committee referred to the new entrant fully funded contribution rate as a percentage of salaries. I take the point that we are now getting into some very difficult water with the existing scheme, because the Government is responsible for more than 80 per cent of the moneys paid out on pensions. The reason for that is that the liability it has incurred has never been provided for within the scheme. One of the great difficulties facing Governments in this country is that we have many schemes which have unfunded liabilities. We have seen the workers compensation scheme in Victoria which is estimated to have some \$3 billion worth of unfunded liabilities. In our wisdom we have determined that the South Australian scheme shall be fully funded from day one. I believe it is important that the Government meet its responsibilities from day one otherwise our children will have to bear that responsibility.

I know that in a number of countries under these circumstances there is a separate accounting. Money is put into a trust fund and Governments, which are always short of cash, borrow it back. But at least there is the semblance of an attempt to provide for future liabilities because we do not wish the children of tomorrow to pay for the sins of today. Indeed, we have an escalating superannuation bill in all States for the very same reason—because they have never been funded from day one of the scheme. It is an important point and I ask the Minister whether he intends that the Government will set aside moneys or whether we will be

paying the bills in 20 years time as we are now paying for the existing pensions scheme.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** No, the Government will not be making that provision. Superannuation is paid when it is due; it is the same in relation to all Australian States plus the Federal Government. It is a very interesting philosophical debate which goes nowhere. I have never been convinced of the necessity to fund it. I understand the arguments for funding the scheme: they have some legitimacy, but it seems to me that it is a bit of a circular argument. If we have to borrow money to fund a scheme and then lend it back, that seems to be doing nothing more than employing bureaucrats and getting involved in a lot of unnecessary accounting.

I appreciate that what the honourable member says is a legitimate argument. However, we disagree and believe, as do all the other States and the Commonwealth, that the current method of funding pensions in South Australia is proper at this time with sums of this amount.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I point out to the Minister that in the private sector, which the Minister chooses to pick up on certain occasions to suit his argument, they must put money aside so that when it becomes due it is there and can be paid. We are reaching a stage where it is not payable. I was trying to quote certain overseas countries to give the Minister a way out. My preferred position is that all expenditure should equal all revenue, no matter where it comes from. That is virtually the Singapore accounting system which says, 'Everything that we spend and everything that we raise in revenue should be equal at the end of the year.' My philosophical base is that we should be saying that all revenue should be equal to all income in terms of Government expenditure.

The difficulty is that we are \$4 billion in debt, our interest bill is \$575 million a year, and our real running deficit some \$355 million a year. So, it is not practical to talk in the terminology that I would like to see. It would have been nice if this had been done 100 years ago because we would be on the right economic track today. From a philosophical viewpoint we are saying that it should be provided for and that we should not be running up debts where the benefits and the costs are being accrued today and the big pay-outs will come 20 years later. It is an important point and a philosophical point: that Governments should provide and should not allow the people who may not have our capacity to pay bills to incur these heavy burdens in 20 or 30 years time.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The important thing mentioned by the member for Mitcham is that it goes back to when the fund was first established, and I think he said that it was 100 years ago (although I am not sure about the accuracy of the time scale). There is certainly some merit in that argument. However, the bills are coming in every week as people leave and require their superannuation payments. If you put on top of that funding for the future, in effect we will have to find twice as much money. Once you are on this roundabout of paying as you go I think you are stuck on it.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The member for Mitcham said that it would be nice to get off it. I point out that from 1979 to 1982 there was no attempt by the previous Government, of which the member for Mitcham was a supporter, to try to get off it. I am sure that if the Liberal Party ever gets back into Government in this State it will still not make an attempt to get off the roundabout. While the debate is interesting, it really does not take us very far.



Clause passed.  
Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

**ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

**JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 11.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 25 February at 11 a.m.

---