

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 8 August 1991

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. N.T. Peterson) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr G.D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.16 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the speech of Her Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.47 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

DEATH OF Hon. C.R. STORY

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

That the sitting of the House be suspended until 2.15 p.m. as a mark of respect to the memory of the late Hon. C.R. Story.

It is with considerable regret that we mark in this place the passing earlier this year of the Hon. C.R. Story at the age of 71 years. Ross Story was a member of the Legislative Council for 20 years, from February 1955 when he entered in consequence of a by-election for the Midland district until July 1975 when he retired. His parliamentary career included a number of distinguished positions: chairmanship of the Industries Development Committee; membership on two occasions of the Public Works Standing Committee and the Subordinate Legislation Committee; the Liberal Party Whip in the Legislative Council; and, finally, Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests in the Hall Government from 1968 to 1970.

Although he was not re-elected to the Legislative Council in 1975, Mr Story maintained a strong and quite influential position not only in his Party's affairs but also during the term of the Tonkin Government in its role as the Government of South Australia following the 1979 election, as the Executive Assistant to the then Premier, David Tonkin, and Secretary to the Cabinet. In this latter position he has the distinction, I think, of being the only non-Minister to sit in on Cabinet meetings over the course of this century. Certainly, there were those who said that Mr Story was the grey eminence of the Government. It is certainly true that his advice was obviously sought after, as his experience was extensive. I guess you could call him an eminence in that respect, although 'grey' is hardly a word I would ascribe to a fairly colourful character such as Mr Story.

I am told that Mr Story was the first Renmark citizen to be elected to Parliament. In fact, much of his early career was spent on matters involving the Riverland and irrigation generally. He spent his early working years with the Renmark Irrigation Trust, and subsequently he became a member of the board of that trust. He served on the Upper Murrayland Settlers Association, the South Australian Canning Fruitgrowers Association and the Renmark Fruitgrowers Cooperative Packing Company. During the war Mr Story joined the Australian armed forces and rose to the rank of Regimental Sergeant Major before retiring from the AIF in 1946. So, he came to the Parliament, although still at a comparatively young age, with very extensive experience behind him.

Following the war, Mr Story had an active interest in ex-service matters, becoming chairman of a number of Riverland organisations for returned soldiers. He is certainly remembered by all those who knew him as a very forthright and likeable member of Parliament and personality. He was

always courteous, always good company, and direct and plain speaking in his dealings. He certainly was able to get on with people, and I can testify to the fact that, although essentially involved in policy making and promotion of his Party's interests, he was nonetheless always very approachable and willing to discuss matters in the general interest of the State across all Party lines.

Mr Story was awarded a CMG in 1981 for his political service and services to the State. That and the positions he held indicate the esteem with which Ross Story was held. He is survived by his wife and two married children. I extend our condolences to them in paying our respects to a distinguished former member of the Parliament of South Australia.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I join the Premier in remembering the parliamentary and public service of Ross Story. As the Premier said, Ross was a member of this Parliament for two decades, involving the period of transition from the Playford era. For the first half of his parliamentary career, Sir Thomas Playford was the Premier of South Australia. During this period, Ross was an active participant in important parliamentary debates and in committees. As a result, on the election of the Hall Government in 1968, he was appointed Minister of Agriculture. This appointment also reflected his wide and deep knowledge of agricultural affairs.

In his closing years of service Ross worked hard to maintain the role and relevance of the Legislative Council in our parliamentary system. On 10 June 1975, in one of his last speeches in this Parliament, he said:

I believe in tradition. I believe in the institution of Parliament. This was a speech congratulating the Hon. Don Banfield on his election as Leader of the Labor Government in the Legislative Council. It speaks for the respect people on all sides of this Parliament had for Ross Story that Don Banfield was one of the several hundred who attended Ross's funeral service on 13 May. In more recent years, there has been a breakdown in the respect which members have shown for their parliamentary and political opponents. We should examine the legacy which people such as Ross Story have left us.

Before and after his service to the Parliament, Ross participated actively in a range of community affairs. His continuing involvement with his regimental colleagues was eloquently remembered at his funeral service. He retained his deep interest in rural matters, particularly those affecting the Riverland. In politics, he served the Liberal Party organisation in a number of capacities. He was also the senior adviser to the last Liberal Government in this State. In that capacity he was valued for his political knowledge and, of course, for his wisdom. He not only advised Ministers, as the Premier has indicated, but was always ready to assist new members embarking on their parliamentary careers. His wise counsel was appreciated by the more experienced and the new members alike.

As well, he had the respect of public servants at all levels for his sense of propriety in the conduct of the Government and its affairs. Ross Story lived a full life. He was a true servant of the people in many respects. To Sheila, their surviving children Angas and Lyndal and grandchildren Kara and Heidi, who affectionately remember their Rossie, we express our condolences; we thank them as well for the support and assistance they gave Ross in his service to the Parliament and to the wider community.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I add my thoughts to this quite solemn moment in relation to a person who was

a serving member of the Parliament while I was here and who was very vitally involved in the district which I represent, as a member of the Midland Legislative Council team, as it was in those years, and a person upon whom I looked as a friend and, to some degree, as a mentor. He was a person in whom one could always have trust. I had the opportunity to speak with him but 10 days before his death and I know that his interests remained those of South Australia and the people throughout the State but, more specifically, those who were directly involved with agriculture and his beloved Riverland. To Sheila and the members of the family I add my thoughts of condolence.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I wish to be associated with this tribute to Ross Story. He was a personal friend of mine, as indeed he was of many members of this place. As has been indicated, he served as a Minister during the life of the Hall Government. He was a member of most of the committees, I think, associated with this place over many years. When he left Parliament his interest in the affairs of Parliament did not cease: he became an adviser to some Federal members and, as has been indicated, an adviser to the Tonkin Liberal Government. As Deputy Premier during that period I can testify probably as well as anybody to the value of Ross Story's sage advice on many occasions. He was never hurried; Ross always seemed to have plenty of time. He was always unhurried and unruffled, and I think that probably contributed to the fact that he got through a fairly large work load and that his advice was always well considered and useful.

I also knew him quite well outside this place; in fact, I was given the honour of speaking during the eulogy at his funeral. I remember that, on one occasion when my wife and I were going by train to Western Australia, Ross's innate love of nature was quite apparent. Every bush, tree, bird or animal that we saw on that trip could be identified by Ross—and described in detail. He had an inquiring mind and was intensely interested in people and events. He was a shrewd judge of people and events, but I believe that his judgments were always tempered with kindness. So, I am very pleased indeed to have the opportunity to pay tribute to the work and life of Ross Story and would express our sympathy to his widow and his family.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I rise to record briefly my respects to the late Ross Story and to extend sympathy to his family. I do so following a fairly long-term association with him. He was a member of Parliament when I came here in the early 1970s and, as has already been mentioned, he served us in the Tonkin Government in a very senior capacity and as a friend to those who were in Government at that time. Clearly, I, too, recognised his agricultural experience. He was a politically wise man and also a very sensitive individual. I found him most useful, on those occasions when I was summoned to meet the Premier for some reason or another, acting in the capacity of a buffer and offering some advice as to how those respective situations might have been properly handled.

I have particular feelings for Ross Story, who was at the time we were in government one of only two of our predecessors from this side of politics in the field of agriculture—along with the Hon. David Brookman—who had served as Minister of Agriculture. In holding the agriculture portfolio, I found his experience of particular note and I held him in special regard in that way. To Sheila his wife and to his family, I extend my sympathies.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support the motion moved sincerely by the Premier and seconded by the Leader

of the Opposition. The late Ross Story had a profound influence on my seeking to become a member of this House. I remember visits to his house in the mid-1960s when numerous people gathered there on weekends to seek his advice. Certainly, I received much valuable advice at that time and, on my coming into this Parliament in 1968, Ross Story was the then Minister of Agriculture. He still retained his home at Renmark and, as I said, he tried to be there on most weekends. There was a constant flow of constituents visiting his home on the weekends seeking his advice and discussing agricultural and horticultural matters with him.

There was always a very warm welcome extended by his wife Sheila to everyone who arrived at his door. There was always a drink and something to eat and there was a constant stream of visitors. Ross Story was highly regarded, as has been mentioned by the Leader, for his contribution particularly in respect of the horticultural and irrigation industries and through his involvement with the Renmark Irrigation Trust and land settlement following the Second World War.

His contribution will be remembered, particularly in the Riverland, for a long time to come. Certainly, his stable and quiet approach was such that it was difficult to fluster Ross and, when many of us would become agitated over an issue, I remember him saying at different times, 'Just take it easy. Time cures all problems'. In many respects he was right: time has that result, but his was a stabilising influence. Every member of this House at times has been agitated and has not been sure which way to go. The advice of Ross Story to 'Let's see what it looks like tomorrow and make a decision then rather than making the wrong decision today,' was well received by people on both sides of this House. I extend to Sheila and her family my condolences and regrets at his passing, because to me it is the loss of a very close friend.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I rise as Ross Story's local member in latter years to support the motion of condolence and endorse the remarks of the Premier, the Leader and other speakers. To what has already been said, I would simply like to add that at the local political level, at branch level in the Liberal Party in the electorate of Coles, Ross Story continued his commitment to the Liberal Party right to the end. I always valued his wise counsel and his loyalty. I also would like it recorded that Ross Story approached his death as he approached his life: with dignity and constancy. I feel sure that his political achievements were enabled and to a large degree made possible by the constant and loving support of his wife Sheila and his family, and I extend my condolences to them.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I rise briefly but with appropriate respect to join others who have spoken in recognition of the passing of a great man who served in this Parliament. Other people could do well to follow the example that he set by his life. He was very helpful to me on the occasion of my election to this place, though let me go back a bit. My first contact with him was as the representative of the State committee of Rural Youth, when he was most helpful in the drafting of plans for the establishment of what is now covered by TAFE in a training program. Were it not for the early election of the Parliament in which Steele Hall was Premier and in which Mr Story was Minister of Agriculture, there would have been a rural youth centre and that kind of training facility established before the turn of the decade in 1970.

At about the same time, he was gratuitously, that is, without my approaching him, very helpful to me and my brothers in the establishment and successful penetration of European markets with our strawberries. He used his good offices to obtain rapid outturn reports on those pioneering shipments of very perishable fruit to the European market during the off-season and enabled us to modify our packaging of the crop for destination in a way which ensured its more satisfactory arrival.

In 1978-79 he again helped during the course of the preselection for the electorate of Mallee, where he encouraged me to pursue that course and, subsequently during my first term, provided me notwithstanding all the other commitments on his time as Secretary to the Cabinet with sound advice from time to time about how best to deal with difficult situations. With those comments and the deepest respect possible to the memory of the man, I offer my condolences as well to Sheila and other members of his family.

The SPEAKER: I thank all members for their kind remarks and remembrances of Mr Story. I will ensure that they are passed on to his family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 1.10 to 2.15 p.m.]

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

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

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that the House has this day, in compliance with a summons from Her Excellency the Governor, attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where Her Excellency has been pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which speech I, as Speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

PETITION: ITALIAN LANGUAGE PROGRAM

A petition signed by 1 150 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to expand the Italian language program at all levels of education was presented by the Hon. G.J. Crafter.

Petition received.

PETITION: PUBLIC LIBRARIES

A petition signed by 87 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to maintain a centralised public library service at the Local Government Services Bureau was presented by the Hon. M.D. Rann.

Petition received.

PETITION: HEATING APPLIANCES

A petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to review

the policy on the provision of heating appliances in Housing Trust dwellings was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: FREE STUDENT TRAVEL

A petition signed by 1 017 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide special trains and buses for free travelling passengers during school travelling times and retain existing numbers of guards was presented by Mr S.J. Baker.

Petition received.

PETITION: JUVENILE RESTRICTIONS

A petition signed by 1 064 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to restrict juvenile access to materials used for graffiti, restrict free travel on public transport and increase penalties for juvenile offenders was presented by Mr S.J. Baker.

Petition received.

PETITION: NEW GAWLER HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 4 247 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to immediately commence the development of a new hospital at Gawler was presented by the Hon. B. C. Eastick.

Petition received.

PETITION: EXCESS WATER CHARGES

A petition signed by 237 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reconsider the increase in excess water charges to Housing Trust tenants was presented by the Hon. B. C. Eastick.

Petition received.

PETITION: PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

A petition signed by 406 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to install a pedestrian crossing at the intersection of Jetty Street and Military Road at Grange was presented by Mr Ferguson.

Petition received.

PETITION: UNRESTRICTED RETAIL TRADING

A petition signed by 285 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to introduce unrestricted retail trading was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: PUBLIC CONVENIENCES

A petition signed by 226 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to part fund the erection of public conveniences in Coomandook was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: HALLETT COVE SCHOOL

A petition signed by 694 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide tuition to year 12 at Hallett Cove School was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

PETITION: POLICE STATION

A petition signed by 1 283 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to establish a police station at the Hallett Cove Shopping Centre was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

PETITION: STIRLING OVAL

A petition signed by 4 616 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to prevent the sale of the Stirling Oval was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: WATER RATING SYSTEM

A petition signed by 472 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to revert to the previous water rating system was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board—Report, 1990.

Remuneration Tribunal—Reports relating to—
Members of Parliament.
Members of the Judiciary.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Lottery and Gaming Act 1936—Regulations—
Expiation (Amendment).
Licence Numbers.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

The Commissioners of Charitable Funds—Report, 1989-90.

Lyell McEwin Health Service Superannuation Fund—
Report, 1989-90.

Regulations under the following Acts—

Controlled Substances Act 1984—Regulations—Pest
Controller Fees.

Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935—Regula-
tion—Noarlunga Health Services Incorporated.

Food Act 1985—Regulation—Labelling.

Health Act 1935—Regulations—
Septic Tank Fees.

Swimming and Spa Pools Revocation.

Physiotherapists Act 1945—Regulations—Fees.

Psychological Practices Act 1973—Regulation—
Registration Fee.

Public and Environmental Health Act 1987—Reg-
ulations—Swimming and Spa Pools.

Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982—Reg-
ulations—Ionizing Radiation—
Definitions and Dosage.
Fees.

South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—
Regulations—
Cancer Reporting.

Compensable Patient Fees.
Multiple Prescription Drugs.
Private Patient Fees.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of the 135th
Meeting.

Australian Soil Conservation Council—Resolutions of
the 6th Meeting.

Citrus Board of South Australia—Report, 1989-90.

Regulations under the following Acts—

Meat Hygiene Act 1980—Regulations—
Licence Fees.

Inspection Fees.

Stock Act 1990—Regulations—Diseases, Certifica-
tion and Tagging.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—

Abalone Fishery—Scheme of Management.

Aquatic Reserves—Port Noarlunga and West Island.

Exotic Fish—Permitted Species.

Experimental Crab Fishery—Licences.

Fish Processors—Registration Fee.

Fish Processors—Registration, Records and Fees.

General Fishery—Definitions, Sizes and Licences.

Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Scheme of Manage-
ment.

Marine Scalefish Fishery—Scheme of Management.

Miscellaneous Fishery—Licences.

Prawn Fishery—Scheme of Management.

River Fishery—Scheme of Management.

Rock Lobster Fishery—Scheme of Management.

Fisheries (Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery Rationalisa-
tion) Act 1987—Regulations—Licence Transfer.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Classification of Publications Board—Report, 1989-90.

Privacy Committee of South Australia—Report, 1990.

Teachers Registration Board of South Australia—Report,
1990.

Corporations (South Australia) Act 1990—Rules of
Court—Jurisdiction.

Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Local
Court Rules—Case Management.

Supreme Court Act 1935—Rules of Court—High Court
Remissions.

Regulations under the following Acts—

Associations Incorporation Act 1985—Regula-
tions—Fees.

Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1966—
Regulations—Fees.

Builders Licensing Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.

Business Names Act 1963—Regulations—Fees.

Classification of Publications Act 1974—Regula-
tions—SHHH Australia Incorporated.

Commercial and Private Agents Act 1986—Regu-
lations—

Executor Trustee Australia Ltd.

Fees.

Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Regulations—Fees.

Consumer Credit Act 1972—Regulations—Fees.

Consumer Transactions Act 1972—Regulations—
Fees.

Co-operatives Act 1983—Regulations—Fees.

Credit Unions Act 1989—Regulations—Fees.

Cremation Act 1891—Regulations—Fees.

Education Act 1972—Regulations—Corporal Pun-
ishment.

Fees Regulation Act 1927—Regulations—

Overseas Student Fees.

Places of Public Entertainment Fees.

Goods Securities Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.

Land Acquisition Act 1969—Regulations—Forms
and Conditions.

Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Reg-
ulations—

Disclosures.

Executor Trustee and Land Brokers Society.

Fees.

Landlord and Tenant Act 1936—Regulations—Fees.

Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—Fees.

Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913—Regula-
tions—Fees.

- Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983—Regulations—Fees.
Licensing Levy.
- Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia Act 1983—Regulations—Certificates and Fees.
- Strata Titles Act 1988—Regulations—Record Keeping and Information.
- Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulations—Traffic Infringement Notices.
- Trade Measurements Act 1971—Regulations—Fees.
- Travel Agents Act 1986—Regulations—Definitions and Trustees.
Fees.
- Trustee Act 1936—Regulations—Housing Loans Insurance Corporation Limited.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
- Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—
Application to Lease, 12, 26 June, 10 July 1991.
Issue of Licences, 10, 24 April, 22 May 1991.
Transfer of Licences, 8 May 1991.
- Regulations under the following Acts—
- Commercial Motor Vehicles (Hours of Driving) Act 1973—Regulations—Log Book Fees.
- Metropolitan Adelaide Road Widening Plan Act 1972—Regulations—Building Works.
- Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Regulations—Consumer Safety and Service.
- Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Regulations—Fees.
Towing Fees.
Definitions and Licences.
- Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—
Inspection Fees and Exemptions.
Moonta Jubilee Hospital Incorporated.
Speed Limit and Safety Helmets.
- Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulations—
Infringement Notices.
- By the Minister of Finance (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
- Friendly Societies Act 1919—
General Laws of the Friendly Societies Medical Association Incorporated.
Amendments to Laws and Rules of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows Grand Lodge of South Australia, Manchester Unity Friendly Society and Lifeplan Community Services.
- Superannuation Act 1988—Regulations—
Commutation Limits.
Lotteries Commission Staff.
Non-monetary Remuneration.
STA Employees.
- By the Minister of Public Works (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
- West Terrace Cemetery Act 1976—Regulations—Fees.
- By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
- Racing Act 1976—Rules—
Bookmakers Licensing Board—
Field Racing.
Runner and Bookmaker Risks.
- Harness Racing Board—
Age of Licensees.
Fees.
Name Changes.
Race Safety.
Whips, Disqualification and Horse Sales.
- By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
- Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Report—Child, Adolescent and Family Health Service, Whyalla.
- Regulations under the following Acts—
- Beverage Container Act 1975—Regulations—
Exemptions.
- Building Act 1971—Regulations—National Technical Code.
- Clean Air Act 1984—Regulations—Licensing and Transfer Code.
- National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Regulations—
Revocation.
Endangered and Rare Species.
- Native Vegetation Act 1991—Regulations—Vegetation Clearance.
- Planning Act 1982—Regulations—North Haven.
- Waste Management Act 1987—Regulations—Fees.
- By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
- Regulations under the following Acts—
- Sewerage Act 1929—Regulations—
Fees.
Registration and Examination Fees.
- Water Resources Act 1990—Regulations—Fees.
- Waterworks Act 1932—Regulations—
Fees.
Registration and Examination Fees.
- By the Minister of Lands (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
- Regulations under the following Acts—
- Bills of Sale Act 1886—Regulations—Fees.
- Crown Lands Act 1929—Regulations—Fees.
- Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989—Regulations—
Compensation and Fees.
Fees.
- Real Property Act 1886—Regulations—
Land Division Fees.
Real Property Fees.
- Registration of Deeds Act 1935—Regulations—Fees.
- Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1932—Regulations—Fees.
- Strata Titles Act 1988—Regulations—Fees.
- Surveyors Act 1975—Regulations—Fees.
- Valuation of Land Act 1971—Regulations—Definitions and Heritage Land.
- By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
- Firearms Act 1977—Regulations—Fees.
- Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulations—
Photographic Detection Devices.
- By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
- Regulations under the following Acts—
- Gas Act 1988—Regulations—Examination Fees.
- Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920—Regulations—Fees.
- Mining Act 1971—Regulations—Fees.
- By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
- Industrial Court and Commission of South Australia—
Report 1990-91.
- Industrial Relations Advisory Council—Report, 1990-91.
- Motor Fuel Licensing Board—Report 1990.
- Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972—
Industrial Proceedings Rules.
- Regulations under the following Acts—
- Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1968—Regulations—Fees.
- Dangerous Substances Act 1979—Regulations—Fees.
- Explosives Act 1936—Regulations—Fees.
- Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972—
Regulations—Prescribed Employees and Oaths.
- Lifts and Cranes Act 1985—Regulations—Fees.
- Worker's Liens Act 1893—Regulations—Fees.
- Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986—Regulations—
Claims and Registration.
Levy and Expiation Fees.
Replacement Value.
Review and Appeals—Costs and Appeals.
Sporting Professionals.
Disclosure of Information.
Forms.
- By the Minister of Occupational Health and Safety (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
- Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986—
Occupational Health and First Aid in the Workplace—
Regulations and Approved Code of Practice.
- Regulations—
Asbestos—Fees.
Confidentiality of Health Records.
Construction Safety—Fees.
Health and First Aid.

- By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
 Harbors Act 1936—Regulations—Mooring.
 Marine Act 1936—Regulations—
 Certificate of Competency Fees.
 Survey Fees.
- By the Minister of Employment and Further Education
 (Hon. M.D. Rann)—
 Roseworthy Agricultural College—Report, 1990.
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981—
 Regulations—Personal Servicing.
 Local Government Act 1934—Regulations—
 Expiation of Offences.
 Parking.
 Local Government Finance Authority Act 1983—
 Regulations—Outback Areas Community Devel-
 opment Trust.
 Private Parking Areas Act 1986—Regulations—
 Unauthorised Damage and Fees.
- Corporation By-laws—
 Town of Renmark:
 No. 5—Cemeteries.
 No. 6—Taxis.
 No. 7—Streets.
 No. 14—Libraries.
 District Council of Loxton:
 No. 38—Camping on Council Land.
 District Council of Victor Harbor:
 No. 29—Taxis.
 No. 30—Repeal of By-laws.
 No. 31—Penalties and Permits.
 No. 32—Garbage.
 District Council of Wakefield Plains:
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties.
 No. 2—Taxis.
 District Council of Warooka:
 Amendment By-law No. 4—Garbage Con-
 tainers.
 District Council of Yorketown:
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties.
 No. 4—Caravans.
 No. 6—Bees.
 No. 7—Repeal of By-laws.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Speaker, I wish to advise the House of the Government's response to the recommendations of the report of the Government Management Board into the operations of the State Government Insurance Commission. I understand that copies of the report have been distributed to all members of the House. At the time of the 1989 State election, I announced that the Government would progressively review the operations of Government business operations. Mr Brian Sallis, a well-known businessman who is currently Chairman of the Advertiser group, was asked to join the Government Management Board to head a sub-board to oversee these reviews.

In February of this year, I asked the Chairman of the Government Management Board to give priority in its program of reviews to examination of financial institutions commencing with SGIC. On 14 February I advised the Chairman of SGIC of this review and directed that the commission cooperate fully with the Government Management Board review team. The House was advised of these decisions in answer to a question from the member for Walsh on 21 February. At that time I also announced the composition of the review team.

The Government structured the review to ensure that SGIC was subject to a thorough and independent examination. The terms of reference were broadly drawn and the review group was comprised of persons from outside the

Public Service with wide experience in financial issues. The report we now have before us vindicates those decisions and its publication in full demonstrates my Government's commitment to ensuring that the operations of public sector financial institutions are as open to scrutiny as commercial considerations allow.

The findings of the review have been widely reported in recent days and will no doubt be the subject of debate later today. Consequently, I do not intend to dwell on them in this statement. However, I believe it is appropriate to refer to the committee's comment which indicates that the committee recognised that SGIC was in most respects well managed and its operations conducted efficiently. I quote the committee's comments in the summary of the report:

As with any organisation of the size and complexity of SGIC there are always some areas which do not perform as well as others. It is inevitable in a review of this type that attention should be concentrated upon those areas. This review is no exception. The committee wishes to emphasise, however, that the majority of SGIC's operations are well-managed and conducted efficiently.

The Government accepts that the review team concentrated on areas of SGIC's operations in which reform and change were necessary. I believe that all members should be reassured by the emphasis the report lays on the fundamental viability and strength of SGIC. However, the Government does view with concern the shortcomings which have been identified and is determined to take action to correct them.

The report contains 21 recommendations, of which one is a procedural proposal concerning a process for dealing with the remaining 20. Of these 20, 12 have been agreed to by the Government, and three have been agreed to in principle, recognising that some further consideration of detail is necessary. Of the remaining five, four have been noted because they have already been in effect implemented or do not require Government action, and one is to be the subject of further consideration in the context of the review of the Act.

Mr Speaker, I now table a schedule which details Cabinet's decisions concerning each of the recommendations. These decisions have been communicated to the Acting Chairman of the SGIC who has advised me that the commission is totally supportive of the decisions the Government has taken concerning the implementation of the recommendations. I would like at this stage to make some comment on what I believe to be the more significant recommendations flowing from the report.

The report proposes the formation of a group to review and assess its recommendations and to monitor their implementation. The composition of this group is to include representatives from SGIC, Treasury and the Government Management Board. The Government accepts that the formation of this group is essential to the process of implementing the recommendations and meeting the objectives of the review. Consequently, I have directed that the establishment of the group be given priority. The Government Management Board has nominated Mr John Heard, the Chairman of the sub-board which conducted the review, to represent it on this group. I support this decision as it will ensure that the impetus created by the review is maintained and that the concerns expressed by the review group remain firmly at the centre of any consideration of change.

The report also makes a number of recommendations which require amendment to the SGIC Act. The Government has accepted these recommendations and will bring forward appropriate amendments. However, on that legislation being read a second time the Government will move that it be referred to a select committee of the House of Assembly. The report also makes recommendations on the

contentious issues of credit risk insurance, in particular property put business, and interfund loans. The report notes that Treasury has agreed on guidelines with SGIC, which impose prudential controls on exposures undertaken through credit risk insurance. These guidelines were confirmed in a letter dated 19 March 1991 from me to the Chief General Manager.

In relation to put-options, the correspondence I have just referred to also confirmed that the commission would not undertake any further property put transactions without further approval. The report recommends that the property put business should be critically reviewed before SGIC re-enters this area. However, the Government intends to maintain the prohibition of this type of business and consequently does not believe any further review is necessary.

On the question of interfund loans, the report identifies three areas of concern. Primarily, it concludes that such loans are not authorised by the SGIC Act. The report acknowledges that the matter is not beyond doubt; nevertheless, it concludes that the practice was uncontrolled and indeed unknown to the board for some time, and was therefore inappropriate and improper. The opinions which throw doubt on the legal basis of these loans point out that they could have been put beyond doubt if they had been made via another entity such as a subsidiary company. This highlights the technical nature of the legal issues involved, which the Government believes necessitates further examination in the context of the review of the Act.

Finally, the matter of SGIC's capitalisation has been the subject of considerable comment. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that SGIC has reached its current position without any taxpayer-provided capital beyond an initial loan, which was quickly repaid. I also note that the report is not suggesting that capital is required to meet current liabilities. The Government accepts that the discussions currently under way between SGIC and Treasury concerning the adequate capitalisation of SGIC should be continued with a view to making recommendations.

The Government set up this review to tell it whether mistakes were being made, whether systems were inadequate or policies inappropriate. It did not ask the review team to provide a litany of SGIC strengths and successes. In response the review team has provided a report which is uncompromising but balanced. The review has identified problems but has done so in the context of reminding us that SGIC enjoys a remarkable record of growth and achievement. It draws attention to inadequate practice but stresses the basic strength and viability of SGIC. And it calls for new procedures while recognising that the majority of SGIC's operations are well managed and conducted efficiently and that significant efforts to make improvements have already begun, with much already achieved.

I have already referred to the series of reviews of Government business operations being undertaken by the Government Management Board. Concurrently with these reviews, the board examined the practices and policy relating to the operation and use of statutory boards. At this stage, the board's report has not been formally considered by Government. However, I would indicate to the House that it makes recommendations which would establish consistent guidelines concerning responsibility and accountability between all statutory authorities, in particular in relation to such matters as:

- The duties of directors.
- Powers and functions of boards.
- Provisions for dealing with conflicts of interest.
- Requirements regarding disclosure, annual reporting and performance.

- The regulation of the relationship of Government through a requirement to develop operating and financial charters. This charter would include specific statements concerning the agencies' key objectives, targets and measures by which performance will be assessed.
- I would expect to be able to advise the House of the action the Government will take in regard to these matters in the context of the presentation of this year's budget.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following after session reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children,
Hamilton High School Redevelopment,
Rehabilitation of the Trunk Sewer in Warren Avenue/
Bonython Avenue at Glenelg and Novar Gardens,
Seaford Residential Development—Water Supply and
Sewerage Headworks,
Waikerie Salt Interception Scheme.

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works—Replacement Engine
Generator Sets,
Port Augusta College of TAFE—Coober Pedy Campus
Redevelopment,
Woodcroft Primary School.
Ordered that reports be printed.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE REPORT

The **SPEAKER** brought up the first report of the Standing Orders Committee (1991).

Ordered that report be printed.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time allotted for this debate be until 4.47 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I move:

That this House, recognising:

that section 3 of the State Government Insurance Commission Act makes the commission subject to the control and directions of the Government through the Treasurer;

that a review of the SGIC by the Business Operations Reviews Sub-board of the Government Management Board has reported the following actions which are contrary to the provisions and intent of the Act for which the Treasurer is the Minister responsible:

- failure to keep separate and distinct funds for insurance business (section 20);
- failure to keep proper accounts and records (section 19);
- carrying out insurance business outside South Australia (section 12);
- failing to follow proper investment procedures and maintain investment guidelines (sections 16 and 16 (a));
- failing to report outside company directorships held by executives (section 16 (a));
- failing to maintain a board of five members (section 3)

that the intention of Parliament in amending the Motor Vehicles Act in 1986 to contain the cost of compulsory third party

insurance has been flouted by illegal interfund loans and other contrived financial arrangements within the SGIC which have reduced the investment income of the CTP fund

that Parliament, notwithstanding persistent questions asked about the SGIC's operations over the past two years has been misled by the Treasurer in the following respects:

- the prudence of the SGIC's investment performance;
- the management of the compulsory third party insurance fund;
- the advice sought by the commission before seeking approval for a series of property put options;
- the funding and operations of the SGIC's health insurance;
- the cost and returns from SGIC's investment in the radio industry;
- the reasons for the SGIC's recent sale of shares

that, notwithstanding section 5 of the South Australian Timber Corporation Act making the corporation subject to the control and direction of the Minister of Forests, the corporation and the State Government Insurance Commission have lost up to \$60 million through the Scrimber project despite warnings from the Auditor-General from 1986 and repeated questions in this House about the viability of the investment

that, notwithstanding section 14 of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act making the WorkCover Corporation subject to the general direction and control of the Minister, section 66, which requires WorkCover to be fully funded, and an assurance by the Minister of Labour to this House on 22 August 1989 that WorkCover was fully funded, WorkCover now faces unfunded liabilities of \$250 million and internal estimates of further increases to almost \$500 million

this House has no confidence in the Government, because of its demonstrated financial incompetence, its failure to enforce the Acts of this Parliament under which its financial institutions operate and its failure to account to this House fully and honestly for financial operations directly funded, underwritten or guaranteed by taxpayers, and calls on the Premier and Treasurer to tender the resignation of his Government forthwith so that public and business confidence in South Australia can be restored as soon as possible.

This motion is deliberately specific. It makes three basic charges: that this Government is financially incompetent; that it has failed to enforce the Acts which govern the State's financial institutions; and, that it has failed to account fully and honestly to this Parliament.

Any one of these charges would deserve the censure of this House, but taken together they demand action by all members of this House who believe in the right and responsibility of this Parliament to hold the Government to account on behalf of the electors. I will not mince words. I say this directly to the member for Elizabeth: I respect his commitment to the vital role of Parliament in our democratic process. This afternoon he has an opportunity to join with us in asserting that role through his support for this motion.

The motion lists three major examples of financial incompetence and failure of accountability to this House. With SGIC, the Premier as Treasurer argues that there is no reason for any fundamental concern. The Treasurer smugly deludes himself, ignores irrefutable and independent evidence and continues to surround himself with yes-men who tell him what he wants to hear. The report of the review committee speaks for itself. It does not matter what the Treasurer or anyone else involved with that report now says with the benefit of hindsight.

SGIC's contingent liabilities now exceed \$1.5 billion. The Treasurer was warned of the potential huge financial risk that this implies in a memo from then Under Treasurer Prowse dated 20 April 1990. Yet, for almost 12 months, he took no action. SGIC has more than \$750 million of non-performing assets when the Collins Street put option is brought to account. Almost half its assets are non-performing. Were it a private insurer, SGIC would be insolvent.

The simple truth is that SGIC can remain viable only if it retains a monopoly on third party insurance and a Government guarantee of its operations. Because there is no independent market valuation of SGIC's assets or liabilities, the situation could be even worse. Our motion also refers

to Scrimber, which is in part associated with the SGIC debacle and to the scandal of WorkCover. My colleagues, the Deputy Leader and the Shadow Minister of Labour, will deal in further detail with these matters.

We could also list the State Bank, which is the greatest financial disaster in South Australia's history. But that is inappropriate for today; it will be saved for another day. This Opposition has resisted the urgings of many people outside this Chamber to bring about the downfall of this Government. This is despite the arrogance consistently shown by the Government in thinking it could gamble profitably with taxpayers' money and compete with the private sector. Up to now, we have felt that, with an election only 20 months ago, this Government was elected to govern. Certainly it is a Government by default—it received the support of a minority of the State's voters—but, on the electoral laws that existed in 1989, it was legally elected. We accepted this. However, the mismanagement of this Government has now been given a grotesque new face.

We have had the duplicity of the Treasurer clearly exposed by independent financial experts in a report on the SGIC. We have witnessed yet another financial scandal which threatens to rob the State of many millions of dollars that might otherwise have been available to maintain Government services and reduce the tax burden of the State Bank debacle. We have watched the disintegration of Scrimber at a cost of \$60 million, on top of other multi-million dollar South Australian Timber Corporation failures—failures the Government was warned about up to five years ago. And we are still in the process of facing the mounting stench of the ill-conceived WorkCover Commission which has unfunded liabilities mushrooming towards \$500 million.

All these disasters have been confirmed with hideous clarity since February. Our predictions, concerns and questions have been vindicated. Now, our patience has run its course. The people of South Australia deserved better than this when they elected this minority Government. We do not take lightly the moving of such a motion against the Government. But the events of the past few weeks compel us to take this step and have everyone in this Chamber stand up and be counted.

I turn now to specific matters of substance regarding SGIC. In doing so, I seek to outline to the House the following: the clear responsibilities of supervision and control that are placed on the Treasurer in the management of SGIC, how the Treasurer has ignored and evaded these responsibilities, and how the Treasurer has breached the Act and, in several significant instances, acted illegally; how the Treasurer has misled this Parliament; and how these breaches of the Act and misleadings of Parliament expose further the Treasurer's culpable financial incompetence.

First, the SGIC Act in several of its key sections places the commission quite specifically under the direction of the Treasurer. That is how Labor wanted it to be when it established SGIC 20 years ago, and that is why the buck stops very squarely with the Treasurer right now. Section 3 (3) alone gives the Treasurer the power and responsibility over all aspects of SGIC's operations, as well as specific power over investments. This power and responsibility has been abused. The review committee reported a 'general lack of control' of SGIC operations.

Section 3 (5) states that the board of the commission 'shall consist of five members' and subsequent sections provide for filling casual vacancies or making new appointments to maintain that number. But for almost two years there have been only four members on that board. Section 12 (1) of the Act empowers the commission following 'the directions of the Minister . . . to undertake and carry on in the State

the general business of insurance'. This requirement does not square with the interstate property put options approved by the Treasurer which are insurance contracts which insure the project financier or developer against a fall in the value of the building by the time it is completed and ready for sale or lease.

Section 16 of the SGIC Act relates to specific SGIC investments which must be approved by the Treasurer. The existence of this section again ensures that the Treasurer cannot avoid the blame for any of the commission's non-performing investments. Other investments under section 16 and 16a must fall within investment guidelines set by the Treasurer. But the review states at page 14:

... no guidelines are in force for the separate insurance funds. Guidelines were last approved by the Treasurer in April 1987.

Section 16a also requires that any directorships or other prescribed relationships of any SGIC member, officer or employee during a financial year must be reported in SGIC's next annual report. But section 16a was breached in the 1989-90 annual report. The Chief Executive of the commission and other senior executives hold many directorships which were not reported. So, too, do commissioners. For example, SGIC executive Brian Jones holds directorships including Brileen in which SGIC has a large and poorly performing investment.

Section 19 (1) of the SGIC Act requires that 'the commission shall at all times keep proper books of account and in such manner and form as are approved by the Treasurer' and that they must 'at all times' be 'true and accurate'. This surely should make invalid practices contrary to the Australian accounting standards, and places the onus fairly and squarely on the Treasurer for what methods are used and the disclosures made.

Section 20 (1) requires separate and distinct funds for different categories of insurance business. Again, quite clearly this section has been breached by illegal interfund loans and transfers involving the compulsory third party and general insurance funds.

The Treasurer's responsibilities under the SGIC Act are extensive. Those responsibilities are quite clear, quite specific and cannot be denied even by a Treasurer very practised at evasion and denial.

I turn now to the independent review committee's extensive report of the SGIC investment procedures and management practices. Please be reminded that these procedures and practices are all required to be under the supervision of the Treasurer. What a damning chronicle of ineptitude and mismanagement this report reveals. It would take more time than is available to me to itemise exhaustively each criticism levelled at SGIC management and its philosophies. I will concentrate on some of the worst.

The commission has been waiting since December 1989 for a fifth member of the board to be appointed by the Treasurer. At a time of very rapid business growth, the commission was denied the full resources at board level to oversee that growth. Page 35 refers to the likelihood of increases in third party premiums in the near future because the CTP fund has had to cope with most of SGIC's poor property investments. The motorists in South Australia will now have to pay for this Treasurer's incompetence, and all because of interfund loan activities which the Crown Solicitor says are not provided for under the Act and which, the review concludes, have no legal basis. Most of the worst performing of SGIC's investments like Scrimber, the Terrace Hotel and Centrepoint (see pages 38, 39 and 86 of the report) have been piled into the CTP fund because SGIC's monopoly means that motorists will have to pick up the tab.

On 31 October 1990, 5.3 million Adsteam shares were transferred to the CTP fund at book value, and that cost the fund \$21 million more than true market value (pages 87-88). This is only one of the CTP fiddles the review exposes. By 31 January 1991 illegal interfund loans had reached \$236 million or 50 per cent of the total investments of the life fund (page 47). To discontinue these loans, some of the commission's blue chip South Australian equities have had to be sold. The review describes such interfund loans as 'reaching huge proportions' and describes them as 'improper', 'inappropriate' and 'must not occur'. This is stated on page 87 of the report.

What greater condemnation of the Treasurer's neglect can there be? And it goes on. On page 53, the review refers to SGIC's corporate plan for 1990 which, says the review, emphasises growth 'with little emphasis on profitability' and contains 'little about investment strategy', which quite obviously is a 'significant shortcoming'.

SGIC has clearly failed to act on the advice of the consultants whom it appointed in June 1989 and who found that the commission had 'no formal investment strategy'. I ask you, Mr Speaker, what more basic criticism can be levelled against an administration than that it had little regard for profits and no formal investment strategy? A managing director of a private company would be sacked for less. The Opposition asked the Treasurer what investment guidelines he had approved for SGIC on 12 December 1990, on 7 March 1991 and again on 14 March 1991. Contemptuous of the Parliament, the Treasurer failed to answer the question.

The review states that SGIC has not adequately analysed or documented investment proposals, and lists a series of non-performing assets amounting to \$272 million. This will soon rise to a massive \$750 million when the ill-fated 333 Collins Street building is brought on balance sheet. The list of SGIC investments reads like a corporate list of death notices, including Scrimber, Centrepoint, the Terrace Hotel and First Radio. What enlightened management vision found that lot? What inspired Government supervision gave them the green light?

Not only did the Treasurer approve the disastrous put option in Collins Street without any reinsurance but he personally approved at least six other property puts, two of which were interstate and two in New Zealand. And I know of at least two other puts which apparently the review was unable to discover. At a time when the \$520 million Collins Street risk had already been taken and the property market was crashing, the Treasurer approved a \$740 million put option on the Chifley Square building in Sydney which mercifully for South Australia was not accepted. The review committee calls this 'lack of prudence'. I call it reckless, wanton speculation.

I turn now to demonstrate how the Treasurer has misled the House. On 21 October 1987, the Treasurer described SGIC as a 'very prudent investor'. He was answering a parliamentary question about the commission's share buying in the bull market just before the stockmarket crash. And on 5 December 1990, answering an Opposition question, the Treasurer said:

The guidelines under which SGIC is required to seek specific approvals are all in place.

Compare this with the independent review report which said:

No Treasurer approved guidelines are in force for the separate insurance funds.

Even if the guidelines that the Treasurer last approved in April 1987 were still in place, SGIC would be in breach of them, because SGIC's property holdings vastly exceed the

25 per cent allowed. The review also reported that, of the \$412 million of investments in new and unproven areas, few have been successful. In April 1991, again answering an Opposition question, the Premier said:

I would hope that any investment that the SGIC undertakes would be in competitive and commercial ways. That is what it advises me and I have no reason to doubt it.

A month earlier, on 7 March, he said this on what formal investment guidelines he had approved for SGIC:

The guideline there is one of commercial return. Obviously it has to conform to SGIC ensuring it has balance in its portfolio and that it is a profitable allocation for its money.

Compare this with pages 62 and 97 of the review which identified lack of balance in SGIC investments with rapid growth in property investments and areas, particularly health insurance and radio station investment, where interest free loans and other non-commercial arrangements were being used. SGIC totally ignores the requirements of the Commonwealth Insurance Act and its watchdog, the Insurance and Superannuation Commission. Just as with SGIC's breach of the Broadcasting Act, the Treasurer sits idly by and does nothing.

In 1986 Parliament legislated to contain costs of third party premiums and reduce fraud. Management of the fund has flouted the intentions of Parliament with the result that motorists now face increased premiums. The Premier told Parliament on 4 September 1990:

The chief improvement that we have seen in recent years has been the way in which SGIC, together with road safety measures and legislative changes . . . has been able to control the compulsory third party insurance scheme.

Compare this with the review committee's finding at page 35 that 'some increase in (CTP) premiums seems unavoidable'.

The notorious put options also involve misleading statements by the Treasurer. According to page 24 of the independent review of SGIC, section 12 (1) of the SGIC Act clearly means that the 'SGIC is effectively restricted to conducting its insurance operations solely within South Australia'. On 13 March 1991, in answering an Opposition question about 333 Collins Street, the Premier said, 'Of course, SGIC would take advice and indeed it takes independent advice on these areas before making some assessment.' The review says at page 77 that 'the apparent level of analysis and documentation on which the decision was made was inadequate'. I will read a long quote from the Premier which shows what a real financial whiz he really is. On 20 March 1991, the Premier told Parliament:

SGIC's practice regarding reinsurance of potential large liabilities is to reinsure the amount of the risk that SGIC believes it is unable to handle on its own account, having regard to its own financial resources. The question of the put on 333 Collins Street is different to other insurance transactions where, in the event of a loss, an amount is paid covering that loss. As regards 333 Collins Street, if the put is called, an amount is paid in exchange for an asset, that asset being the building located at 333 Collins Street. In this instance, reinsurance was not taken but SGIC could have sold down part of the risk. This was not done as it believed there was little likelihood of the put being called.

That from the mouth of the Treasurer of South Australia! The review states at page 76 that it appeared SGIC had entered into the arrangement 'without adequate consideration of reinsurance to control the risk'. Further, the review states at page 10 that 'SGIC's venture into property puts has had disastrous consequences'.

On health insurance, the Premier advised the Estimates Committee on 11 September 1990:

We certainly do not see SGIC as being a big competitor of the existing health funds although we think it quite appropriate for them to offer health cover.

The review has this to say at pages 8 and 51:

The board philosophy has been to subsidise the health operations to obtain market share . . . operating losses have been made each year.

SGIC has done all it can to attempt to put Mutual Community out of business with a \$14.5 million interest-free loan and subsidisation of running costs. I believe in competition. But what we have here is the reckless pursuit of market share using interest-free funds and other subsidies that are Government guaranteed; in other words, the very opposite of fair and open competition. It has been the same with the commission's involvement in the radio industry.

In First Radio 5DN (now 102FM), the commission took equity of \$2.8 million and has made loans of \$8 million where interest has been forgone or written off, and a further \$250 000 interest-free loan was made earlier this year in the form of pre-paid advertising. An avowed purpose of this investment has been the destabilisation of 5AD. In a written reply to an Opposition question on First Radio on 21 August 1990, the Treasurer states:

The investment is one of a number in the total portfolio of SGIC which in recent years have provided excellent returns to the people of South Australia.

Compare what the review committee has to say about that at page 67:

First Radio has always been in a loss-making position from the time of SGIC's investment.

The Treasurer has also misled this House about reasons for the SGIC's recent sale of equities. On 5 March this year he was asked:

What was SGIC's rationale for the sale of South Australian Brewing Holding's shares on 1 March?

The Treasurer replied:

This was done by SGIC as part of its ongoing review of portfolio weighting of its overall share portfolio.

However, the review committee states at page 87:

The effect of reducing the interfund loans has been to sell income producing assets such as listed equities whilst retaining long-term poor income producing assets. This will mean reduced profitability in the immediate future in the CTP fund.

In other words, to repay the illegal interfund loans, SGIC has had to make large-scale share sales. Contrary to what the Treasurer told this House five months ago, these share sales have been forced by improper management. This is but a small sample of how the Treasurer has misled the House, either in fact or in emphasis. Outside the Chamber, he has been similarly evasive.

In the *Advertiser* of 2 March 1991, a spokesman for the Premier was quoted as saying that no formal approach had been made by the SGIC for a capital injection. The review committee states at page 105:

SGIC has corresponded with Treasury on the issue of capitalisation over the past four years without resolution. The committee is of the view that an issue of capitalisation should be reviewed.

The member for Elizabeth proposes greater parliamentary scrutiny of agencies such as SGIC. I agree. We have used Parliament to do so responsibly to the limit of existing procedures. But this Government promised at the 1985 election to establish a permanent parliamentary watchdog to monitor the SGIC and other statutory authorities. This has become just one example of the litany of this Government's broken promises. The member for Elizabeth surely cannot trust this Government to act now.

What also must be remembered is that bland assurances from the Treasurer about the SGIC investment policies come after warnings from the Auditor-General in his 1989 report, from the Under Treasurer in April 1990 and from the new Under Treasurer in July 1990. In other words, he was receiving serious advice and warnings from Government advisers but replying in Parliament to Opposition questions that guidelines were in place (although he would

not specify them); that they were being observed; and that SGIC investment procedures were all properly assessed, resulting in investments which were performing well.

The result of these 'proper assessments' is exposure to \$750 million of non-performing assets and \$1.5 billion in contingent liabilities. Some assessment! Some scrutiny! The Treasurer stands condemned of breach of trust by the electorate, of misleading Parliament, of flagrantly ignoring established administrative and accounting practices and of condoning actions by a Government instrumentality in contravention of an Act of Parliament.

The Opposition is under no illusions about the outcome of this motion. We are ready to accept the challenges of government. We have already established our credentials. Even without the resources of government we could foresee the State Bank, the SGIC, the Scrimber, and the WorkCover debacles. This Government claims it could not.

We have been prepared to ask the hard questions. We have won no favours in the South-East for exposing the Scrimber scandal, but we were more interested in attempting to protect all South Australian taxpayers rather than seeking local political kudos. The same cannot be said for this Government. It has allowed the WorkCover scandal because its union mates set the agenda.

At least week's Caucus seminar, a concerned backbencher asked the Premier what he was going to do about WorkCover. The Premier, of course, handballed the problem straight to the Minister of Labour, which astonished the Caucus. Expecting the Minister of Labour to sort out WorkCover is a bit like the Premier appointing Christopher Skase to return our State Bank to profitability. It was a very good Caucus meeting, I am told. The same might be said of the Minister of Forests being able to sort out Scrimber. With Ministers like these, how can we go on living with this Government?

The Treasurer's hands-off approach has evaded his own responsibilities for far too long. We do not say that the Premier and Treasurer should be exercising day-to-day management of the State's financial institutions—even if he had the ability. But, he should have been aware of the problems that have now been exposed and done something about them before they began to cost all South Australians so much.

If the Opposition knew, the Government should have known. The Treasurer, in particular, stands condemned of breach of trust by the electorate. He has failed properly to administer an important Act of this Parliament. He has failed in his duty and allowed that Act to be breached in a number of respects. He has destabilised the State's vital institutions. He has placed in jeopardy necessary State projects and investment potential. Responsibility for these financial disasters is his and his alone.

We cannot afford this Treasurer and cannot afford this Government. If we do not remove this Government this afternoon, we will not relent. Eventually we will prevail. The taxpayers of South Australia demand that we make the Treasurer accountable to the Parliament for the illegalities, financial incompetence and misleading statements he has made. I implore the House to administer today the ultimate sanction and express itself no longer confident in this Government so that we can begin the task of rebuilding public and business confidence in South Australia.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): The past few minutes of that rather tedious diatribe I think gave the game away quite fully. Members of the Opposition sit

there saying that they are delighted with the accuracy of their prophesy, in that a number of things have not turned out as well as those with the interests of South Australia at heart would have liked. Members opposite are delighted that that has happened, and they are going to stir the pond as much as they can. That is a great approach and a great attitude! Of course, there have been dozens of other things over the course of the past few years that the Opposition has condemned, cast doubts about or had concerns over—a great long list of them. But, we hear nothing about them because they did achieve their objects and they were successful.

As I say, the Leader gave the game away with his approach. This is not really an attack on the Government. We can see the substance of what is going on and the way in which the Opposition of this State is behaving in the middle of one of the most difficult economic periods that this country has had to contend with, and we can see the pattern both within this House and outside it—the scuttlebutt, the minutes carefully distributed to the media and then denied, as the Leader of the Opposition assures everybody that he is not seeking to undermine the State's financial institutions.

This motion is not an attack on the Government: it is an attack on this State and its future, and it is time it stopped. Every aspect of South Australia's life, including every institution, is being attacked and run down—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This House listened to the Leader of the Opposition in absolute silence. There was not one interjection at all from the Government. Members of the Opposition should give the Premier the same right. If they do not, I will insist upon it.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As usual, the Opposition cannot cop it. We sat here silently listening to the Leader of the Opposition. There were a dozen issues that were wrong, and I will deal with a number of them shortly. We did not interject. We let him have his say. We let him put it all on the record. However, as soon as there is some come back, as soon as the record is put straight, listen to the Opposition benches. Up they go, trying to suppress the debate in this House, trying to hide the fact that what I am saying is spot on.

No South Australian would or should respect an Opposition that sees its role as that of acting as a spoiler rather than offering constructive criticism and proposing some positive solutions or alternatives. Like every other State in this nation, South Australia is facing major problems in many areas. I might add that we are doing better than some other States, but we hear nothing about that from members opposite. There is a deafening silence, with not even a nod in that direction. To solve our problems, we have to face them squarely and tackle them head on. That is what the Government is doing. We are discharging our responsibilities, inquiring and commissioning studies and putting into effect the recommendations—doing the things that a Government has to do.

In that, one would hope that there would be at least some constructive support from the Opposition, but not a bit of it. If spending cuts are involved, we find the Opposition spokesperson in that area denouncing them and trying to stir up opposition to them. If it is in terms of the taxing and charging system, again the Opposition is on the front line. If it is about State finances, it is undermining our institutions, and so it goes on. I think people in this community are sick and tired of that approach. They are looking for an Opposition that has not only some sort of perspective as to where we are and recognises that South Australia is sharing problems with other parts of this country (and, in

some cases, handling them better) but, more importantly, has something constructive to say about what it would do or what the alternatives would be. We hear nothing about that. We hear all the negatives and concerns, but never any constructive proposals, because the Opposition has only one policy. It is a simple policy: to get power in this State by any means as quickly as possible.

The Opposition says to the people of South Australia, 'Forget about our policies, trust us; just put us in. We are sure that everything will turn out all right.' That is not good enough! The people's opportunity will come, but it must come at the appropriate time, when the Government has served its term and we go to the people to be judged on how we have handled these difficult years of crisis. It must not occur as a result of the opportunism of an Opposition that just wants to seize an immediate moment in an attempt to scramble into power with no policies and no constructive alternatives.

Let me turn to the issues and put them into perspective. We have certainly heard the horror list of the Opposition, and I will address in a moment the detail spelled out by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech. However, the substance of the argument really is not the motivation for this debate. Why are we having a no-confidence motion debate on this day in this way? The reason is that there has been some sort of demand for it—no doubt a demand in the Party ranks, but certainly a demand in the media, with the suggestion that an Opposition that did not do this was wimping out.

In thinking back a few months ago, certainly one member opposite was very keen on this tactic and followed it through single-handedly, and I refer to the member for Coles. We are well aware of the pressure that she is putting on the front bench of the Liberal Party while she sits on the back bench.

The Leader talks about our Caucus meeting. It is interesting that he did not mention the Party meeting that was held last week—with which this motion also has a lot to do—the meeting at which some minor reforms in a crook pre-selection system in the Liberal Party were debated and discussed. The Leader of the Opposition is apparently part of a reform group which is trying to get its way and which goes to this council meeting. There are absolute ructions—total divisions; indeed, a vote was taken twice on the floor. Admittedly, we have not seen much about that in the papers. Certainly, if it were in our Party, I suspect that it would be on the front page.

Be that as it may, it is all happening there; the tensions are there, and the Leader is being asked to perform, to get off his backside, as it were, and not stand there criticising and cavilling but to try to show a bit of leadership on behalf of his Party. Well, he demonstrated it in his lack of success in that little internal reform, and he is demonstrating it again today in the pettifogging, negative approach that he has taken.

The SGIC has been a major target in this area. The Leader of the Opposition has picked up this report and gone through it in great detail. He has picked out the most unqualifiedly negative interpretation he can of everything that is said. Incidentally, in passing, he talked about our being surrounded by yes-men to advise us. I find that odd. It was in fact the Government and I who commissioned this report and appointed the group that makes the inquiry. If the Leader says on the one hand that this is a terribly objective, damning indictment that has thoroughly exposed the Government and its sins, and on the other that it has been commissioned by us and written by yes-men, I would suggest that it is a very odd conclusion to draw.

What is wrong with the Leader of the Opposition's analysis is that total negativism. Look at the article in today's morning newspaper. There is an interview with one of a very skilled group of independent financial experts who undertook this inquiry. In this interview, Professor Scott Henderson, who is the Professor of Commerce at the university and one of the three on the subcommittee, says he is somewhere between 'bemused and bewildered' at finding himself the co-author of a report that the Opposition claims is the most damning ever written of a Government. And well he might be, if one reads the report carefully and objectively. I seem to recall the Leader of the Opposition claiming that there was 'a scandal on every page'. Well, that is not how Professor Henderson sees the report. He says, in fact:

I don't see it that way at all. Our impression was that the insurance business was effectively run. We had no real criticisms of the insurance branch. And indeed the great bulk of their investments were successful, as well.

Then, there is this conspiracy theory that is being put up by the Opposition around the Collins Street put option—the 'SA Inc.' proposal that it has been trying to run with very hard indeed. One of the findings of the report is that it simply does not exist. It does not exist because this Government took great care to make it not exist. I might say in that context that perhaps there should have been some areas where a more concerted approach was necessary, and perhaps that is one of the areas we need to examine. The evidence is there; it did not exist, and as for some conspiracy which fixed up the Victorian Government, again, the Professor says:

We found no evidence of that. The property put for this building was being hawked around. SGIC made an offer. We found no evidence . . . that this was one Government helping another.

Nor was there, and it is absolute nonsense to claim so. In looking at the SGIC report and at those criticisms, let us recall that perspective and balance in this whole matter. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology will talk a bit about our State's economic performance when he addresses the issues in this debate, and he will put the structure of our economy into some perspective. He could well mention some of those things, such as the Grand Prix, the Convention Centre and the whole tourism industry, the submarine project, the Anzac frigates project, the bid for the Commonwealth Games, the way in which our defence and aerospace industry has developed—all of these, which have changed the basic structure of our economy; all of which have had to a greater or lesser degree major success and are major marketing tools; all of which in some way or another have had Government involvement. Do we hear anything about them from the Opposition? Not a word.

When the MFP feasibility study was released and when the committee said that the project was a goer and had huge potential for jobs and everything else in South Australia, what did the Opposition do? It said that it was no good and ought to be rejected. An outrageous statement!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, the honourable member apparently is going to speak; I would be more interested in hearing him on that than on SGIC and the other matters he wants to talk about. I would like to hear his reaction to a project which we fought for in this State, which we got against all odds, for which we have just recently obtained Federal Government acceptance and with which we are going to move into the twenty-first century.

When we look at a number of those examples and when we look at the positive population inflow that is occurring in South Australia, we see that things cannot be too bad if that is the situation. When we look at the state of our

housing program and business investment generally, we see there is a lot to be pleased about in South Australia in its weathering of this economy. We have done this from a base of being the lowest taxing State—with the one exception of Queensland—in the country. We are a low taxing State. We have done this by providing services that are recognised by the Grants Commission as being the best in the country, and we have done it having one of the lowest debt ratios of that in any State. We have the second lowest amount of our revenue put into servicing interest, the second lowest per capita debt and the second lowest debt as a ratio of gross State product. Admittedly, we have to cope with issues such as the servicing of the State Bank indemnity fund, and that will alter our debt profile which, incidentally, we have worked down every year we have been in office so far: we have worked down the State's debt.

Is this financial mismanagement and incompetence? I do not know where the honourable member has been. If a State that has low debt, low taxes and high services is able to put that package together, there is a lot to be proud of and we will hear much about it.

As to SGIC, in my statement I have already responded to the recommendations of the report. We have acted on them promptly. We have accepted the vast majority of the recommendations and, of those we have not accepted, we have not accepted them either because they are already in train and accomplished or because a couple of them need a much closer examination because one is trying to decide between two considerations and it will depend on the shape that the Act should take.

The review board did exactly what we asked it to do—to provide a frank, balanced and fearless assessment of the SGIC, but it was not, as Professor Henderson reminded us this morning, asked to write some kind of eulogy or praise of the SGIC and its good points and operations. That is not what we were looking for: we wanted to know where the defects were and how they could be fixed. If members look at our response to those recommendations, they will understand that they are being implemented speedily, they are achievable and, as I have said in terms of parliamentary consideration, when we get to the stage of bringing before this House a Bill that will deal with some of those complex matters, we believe the best way of getting them examined properly is for a select committee to look at the provisions of the Bill.

This is not a Government that is hiding anything or backing away from the issue or trying to cover it up; quite the contrary. That has characterised every action we have taken on this matter and in other areas, and we will continue to do so. The Opposition's slash and burn mentality over the SGIC is absolutely disgraceful. Let me put a few balancing facts on the record.

The commission enjoys a strong cash flow: each year more than \$350 million is gathered through premium income and millions of dollars more from investments. Most of that is put back into this State, instead of being siphoned off interstate as occurred in the years before SGIC existed. SGIC has an equities portfolio which is worth about \$500 million and which has out-performed the market over the past six months. In 1990 it made a net profit of about \$30 million on net assets of \$100 million—a healthy return against assets of about 33 per cent. Last year SGIC made a greater profit than most of the household insurance names in this country made, for example FAI, MMI and Royal Insurance, etc.

In fact, it was the fifth most profitable insurance company in the country. Even when 333 Collins Street comes into its portfolio, the ratio of borrowings to assets will be only

25 per cent. So, in all the stoking of the SGIC debate, the Opposition has played up this Collins Street property and the problems that it has caused—a marvellous exercise in hindsight, typical of the way in which the Opposition has behaved on all these issues. Opposition members love to say, 'We told you so,' but they did not, not at all, and that has been consistently established.

For instance, if this was such a disastrous exercise and should have been stopped and called to order, why did the Opposition take nearly a year to even ask a question about it? The Collins Street put option was quite well reported. In fact, in *Australian Business* of 14 December 1988, the financing arrangements, the banks involved, the term of the debt and the involvement of SGIC were all detailed. If there was this massive and major concern, we had days and days—months in fact—of sitting through that period. It was not until the end of 1989 that even a question was asked about it.

SGIC will handle that Collins Street option. It has borrowed \$200 million to pay for the construction debt and it will take over facilities to cover the rest. There is no bail-out. In fact, it holds a property which has very great value. Incidentally, one could be excused for thinking this is an empty white elephant standing there without any activity around it. Of the 29 floors, 11 are leased, and the car park is fully committed. The 59 suite hotel—the Sebel of Melbourne—is showing an occupancy rate of 60 or 70 per cent after only one month's operation. By the middle of this month, 1 000 people will be working in the building and, by the end of the year, there will be an income stream of something like \$6 million from tenants.

We have heard about the Terrace Hotel, and this is another example of the way in which the Opposition seeks to emphasise the negatives. I am delighted that SGIC was prepared to undertake an investment and refurbishment of a terribly degraded hotel property in this city. I am delighted it increased our capacity to handle tourism around Grand Prix and at other times. The Terrace directly employs 340 South Australians and it gives work to some 500 suppliers. It is the only South Australian-owned and managed five-star hotel and it contributes \$16 million turnover to the South Australian economy.

What about SGIC Health? Apparently this is another terrible indictment of the SGIC. We know that the Opposition does not want SGIC to do anything; it was opposed to it from the beginning. SGIC Health commenced operations in August 1987. It was in part response to the fact that other insurance companies and other health funds, including Mutual Community, were going into the general insurance business. Did SGIC sit back on its hands and say, 'Well, they can invade our business but we cannot have anything to do with their areas. They can say they offer a total service to clients, but we cannot say that. We will have to have a narrow base.'? It was a reasonable decision for SGIC to undertake it and the fund has experienced considerable growth. As at 30 June 1990, its capital was \$14 million and it remains within SGIC as a subsidy. It had accumulated losses of \$2.1 million, all within the projections of a start-up business which, of course, is in a loss over the period of its inception, as the Leader well knows, but in this case refuses to concede.

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Any business he has been involved in has been in exactly the same position, and he knows it. You work out how long it will take to build up your share of the market and move into profitability. That is exactly what is happening with SGIC Health. Indeed, if

it does not move into profitability within that program, SGIC should get out of the business, but at the moment it is on target. In fact, it has taken a large share of the market. It has helped keep premiums down by its competitive approach and thousands of South Australian families can be grateful for that. In terms of its reinsurance and its charges, it is providing a competitive product in the marketplace. I repeat, it has to be commercial; it has to be profitable in the long run, and so far that is all right.

What about the CTP fund, Mr Speaker? In 1990 it returned a trading surplus of \$36 million. The deficit is now just around \$9 million. If, in fact, it were liquidated, it would show a profit. Compare those figures with what we call the 'old funds' in New South Wales and Victoria: a \$3 billion deficit in New South Wales and \$2.4 billion in Victoria. Look at the premium levels and then say whether or not CTP is performing in this State. There was a 10 per cent reduction in 1989.

If, in fact, those premiums had been increased with inflation since 1987, they would be \$78 per year more than they are now. In real terms the average weekly cost of third party premiums in South Australia has increased by only .02 per cent since 1974. This is the fund that the Leader of the Opposition denounces for its performance! South Australians pay third party premiums that are 34 per cent less than those of New South Wales and 55 per cent less than those of Victoria. In other words, we are talking about \$250 to \$350 in New South Wales and \$288 in Victoria, against \$86 here. That is not a bad deal for the motorists of South Australia—not a bad deal at all.

And on put options: again, the Leader of the Opposition claims that I have approved six of these options. That is not correct. When options were referred to me following a decision in August 1988 that this was necessary, three, in fact, were put before me for approval. Only one of those—333 Collins Street—was proceeded with and, unfortunately, has also been put—and we have been into that before, Mr Speaker—but the other two were not proceeded with.

As to those that the Leader suggested I had approved and SGIC had entered: not so. The Chifley Square put option and the office building in Christchurch were both rejected by the SGIC before they reached the stage of seeking the Treasurer's approval. So, the Leader had better get some of his facts right before he starts waving around those sorts of figures.

It is interesting that the Executor Trustee Austrust instance has not been raised, either, although no doubt that will come up, and, in view of the time, I will deal with that at the appropriate stage. We were told that from the Leader of the Opposition we would get more grand indictments over scrimber, over WorkCover and over a number of other things. I should like to deal with scrimber.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition says that he would like to see some. Yes, indeed, we would! In my view, this undisguised gloating over the failure of a high-tech vision is absolutely disgraceful. The scrimber concept, conceived initially by our foremost scientific research organisation, is a superb opportunity to get a timber-based structural material that would have major environmental considerations because of the pressure being exerted on the world's diminishing natural forests of hardwood; one that would use immature forest thinnings that were of low or virtually no value, and manage out of that a structural timber product of high value: that was the vision involved, through the pilot plant status.

We found the task of bringing the scrimber concept from the pilot stage to the fully automated commercial produc-

tion beyond the resources of the partnership, because the technical problems have made it fail. That is nothing to feel good about or to gloat about, as members of the Opposition are doing. The fact is that there were no major commercial takers for this process. It was a major opportunity for us, and there were many reasons for doing it.

What have we had from members of the Opposition? We have had the Hon. Mr Davis in another place, the shadow Minister of Forests, running around the country telling everyone that the project is never going to work, the technology is too difficult and expensive, and he is not surprised that it has failed. He is not surprised! Indeed, he has undermined the project consistently, ever since it has been in operation. Of course, he has not had any regard to his colleague the member for Mount Gambier, the previous shadow Minister of Forests, who has since exiled himself to the back bench (again weakening the front bench of the Opposition) and who, in response to this problem, has in fact stated that 'we should call for world-wide expressions of interest to continue the development and research. In the short term we continue to struggle that we may ultimately, in partnership with another research and development company, benefit from sales and royalties down the track'.

In this instance we agree with the member for Mount Gambier, and it is a reasonable thing to do. There are many more things that can be said about scrimber, but let me just pause on that point and say that I find it extraordinary that the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues seem to get such great delight out of the failure of that project to date. In fact, the Leader should remember his own words of September 1989, when he said that, on financial grounds, he had been a critic of the scrimber operation but he 'supported the Minister and the Timber Corporation to see licences for the right to produce scrimber overseas sold, and to get money for that'. 'A very sound and proper way to go,' he said. 'In fact, if the operation is as good as the Minister says, there would be some future in it for this country and this State.' Yes, indeed—and we have pursued that ideal. Unfortunately, it has not come off.

Reference was also made to WorkCover. Again, I will not take up much of the time of the House in dealing with that issue, other than to say that there has been intensive examination of the operations of WorkCover. There have been major administrative changes and reforms (a very long list indeed) in relation to the whole way in which that fund has been operated. Other things are in contemplation and active consideration.

We are committed to making that fund competitive, but we are still waiting for actuarial and other information in order to work out the best way to go. There is even a select committee of the Parliament looking at the matter. So, it is pretty outrageous, and indicates the negativism of members of the Opposition that all they can say about WorkCover is that it is not good and it is not going to work. They have not come up with a single, constructive point of view.

They leave that to others. They leave it to us to talk to the trade unions and the employers while they stand on the side and stir as much as they possibly can. Members opposite must have been very unhappy when they looked at the afternoon newspaper on Tuesday. Across the top of the page was the headline 'SA recovery on the way'. I can imagine Opposition members feeling the chill of that.

Yes, the Deputy Leader throws up the jobless figures. I might remind him that South Australia's employment has held up better than that of any State other than New South Wales relatively over this difficult recessionary period—and

again members of the Opposition want to dance up and down with delight when one month's figures show difficulties.

We still do not have the highest unemployment in the country—something in which the Tonkin Government managed to succeed over something like 30 straight months in the early 1980s. There are some good signs in this economy. There are some things worth fighting for; but there is no way that we will get out of our problems if we have this constant attack on our financial institutions and on investors in this economy, and knockers of any project worth its salt. It is time that it finished, and it is most important that the House reject this destabilising, inappropriately timed and outrageous motion.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Premier has obviously tried to turn this into a Punch and Judy show. The only difference is that this time he is playing Judy for sympathy, because what we have had here today is a disgrace. The people of South Australia deserve much better than this. We are talking about millions of dollars of money poured down the drain. If we take account of the State Bank, we are talking about billions of dollars, and the Premier took the time of this House to talk about how he was hurt that members of the Opposition had asked responsible questions.

People will remember that he spent some time talking about liberal reforms, attacks on this State and the major problems being faced. I remind members that many of the problems we face today fall directly on the table of the Premier of this State, because it is his financial mismanagement that has caused some of the problems and some of the long-term fallout for the fortunes and future of this State.

I also remind the Premier what the debate is about. He did not address the four main issues, and I will briefly state them again. He did not in any way excuse his actions for flagrantly breaching sections 3, 12, 16, 16 (a), 19 and 20 of the SGIC Act. He did not explain what had happened to the compulsory third party fund. If he wants to look at what his independent report has to say about that, I suggest that he read pages 7, 12, 13, 35, 38, 39, 62, 63, 84, 85, 86, 87 and 88. The report says that what the Premier and SGIC are indulging in is downright fraud. It is downright fraud that all these losses in respect of SGIC funds will be recouped through CTP, so that the motorist cops it in the neck at the end of the day.

The Premier did not answer one question about the way in which he has misled this Parliament. In fact, he did not offer any explanation why the guidelines, which were supposed to be in place, were not in place. He did not explain how the decision-making process for significant investments had been agreed to when it had not been. He did not explain his statements on re-insurance. The Premier did not explain the statements about why the health fund was not a competitor in the health field. He did not explain why his comments to the Parliament on the excellent investments for radio stations were such a success. The Premier has misled the Parliament on a number of occasions.

We do not know what the Government is doing until the reports come out. In fact, as soon as the report concerning 333 Collins Street came out we asked questions about it. So, the Premier cannot say that we did not ask questions early enough. If the Premier wants to cross the floor, we will take over Government and we will do the job properly. The Premier talked about the Terrace Hotel being a very financially viable institution. I remind him that any busi-

ness that does not account for \$15 million worth of interest on its loans can be financially viable.

The Premier talked about the health fund standing on its own two feet. Yet, the report says that it has not, that it has had to have interest-free loans to make it viable. On all those issues the debate is about financial responsibility and not about the state of the economy, whether there are reforms, the Grand Prix, submarines or the MFP. The Premier should ask his Federal colleagues about their financial commitment to the MFP; and one can wonder whether the project will get off the ground before the twenty-first century, given the endorsement it received recently.

We are not here to debate those issues; we are here to debate the issue of financial responsibility, in which area the Premier has failed. I note the Premier and the Minister of Forests have made statements about Scrimber. I remind members of what was said on 17 November 1989 when the Premier prematurely opened the Scrimber venture. He said, 'The tremendous impact on future timber technology throughout the world...'. One can only suggest that the 'tremendous impact' has been of an extremely negative nature, because we have nothing whatsoever to show for \$60 million worth of investment. The incompetence of the Premier and the Minister in relation to that \$60 million has caused tragedy for the families involved, the South-East and taxpayers. That project has further tarnished our reputation in respect of what this State can achieve.

They are the things we are talking about today—not the MFP or the Grand Prix. We are talking about the Premier's financial responsibility, and he has failed us. I remind Parliament that the problems with respect to Scrimber are not new. On 26 July 1986 the Auditor-General questioned the Government about the project and said that he had concerns about it, and the Treasurer knows that. Members will find that in his 1987, 1988, 1989 and 1990 reports the Auditor-General outlined his extreme concern about the viability of that project, particularly in respect of the cost blowouts. He made the point very succinctly when he said, 'Every time you increase the cost of the project it makes it less viable.'

In 1985 this project was to cost \$12.5 million. In 1986 the Auditor-General said that he was concerned, because the estimate was that it could cost as much as \$20 million. In 1987—and this is well documented—*Hansard* records the extent to which two aspects of this project were seriously questioned, particularly by the Hon. Legh Davis, a member of the other place. Questions were raised about SATCO not making a profit on any of its projects since 1979. I mention names like Punwood, Shepherdson and Mewett, Zeds, Ecology, Beddison, Mount Gambier Pine and Aorangi, Timber (which then went into the infamous IPL). SATCO was taking new technology forward but had not made a profit on previously profitable mills, so what hope did it have?

We have warned the Government. This is not new. The Auditor-General tried to warn the Government. The Hon. Legh Davis, the Leader of the Opposition, and the member for Mount Gambier all tried to warn the Government. All we got from the Minister of Forests was that we were trying to undermine the project, that we were trying to sink it, and that the claims of the Opposition were rubbish. That has been the level of debate of this Government. I find that level of debate disgusting. There is nothing that the Government can hold on to now in its attempts to imply that we acted in any way irresponsibly. I believe that the Premier and Treasurer of this State and the Minister of Forests have not only misled the Parliament on one or two occasions about the operations of Scrimber and its 18 proposed opening dates but also that they have acted quite irresponsibly.

This is a serious matter. It is in concert with the issues that have been raised in relation to WorkCover and SGIC. Of course, SGIC is part and parcel of the Scrimber project as it is a 50 per cent owner. It is now time for the independent member for Elizabeth to apply the ultimate sanction to this Government that has lost its way and has failed to be accountable.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology): I believe that today we have seen another definition of an anticlimax. We have had the whole of South Australia whipped up to an elaborate expectation, to a state of electricity, anticipating that the Government would be placed on the ropes. Today, according to the Opposition, we were going to hear the supposed truth uncovered, and that the full incompetence, so believed, of the Government would become transparently obvious. What we have seen is nothing more than an anticlimax. I do not believe that the real question today is who on this side of the Chamber will end up crossing the floor and voting against the Government; in the minds of some members opposite it must surely be how come they are stuck voting with the Opposition on this motion.

The substance of the motion is in its last sentence. The Opposition is asking this Parliament and the people of South Australia to call for the resignation of the Government so that public and business confidence can be restored as soon as possible. The key to the motion is the want of confidence. The key to the motion is which leading Party in this State is more able in these hostile economic times to provide leadership and decision-making, and to make the decisions even when they are hard decisions, to acknowledge when mistakes have been made and to correct those mistakes and do something about it. That is what this debate is all about. It is interesting to note that it is what the response to the *Advertiser* poll on Wednesday seemed to be all about. When the electors of Elizabeth were polled in that *Advertiser* survey who did they come out believing was the better leader of this State? Not the Opposition Leader, but the Premier of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The real test is what this Government has to offer compared to what the alternative Government has to offer. In facing that question, some things must be acknowledged. Investment decisions have been made in South Australia that are not perfect. Which business in the private sector has ever been able to record a 100 per cent track record on its investment decisions? There are a number of which members opposite have been strong supporters or have been associated with over the years that cannot hold up a 100 per cent track record.

Further, it also has to be acknowledged that we are in very hostile economic times. This country is in a recession. Internationally, we are in a hostile economic environment because of what is happening with the corruption of the international agricultural commodities market. So, the decisions are hard. The results we are facing in this community are hard. So, what is it that the alternative Government says should be happening? Well, we do in fact have words to quote from members opposite as to what they believe should be happening. Far be it for me to put words in their mouth. I will pluck their own words from their own mouth and enter them into the debate, because they do not seem to have entered the speeches of members opposite.

As part of his desire to whip up the mood of gloom in South Australia, the Leader of the Opposition was recently quoted in the Kingston *Leader* as saying:

South Australia is on the brink of bankruptcy.

Relishing these thoughts, he then went on to talk about the 'Baker solution'. He said a number of interesting things, including:

Under a Liberal Government, there will be no subsidies from Government at all. The Government cannot afford to be propping up people. If you think you are going to have your hand held by Government, especially in South Australia under a Liberal Government, well this is not going to happen. We cannot afford to get into the subsidy mode that we have been in this country for a long time. We will never never as a State Government put in capital for primary producers again.

What then will members opposite do? In what is one of the most amazing about-faces, in the next paragraph he is quoted as follows:

What the Liberal Party intends to do is grant interest rate subsidies to those in financial trouble, whether it be because of economic conditions, drought, fire or flood. These subsidies will be made available for whatever period of time the problems are expected to continue.

That is just two paragraphs after saying that is not what they will do. What else will they do? What is the alternative they are suggesting should give the public and the business community of South Australia—which is in the wording of their motion—the confidence that we need to face these hostile times? We can turn to the shadow Minister of Agriculture, when addressing the United Farmers and Stockowners, the key body of farmers in this State. The UF&S is anxious about the economic conditions facing this State, and the shadow Minister says that he has the answers! This is the answer to the confidence that we seemingly lack in South Australia. He said to that group:

What do the Opposition policies hold for the future? Rural industries are the single most important renewable resource contributing to our State's economy. We are determined to promote and encourage the efficient economic development of South Australia's rural industries. In case of new rural industries, we need to consider approaches such as those used in the State of Louisiana.

I do not want to decry the good burghers of Louisiana, but I had not really thought that the easy solutions to the harsh economic conditions we faced were likely to come from there.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The music is good!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The music is good but, nevertheless, it did not seem to me that the economic solutions were there. However, he does not just leave it there. He actually comes up with examples. What is the solution that Louisiana has to offer us? Here is the key example in his speech to the key organisation of farmers, the key proposal that will help South Australia. His example was catfish farming! He suggested that the Government should give the incentive of a \$10 million guarantee, plus a \$500 000 loan, plus the purchase of stocks and shares in a catfish farming project to help us out of the economic recession that we are in. He even had a bottom line to this. He told the UF&S, which is more interested in knowing how the Liberal Party would respond to the serious rural problems, that hundreds of jobs would be created.

Mr Meier: Thousands!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, his own text said 'hundreds', but the shadow Minister now tells us that he decided to inflate it a bit later and that catfish farming would lead to the creation of thousands of jobs. What about the achievements of this Government? What about what this Government has attempted to do to bring the country back onto the path of economic prosperity? The reality is that there are many projects that have succeeded in this State. You will not find them by reading through Opposition speeches or press releases, but they are there. What about the \$200 million Apcel pulp mill expansion, the BHP \$200

million continuous castor project, the expansion of Adelaide Brighton Cement, the batteries plant at Port Adelaide, the strengthening of the Australian Aviation College, and the many other things that have happened in manufacturing in this State that meant that, between 1987 and the start of the economic recession in this country in 1990, South Australia had a growth rate in manufacturing employment three times the national average?

We reached the stage where 55 per cent of our exports were manufactured goods, and where this State's balance of payments in international trade was in surplus. Unlike the country at large, we have been exporting more than we have imported. Why is that so? Clearly, it is because of what business has done in this State. Clearly, it is because of what South Australians have done and because of the partnership role played by this State Labor Government. I have no doubt that the late Tom Playford, were he to look at what has been achieved by this Government, would not feel embarrassed or ashamed to say that he was proud of it. Labor people were not ashamed or embarrassed to be proud of what Tom Playford did for this State because, in the final analysis, we knew that what really counted was the economic well-being of this community, and it was important for us to work together. Confidence is based upon precisely that element.

Let us consider the real issues facing business in this State, those issues that determine whether or not they have a want of confidence in the Government. There are issues that come within government control, such as payroll tax. What is it that this Government has attempted to do in very harsh times? Accepting that it is not a tax that we believe should be there but acknowledging that we must have it because of the State's limited tax base, we have gone for a lower payroll tax rate than the other two major manufacturing States.

It cannot be denied that payroll tax rates for firms in this State are lower than the national average. In the case of electricity, where it has been acknowledged that there have been problems for certain types of pricing of electricity, this Government has not only committed itself but has delivered reductions in real terms in the price of electricity over a number of years, particularly to the benefit of industry and of irrigators and others who use electricity for wealth generating purposes.

Reference has been made to WorkCover. All I need do is draw attention to the Premier's own statements on the 22 March statement responding to the Federal Government's statement on industry in this country. We are committed to a reduction in the impact of WorkCover costs on industry in this State, and have been working progressively to examine the most appropriate ways of doing that. Related to that are such questions as micro-economic reform. It is interesting to note that example.

We have achieved in this State a number of things. For example, dealing with marine and harbors, we already have the most efficient port system in the country and the best costs and productivity. However, we are aware that more needs to be done to make them internationally competitive and, as a result, we have gone on with issues of restructuring in that area. The Opposition bailed out on that issue, which is an attempt to improve the productivity of this economy. The Leader of the Opposition decided that this was the time to do some rabble-raising, that this was not the time to be a part of strengthening South Australia's economic core but to go for some cheap political advantage without any long-term benefits for those whose support he might have gathered.

However, there was an occasion just recently when it would have been enormously appropriate for the Opposition to be a party to the concerns of people in the workplace. That took place on Tuesday of this week when employees of Tubemakers were told that they would lose their jobs within the next 18 months. We indicated that that would take place as a result of the very things we feared would happen through the acceleration of the reduction in automotive industry tariffs in this country.

In other words, this is the first instalment of the jobs to go in the 3 000 jobs that the Premier warned would go in the automotive industry directly and 9 000 in associated industries. We were there; the Government of South Australia was there standing up on behalf of them and the industry they represent, because we recognise that, if this State is to have confidence in its public and business arenas, it will have to be able to rely upon a strong automotive sector, and that we have to be part of trying to make that confidence remain, or return, if it has gone. What a wonderful opportunity that would have been for the members of the Opposition to join with the people of South Australia in expressing concern about the changes that are taking place in that arena, but were they there? The answer is that they were not. They were found wanting. When it mattered that they could have been doing something to help, they were found wanting.

This report, which has been the focus of the attention of the Leader and the Deputy Leader in their speeches this afternoon, has been dealt with in great detail, and indeed, most significantly, as the Premier has said, it was dealt with in this morning's *Advertiser*. I can just see the scenario that took place. When members opposite read Saturday's *Advertiser*, with the Rex Jory column which stirred them up and catalysed them (and which essentially said 'If you do not do something, you are wimps'), they said, 'We have to go out and do something; we have to prove we are not wimps, so let's move a no-confidence motion. We don't know what it will be about yet, but we will move it.' Monday came and they announced that they would move a no-confidence motion, and then the very person who catalysed them in the first place naturally made a quite reasonable assessment on Tuesday of this week in a further article; he wrote that, of course, the Opposition must move a motion, but there is no reason at all why the Government should lose it; it does not deserve to lose it. That put the members of the Opposition in a bit of a fluster, because they had looked the gift horse in the mouth and suddenly they found that it bit them.

Then matters worsened this morning, because this very report, which is at the crux of their attack on the Government and the page numbers of which they are quoting as if they are calling bingo, was suddenly dealt with again in this morning's *Advertiser*, with one of the very authors of the report commenting. He makes the point that he is bemused or bewildered, as the Premier says, and I can only suggest that, before the Opposition speaks any more in this debate, it shred its prepared speeches and take into account the comments made in this morning's paper about the context in which that report should be received. The report does make criticism—trenchant criticism—of a number of areas, and the Premier responded to those today. The Premier responded to the sorts of things that should happen as a result of what that committee has found, and legislation will come before this Parliament and a select committee will allow a full opportunity to canvass the legislative responses that should exist.

However, what did the report not comment on? What did it not say? What did it not find? It did not find that

there was political manipulation; it did not find that there was political interference. This very report, which the Opposition says is an indictment of the Government and worthy of causing the Government to fall, did not make those findings. But why should members of the Opposition allow the facts to spoil a good story? They do not care that a select committee will allow members of both sides to investigate thoroughly what should be the legislative controls of the SGIC. They do not care that, before this debate started, the Premier had already indicated what has been put in place as a result of the findings of that report. They do not care that there are things that the SGIC has done.

The Premier talked about the CTP fund and the benefits that it has had for South Australians in terms of real reductions in the cost of their compulsory third party premiums over the past five years. They do not care about that. That is not something that is of any concern to members of the Opposition, because all they want is to achieve as quickly as possible the simple political objective of power and, truly, it would be power without glory, because they do not have the options for this State. They are not proposing to build the confidence of the people of this State: rather, at every opportunity they are proposing to take the cheapest shots that they may.

The Scrimber decision that has been announced by the Minister of Forests was a very difficult decision, again, in very difficult times, and one could have wished that this project had been much more successful. What was the justification for the Government's approving the entry of SATCO into that field? First, it was a concept that came out of the CSIRO stable and had excellent credentials in scientific terms. Secondly, it had undergone considerable pilot scale research in a joint venture between the CSIRO and REPCO (later to become RAFOR). Thirdly, we do have a relative abundance of the basic raw material required—small diameter pinus radiata logs extracted routinely from our forests as first thinnings. These logs have otherwise been used for treated posts and rails or were shipped for pulping either in Australia or overseas. The technology seemed to offer a means of converting a low-value timber resource into a high-value structural material, adding value to Australian raw materials, which surely we would accept is a national imperative.

Those were the elements that contributed to the decision to participate in Scrimber. Not every decision works out well. Very unhappily, this one has not, but the reality is that the basis upon which the decisions were made by SATCO, the Minister and the Government detailed an attempt to bring about economic benefit to this State. The substance is that this Government is committed to taking on the hard times as well as enjoying the easy times, and to making all the decisions that need to be made and not to be diverted by the type of political shilly-shallying that comes from the other side. The question is really who the Opposition will vote for in this debate. As members opposite look amongst themselves and know that the performances they have seen from the Leader and Deputy Leader have been sadly wanting, will they not be saying to themselves, 'Oh Dale, where is thy sting?'

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That is twice I have had to speak to the member for Mount Gambier.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I would like to comment briefly on some statements made by the Premier, because I thought that fudging had gone out of fashion. I thought that was a problem we had with a previous Deputy Premier in this State. First, the Premier talked about how negative the

Opposition was. If anybody wants to find out how to make a negative speech, all they need do is look at the contributions made between 1979 and 1982 by the then Leader of the Opposition; his negativity, his continual carping and his continual attacking of the Government of the day will teach anyone very quickly how to make negative speeches. His most famous statement was about the mirage in the desert—that mirage, that magic development for South Australia of Roxby Downs. As soon as he became Premier of this State, it suddenly became an important economic tool for his development wagon. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology talked about the excellent position this State is in. I wonder whether he has looked at today's paper in which a headline states, 'One in 10 jobless'. There are 10.4 per cent of South Australians out of work and, a few sentences further on, it states that SA is the inflation capital of the country. Every single bit of this mess was created by this Government and by its Federal colleagues.

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology also talked about electricity costs. Let me remind the Minister—because he has also fudged to this Parliament today—that the electricity costs in this State are the second highest of those in the Commonwealth, with costs only in Western Australia being higher. He made a flippant comment to the shadow Minister of Agriculture about catfish. I remind the Minister that the Premier supported investment in boar, goats and a failed laundry. If we want to talk about flippant matters today, we should recognise that anyone can throw such things into the arena.

Let me talk about another comment that the Premier made today about competitiveness and the need for South Australia to do the right thing. He talked about the Terrace Hotel. Certainly, I would like to own the Terrace Hotel and have \$100 million given to me without my having to pay any interest on it in order to compete with the Hyatt. I could make a profit doing that, and even the Premier could do that.

When the Premier talks about such issues, he ought to put all the facts on the table and not half fudge the issue. The Premier should talk about the fact, which should have been in the report this morning, that the Terrace has not paid any interest on the \$100 million it borrowed. No wonder it can compete with the Hyatt, cut prices and offer such rates to everyone around town. The Premier should stop fudging and put the complete story on the table.

My contribution today relates to WorkCover. In 1986 all members of Parliament recognised the need for and demanded changes to workers compensation provisions. The Premier set up, through legislation, a new Government monopoly and, in establishing that monopoly, he promised a 30 to 40 per cent reduction in premiums, a fairer system for both employers and employees and improved benefits. What magnificent benefits they are!

The Premier promised a better and cheaper administrative scheme because the monopoly—the change from involvement of the private sector—would turn the whole exercise around. What has occurred in that period? Premiums for small and medium size businesses are the highest they have ever been and South Australia has the highest average rate of premium in Australia. The rate in New South Wales has been reduced to 1.8 per cent. We receive complaints daily from both employers and employees about fairness. We have the highest benefit system in Australia and an administration that has absolutely gone mad in terms of numbers.

In 1986 it was estimated that 300 people were involved in the delivery of the workers compensation system in this State in the private sector. Today the Government monop-

oly involves 588 people doing the same job. In 1986 the system was put forward as a panacea, but today we can see what has really happened. The member for Elizabeth well knows about all these problems: he knows the system and he knows that WorkCover is a disaster.

I now refer to my major concern about WorkCover, that is, that it is not being fully funded. In 1986 Parliament passed the new Act, clause 66 of which provided clearly that the new corporation was required to set levies, pay out benefits and administer the scheme with no deficit: it was to be fully funded. This new scheme shows how a Government socialist monopoly can go berserk. In the first year of its operation it had a deficit of \$18 million. In the second year it had a deficit of \$70 million and in the third year the deficit was \$161 million. In the fourth year the deficit had blown out to \$259 million, and there has not been one year in the operation of this monopoly in which WorkCover has met the requirement set down by this Parliament that its operations be fully funded. I repeat that that has not occurred in one year.

It is also worthwhile to note an internal document presented to the board by the General Manager, Mr Lew Owens, who said that in 1989 the accumulated deficit was \$161 million and the projected deficit this year is \$259 million. Wait for it, because he continued and said that in 1994 it will be \$485 million. He said that if there was no change this would be the sort of disaster we would end up with. There has been no change in the direction of WorkCover in the past few years.

On 22 August 1989 the Minister of Labour misled this House as to the full funding of WorkCover. In reply to a question from the member for Henley Beach he stated:

In South Australia WorkCover is working extremely well. It is fully funded in less than two years of operation.

In August 1989, as members well know, WorkCover's unfunded liabilities were at least \$80 million, yet the Minister had the gall to say in reply to a question from the member for Henley Beach that it was in a balanced position. That was a deliberate misleading of Parliament and the Minister and the Government truly showed their attitude in respect of Acts of this Parliament through such comments.

There are two sides to the WorkCover problem. The first relates to employers. All the Government has done is attack employers through increasing rates. On the expenditure side, the Government has done nothing about that. Why has the Government done nothing about that? Because that is where all its union mates are to be found and the Government cannot do anything about the expenditure side.

I refer to comments not from me but from WorkCover actuaries who stated:

WorkCover is the most expensive scheme in Australia and one of the most expensive schemes outside America and Canada. It is much dearer than the New Zealand scheme, which provides 80 per cent of the pre-injury income to age 65 of all those injured people in any accident, whether it be workers compensation or whether it be motor vehicle.

In other words, South Australia's WorkCover scheme is almost the most expensive scheme in the world, yet it has been touted as the panacea to our workers compensation problems. The actuaries also said that the scheme should be fully funded. They have said that several times. They have said that the administration costs are too high and that WorkCover's liabilities exceed its assets. They have said that WorkCover can operate only because there is an implied guarantee by the State Government.

That means that, if it were a private sector operator, it could not work: it would be bankrupt. WorkCover can continue only because of the implied Government guaran-

tee. The Minister of Labour has known for at least two years that he could clarify changes in respect of long-term injuries. He has been advised by his General Manager that simple clarifying legislation could be brought before Parliament so that the WorkCover deficit could be wound right down. It has not been wound down because it would affect the Minister's union mates. Just like SGIC, WorkCover is in breach of its Act. I call on the member for Elizabeth to support our motion and upset this Government.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): This debate is about accountability and it is about confidence. As a result of the debate this afternoon, I have no doubt about which leader or prospective leader I should place my confidence in in this House. However, when we turn to the question of accountability I have to look much more seriously at this subject because there is a range of issues that needs to be debated. We have the accountability of this Government to Parliament and to the people of South Australia, and the people of South Australia gave their judgment some 18 months ago, in the result of the election. This is the Government that has been chosen to administer the affairs of this State for four years. It is my intention that this Government should administer the affairs of this State for that full period and that the problems that arise during the period of this Administration should be dealt with effectively and in a timely manner by this Government.

The Premier is the elected leader of this State. He has identified this afternoon those issues about which he is accountable to this Parliament and the way in which he intends to respond to the problems that the report into the SGIC correctly identified. He will be held to that program by every member of this Parliament and I am sure that, as an individual member of Parliament, I will play a role in that process of accountability.

However, we have also to look very closely at the accountability of statutory authorities to the Executive Government of this State and Parliament. For decades Parliament and political Parties of both persuasions have freely given away their responsibility and have delegated their power to statutory authorities to administer on their behalf some very important areas of this State's political administration. Many of those statutory authorities have performed well in the good times, but that is not really that hard, is it?

The reality is what happens when times are harsh. What happens when the economy is not performing so well? What happens when there is a property market crash across the country and property values are significantly diminished? That is when the real tests come, and some of our statutory authorities have performed better than others in the harsh economic climate about which other members have spoken this afternoon. It is quite clear that any problems that exist by way of accountability and mechanisms of accountability come to light then, and they have certainly been evident in areas of the SGIC, and the Premier has detailed just how the Government intends to respond to them.

I believe that the report into the SGIC was a very valuable and worthwhile document. It is unfortunate that it has taken this kind of climate to produce that kind of report because accountability needs to occur on an ongoing basis. Unlike the Opposition, I have put forward in the past, and the Government has now accepted in part, some effective measures of dealing with this question of accountability. Parliamentary committee reform, a Bill for which was introduced into another place by the Attorney-General on the last day of the last session, is an effective measure that addresses the question of parliamentary accountability.

The Government is committed to support that measure and I am very pleased to see that support for it. It is a long overdue process but it is not one that has so far been supported with any great effect or public comment by the Opposition. I have not yet seen from the Opposition any effective response to the Bill that has been on the table of the Upper House for four months. Indeed, it has failed to support what is really one of the most effective measures for improving parliamentary accountability that this place has seen for some decades. If it is adopted by this place, it will give parliamentary committees a real and effective say in holding important statutory authorities to account. I believe that it is an essential measure and one that should enjoy the support of both sides of this Chamber. So far it has enjoyed the support of only one.

Clearly, mechanisms such as the Public Accounts Committee have not been able to address effectively those areas of accountability in statutory authorities and this Bill, which will be before Parliament shortly, makes effective provision to allow us to look inside statutory authorities and do what the report into the SGIC has done effectively, that is, highlight problems and anomalies that need to be addressed. Boards of statutory authorities are given tremendous power and responsibility. The way in which they exercise that is a critical matter. Unfortunately those boards are often in place for long periods. They become dependent on the management structured around them. The two organisations support each other. Governments, Parliament and the people are often left on the sidelines in that structure, and we have seen some elements of that in the SGIC. We have perhaps seen even greater elements of it in the State Bank. I hope that we will not see much more of it.

Fortunately, the Government Management Board exercises that are now in place, perhaps a little late, will produce effective examples of how we can address these problems. This Parliament needs to make sure that they are in place, because it is a failing not only of Governments of both political persuasions but of Oppositions and all members of Parliament that these effective management tools for accountability are not already in place in the Acts of Parliament that govern them. I think we also need to address very strongly the question of just what a statutory authority needs for its administration. It has been too easy a solution in the past to form statutory corporations and entrust them with the power that we now see. If members look at the examples of management failure that are being raised in the community and in this place by the Opposition, they will note that they are all statutory authorities: the State Bank, SGIC, WorkCover Corporation and Scrimber. The whole range is attached to statutory authorities. We need to seriously question their role in the administration of South Australia.

I would even go so far as to suggest that organisations such as the State Transport Authority, the Housing Trust, the Health Commission and ETSA need to be examined as to whether they should be statutory authorities because by creating them in this context we create organisations where the lines of accountability are blurred, where boards and Ministers are often jointly responsible, and where Parliament, through its normal mechanisms of accountability in Estimates Committees and Question Time, has great difficulty in pinning down who is responsible for which failures of administration. We need to look closely at which organisations need that cloak of statutory authority and independence as distinct from direct accountability, political accountability, that the administration of a Crown department provides for Parliament, and that needs to be done very quickly.

WorkCover Corporation is another example to which the member for Bragg has quite correctly drawn attention this afternoon. Like him, I am a member of a select committee that is investigating that corporation. That committee needs desperately to make further progress. So far its progress has not been adequate. As a member of that committee I must share responsibility for that, but there is a joint House committee examining WorkCover and I believe that, the sooner that committee is able to make good progress on that issue, the better. I am sure the Minister will assist the committee in that process and I have every confidence that he will do that in the course of this session.

Indeed, Her Excellency the Governor in her speech today has implied that the Government will soon be producing for the attention of the committee and this Parliament further reforms in the WorkCover area. Given the size of the financial commitment of that corporation and the importance of workers compensation insurance, not only to the workers who are employed in South Australian industry but also to the employers and shareholders in our economy as a whole, that corporation needs the urgent attention of the select committee and the Government. I believe that it will receive it during this session.

We have had a useful and constructive debate this afternoon. I believe that the no-confidence motion moved by the Opposition in this place was an appropriate mechanism for ensuring the accountability of the Government to the Parliament and the people. The Government will face an election in due course and, at the appropriate time, the people of South Australia will have the opportunity to pass judgment on it. Because of the fact that the Opposition has chosen to move a motion of no confidence, the first of this Parliament (and that is appropriate because a bizarre situation has prevailed in Tasmania where the Liberal Opposition has moved seven motions of no confidence since the last election there, and that kind of behaviour does it no credit; fortunately the Opposition here has not conducted itself in that way), this debate has been a useful way of bringing to the public's attention and that of Parliament some areas that certainly need further consideration. The Government has been required to place on the record what it intends to do about it. The people of my electorate and, I believe, Mr Speaker, your electorate as well, do not want this Government forced to the polls. They want this Government required to act responsibly and required to have effective financial management. As one member of this Parliament I intend to play my part in ensuring that that is done.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): In debate on this motion, the Opposition listed three areas: SGIC, Scrimber and WorkCover. I outlined the problems with SGIC and documented in detail all the problems in that area. That was carried on by the Deputy Leader, who outlined the problems in the Scrimber operation and then the responsible shadow Minister dealt with WorkCover. All we got in reply from the Premier was a garbled response about the Opposition's being negative. He tried to nobble our responsibility to the taxpayers of South Australia to ask questions on the financial performance of this Government, suggesting that that was not our role. We did not hear one word from the Minister of Labour or the Minister of Forests. The Minister of Forests has cost the taxpayers of South Australia \$60 million through the failure of the Scrimber operation alone, but he did not have the guts to take part in this debate.

The Minister of Labour, who is presiding over what is generally accepted as one of the most mismanaged organi-

sations in the history of this State, apart from those which the Treasurer organises, did not have the guts to stand up and defend the accusations made against him by the shadow Minister. That is the sort of wimp-out we have seen today. We will continue to ask questions on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia, and we will not be nobbled by the nonsense from the Treasurer that we are being negative.

We will be constructive. We have been constructive, and I want to impress on the member for Elizabeth that at all times we have been constructive in our probing of the mismanagement of the finances of South Australia, and that that constructive approach will not stop. But I listened hardest to the Minister of Agriculture—although I do not know why he took part in the debate. He had nothing to do with it. Not one thing in this motion did the Minister answer.

However, there were snide comments from members opposite when he said, 'Plenty of people in private enterprise get into trouble.' They said, 'Yes, your ex-leader. That must have been some gentleman named Elliott, who got into trouble with finances with Elders'. Then we heard the snide remark of another honourable member who said, 'What about Qintex? They got into trouble in private enterprise and failed, so don't blame the Government for getting into trouble.'

Then I heard someone at the back say, 'What about the Bond Corporation? They went.' The difference is that when Elders got into trouble, Elliott went; when Qintex got into trouble, Skase went; and when Bond got into trouble, Bond went. But \$2 billion of taxpayers' money in this State has been blown, and Bannon is still there. That is what this motion is all about, and I urge members' support for it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker (teller), S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, J.C. Bannon (teller), Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Mayes, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

The SPEAKER: There being 23 Ayes and 23 Noes, I cast my vote for the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Motion negated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! All members will resume their seats. It was a tied vote and the vote was given to the Speaker, who has absolutely the same right as every honourable member of this House to vote whichever way he chooses. If anyone disputes that right, I refer him or her to Erskine May, as it involves a breach of privilege. If it occurs again, I will name the person and treat it as a breach of privilege.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: the Speaker and Messrs Blacker, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gunn, Oswald and Trainer.

Printing: Messrs Atkinson and M.J. Evans, Mrs Hutchison, Messrs Lewis, McKee and Matthew.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I nominate the member for Mitchell to move an Address in Reply to Her Excellency's opening speech, and move:

That consideration of the Address in Reply be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

Motion carried.

HOUSING CO-OPERATIVES BILL AND RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction): I move:

That the Housing Co-operatives Bill 1990 and the Residential Tenancies Act Amendment Bill 1990 be restored to the Notice Paper as lapsed Bills pursuant to the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSING CO-OPERATIVES BILL

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction): I move:

That the Select Committee on the Housing Co-operatives Bill appointed by this House on 12 December 1990 have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up its report be extended until Thursday 15 August 1991.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE LAW AND PRACTICE RELATING TO DEATH AND DYING

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the Select Committee on the Law and Practice Relating to Death and Dying appointed by this House on 13 December 1990 have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up its report be extended until Thursday 24 October 1991.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE GULF ST VINCENT PRAWN FISHERY

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I move:

That the Select Committee on the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery appointed by this House on 10 April 1991 have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up its report be extended until Tuesday 10 September 1991.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE ABALONE INDUSTRY

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I move:

That the Select Committee on the Abalone Industry appointed by this House on 10 April 1991 have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Tuesday 8 October 1991.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PRIVACY

Mr GROOM (Hartley) brought up the report of the select committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEES ON WORKCOVER AND PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the members of this House appointed to the Joint Select Committee on WorkCover and the Joint Select Committee on Parliamentary Privilege have power to continue their considerations during this session.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the appropriation of money from Consolidated Account for the financial year ended 30 June 1991. 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 the explanation of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It provides \$1 200 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$850 million and was designed to cover expenditure for the first two months of the year. This Bill is for \$1 200 million, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received.

The amount of this Bill represents an increase of \$60 million on the second Supply Bill for last year to cover wage and salary and other cost increases since that time.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to \$1 200 million.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I want to turn away from the type of proceedings that we have had before this Parliament today, and particularly turn away from bad news such as that on the front page of today's *News* which tells us that one in 10 people is jobless, to some good news that has sprung from a scourge in our society. I want to talk about a fabulous development that has occurred in the fight against graffiti, a development that I believe will occur in every electorate. I refer to the 'Adopt a Railway Station' scheme which was launched by the Liberal Leader, Dale Baker, and me on 12 November 1990 at the Hove railway station.

Many members of this Parliament would be aware that that launch followed a number of informal discussions that I had with the Minister of Transport about the virtues of introducing such a scheme. Unfortunately, it took some time before the Minister was finally prepared to support this very positive innovation for ridding the State of the scourge of graffiti. Indeed, in this Parliament on 14 March 1991 the Minister berated me about the scheme in an attempt to criticise it and thwart its introduction. I draw members' attention to what he said in the Parliament on that day:

The unions tell me about the volunteers from service clubs who want to come in and do another person's job and put them out of work. How would it be if I were to go and do their job and put them out of work? For volunteers, the painting over of graffiti at the stations is only a pastime to make them feel good, whereas, for the workers employed to do this, it is their bread and butter. Would people in those service clubs like me to come in and say, 'I'm volunteering to do your job'? So, we must appreciate the point of view of ordinary workers.

I am glad to say that the Minister finally saw good sense. In fact, he echoed the words of the Liberal Leader and me by announcing, on 26 March 1991, that 'Adopt a Railway Station' would in fact be supported by the State Government.

What has happened since has been quite significant. On 29 May this year a new scheme came into being, and that scheme is known as 'Community Pride'. The Community Pride scheme came into being through the Hallett Cove Estate and Neighbourhood Watch Group and, as an initial pilot, it painted out the Hallett Cove railway station. The response from the community has been absolutely fantastic; the response from business has been unbelievable. So successful was the paint-out of that railway station that the group started to expand in number and donations from the community poured in to help further its endeavours.

That group now has painted 600 metres of fencing facing that railway station. If any member of this Parliament would like to drive down, or preferably catch the train, to have a look at the Hallett Cove railway station and compare it with surrounding stations, they will be pleasantly surprised. They will find that that station is resplendent in colours of heritage green and cream, and that all surrounding fences facing the station have been painted bronze olive.

That railway station has now been graffiti-free for two months. The scheme works, and works well. I am delighted to be able to tell this Parliament that the people who have done this work do not want to stop there: they want to involve the whole State. Quite recently Rotary clubs, Lions clubs, Neighbourhood Watch groups, Apex clubs and Rotaract clubs right through this State received the following letter entitled 'Community Pride Day, Saturday 16 November 1991'. The letter states:

A project called 'Community Pride', designed to rid our area of graffiti, was formed at the Hallett Cove Estate Neighbourhood Watch meeting on 29 May 1991. It was decided to overpaint all graffiti in our zone with materials donated by sponsors. Our sponsors are Dulux, Federal Airports Corporation, Hutchinson Telecoms and Mitre 10 (Hove). Richard Stevens and CIG (Lonsdale) have also assisted with reductions in the cost of equipment. STA has donated paint for the repainting of the railway station and surrounds and ETSA for substation boxes in our area.

Painting commenced 1 June 1991 and we have covered approximately 600 metres of fencing, a railway bridge and numerous ETSA boxes. Residents have supported us totally with donations of paint and money, the majority from owners of graffiti defaced properties. This response from residents and also the praise from people passing by has validated our belief that the public of South Australia is totally abhorrent of graffiti and is ready to take a stand against it.

With knowledge of the level of community support we have decided to spread the project Statewide. With the support of the 322 Neighbourhood Watch Zones it would be possible to mobilise at least 6 000 people from all over Adelaide with paint and

brushes to clean up our State. This project has been fully endorsed by the Crime Prevention Department. It is understood that some zones may not have the major problems of other areas and with this in mind approaches have also been made to Apex, Rotary, Rotaract and Lions to make this a joint project. Support from any of these clubs will only enhance the day and increase community involvement in this most satisfying and worthwhile project.

Financing the project has been generously assisted by Dulux who have offered unlimited quantities of paint at \$3 per litre. Their only stipulation is that they have sole paint sponsorship. Contact with Dulux must be made through a project coordinator on Pager 378 2365. We estimate that, if each Neighbourhood Watch Zone and participating club contributes an amount of \$200-\$250, with the offer from Dulux enough paint could be purchased to give our whole State a facelift.

Some people have said, 'Why bother; they will only do it again.' We find this attitude unacceptable and wish to make a clear statement to those in our community who think vandalism is acceptable that we will not tolerate it any longer. It is unrealistic to expect that no more graffiti will appear so follow-up moves are important. In our area we have left paint with local residents near the major trouble spots. These people have volunteered to look after specific areas and repaint within 24 hours any follow-up graffiti. This keeps the area clean and ensures continuous community involvement in looking after our local environment.

At the same time all major hardware and department stores have been contacted re the upgrading of security on spraycans and marker pens. We are suggesting that accessibility to these products be severely limited with store staff having total control over issue of these products . . . In conjunction with our 'Community Pride Day', to ensure all graffiti is erased, we are also liaising with Government departments and local councils to gain their support to concentrate on painting over graffiti on their properties in the week of 11-15 November 1991, with the residents of the State finalising the transformation on Saturday 16 November.

The letter continues a little further and is signed by Trevor Twilley, police coordinator, and Kym Byass, Community Pride Project Coordinator. These two gentlemen have used an enormous amount of energy to get this project off the ground.

I would encourage members of Parliament, from both sides, to liaise with community groups in their area with a view to making 16 November 1991 an almighty success throughout our State. There is no doubt that many of us—probably all of us in this Parliament—have had complaints from people about the proliferation of graffiti. This is a chance to wipe it out and to wipe it out once and for all. We have demonstrated that it works in the pilot area. It can work throughout the whole of the State to once and for all erase this scourge from the face of metropolitan Adelaide and country regions.

We can concentrate on tram stations, bus stops, ETSA boxes and train stations to ensure that the graffiti artists give up because their work will be gone for ever. That is something that can only be valuable to our community as a whole. It is worth mentioning also that Trevor Twilley, the police coordinator, is a uniformed officer from the Darlington station, and he has given up his time out of hours to involve himself in the painting. That sort of action goes above and beyond the call of duty, and I think is a tribute to one police officer in our force. Indeed, many other officers act in this way. It is heartening to see some members of our fine Police Force doing this to eradicate this scourge.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Many people in South Australia would agree with me that the formation of the Crows and the associated number of matches played at Football Park have created a tremendous amount of interest in the sporting arena. Whilst I strongly support the local league, I am a realist and believe that the AFL matches have created a tremendous input into South Australia. I refer to the amount of part-time and full-time employment generated, particularly by people who travel from interstate.

I also refer to the assistance it gives to the hospitality industry, the business houses and the restaurateurs who benefit considerably.

As the member for Albert Park, I know of the large volumes of people who flock to Football Park to watch the Crows and the teams who come to South Australia from interstate. Certainly, it has been a tremendous fillip to South Australian football. Having said that, I suppose with every good thing that happens there is also a negative. There are negatives associated with this matter. I refer to those ignoramus who drive motor vehicles but must be blind because they cannot see the 'no parking' signs around the streets within my electorate. I refer particularly to those people who come from out of my electorate. I believe that these ignorant people are in the minority, but they are seemingly oblivious to the demands and rights of people within my electorate.

On many occasions since I have been a member of this Parliament I have stood up and complained angrily and bitterly on behalf of my constituents about the appalling attitude of this minority within our community. My constituents, quite properly so, have complained that they fear that an ambulance, for instance, would not be able to get into their street should a loved one take ill, or that the fire brigade or any other emergency service would not be able to travel freely.

On one memorable occasion, when the team I support was in a grand final, I was a passenger in a police helicopter hovering above Football Park watching what was happening with respect to the traffic flow in and around my electorate. The police have played a tremendous part, as have the local Woodville council parking inspectors. Unfortunately, that has not been enough.

In the past six weeks, I have had occasion to have discussions with Mr Jim Olds, the senior parking inspector from the Corporation of the City of Woodville, and with a representative of the South Australian National Football League, because of the problems complained about by my constituents and to which I have just referred. That discussion was very fruitful to say the least. It arose because I wrote to the Minister for Local Government Relations requesting a \$500 fine and a tow-away provision for those people who chose to ignore the parking signs around that area. However, the Minister wrote back and suggested that, whilst she could not agree with that proposal, I have discussions with the local council and the SANFL, which I did. Arising from those discussions, it was resolved that the Woodville council would have additional inspectors on duty on those days when AFL matches were played, and they would police rigorously those illegal parking activities.

In addition, the Woodville council inspectors have the right under the Act, on the hour, every hour, to impose additional penalties on those ignorant people who park their car where they believe they can get away with it. However, the Woodville council has policed that rigorously. I understand that on the first Sunday more than 100 parking tickets were placed on offenders' cars. During the second Sunday AFL match I understand that in excess of 230 parking tickets were issued to those offenders. I hope that those ignorant people will get the message. In addition, the South Australian National Football League has played a very important role in that it uses a public relations system at the park to advise patrons that Woodville council inspectors are policing illegal parking. I am told that that is repeated at quarter time, half time and three quarter time and whenever the opportunity arises. I am told by some people at Football Park that it is quite humorous to see some people scamper out of the park to move their cars, and a number

of them were dismayed to find that they already had parking tickets.

I make no apology for pursuing this issue, because it has been a well-known fact for many years that there are some people in the community who want to exploit or abuse the Private Parking Areas Act and the Local Government Act. What they have been doing is banding together in a group of four or five, jumping in a car, parking where they like around Football Park and sharing the \$12 fine amongst themselves. They laugh and think they are being quite smart about it. Now that we in the western suburbs have come to grips with this, these people will find that, every hour on the hour, the Woodville council inspectors will be policing and issuing additional tickets.

Finally, whilst the Minister for Local Government Relations has disagreed with my request for tow-away provisions, I give notice to her that, despite the first knockback, that is not the end of the question, as far as I am concerned. I intend to pursue the need in South Australia for tow-away provisions. I believe that councils and, indeed, the police should have the unfettered right to tow away illegally parked vehicles, particularly where they obstruct a person's driveway or where the vehicle is parked in the driveway. I have seen this in my electorate. The gall of some of these people never ceases to amaze me. I believe that if they want to do that, let them pay the penalty—and let the penalty be severe. I will also pursue the right of the police and local government to have lock-up facilities placed around a person's car so that they cannot move the car until the penalty is paid.

If some people choose to ignore the rights of other people in the community, we should hit them where it hurts. They will learn. In particular, on a number of occasions in my electorate I have seen that people with big flashy cars will park anywhere around Football Park as long as they can get in there quickly, but they are not prepared to accept the protocols of parking in appropriately designated parking spaces. So, I give notice to the Parliament, indeed to my colleague in another place, that I do intend to pursue those tow-away provisions. I hope I can convince my colleagues on this side of the House and, indeed, in the Parliament, to accept that proposition some time in the near future. I would commend it to my colleagues and I would ask them to think about it and digest it, because I believe that it is applicable not only in my electorate but also throughout South Australia.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I have been a backbencher in this House for less than two years. It was therefore with some sense of anticipation that I listened carefully this afternoon to a debate that might yet prove to be of major significance to the people of South Australia. The cruel irony that escaped some speakers of the number one ticket holder of the North Adelaide Football Club being hand-balled a report of the SGIC bound in red and white, especially at a time when his club was doing quite well, did not escape all members of this House. My colleagues who have made a study of SGIC, WorkCover, Scrimber and the State Bank this afternoon have exposed criticisms of this Government, which criticisms, I believe, still remain unanswered. I would contribute to the discussion in this place with a simple question.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

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

Mr BRINDAL: My question is: who is the captain of this ship? Who is responsible for what is happening in this matter? Who is responsible to this Parliament and who is responsible to the people of South Australia? If it is the

Premier—and the people of South Australia and I believe it is—it is simply not good enough to sing 'Mares Eat Oats and Does Eat Oats and Little Lambs Eat Ivy'—the type of song that was sung by the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon when he said (and I think this must be one of the most quotable quotes and should be repeated in the *Sunday Mail* week after week), 'There have been some investment decisions in this State which have been less than perfect.' That is a remarkable quotation.

Today I wish to concentrate not on that larger picture but on the effects that the Government's funding problems are having on the people of Hayward in particular and, I believe, on the people of South Australia in general. Every day we read bad news in our newspapers. My colleagues and I, despite what is said opposite, do not applaud that bad news. It is frightening and it is getting to the stage where the accumulated figures are of such fairytale proportions that people have just lost comprehension of the amounts of money involved. It happens daily. As I said, my colleagues and I do not applaud it: we deplore it. It is having a most serious effect on the ordinary people of South Australia.

I would like to provide some illustrations. During the parliamentary break I wrote to the Minister of Transport on the matter of rebates for the compulsory wearing of cycle helmets, which has just recently become law in South Australia. While I believe that the Minister had some sympathy, he basically wrote back to me on a number of occasions and said that there simply was not the money. There is a case where, over the past couple of years, this Government has commendably encouraged the schoolchildren of South Australia to purchase cycle safety helmets under a rebate scheme, and I believe with some success, yet I am faced, and I am sure every member opposite has been faced, with electors who are middle-aged, unemployed people with children, or elderly people on fixed incomes, ringing or coming into the office to say that they simply cannot afford a bicycle helmet. It is too much to afford from a limited income. So, I wrote to the Minister and suggested that there should be a once-only rebate on bicycle helmets for people in needy circumstances. While I believe that the Minister was not being unsympathetic, he wrote back and said that the money was not available.

At the same time, the Minister of Agriculture went on radio talking about the rural crisis and said—I think I can quote him almost verbatim—'We must do it within the funds available.' So, again, a Minister of the Crown at a time of great financial difficulty for people in this State—for a large and important sector in this State—is saying that we simply do not have the funds.

Closer to home and on a matter that effects my constituents and the constituents of the members for Mitchell, Walsh, Morphett, Bright and Fisher I point out that Flinders Medical Centre cannot employ a neurosurgeon on the weekend. If the child of any of our electors sustains a head injury on a weekend, they will be transported to Flinders Medical Centre because of the requirement (I do not know whether it is law) that St John take them to the nearest competent medical facility. They would then be taken to the Royal Adelaide Hospital because Flinders simply does not have a neurosurgeon on duty on the weekend. The reason for this is a lack of funds.

About a year ago the Opposition was subjected to a fairly clever trick by the Government, which listed everything the Opposition had asked for. It spent some time detailing the list of our requests and telling the House how greedy Opposition members were.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, massive requests, asking for things like overpasses for crossings that the then Minister Keneally promised to my electorate three or four years ago, and asking for upgrading of schools.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Spence asks where the money will come from. My reply to him is simple: when we asked for those facilities and were told that we were greedy, there was much more money in the State's coffers, because we had not bailed out the State Bank and we had not thrown as much money as we have now thrown away on Scrimber and we had not lost the money that we appear to have lost on SGIC.

The State was in a better position and, if the Government had granted every request by the Opposition, South Australia would have had some major capital works and would be much better off. Certainly, money would not have been thrown down the toilet by this Government's mismanagement of many of its projects. It is easy to claim that we are being greedy and want things that South Australia cannot afford but, at the same time, we have a Government that appears to be able to throw money away and then justify itself by saying, 'It is just bad luck.'

This is not a matter for levity or wit because, during the recess, I wrote the Premier a fairly simple letter saying that any State that is managed well would have a financial reservoir. This State must have had some good management in the past, because there was a reservoir to bail out the State Bank. Once we have drained the reservoir, the next bushfire is the most dangerous one because, if there is no water in the reservoir, there is nothing left with which to fight that fire.

That is the analogy I drew. The reservoir of this State has been drained and, as with the examples I have given

today, this Government is unable to support two of its strong planks. It claims continually to be a Government of equity and social justice, yet on issue after issue concerned with equity and social justice it fails to live up to its obligations. I asked the Premier to recall Parliament and tell the people of South Australia what financial pills we would have to take in order to put the State back on a sound financial footing.

I believe that the electors of Hayward who elected me would rather know what measures must be employed to put this State back on the road and suffer those measures, no matter how distasteful they are to all of us, than to see people who should not be disadvantaged being further disadvantaged because the Government does not have the courage to introduce the measures that are necessary. The answer I got from the Premier was that I should not be so backward looking, that I should be forward looking. I do not understand the Premier's logic. I have accepted that we can do nothing to recover the money lost by this Government's mismanagement.

An honourable member: What would you do?

Mr BRINDAL: I asked that the Government come into this House and tell us what it must do to put this State back on a secure financial footing. I plead with the House that social justice and equity truly should be a plank of this Government, which should no longer hide behind snide and smart remarks. It should care about the people who vote for it, about those who have traditionally voted for it, and do something to support them instead of coming up with the sanctimonious clap-trap that we have heard this afternoon.

Motion carried.

At 5.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 13 August at 2 p.m.