

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 13 August 1991

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: OZONE DEPLETING SUBSTANCES

A petition signed by 90 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to regulate for the safe disposal or recycling of ozone depleting substances was presented by Dr Armitage.

Petition received.

PETITION: WASTEPAPER RECYCLING PROGRAM

A petition signed by 614 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to establish and promote a program for the recycling of all paper waste was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore.

Petition received.

PETITION: WATER RATING SYSTEM

A petition signed by 45 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to revert to the previous water rating system was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

PETITION: THEBARTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 359 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the Thebarton Primary School on its present site was presented by Mr Heron.

Petition received.

PETITION: CHILD ABUSE

A petition signed by 3 131 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase penalties for offenders convicted of child abuse was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

PETITION: TRAFFIC LIGHTS

A petition signed by 477 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to install traffic lights at the intersection of Yatala Vale Road, Golden Grove Road and the Grove Way at Surrey Downs was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

PETITION: PETROL TAX

A petition signed by 115 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reduce

the tax on petrol and devote a larger proportion of the revenue to road funding was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Remuneration Tribunal—Reports relating to—
Assistant Supervising Magistrate.
Judiciary and Statutory Office Holders.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Lottery and Gaming Act 1936—Regulation—Exemption
(Amendment).

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

General Election, Statistical Returns 25 November 1989;
Custance By-election, 23 June 1990; Referendum, 9
January 1991.

Classification of Publications Act 1974—Regulation—
Prevention of Child Abuse.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Applications to Lease.
Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulation—Traffic Prohibition—
Woodville.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon.
S.M. Lenehan)—

Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Report—Proposed
Division of Rural Land by a Government
Agency.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Disciplinary Appeals Tribunal—Report, 1990-91.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GRAFFITI

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Youth Affairs): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am sure I speak for all members of this House and for the vast majority of South Australians in voicing my anger and disgust at the extent of mindless graffiti that is defacing public and private property in this State. Graffiti vandalism is costing South Australians millions of dollars each year in clean up and insurance costs. Several months ago the Premier asked me, as Minister of Youth Affairs, to prepare a comprehensive anti-graffiti strategy to present to the ministerial task force on crime prevention.

We have received advice from interested members of Parliament, such as the member for Albert Park and the member for Elizabeth, who have both made constructive contributions to the strategy, and I know that the member for Hanson has an interest in this area as well. We have spoken to local government elected members and officials both in South Australia and interstate, church leaders, retailers and wholesalers of paints and pens, youth workers and young graffitiists. Following my public request I have also received from members of the community a range of constructive ideas on how to tackle graffiti.

These discussions have led me to believe that no single approach, either punitive or preventive, will be effective on its own. It is quite clear that there is overwhelming support for a systematic attack on graffiti incorporating both stiffer penalties and longer-term preventive programs. Detailed work on this strategy, which I hope will be the most comprehensive in Australia, is nearing completion and will be announced in the next few weeks. I will announce the strategy combining prevention programs and punitive measures.

However, following requests from members, I am able to announce today the first stage of that strategy. The Government will introduce tough new legislation to combat graffiti vandalism. Legislation will be prepared and introduced to create a new offence of unlawful possession of a graffiti implement. This will include items such as spray cans or wide textas. It will enable the police to prosecute any person who is found in possession of a graffiti implement with intent to mark graffiti. It would also be an offence for a person to have a graffiti implement in their possession without a lawful excuse. The penalty under this proposed new offence would be up to six months imprisonment or a \$2 000 fine. I believe this proposed new offence would enable us to tackle graffiti vandalism without having one arm tied behind our back.

This proposed new legislation would avoid making criminals of people who innocently possess or carry implements such as paint spray cans. Instead, it would focus on the purpose to which these implements have been, are being or are about to be used. I can also inform this House that legislation will be introduced to more accurately define graffiti implements.

We will also move amendments to section 48 of the Summary Offences Act to double the existing penalty for people convicted of unlawfully defacing buildings, walls and other structures. This would involve increasing the penalty from a maximum three months imprisonment or a \$1 000 fine to six months imprisonment or a \$2 000 fine. Members will be aware that amendments to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act now allow community service orders to be imposed without a conviction being recorded. I understand that many offenders are already working on clean-up programs with the STA. I am sure we would all agree that we must ensure that young offenders take responsibility for the consequences of their actions. The Government will also hold talks with retailers to establish a voluntary code of conduct to restrict access to graffiti implements such as aerosol cans.

The State Government is also delighted to be able to announce its backing and financial support for a Statewide clean up of graffiti being organised by a group called Community Pride. This group plans to secure the support of more than 300 Neighbourhood Watch groups around the State for a massive clean-up in November sponsored by Dulux, the Federal Airports Corporation and Hutchinson Telecoms. Community Pride wants to involve Neighbourhood Watch in an ongoing role in graffiti prevention and clean-up activities.

As well as penalties for offenders, many people recognise that longer term solutions are also needed, in education and redirection of these youthful energies into more productive activities. I and a number of other members recently visited Gosnells, a city south of Perth that has instigated an anti-graffiti initiative that involves the joint efforts of rapid clean-up of vandalised sites and the establishment of supervised 'legal sites' for serious applications of murals of 'urban art'.

This preventive approach has certainly paid off for Gosnells with a 50 per cent reduction in all illegal graffiti, including tagging, in that city. I will inform this House of further details of our assault on graffiti vandalism as we finalise our strategy.

QUESTION TIME

SCRIMBER

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister of Forests. Who ordered the

removal of filing cabinets from the Mount Gambier headquarters of Scrimber on 31 July; who currently has custody of those documents; and will the Government take immediate action to ensure that all relevant documents will remain available for a public inquiry into Scrimber?

On 31 July the Chief Executive and the Engineering Manager at Scrimber were both given 30 seconds notice of their dismissal and told to leave the building immediately. At the same time, filing cabinets were removed from the Scrimber headquarters and put in a utility parked near the building.

I have been informed that these filing cabinets contained board minutes, management reports, tapes and other sensitive information that will be vital to any full inquiry into this project. It has also been suggested to me that, before such an inquiry begins, former Scrimber executives whose reputations have been impugned by the Minister of Forests should be allowed to inspect these filing cabinets under supervision to ensure that no relevant material has been removed.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The answer to the honourable member's question is that the board ordered the collection of those documents; the board has them in its possession; and, yes, they will be made available to any inquiry. As to my impugning particular people, I note that the honourable Leader has said so both outside and inside this House. I completely deny that. What I have done is to indicate that the consultants in this matter and the board, after having checked it, have indicated to me that the information that was provided to the board by senior management was not, in fact, accurate information.

KICKSTART

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education report to this House what steps the State Government is taking to create employment and training opportunities for unemployed people in South Australia? The western suburbs, in which my electorate and, indeed, yours, Sir, are located, is an area with a large number of unemployed people.

In recent months I have noted a great increase in the number of constituents who have approached me requesting assistance in seeking employment or wanting information regarding support programs for unemployed people.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am delighted to be able to inform the House that Kickstart, which was launched yesterday, is a \$16 million employment and training initiative that will involve a partnership between government, industry, unions and the community to ensure that the greatest possible effort is made in equipping our workforce with the necessary skills for the future. I think that every member of this House would agree that training is vital to our future. We need to ensure that South Australia is well placed to come out of this national recession in a better position to take advantage of emerging opportunities.

Time and time again the point has been made that in previous recessions we have seen the tap turned off on training and, when the recovery comes, as it inevitably will, people have, in the past, found that there have been serious skill shortages. Governments alone cannot achieve this. Obviously, it has to involve a commitment from industry, unions, local bodies and communities to make employment growth the number one priority.

Kickstart involves three major initiatives: taking a new regional approach to employment and training; almost doubling the revocational training positions available in TAFE

in South Australia; and, with the support of the Commonwealth, moving to protect and support apprenticeships threatened by the recession. The main thrust of the strategy involves taking a regional approach to the State Government's employment and training programs so that regions around the State with differing needs, opportunities and problems can work with Governments to generate local jobs and training opportunities.

The western suburbs area of Adelaide is one of four regions which has been invited to take part in the pilot stage of the scheme. Whyalla, Port Augusta and the Eyre Peninsula have also been approached. Next year, Port Pirie and the southern suburbs will come on stream. Over a period of three years all regions of the State will be included. In the meantime, programs for other areas will be maintained and even expanded.

I have just been informed that teams will be in Whyalla and Port Augusta on Thursday and Friday of this week: they are already meeting with western metropolitan regional people and will be in Port Lincoln and the Eyre district on Wednesday 21 August. I think that this is in a kickstart lane to inject new energy and effort into employment and training activity in the various regions by harnessing significant local community support and involvement.

SCRIMBER

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Why did the Minister of Forests fail to visit the Scrimber headquarters in Mount Gambier during the 20 month period between the official mid-November 1989 pre-election opening and 31 July 1991, when the management was dismissed, documents were removed from the Scrimber headquarters and Government funding was almost completely curtailed, as it appears to have been?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Basically because I could not see much point in visiting a factory—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is fairly typical, Mr Speaker, that members opposite ask a question and then cannot wait for an answer; they have to start making comments. The point is that I am not an engineer. I do not have the capacity to look at a lot of machinery and tell whether or not that machinery is at the operating stage, near the operating stage or not likely to operate. I just do not have that capacity, and I make no apology for that. Neither am I an electrical engineer, a fireman or a top police officer. I do not have those capacities. Therefore, there is not much point in my pretending that I know that information as a result of going down there—as in fact members of the Opposition did on several occasions—and saying, 'Ooh' and 'Ah' at all the machinery, and then coming away and making further comments.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member opposite claims that because I am a Minister I am supposed to either have the information or be doing the ooh-ing and ah-ing that members opposite do. Neither of those propositions is true. I could not see the point in going to a place where I could not make judgments on whether or not things were going well. What I was getting was information from the board which, in fact, had been provided to the board by the management. That seemed to me the most appropriate way of getting information as to whether or not the enterprise was working. As it turns out, the information that was provided to the board by senior management, whose duty it was to provide the information, was not accurate and, in fact, has been described as misleading.

If members can tell me that by going to the site I could have looked at all that machinery and said, 'Oh, yes, the information provided by management to the board obviously can't be true, because that machinery up there looks different', then the Opposition is being rather peculiar, to say the least. Indeed many members of the Opposition visited the site, and none of them came back and said, 'Under no circumstances will the project work.' Yet, they had the advantage of having been able—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have read *Hansard*, Mr Speaker, and under no circumstances have members opposite said that the project would not work. What they said was that it was costing more than they expected and they were unhappy about that and lots of other things but, to my knowledge, no member of the Opposition has gone to that plant, looked at it and said, 'My goodness, it can't possibly work, because I can see that the nut over there is in the wrong place,' or whatever else.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In fact, the nuts are not in that plant as much as they are on the other side of the Parliament. Anyway, the reason I did not go down there was that I could not get any information from going there and looking at the plant that I could not get here just as easily.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

YOUTH WORK CAMPS

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Can the Minister of Youth Affairs advise the House whether the proposal by the member for Murray-Mallee for compulsory work camps whereby youths weed national parks and catch rabbits and feral cats bears any similarity to the State Government's current Youth Conservation Corps?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am delighted to answer the question. The member for Murray-Mallee is clearly aware that recently I announced four Youth Conservation Corps projects as the first expansion of the scheme following the successful pilot projects launched in January by international environmentalist David Suzuki and our Premier. The interesting thing is that there is absolutely no similarity between the two schemes, and let me point out why. First, these are not forced labour camps. Secondly, we heard one radio announcer talking about Mr Lewis's plan as working for the dole: in fact, it involves working without the dole.

Thirdly, the people involved in these Youth Conservation Corps projects want to be involved, and we want to harness their enthusiasm for the environment and give them real skills, because 50 per cent of their time is spent actually working in TAFE, learning skills such as literacy, numeracy, communication, job search skills, and horticultural and farm practice skills.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am surprised at that interjection from the Leader of the Opposition, because I understand that his office and that of the Hon. Rob Lucas spent most of the morning hosing down this story. What we need is an attack on unemployment and not an attack on the unemployed—not punishment of the unemployed with some sort of stalag approach.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Speaker, I seek your protection.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hayward is out of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: They are all rushing to his defence. It seems that the shadow Minister of Mines and Energy has this kind of salt mine or Gulag approach to dealing with unemployment. Certainly, we do not need forced compulsory labour camps in this State: we want to give kids skills for the future. Let me say this: when we meet with the Manufacturing Advisory Council and industry, they do not tell us that rabbiting skills are top of their agenda. No-one is saying to me that we are going to have a rabbit-led recovery in South Australia although, if the Leader of the Opposition became Premier, that would be the obvious keynote of his strategy. I can only conclude that the member for Murray-Mallee was about to be dumped in the June reshuffle and that this is his last ditch attempt to gain some support.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

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

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Can the Treasurer say how much of the \$970 million of taxpayers' funds allocated to the State Bank Asset Valuation Reserve Account has been paid to the bank? Does the Treasurer expect that this original indemnity fund amount will need to be supplemented?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The original debt indemnity fund that I announced on 10 February, and further outlined in a full statement to this place, I think, on the 13th, referred to the fact that the amount of \$970 million would be made available to the indemnity fund, \$500 million of which would be paid into the State Bank immediately and \$470 million held in an interest earning fund to be called upon at the appropriate time. I said also in that statement that, if more money was needed as a result of a more detailed examination of State Bank accounts or the bringing forward of certain liabilities, obviously the Government would stand ready to provide it. That remains the case. As to how much has actually been spent, if one can put it that way, that amount would be very small indeed, because members would understand that the concept of the indemnity fund is that it is in the accounts of the State Bank but the State Bank works out the various non-performing loans and liabilities, obviously seeking the greatest return possible. In many cases—in fact, in most cases—the exact ascertainment of how much that liability will be and what write-off is necessary could take some considerable time—in fact, a matter of years—because there is no way that we should be encouraging the bank into fire sales or quitting assets without getting maximum return.

We want that money repaid to the State. We want the bank to make a profit in order to repay that money to the State. Therefore, we want it to get the maximum return from those assets. That means making correct commercial judgments that are not based on a sudden desire to just simply quit an asset. So, there must be discipline and control over the asset management of the State Bank, and I am very confident from the reports I have had from the bank board that that is being seen as a matter of high priority.

An asset management division has been established, with expertise being applied to it, and that is a very important task that the State Bank has to carry out. To the extent that it can minimise the draw on the indemnity provided, at

whatever level, that means to that degree that money will be repaid to the State over time.

As to the current situation, there has been much speculation over recent days. I think that that speculation is most unfortunate and quite unnecessary. The Chairman of the bank board, Mr Clark, has made clear to me that the bank has been doing a very assiduous assessment of its liability and end of year results. In turn, they will be audited, and I imagine that the audit will be extremely detailed and careful. Those accounts will be available. In fact, I have asked that they be available for publication with our State budget, so that the State Bank's results and position can be seen in the context of our overall State finances. This is the appropriate and responsible way to do these things. I have also made the same request of SGIC, for instance, in the finalising of its accounts this year. Those institutions are in fact working to that target and deadline.

As the Chairman made clear to me, and as I would agree completely, until those figures are finalised and written off, there should not be speculation, discussion or anything placed in the public domain, and that is the position. So, I assure members that all effort is being made to meet that publication date of 29 August which I have required and which is the nominated date for our budget presentation, so that the full picture can be provided.

YOUTH WORK CAMPS

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House of the potential employment opportunities for people who might be placed in camps to gain experience as feral cat catchers, national park weeders or railway builders as suggested by the member for Murray-Mallee?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It seemed to me, as it did to my colleague the Minister of Youth Affairs, quite a bizarre proposal that we read in this morning's paper. I remind the member for Mitchell that the member for Murray-Mallee was talking about compulsory camps. We are not talking about people who might wish to volunteer their services to work within our national parks and wildlife system. As my colleague has said, it seems to do two things: first, it will punish young, unemployed people by suggesting that they be compulsorily located, 200 strong, in a national park. One can only assume that they would have to live in the national park. I suspect that that raises very serious questions for the management of our parks.

Secondly, these people will not be there because they love the parks and want to do some valuable work within them: they will be compulsorily put into these labour camps. If I did not have the article in front of me, I would almost think that the whole thing was straight out of *Hogan's Heroes*. In fact, one could only describe the member for Murray-Mallee as some kind of bizarre, modern-day Colonel Klink. It is quite crazy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It should be pointed out that, in making their responses on their area of responsibility, Ministers are certainly answerable to the House. However, I think that, when Ministers are answering questions and tend to go into the personal side and the alleged foibles of members of this House, perhaps we are stretching Standing Orders a little.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask that, when responding to questions, Ministers maintain the line on Government policy and the application of that policy.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would be delighted to do that, and I would like to raise some questions from the media report. For example, where does the honourable member propose to locate the forced youth labour camps? Is he proposing to locate them within the national parks system? The second question is: who will pay for these young people, because it is reported that in fact they will not receive the dole? Is he therefore suggesting that the National Parks and Wildlife Service should pay for these people? If that is indeed what he is suggesting, it would be an enormously expensive proposal and would take funds from the very important nature conservation programs that are being implemented.

It would seem that the allocation of such camps within the system would pose major management challenges. I think it is also important to note that the honourable member suggests that, if a youth were to run away from one of the camps, he or she could be relocated to a camp further away from the major towns. I have just visited the Witjira National Park. On this side of Parliament we are working on a policy to give a joint management function to the Irrwanyi Aboriginal people, for whom that area is the homeland. It seems to me that this Government has a far different policy on the management of our parks—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 128, which deals with relevance.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not uphold the point of order. I have made the point previously that the responsibility of a Minister in this House is to respond on Government policy and the application of that policy. I would suggest that the Minister has made a long answer, and perhaps she could draw the answer to a close.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, I will, Mr Speaker. I was in fact drawing out the difference between the Government's policy on the proper management of our national parks system and this bizarre proposal that has been put out to the community, which would see our young people placed in forced labour camps within our national parks system. As the Minister responsible for parks in this State, I totally reject this proposal, because we must encourage people through the Friends of Parks to work within our parks system. On behalf of those who want to be part of our national parks system, we on this side will reject forcing people who do not want to be part of that system to work within it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier is out of order, and so is the member for Eyre.

STATE BANK

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My question is addressed to the Treasurer. Is the Treasury still receiving the State Bank Group's monthly operating reviews which show all changes in non-performing accounts and profit, and has the Treasury also received the group's draft annual accounts to assist in the preparation of the budget and, if these documents have been received, why will the Treasurer not tell the public what position the bank is currently in?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the member for Morphett for his question. Perhaps 'question' might be putting too high a note on it, given that the question travelled from the gallery to the Leader's bench, to the member for Heysen and across to the member for Morphett. I am glad he had time to read it. It is just as well the Minister took the time she did over her reply so that the question could be asked.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the Premier back to the question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, Mr Speaker, I will. Treasury is keeping in very close contact with the State Bank, in both working on its accounts and the outcome for this year. Obviously, it would be kept right up to date with information, but I make the point again, as I did a moment ago, that until those accounts are signed off and audited it is inappropriate for any figures to be put in the public domain.

SEWAGE TREATMENT

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Water Resources provide details of progress made by the Engineering and Water Supply Department on plans to construct a pipeline to carry sludge from the Glenelg and Port Adelaide sewage treatment works to be treated at Bolivar as part of the program of environmental works being funded by the 10 per cent levy on sewerage accounts?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. For some time he has been very interested in the whole question of the quality of the sea grasses which abound outside the electorate for which he is responsible and of the water and environment within his electorate. I am sure that the House will be interested to learn that the treatment of Adelaide sewage generates some 1 200 megalitres per year of digested sludge. While that may not be a statistic that excites members of this House, it poses a considerable problem for the department in terms of the safe disposal of this digested sludge.

The sludge contains solids which have been biologically degraded to a relatively stable state and it is produced in a fluid consistency. With the passing of the Marine Environment Protection Act, the Government has made a commitment to cease the discharge of sewage sludge into the sea by the end of 1993. A range of options—

Mr Brindal: 1992, you are on the public record as saying.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: By the end of 1993. A range of options to achieve the Government's objectives has been investigated, including mechanical dewatering and disposal off site. As well as that, we have looked at the concept of the incineration and pumping of sludge in its fluid state to Bolivar for disposal. The E&WS has recommended that the pumping of this digested sewage sludge from Glenelg and Port Adelaide to Bolivar for air drying prior to disposal on land is the most efficient way of achieving the Government's objective, and these proposals have now been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. The estimated capital cost of the recommended scheme is some \$13 million, with an associated estimated additional cost of operation and maintenance of about \$300 000 per year. It is not a cheap option; it will involve \$300 000 in ongoing operational costs a year.

It is important to put on the public record that some concerns have been expressed by residents who live near the Bolivar works, and the Salisbury council has raised this matter with me, as well, regarding a possible increase in odours from the Bolivar sewage treatment works caused by the pumping of this additional sludge for disposal. Departmental officers attended a council meeting and outlined the proposed measures for controlling the odours. Following the meeting, the council indicated it would have no objections to the scheme.

In fact, it is important to point out for all members who represent electorates in that area, including you, Mr Speaker, that this pumping of sludge to Bolivar will in no way

increase the odours from any of the sewage treatment plants, because that is not where the odours come from. I will not give the House an analysis of where they do come from, but I can assure members that this is a very positive environmental move on behalf of the Government. It indicates to the community and to the member for Henley Beach and his constituents that the environmental levy is being very well spent and that we will meet our commitment of removing sludge from the gulf by the end of 1993.

WORKCOVER

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Following the Premier's commitment on 22 March this year in his response to the Prime Minister's industry statement that the Government will strive to achieve 'nationally competitive' WorkCover levies by 1993-94, what percentage reductions is this Government considering; is it intended to phase in these reductions; and, if so, when will this begin?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Government is considering a number of strategies and will introduce and announce those when the time is right.

TARIFF REFORM

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology outline to the House what steps he is taking to get the Federal Government to slow down the implementation of tariff reform? Members were no doubt aware of the Tubemakers situation that resulted in a rally outside this Parliament last week. Reputedly, the closure of Tubemakers has been brought about because steering columns for General Motors-Holden's will now be sourced overseas because of tariff reduction. Members are also no doubt aware that the Federal Opposition policy is for the total abolition of tariffs.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, because it is a very important one, made more so by the events at Tubemakers. It is also relevant because of concerns that have been expressed by a number of other companies and a number of other component manufacturers in this State. The question who has been reducing the tariffs has been asked. Let me remind the House of the policy of the Federal Liberal Opposition, which wants to reduce it to zero. What I should like to know—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: When this State Government was putting submissions to the Federal Government, saying that it should not be reducing tariffs at the accelerated rate that is now being proposed, we should have liked to be able to speak on behalf of the Parliament of South Australia and to take a view that united the major Parties of this State. Did we get such a united view? We did not. The Opposition's silence on the automotive industry and on tariffs applying in that case clearly indicates consent to the policies of Ian McLachlan, John Hewson and others in the Federal Parliament.

What that means is that the investment decisions of the boards of automotive component manufacturers and car manufacturers in this country are in danger of being put on hold, because they will not know whether there is any possibility at all that, at the Federal level, a zero per cent tariff is in the offing. We are doing what we can to have this matter further considered by the Federal Government.

The Premier has given an undertaking to a delegation that he and I met from the employees at Tubemakers that that issue would be taken up with the Prime Minister. I will again take up the matter with John Button, the Federal Minister of Industry, Technology and Commerce. Indeed, I will raise it at the forthcoming meeting of the Australian Industry Technology Council.

One of the things that we will want to ensure is that we take a comprehensive view of what is happening to the automotive industry in this State and in this country at large. The task force that the Premier announced in his response to the Federal Industry Statement on 22 March—the automotive task force that I chair—is bringing together employers and unions from the automotive sector, and one of the first things we are attempting to do is to get a real feel for what are likely to be the investment decisions that might be put off as a result of the cutback in tariffs.

We can then report on the situation to John Button, the Federal Minister, saying, 'Your advisers believed that we were being unnecessarily concerned, that there would not, in fact, be the job losses that we in South Australia have been predicting. What we want to say is that the situation is not as your advisers have suggested: it is worse than that.' The job losses which we predicted and which the Premier announced last year would see 3 000 jobs go in the automotive industry in South Australia, and 9 000 other jobs. We are starting to see that score card being filled up. Therefore, now that we can come back with evidence, is it not time to look at rolling back that situation and slowing down that reduction in tariffs to that which we proposed in our own submission to the industry commission and to the Federal Government, which was a reduction from 35 per cent to 25 per cent?

But time still exists for the Opposition to join us in this respect, because as we are making these calls to the Prime Minister and to the Federal Minister it would be—and I repeat this point—enormously useful if we could say, 'Yes, the State Liberal Opposition supports us on this.' The Opposition has had lots of opportunities to say that. It missed the opportunity to tell the employers of Tubemakers that when the member for Playford and I were putting our views on this matter, as was the Federal member for Adelaide, Bob Catley. Where was the Liberal Party? It was nowhere to be seen.

Now it has the chance to say something on this matter, and I would suggest that the Address in Reply is a wonderful opportunity for the Liberals to do that. I look forward to reading with great interest the views of members opposite on the automotive industry in their responses to the Governor's address.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I direct my question to the Treasurer. In view of his statement to the Estimates Committee on 11 September last year that the Government wanted the SGIC's health insurance to operate 'on a profitable basis' and in view of the revelation by the SGIC review committee that these operations have made operating losses for the past four years and are being subsidised by interest free loans and other financial arrangements within SGIC, for how much longer will SGIC continue to make these losses while competing unfairly with private health funds?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer is 'Not very' Mr Speaker. Secondly, I do not believe that the case has been

established that SGIC Health is competing unfairly with the other funds. It is certainly competing. Members opposite who like the idea of market forces, how one develops a business, market shares and things of that kind, and who complain about the cost of health services and health fund insurance in this State should be applauding SGIC's involvement in that field of activity.

The fact is that SGIC has been able to provide, through SGIC Health, a competitive, well-tailored product that has found ready acceptance in the marketplace. If we were dealing with some other issue every member opposite would recognise the fact that if someone wants to get into a particular business they must win some market share, build that business and be competitive to do so. If the member for Adelaide now were entering the deregulated airline system as the managing director of Compass Airlines, he would be charging a premium on the prices of Ansett and TAA, because that airline did not have its craft operational and paid for and did not have its own terminal facilities, and he would have to immediately build up funds for that. But, how many passengers would he get and what share of the market would he have? The answer is absolutely nil.

SGIC, in embarking on health, firstly embarked to an extent in a reactive manner because those in the health insurance business were moving into general insurance in the nature of offering a range of products. It was only reasonable that SGIC should respond to that challenge, and it was only reasonable that its competitors should understand that it was responding to that challenge. Secondly, it is only reasonable that SGIC should target a market share. Indeed, it has succeeded in terms of its development plans and market share because its product has been so successful. Thirdly, it would be conceded by its competitors as well as by SGIC that, in the initial stages of its business, it was not going to return a profit from day one. Finally, it must be conceded by its competitors that over time it must show a profit or it should no longer be in the business.

On all those points I concur completely. Indeed, when the private health insurance funds complained to me about SGIC's competitive behaviour, the one thing I could address—and that is interesting in this current debate to see a lot of those in the competing business come out of the woodwork (I do not blame them; this is an environment in which they can try to grab back some market share)—was that I completely agreed that SGIC should not run a loss-making, unprofitable business in health insurance and had no right to be in there if it was going to do so.

But it had to be given a reasonable time to demonstrate its profitability and, as I said right at the beginning of this answer to the honourable member, that time is approaching. It is approaching rapidly, and I would expect SGIC to begin to show those profits. If it does not, it can get out of the business, but it should not be driven out of the business by those who seek to attack it in a non-commercial way because, essentially, that is what the Opposition is saying, that there is one set of rules for SGIC and quite another set for those with whom it chooses to compete. The fact is that SGIC's competition in this field has resulted in the benefit of lower premiums to many families in this State.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member is in the medical profession and in the course of his duties he must see people who complain to him about the cost of health insurance and explain how difficult it is. Has he ever once drawn their attention to the package offered by SGIC?

Dr Armitage: Yes, I have—

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member responds that he has, and I appreciate that frank admission.

What he would be doing in that instance would be showing his patients quite correctly the range of options open to them, and I bet that he is pleased he has those options because, if it were a totally monopolistic situation, he might not have those options and the position with health insurance and its cost would be very different. All I am saying is that we should give SGIC a go in this area. It cannot have an unreasonable go because it has to return a profit, but give it a go and stop trying to undermine its efforts.

The SPEAKER: Order! Some members are taking advantage of my delicate condition and gentle voice. I warn them that it is covering a fairly harsh interior.

COUNTRY RAIL SERVICES

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Transport inform the House when it is anticipated that the Federal Minister for Transport and Communications is likely to make a decision on the possibility of reinstating the three country passenger rail services in South Australia? I am aware that the Minister had a meeting with the Federal Minister last month to discuss the future of Australian National country passenger train services in South Australia.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Stuart for her question. I have not received a definite date from the Federal Minister, but he did assure me that he would get the costings done as soon as possible. It was quite clear from what the Minister said that he wanted those costings done early and that he wanted the debate back in the community. Certainly, he is not afraid of debate—he welcomes it—but it should be debate based on fact rather than on emotion.

As all members of the House will know, the South Australian Government was successful before the arbitrator in insisting upon our rights under the rail transfer agreement, and the arbitrator decided that we had made an overwhelming case and a much better case than the Commonwealth had made for closing down the line. I give credit where credit is due, and credit certainly goes to the member for Mount Gambier, who was of great assistance to the South Australian Government. Of course, this is more than I can say for the Leader of the Opposition who, several months before, made some rather indiscreet statements in the local paper to the effect that the line should be closed because it was too expensive for taxpayers.

Despite this clear sabotage of the line by the Leader, we were successful. I have asked the Federal Government, as we have established a legal right in regard to the Blue Lake service and as there is a moral obligation on the Federal Government, to fund AN to reinstate Iron Triangle services and the Silver City service—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —because those two services were actually better patronised and had a higher return on investment than did the Blue Lake service. If the argument stood up for the Blue Lake service, logic would determine that it also ought to stand up for the Iron Triangle and Silver City services. I think that the mayors, particularly in the Iron Triangle, have played a very constructive role. I agree with them, and particularly with Mayor Reid from Whyalla, that there is no point in reinstating the service at the level that it was at before. That is pointless.

For the service to be viable, it has to be upgraded, the rolling stock must be upgraded, with better timetables and, particularly in Port Pirie and to a lesser extent in Whyalla, an actual relocation of the stations is required. If a passenger

is charged half the train fare to get to the station by taxi to catch the train, obviously it will not be terribly attractive. All those costings are being done as quickly as it is reasonable to have them done. They will be made public, and the Federal Minister will be very happy to debate those costings out in the community. I believe that the Federal Minister is very sincere. If the passenger projections stack up on a decent service, we will see those two other services reinstated. I believe that the moral obligation is there and, if the statistics and figures support us, I know that the Federal Minister will reinstate those services.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Will the Premier explain to the House the procedures he established to monitor SGIC's compliance with investment guidelines under its Act; does he accept ultimate responsibility for this mismanagement of an investment portfolio totalling more than \$1.4 billion; or is he only as responsible as the Minister of Forests' new definition of 'ministerial accountability'? The report of the SGIC review committee stated:

Until July 1990 SGIC only had an informal property investment strategy... the control of investment strategies for each fund has been *ad hoc*... investment decisions have been made without a thorough analysis of the proposal and with little documentation of the process.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member spoils her question by selective quoting from the review report following the usual very unfair practice which has been adopted in the way in which the Opposition has approached this matter. I commissioned that report with a request that full and frank appraisal be given of SGIC's position and that a warts and all presentation be made. I did not ask them to give us long details of the successful strategies and areas of SGIC. They summarised that very quickly in the opening pages of the report in which they did give testament to good management and performance by SGIC and went on to deal with some specific areas. A number of those matters need to be very seriously addressed, and I have outlined to the House how we intend to address them.

As far as my responsibility is concerned, I have certainly taken up my responsibility in relation to SGIC and its operations. I do not accept that there has been total mismanagement of the portfolio, as the honourable member suggests. Certainly, there have been some mistakes in some major areas—for instance, in the 333 Collins Street put option which obviously is quite serious in terms of its size and scope. However, that does not mean that we simply wipe off all those other very successful investments and the equities portfolio that has performed consistently very well, as well as a number of other strategic investments that SGIC has made, both in its own commercial interest and in the interests of the State, because it has reinvested money raised in this State as opposed to it filtering away.

An honourable member: What about 333 Collins Street?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already mentioned 333 Collins Street. I believe that those things that need to be done are being done, and I do not accept that SGIC was in a complete free-fall environment. There were broad guidelines, which SGIC had to follow in terms of all its investments. The question of whether they have been detailed enough and whether they need to be further refined was examined by the review. The review says that they do, and that in fact is happening.

HOUSING TRUST PAYMENTS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Could the Minister of Housing and Construction investigate the possibility of trust tenants who live in Elizabeth North being able to pay their rent through the Elizabeth North newsagency? The Minister will be aware that, since May of this year, trust tenants can pay their rents at post offices using the one spot bill pay system. In fact, as a result of this, the trust office at Elizabeth City Centre no longer takes rents over the counter.

I have been approached by numerous constituents from Elizabeth North who desire the same service which is currently being provided at the Elizabeth South shopping centre through the newsagency there. The Elizabeth North newsagency already provides a limited Australia Post and Commonwealth Bank agency, and I understand that the owner is quite prepared to carry out structural changes at his own cost to provide a similar service, which would benefit tenants in the Elizabeth North area.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Napier for his question. Even though these may be his last few years in this House, he certainly shows a continued interest in his constituents and constantly works in their interest. We have initiated some new steps to assist trust tenants in the payment of their accounts, and the 500 or so outlets that are now provided through the post offices have led to many of our trust offices changing the structure of their administration and not providing facilities for the payment of accounts at each individual trust office. That has caused some difficulty, and I appreciate the honourable member's raising it, because it is a matter that I must look at in terms of the residents of Elizabeth North.

The post office facilities, which are provided partly through the Elizabeth South newsagent, have been offering a Housing Trust payment facility. Obviously, the constituents to whom the honourable member refers have looked at what has been offered from the Elizabeth South centre, and I am sure they have drawn the conclusion that perhaps the same should apply to the Elizabeth North newsagency. It is the responsibility of the post office to assess the viability of providing those services through their agencies, and I am advised that they have looked at the electronic counter service at the Elizabeth North newsagency and have reported to the Housing Trust that in fact it is not justified at this time. However, I understand the difficulty and I think it is incumbent on the Government and the trust to ensure that a convenience is available to all trust tenants in the payment of their accounts. In these times, when it is more and more difficult for people to meet those accounts, the convenience of payment is one of the things that we should provide. I have asked the trust to undertake an investigation of this, and I hope we can come up with a proposal that does allow Elizabeth North residents to have the use of an agency so they can pay their accounts more conveniently.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr MEIER (Goyder): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Before approving the 333 Collins Street put option, what analysis and documentation did SGIC present to the Treasurer?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am a little surprised at it, in view of the enormous range of issues that concern the agricultural and primary sector in this country at the moment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is a valid comment to make, if the honourable member wants to use up the limitations of Question Time on issues that do not relate to those that he has been appointed to represent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder is out of order. He has asked his question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is relevant only because the honourable member has been complaining to rural groups that he does not get the chance to ask questions on their behalf, when he is talking about his catfish farm and things like that. In relation to 333 Collins Street, I got advice both from SGIC, in which it outlined the proposal and the opportunity it provided for it, and Treasury, which commented that it believed that this was a reasonable commercial activity in which SGIC should invest or write an insurance policy.

I point out that, at the time, the put option business was seen as a new area of credit-risk insurance and seemed to fall within the parameters of SGIC and its brief. A large number of offers were made to SGIC for various puts. In the event, very few of them were actually written and, in the case of 333 Collins Street, that put has been called, as we well know. At the time at which the proposals were made and on the evidence that was put before me, it seemed a very logical and sensible area in which SGIC should be engaged. I might add that, in the light of developments that have occurred, the commission has ceased involving itself in any such put option business and, as I indicated in my answer to a question—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member chortles, but I point out that by so doing it is probably missing out on a number of commercial opportunities which do not carry major risk and which could be reinsured and a number of other things happen. They are excluding themselves from a particular area of business.

Mr D.S. Baker: Do you want them to go back in?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not advocating that they go back in. I have said that they should not do it. I have made that clear and, in my statement last week in addressing the recommendations of the review, in which the review committee said that it believed the put option business should be a matter of review, I said that we do not agree with that, that we believe that it should not do any more of such business. That is the position so far as I am concerned at the moment. In 1988, when that particular proposition was put, it was a very commercial deal.

ADELAIDE ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction tell the House whether the Hindmarsh Entertainment Centre lived up to expectations on its opening night? Will the Minister say whether the car parking provided was sufficient to keep patrons' cars away from the residential streets of the town of Hindmarsh?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted that the member for Spence should direct this question to me. Of course, he has a very personal and direct interest in the Entertainment Centre and is most interested in the success of the centre. Those of us who were privileged to be there on Friday night to enjoy the gala opening would attest to its success.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Members opposite criticise, but I will ignore the interjections. It is notable that most of them were opposed to it or tried to undermine it during the process of its construction, and I noticed that this morning Samela Harris made some comment about one 'pollie' who was not in favour of it yet tried to squeeze three people into one seat. It is interesting to note—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am not sure.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Heysen makes an interjection but, when the matter was before the Public Works Standing Committee, he voted against it. However, there he was Friday night, bold as brass, fronting up and enjoying the night. Until three weeks ago, the Hon. Mr Lucas was questioning and trying to undermine the Entertainment Centre, trying to score a few political points. Who was there on the night but the Hon. Mr Lucas, as well, to enjoy with his colleagues the opening of the Entertainment Centre! One cannot understand the degree of hypocrisy that occurs on the other side. Of course, we will not hear much about it now because it was an outstanding success. One constituent telephoned me on Saturday morning to complain about one problem, namely, the number of women's toilets available.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Not enough! She acknowledged that there was probably no answer to it, because on most occasions with such a large gathering most women tend to go at interval, and that puts enormous pressure on the facilities.

I said, 'Do you expect us to have some mobile toilets outside?' and she said, 'No, I don't think that's the solution.' That is the only criticism I heard from anyone on the night. In particular, I want to answer some comments made by Mr Goers that I thought were highly inappropriate to the night.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: Especially what he implied about the people of Plympton Park.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Indeed! He suggested in his column that the Apollo Entertainment Centre was a much safer environment than the Entertainment Centre. It is fair to run through the assessment of what we have done in the Entertainment Centre to provide fire safety, Mr Goers having suggested that the Entertainment Centre was a far greater fire risk. I must acknowledge that the building is designed so that the distances travelled for all patrons to a fire safety zone are within those allowed under the Australian code.

In addition, the emergency exit provision is in accordance with the code's requirements. The building has a fully automatic alarm system directly linked to the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service. The building is provided throughout with what we call a very early smoke detection alarm. There is also an emergency warning and evacuation system equipped with horns and speakers, and a central battery bank provides emergency power and exit lighting for a period of two hours in case of power failure.

The building has a full sprinkler system, being the first in Australia to be thus protected. It is the first of its kind with this sort of facility to protect the building itself. Extensive testing was carried out on the sprinkler heads to ensure their efficient functioning. All fixed seating is covered in fire retardant foam with pure wool covers, and loose seating meets Fire Standard Safety Code requirements. The building's extensive curtain system is of pure wool fabric. I hope that that puts to rest once and for all Mr Goers' comments, because that building is one of the most fire safe of its kind

in Australia, and I cannot understand where on earth he obtained his information when writing that column.

From the point of view of parking, ease of access and other facilities, those of us who were privileged, I say again, to be there would have seen how quickly the areas were cleared by the people who were leaving. In fact, within five minutes the surrounding walkway of the main entrance to the centre was vacated, and only those who wanted to stay on to have a further look at the building were to be seen. Those who had left made a very quick exit.

I believe that the parking situation went quite well. Prior to the commencement of the performance, I did two large circuits of the building, both on Port Road and South Road and along the continuation of Port Road in front of the brewery and Coca-Cola, and traffic was moving very smoothly. The problem is that most South Australians, particularly Adelaideans, have historically been able to enjoy arriving 10 minutes before a performance starts and expecting to walk 100 metres through the front door to be seated.

When looking at performances such as that which is showing at the moment, motocross or an opera star, we must face the fact that people will be required to make a slight adjustment to their timetable in order to arrive on time. We are talking about 11 000 or 12 000 people converging on one facility. It is important for us to encourage the community, as the centre manager has, to be aware of the need to plan to go a little earlier than if people were going to a theatre in the city or to a regional cinema.

In my view and given the comments which I heard on Friday night and which I have heard from my colleagues and from friends who attended the gala opening and who observed the Entertainment Centre, it was an outstanding success. I want to congratulate the Grand Prix Board and all those involved in the construction of the centre, because it has been on budget, it has been a success and it was ahead of time. I think that it will be an asset this State will enjoy for many years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister of Housing and Construction suggested that I had voted against the Entertainment Centre. I invite any honourable member of this House to look at the minutes of the Public Works Standing Committee, and he or she will observe that I voted for the Entertainment Centre.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! And a good vote, too!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen has had his say.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Government Bills and motions to be introduced before the Address in Reply is completed.

Motion carried.

GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to regulate the practice of naming geographical places; to repeal the Geographical Names Act 1969; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This Bill is the culmination of a review of the provisions for assigning geographical place names. The current Act has remained unchanged since its proclamation in 1970. The review was mounted as part of an overall examination of the Department of Lands legislative program.

The review identified a number of specific problems that needed to be addressed. It questioned the need for a board to administer geographical naming requirements; it highlighted the problems caused to Australia Post and emergency services organisations by the uncontrolled use of estate names in advertising property development; it identified the inflexibility of the Act in the area of assigning dual names to places which have both Aboriginal and European significance, and it demonstrated the inability to level charges for activities carried out by government in geographical names matters. The review concluded that a completely new Act was appropriate.

As part of the review process, comments were sought from interested parties. A number of submissions were received from local government bodies and property developers, demonstrating that the sector of the community involved in geographical activities had a keen interest in the development of the Bill. Subsequently, draft proposals for a new Geographical Names Act were distributed to those groups which had lodged submissions. The responses were then considered in the formulation of this Bill.

Attention may now be given to specific aspects of the Bill. The object of this Bill is to repeal the Geographical Names Act 1969 and to provide new legislation for assigning geographical names to places. The purpose of the new Act is to provide an orderly means of determining and assigning geographical names to places in South Australia.

A major departure from the former Act is the removal of the Geographical Names Board and the transfer of this body's responsibilities to the Surveyor-General and the Minister of Lands. All applications for the assignment of, or change to, geographical names are currently directed to the Geographical Names Board. The board, after consideration of the facts, recommends to the Minister that the application be either accepted or rejected. Under the new Act, applications will be forwarded to the Surveyor-General. The Surveyor-General, in consultation with the Geographical Names Advisory Committee established under the new legislation, will then advise the Minister on the appropriate

course of action. The final determination of the geographical name will lie with the Minister.

Another area of change is in the assignation of dual geographical names to places. The current legislation makes no allowance for assigning dual names to places which have both a European and Aboriginal name. The new legislation will provide the legislative authority for this procedure. This will be unique in Australia.

A matter which has been of concern in the past has been the uncontrolled use of estate names in urban land developments. Although the current legislation provides that it is an offence to display any name other than the assigned geographical name in advertisements, etc., the Crown Solicitor has advised that the wording is ambiguous and prosecutions would most likely be unsuccessful. The use of estate names is a concern to both Australia Post and emergency services organisations which rely on the assigned geographical name in carrying out their responsibilities.

Complaints of misrepresentation have also come from members of the public who have claimed that when they purchased their land they were not aware of the official suburb name. For example, one person who bought a property in an estate named Huntingdale, on later discovering that the official suburb name was Hackham, contacted the Geographical Names Board expressing his concern that the official suburb name was not shown on any advertising material relating to the land. He claimed that there had been misrepresentation by the developer.

Estate names, however, provide a valuable marketing tool for the land developer. In order to take into account the needs of both bodies, the new legislation will require that, in the advertising of all new estates, the assigned geographical name must be prominently displayed on any material issued to the public. The Surveyor-General has contacted representatives of the land development industry with a view to developing acceptable standards in this area.

Some existing advertising material used to market land may fall outside the guidelines established by the industry. Provided this material does not grossly misrepresent the situation and cause a public mischief, its use will not be considered an offence against the Act.

The administration of geographical names activities costs the State approximately \$100 000 per annum. Much of this is spent in investigating naming applications necessary for the development of the State. Applications are, from time to time, lodged by individuals or organisations requesting that suburb boundaries be altered for various reasons. The costs associated with researching these applications is considerable. It is proposed in the new legislation to allow the Surveyor-General to levy charges on applications of this type. The Government trusts that this Bill will be well received and looks forward to its passage through Parliament and its successful implementation. I commend the Bill to members. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part I comprising clauses 1 to 5 contains preliminary provisions.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 defines words and expressions used in the Bill. In particular, 'geographical name' is defined as a name assigned or approved under this Act to a 'place', which is, in turn, defined as any area, region, locality, city, suburb, town, township, or settlement, or any geographical or top-

ographical feature, and includes any railway station, hospital, school and any other place or building that is, or is likely to be, of public or historical interest.

Clause 4 provides that this Act does not apply to the name of a municipality, district or ward constituted or established under the Local Government Act 1934, an electoral district, division or subdivision established under the Constitution Act 1934 or the Electoral Act 1985, or to a road or street. The Governor may by proclamation exempt any place or any place of a type or kind from the provisions of this Act. The Governor may, by subsequent proclamation, vary or revoke a proclamation made under this clause.

Clause 5 provides that the Crown is bound by this Act.

Part II comprising clauses 6 to 11 contains administrative provisions.

Clause 6 sets out the functions of the Minister. In particular, the Minister is responsible for assigning names to places.

Clause 7 provides that the Minister may delegate any of his or her powers or functions under this Act to the Surveyor-General, to the Geographical Names Advisory Committee or to a person for the time being occupying a particular office or position.

Clause 8 provides for the manner in which the Minister assigns a geographical name to a place.

Subclause (1) provides that where the Minister is satisfied that the recorded name of a place is the name that is, by common usage, assigned to that place, the Minister may publish a notice in the *Gazette* declaring that from the date of the publication of the notice, the recorded name is approved as its geographical name.

Subclause (2) provides that, except where subclause (1) applies, where the Minister proposes to assign or alter a geographical name of a place, he or she must cause to be published in the *Gazette* and in a newspaper circulating in the neighbourhood of that place a notice that sets out a description of the place together with the proposed geographical name or proposed alteration to the geographical name of that place. It must also invite any interested person to make a written submission to the Minister in relation to the proposal within one month of the publication of the notice.

This clause further provides that after taking into account any submission received, the Minister may, by notice published in the *Gazette*, declare that the geographical name of a place is the name set out in the notice or that the geographical name of a place is altered to the name set out in the notice. The Minister may assign to a place a dual geographical name that is comprised of an Aboriginal name that is the Aboriginal name for that place and another name and may, by notice published in the *Gazette*, declare that from the date specified in the notice the use of a geographical name of a place is discontinued.

Subclause (7) provides that the Minister must take into account the advice of the Surveyor-General in carrying out his or her functions under this clause.

Clause 9 sets out the functions of the Surveyor-General under this Act. In particular, the Surveyor-General is responsible for advising the Minister with respect to any matter relating to the administration or operation of this Act.

Clause 10 provides for the establishment of the Geographical Names Committee consisting of the Surveyor-General (the presiding member) and five other persons appointed by the Minister on the recommendation of the Surveyor-General.

Clause 11 provides that the functions of the committee are to advise the Minister and the Surveyor-General on the

performance of their functions under this Act, to monitor the operation of this Act and to make recommendations where appropriate on its administration.

Part III comprising clauses 12 to 18 contains the miscellaneous provisions.

Clause 12 provides that, on application, the Surveyor-General may approve a name given to a hospital or an educational institution or to an area of land that is divided for residential, industrial or commercial purposes after the commencement of this Act or to any other place or type of place specified by the Surveyor-General by notice published in the *Gazette*.

Clause 13 provides that where a geographical name has been assigned to a place under clause 8 or a name for a place has been approved pursuant to an application under clause 12, it is an offence (carrying a division 6 fine) for a person to produce or cause to be produced a document (which is defined to include a book, guide, manual, map, newspaper, notice or billboard) or advertisement in which a name is specifically or impliedly represented to be the name of that place unless the assigned geographical name or the approved name is also prominently represented.

Clause 14 provides that an offence against this Act (which is a summary offence) must not be commenced without the consent of the Minister. In any proceedings for such an offence, a certificate apparently signed by the Minister giving his or her consent to the proceedings is, in the absence of proof to the contrary, to be accepted as proof of the Minister's consent.

Clause 15 provides the Surveyor-General with the power to recover the reasonably incurred costs and expenses in dealing with an application from any person who applies for the assignment of a geographical name to a place, a change to the geographical name or boundaries of a place or an approval under clause (12). In any proceedings under this clause, a certificate apparently signed by the Surveyor-General certifying the costs and expenses incurred in dealing with such an application is, in the absence of proof to the contrary, to be accepted as proof of the costs and expenses.

Clause 16 provides that nothing in this Act and nothing done pursuant to this Act affects the operation or validity of any instrument or agreement that creates or imposes any rights or liabilities. Nothing in this Act imposes any obligation on or otherwise applies to the Registrar-General.

Clause 17 provides for the making of regulations by the Governor.

Clause 18 repeals the Geographical Names Act 1969.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CLEAN AIR (OPEN AIR BURNING) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Clean Air Act 1984. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Obviously members opposite must love the sound of my voice. I would be delighted to read the explanation into *Hansard*. I propose to introduce

a Clean Air (Open Air Burning) Amendment Bill 1991, the principal purpose of which is to aid the administration of regulations relating to fires on domestic, commercial and industrial premises. The amendments are being sought in response to requests by local councils which have delegated responsibility for administering the provisions controlling fires in the open on non-domestic premises and both fires in the open and in incinerators on domestic premises.

The first provision of this Bill seeks to clarify what is meant by a fire in the open and, additionally, to empower local councils to administer the provisions controlling domestic incinerators that are used by occupiers of flats and other multiple household dwellings. The Clean Air Regulations 1984 prohibit a fire in the open on non-domestic premises except by written consent of council and subject to such conditions the council may wish to impose to minimise nuisance.

The Minister for Environment and Planning through the Department of Environment and Planning has responsibility for controlling emissions from incinerators on non-domestic premises. Some units, depending on type and capacity, require a licence to operate under the Clean Air Act. These units are often technically complex, designed to burn specific materials. Local councils generally do not have the technical expertise or equipment necessary to assess the design and operation of these incinerators, hence the State provides this service.

A problem encountered by local councils is determining what constitutes an incinerator on non-domestic premises and whether a fire within a semi-permanent construction is a fire in the open. A notable example of this dilemma is that faced by a council officer when responding to the nuisance caused by the disposal of waste by burning in a 205 litre drum. This means of waste disposal does not meet the department's incinerator criteria and provides an inefficient means of combustion. There is no means by which the burning or the emission of pollutants can be controlled.

Nevertheless, these problems hardly need the technical expertise of the authorised officers appointed by me as Minister for industrial air pollution control, and could be solved more quickly and effectively by local council officers. The Bill seeks to clarify the position by regarding any fire in the open air, that is, any fire not within a building, as an open fire unless the products of combustion are discharged into the atmosphere via a chimney.

There is no point in simply adding a chimney to a rudimentary container and calling it an incinerator. I would point out that such action would allow air pollutants to be tested and the unit would most surely fail the statutory emission standards. This amendment therefore will eliminate a problem of interpretation and provide local councils with the opportunity to control what is essentially a matter of local nuisance.

The second provision of this Bill is also intended to assist authorised officers appointed by a local council in the execution of their duties under the Act. Currently, despite a fire in the open or in a domestic incinerator adversely affecting the public, a council officer only has the power to issue a notice of an offence against the Act.

There is no power to eliminate the source of the complaint by either requiring the fire to be extinguished or causing it to be extinguished. This has led to the unacceptable situation of the law appearing to be administered, yet the air pollution problem remains.

The Bill therefore contains a provision to provide authorised officers with specific power to require a person to extinguish a fire where it contravenes the regulations. Recognising that some offenders may refuse, the officer is

also empowered to extinguish it personally or through another appropriate agency. These provisions are necessary to ensure the effective administration of air pollution regulations relating to burning rubbish, and to prevent unwarranted nuisance associated with that activity. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the operation of the Act to be by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act, which is an interpretation provision. The definition of 'domestic incinerator' has been broadened by the removal of the restriction that for an incinerator to be regarded as domestic, it must be used to burn refuse from less than three private households.

New subsection (2) provides an interpretation of the term 'fire in the open'. For the purposes of the principal Act and the regulations, a fire burning in the open air will be regarded as a fire in the open notwithstanding that it is burning in connection with the operation of any fuel burning equipment or within a container, unless such fuel burning equipment or container has a chimney.

Clause 4 amends section 53 of the principal Act, which deals with the powers of authorised officers.

New subsection (1a) widens the powers of authorised officers. If it appears to such an officer while on any premises that matter is being burned by a fire in the open or in a domestic incinerator in contravention of the regulations, the authorised officer may require the fire to be extinguished. If it is not extinguished, or if there is apparently no person in charge of the fire, the authorised officer may extinguish the fire himself or herself.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the establishment of various parliamentary committees; to define the functions, powers and duties of those committees; to repeal the Public Accounts Committee Act 1972 and the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927; to amend the Constitution Act 1934, the Industries Development Act 1941, the Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1990, the Planning Act 1982 and the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill was introduced into the Legislative Council in April of this year by the Attorney-General in the knowledge that it would lapse. It is now reintroduced following the winter recess and the receipt of a number of submissions which I shall deal with later. Essentially, though, it is the same Bill. It completely overhauls and reforms the existing system of parliamentary committees in South Australia. The increasing diversity of our community and the increasing pace of change place an obligation on Governments to make complex decisions.

It is important that all the decisions of Government, no matter how complex and irrespective of size and conse-

quence, are able to be put under scrutiny. In a democratic society with a system of government responsible to Parliament, that scrutiny to a considerable extent is carried out by Parliament. These proposals will enhance that process. The Government has had a policy of access to information—a fact attested to by the recent passage of the Freedom of Information Bill through the Parliament and the earlier introduction on an administrative basis of access to personal records as part of the Government's privacy principles. Much of what the Government has done over the past decade has been subject to parliamentary scrutiny—and much of that scrutiny has taken place in parliamentary committees.

However, the existing committee system is antiquated and imposes constraints both on the Parliament as a whole and on the roles of individual members of Parliament. The business of Government at the end of the twentieth century should continue to be accessible to the people; they should be able to influence and examine what their Governments do on their behalf both directly and through their parliamentary representatives. The changes proposed in this Bill acknowledge the complexity of a modern urban industrialised community and of the right of citizens to hold their elected representatives to account for their decisions and for their actions. It is a sign of the health of a democracy that open debate is encouraged.

Members on both sides of the House have long acknowledged the need for change to the parliamentary committee system. There have been many attempts at reform including select committees and private members' Bills. Some have tackled the system as a whole, while others have tried to modify and expand what already exists. The commitment of the Australian Labor Party to reform Parliament was announced during the 1982 election campaign. In the policy statement on Parliament, which also contained commitments to disclose the pecuniary interests of members of Parliament, to revive a freedom of information working party and to improve access to the law for ordinary Australians, there was a commitment to parliamentary reform, and I quote:

Parliament should be made a more effective instrument for discussion and debate on community issues and for scrutiny of Government actions. The reputation of politicians is low because people are fed up with political bickering and the point scoring which occurs in Parliament. Mechanisms should be developed to assist the promotion of agreement and consensus on issues which are not of great political controversy.

Unfortunately, the actions of the Parliament in recent years have not always enhanced its role in the community, particularly when privilege has been used as a vehicle to attempt to destroy people's reputations. However, the sentiments remain valid and this Bill should make Parliament a better forum for the debate of community issues and scrutiny of Government actions. In 1983 the Attorney-General moved for the establishment of a Joint Select Committee on the Law, Practice and Procedures of the Parliament which had the following terms of reference:

A review and expansion of the committee system including in particular:

- (i) the establishment of a standing committee of the Legislative Council on law reform;
- (ii) the desirability of a separate committee to review the functions of statutory authorities; and
- (iii) the method of dealing with Budget Estimates including the desirability of a permanent Estimates Committee.

With regard to paragraphs (ii) and (iii), the committee should consider the role and relationship of the Public Accounts Committee in the context of these proposals.

A discussion paper was prepared for the committee which met on a number of occasions. Unfortunately, the Liberal Opposition in this House did not respond to any of the

paper's recommendations and the work of the select committee lapsed following the 1985 election. That a new system was needed then and is needed now is attested to not just by the various private members' Bills seeking to expand and/or alter the terms of reference of the existing committees, but also by the increasing number of select committees being established both in this House and in the other place.

More recently, the member for Elizabeth has played an important role in reviving discussions about the system which it is now proposed to introduce and the Government acknowledges his significant contribution to the development of this Bill. The member for Elizabeth has always taken an interest in the role of Parliament as a forum for policy debate and as the body best able to act on behalf of the community by scrutinising legislation, Government actions and Government decisions.

This Bill abolishes the Public Accounts Committee, the Standing Committee on Public Works and the Subordinate Legislation Committee and replaces them with four new committees which ensure that the full range of activities undertaken in South Australia can now come under parliamentary review. The Bill provides through a single statutory instrument the basis for members of Parliament to scrutinise Government activity, community and policy issues and other matters of importance to the people of South Australia. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The establishment of a streamlined and revitalised review process which involves members of Parliament in the processes of Government and in significant community issues, as well as encouraging discussion and communication between diverse interest groups across the State, is a significant step in maintaining and reinforcing the principles of parliamentary democracy.

An efficient and effective committee system will increase public contact, awareness and respect for the process of democracy and allow the development of a review process which establishes links and promotes discussion across disciplines and professions, between regions, between parliamentarians and those who elect them, and between public and private sectors.

There are many issues in the community which are both difficult and hard to resolve. There are issues about which there are genuine differences of opinion and conscience. There are issues about efficiency and the appropriateness of Government operations. A comprehensive committee system should provide the opportunity for many of these issues to get a hearing.

The committee system proposed in this Bill will allow for full public debate on all the important issues facing South Australians. It will in no way undermine the authority of the Parliament but will enhance it.

It will not become an alternative to Parliament, as the committees are committees of the Parliament and are required to report to it.

It will not become an alternative to Government as there is not and should not be any requirement for Government to submit all and every decision to a committee for approval. Committees which are set up purely for the political purpose of harassing Government and making Government more difficult do not enhance decision making. A responsible committee can however assist the decision-making process and good Government.

In the words of Mr Justice Kirby, a former Chairman of the Australian Law Reform Commission:

Public and expert disillusionment with the Parliament is a serious disease which we should seek to check. The other branches of Government (the Cabinet, Judiciary, etc.) are the elite elements in our form of Government . . . Only the Parliament, with its diversity of members, grafts on to our system the variety of talent and views which partly reflect the mass of the people. Unless we are to give up the notion of democratic Government as nothing more than a triennial vote for the people, we should all be concerned to arrest the declining fortunes of the institution which reflects our diverse democracy.

This Bill gives effect to those sentiments. As Professor Emy has said (*The Politics of Australian Democracy*, 1983, page 407):

The case for committees rests on the general premise that the House as a whole is no longer an appropriate body to carry out the legislative functions of scrutiny and investigation. The House should develop more refined instruments for these purposes. It should also provide greater job satisfaction for the back bencher, utilise those talents which are at present frustrated by parliamentary ritual, and offer parliamentarians a more positive chance to contribute to policy discussions, both before the Government is publicly committed to a course of action, and prior to the purely symbolic exchange of views in Parliament.

The Government accepts that case. This Bill has taken a long time to develop and has involved discussions with many people. I would like to thank those who have been involved, particularly those who made submissions on the Bill which were introduced in April. As a result of those submissions, a number of small alterations have been made to the original Bill. They are:

A change to the definition of 'public sector operations' to include the words 'public officers'. The effect of this is to ensure that the Auditor-General can also be subject to parliamentary scrutiny.

A change to the definition of 'public officer' to exclude officers or members of tribunals as well as officers or members of courts.

An addition to the terms of reference of all committees of the words 'or by resolution of both Houses' to ensure that the Parliament as a whole could give whatever reference they considered appropriate to a committee.

A modification of clause 29 in respect of a pecuniary interest of members which members of a committee might have in respect of a matter before them, to ensure that the wording is consistent with Standing Orders.

The Bill in this amended form has now the firm commitment of the Government. The Bill establishes four new committees. They are:

- The Economic and Finance Committee
- The Environment and Resources Committee
- The Legislative Review Committee
- The Social Development Committee.

These four committees will be able to scrutinise the full range of Government responsibility and community activity. They will be able to examine and report on virtually any matter affecting the State either of their own motion or by references given to them by Parliament or by the Governor in Executive Council. In particular, I would like to draw members' attention to a number of important changes that have been made which may affect them. First, public works: there will no longer be any obligation for capital expenditure to receive the additional approval of what was the Parliamentary Public Works Committee. The passage of the budget will be deemed to be sufficient approval. However, public works can still be subject to scrutiny through the proposals in this Bill.

Members will note that Government operations are allocated to one or other of the new committees. Any public work of any value can be examined by a relevant committee in one of three ways: first, through a reference from the Parliament; secondly, through a reference from the Governor in Executive Council—effectively on the initiative of a

Minister and Cabinet; and, thirdly, by the committee on its own motion. This system is seen as more open, more flexible and in line with the role of each committee developing expertise in a particular area. It will also allow a greater degree of discretion.

Secondly, industries development. The Industries Development Committee will be constituted from the members of the Economic and Finance Committee and will operate in the same way that it does at the moment, namely with two Government members, two Opposition members and a Treasury officer. It will report to the Treasurer and the decision-making procedures are the same as at present. The Economic and Finance Committee is the revised form of the Public Accounts Committee and will have seven members. It is the only committee which will not be a joint House committee. It will not be necessary for the same four members of the Economic and Finance Committee to examine references under the Industries Development Act. That can vary, although the numerical composition of the Industries Development Committee remains the same.

The role and function of the Industries Development Committee have been retained (albeit within the new structure) as an important and valuable means of determining the wisdom or otherwise of using State resources for particular State development purposes. The committee has been linked through common membership to the Economic and Finance Committee because of that committee's role in the scrutiny of public finances. State finances are the most critical element of Government administration. Whether the focus is actual Government operation, statutory authorities, or the regulation of economic and financial activity, this expanded committee represents the Government's commitment, first, to the importance of getting the fundamentals right and, secondly, to ensuring that good quality debate can emerge in the Parliament as a result of the reports and reviews undertaken by members in the House of Assembly.

Thirdly, a new Social Development Committee has been established to cover the variety of human and community services which are provided by and through government and which have increasingly been brought to the attention of Parliament through private members' motions and select committees. This committee has a wide ranging charter and the members who serve on it can look forward to some stimulating debate.

Fourthly, the Legislative Review Committee is expanded from the very constrained confines of the old Subordinate Legislation Committee. It will now have a role in examining legal and constitutional reform issues and the very wide ranging reference to examine the administration of justice, an issue on which there is considerable community debate as well as substantial Government investment.

Finally, the Environment and Resources Committee, freed now from the obligations of examining all public works, will be able to concentrate its attention on the larger debates about land degradation and reforestation, about air and water quality, about urban development and redevelopment and so on. It is an exciting new step and one which will lead to an interdisciplinary approach to the environment and resource management.

Once a report has been completed it is to be laid before Parliament and submitted to the relevant Minister who will be under an obligation to respond to a committee's recommendation. All of the functions of existing committees are incorporated one way or another in one of the committees' terms of reference. Overall, the number of back-bench members of Parliament involved in committees increases by only one. Three of the committees are joint House committees but the Economic and Finance Com-

mittee remains a committee of the House of Assembly in line with its responsibilities as the House initiating appropriations to government functions.

Clauses 32 and 33 provide mechanisms by which the presiding officers of committees can consult with the President and the Speaker about the allocation of resources to each committee. It is envisaged that each committee would be serviced in a secretarial or administrative manner in much the same way as the existing committees are. This may also apply to research staff where the capacity exists. However, where that capacity does not exist within the Parliament or where specialist knowledge is required, the committees may approach the relevant Ministers for appropriate staff, again in much the same way as select committees do now. In addition, the presiding officer of a committee may seek the approval of the President and/or the Speaker for consultancy funds, should they be available within the allocation provided for the administration of Parliament.

This cooperative approach to the servicing of the committees' work should ensure the best utilisation of existing resources. Should there be a need to reassess the operations of the committees after they have been operating for some time, the Government would be prepared to entertain a submission from the presiding officers of the two Houses. It is hoped that this reform of the committee system will encourage Parliamentarians to build up specialised knowledge in particular policy areas and be conducive to an improved public debate on important community issues. The Bill will come into effect upon proclamation and I can indicate that that will be at the earliest practicable opportunity. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the measure to be brought into operation by proclamation. Clause 3 sets out definitions of terms used in the measure. 'State instrumentality' is defined as any agency or instrumentality of the Crown including administrative units of the Public Service and statutory authorities but excluding bodies wholly comprised of members of Parliament, courts, tribunals and councils or other local government bodies. 'Public sector operations' are defined as operations and activities carried on by public officers or State instrumentalities. 'Public officers' are defined as persons holding or acting in public offices or positions established by or under an Act or otherwise by the Government of the State, but excluding members or officers of the Parliament, courts, tribunals, councils or other local government bodies. These terms are used in clause 6 which sets out the functions of the proposed Economic and Finance Committee.

Clause 4 provides for the establishment of an Economic and Finance Committee as a committee of Parliament. Clause 5 provides that the Economic and Finance Committee is to be a House of Assembly committee consisting of seven members of the House of Assembly appointed by that House. The clause excludes Ministers of the Crown from membership of the committee. Clause 6 sets out the functions of the Economic and Finance Committee. These are—

- (a) to inquire into, consider and report on such of the following matters as are referred to the committee:
 - (i) any matter concerned with finance or economic development;
 - (ii) any matter concerned with the structure, organisation and efficiency of any area of public sector operations or the ways in which efficiency and service delivery might be enhanced in any area of public sector operations;

- (iii) any matter concerned with the functions or operations of a particular public officer or State instrumentality or whether a particular public office or State instrumentality should continue to exist or whether changes should be made to improve efficiency and effectiveness in the area;
 - (iv) any matter concerned with regulation of business or other economic or financial activity or whether such regulation should be retained or modified in any area;
- (b) to perform such other functions as are imposed on the committee under any Act or by resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

Clause 7 provides for the establishment of an Environment and Resources Committee as a committee of Parliament. Clause 8 provides that the Environment and Resources Committee is to be a joint committee. The committee is to consist of six members, three from the House of Assembly appointed by that House and three from the Legislative Council appointed by the Council. The clause excludes Ministers from membership of the committee. Clause 9 sets out the functions of the Environment and Resources Committee. These are—

- (a) to inquire into, consider and report on such of the following matters as are referred to the committee:
 - (i) any matter concerned with the environment or how the quality of the environment might be protected or improved;
 - (ii) any matter concerned with the resources of the State or how they might be better conserved or utilised;
 - (iii) any matter concerned with planning, land use or transportation;
- (b) to perform such other functions as are imposed on the committee under any Act or by resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

Clause 10 provides for the establishment of a Legislative Review Committee as a committee of Parliament. Clause 11 provides that the Legislative Review Committee is to be a joint committee. It is to consist of six members, three being members of the House of Assembly appointed by that House and three being members of the Legislative Council appointed by the Council. Ministers are excluded from membership of the committee. Clause 12 sets out the functions of the Legislative Review Committee. These are—

- (a) to inquire into, consider and report on such of the following matters as are referred to the committee:
 - (i) any matter concerned with legal, constitutional or parliamentary reform or with the administration of justice but excluding any matter concerned with joint Standing Orders of Parliament or the Standing Orders or rules of practice of either House;
 - (ii) any Act or subordinate legislation, or part of any Act or subordinate legislation, in respect of which provision has been made for its expiry at some future time and whether it should be allowed to expire or continue in force with or without modification or be replaced by new provisions;

- (iii) any matter concerned with inter-governmental relations;
- (b) to inquire into, consider and report on subordinate legislation referred to it under the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978;
- (c) to perform such other functions as are imposed on the committee under any Act or by resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

Clause 13 provides for the establishment of a Social Development Committee as a committee of Parliament. Clause 14 provides that the Social Development Committee is to be a joint committee and to consist of five members, three being members of the House of Assembly appointed by that House and two being members of the Legislative Council appointed by the Council. Ministers are excluded from membership of the committee. Clause 15 sets out the functions of the Social Development Committee. These are—

- (a) to inquire into, consider and report on such of the following matters as are referred to the committee:
 - (i) any matter concerned with the health, welfare or education of the people of the State;
 - (ii) any matter concerned with occupational safety or industrial relations;
 - (iii) any matter concerned with the arts, recreation or sport or the cultural or physical development of the people of the State;
 - (iv) any matter concerned with the quality of life of communities, families or individuals in the State or how that quality of life might be improved;
- (b) to perform such other functions as are imposed on the committee under any Act or by resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

Clause 16 deals with references to committees. Under the clause, any matter that is relevant to the functions of a committee may be referred to the committee—

- (a) by resolution of the committee's appointing House or Houses;
- (b) by the Governor, by notice published in the *Gazette*;
- or
- (c) of the committee's own motion.

The clause makes it clear that this provision is in addition to and does not derogate from the provisions of any other Act under which a matter may be referred to a committee. Clause 17 deals with reporting by committees. Under the clause, a committee must, after inquiring into and considering any matter referred to it, report on the matter to its appointing House or Houses. The clause allows a committee's appointing House or Houses, when referring a matter to the committee, to fix a period within which the committee is required to present a final report to the House or Houses on that matter. Each committee is required:

- (a) to give priority—
 - (i) first, to the matters referred to it under any other Act;
 - (ii) secondly, to the matters referred to it by its appointing House or Houses;
 - (iii) thirdly, to the matters referred to it by the Governor,
 and then deal with any other matters before the Committee;
- and
- (b) to comply with any limitation of time fixed by its appointing House or Houses.

The clause provides that a committee may make interim reports and publish documents relating to a reference. A

committee may include in a report a draft Bill to give effect to any recommendation of the committee. The clause provides for the inclusion of minority reports in committee reports. Clause 18 provides that, on a report being presented by a committee to its appointing House or Houses, the House or Houses may, by resolution, remit the matter or any of the matters to which the report relates to the committee for their further consideration and report. Clause 19 provides for automatic reference of a committee report, or part of a committee report, to the responsible Minister if the committee so recommends in its report. This is to occur on the report being presented by the committee to its appointing House or Houses. The Minister is required by the clause to respond within four months and to include in the response statements as to which (if any) recommendations of the committee will be carried out and the manner in which they will be carried out and which (if any) recommendations will not be carried out and the reasons for not carrying them out. The Minister's response must be laid before the committee's appointing House or Houses within six sitting days after it is made.

Clause 20 provides for the term of office of committee members. Members are to be appointed as soon as possible after the commencement of each new Parliament and to remain in office until the first sitting day of the members' appointing House following the next general election. Clause 21 provides for vacancies in office and removal of members. A member may be removed by the member's appointing House. The clause provides that a member ceases to be a member if he or she dies, resigns by notice in writing to the presiding officer of the member's appointing House, completes a term of office and is not reappointed, ceases to be a member of his or her appointing House, becomes a Minister or is removed from office by his or her appointing House. The clause provides for the filling of casual vacancies. Clause 22 ensures the validity of committee proceedings despite a vacancy in committee membership. Clause 23 requires each committee to appoint one of its members from time to time as presiding officer of the committee.

Clause 24 deals with the procedure at committee meetings. The clause provides for meetings to be chaired by the presiding officer, or, in his or her absence, by a person elected by the committee and for a quorum of a half plus one. The person presiding at a meeting is to have a deliberative vote only. Clause 25 ensures that a committee may sit during recesses and adjournments of Parliament and during intervals between Parliament, but not while its appointing House or either of its appointing Houses is sitting except by leave of that House. Clause 26 provides that, unless the committee otherwise determines, members of the public may be present while a committee is examining witnesses but not while it is deliberating. Clause 27 requires a committee to keep full and accurate minutes.

Clause 28 provides that a committee has the same powers to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents as a royal commission under the Royal Commissions Act 1917 and attracts the operation of the relevant provisions of that Act. The clause makes it clear that this is in addition to, and not in derogation of, the powers, privileges and immunities that apply to a committee as a committee of Parliament. Clause 29 provides that a committee member is not to take part in proceedings relating to a matter in which the member has a direct pecuniary interest that is not shared in common with the rest of the subjects of the Crown. Clause 30 ensures that a committee may continue and complete matters before it despite changes in its membership. Clause 31 protects committees from judicial review. Clause 32 places a duty on

the President and the Speaker to avoid duplication by committees, to arrange for staff and facilities for committees and, generally, to ensure their efficient functioning. The President and Speaker are to fulfil this role in consultation with the presiding officers of the committees.

Clause 33 provides that a committee may, with the approval of the Minister administering an administrative unit of the Public Service, on terms mutually arranged, make use of employees or facilities of that administrative unit. Under the clause, a committee may, with the prior authorisation of the presiding officer or presiding officers of the committee's appointing House or Houses, commission any person to investigate and report to the committee on any aspect of any matter referred to the committee. Clause 34 provides that the office of a member of a committee (including the office of presiding officer) is not an office of profit under the Crown. Clause 35 provides that the money required for the purposes of the measure is to be paid out of money appropriated by Parliament for the purpose.

The schedule provides for consequential repeals and amendments. It provides for the repeal of the Public Accounts Committee Act 1972 and the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927. It provides for amendments to the Constitution Act 1934, the Industries Development Act 1941, the Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1990, the Planning Act 1982 and the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978. The Constitution Act is amended to remove references to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. The Industries Development Act is amended to change the parliamentary representation on the Industries Development Committee so that the four members (two Government and two Opposition) are drawn from the membership of the new Economic and Finance Committee by nominations from time to time by that committee rather than by appointment by the Governor. The schedule to the Parliamentary Remuneration Act is amended to substitute references to the new committees for references to the existing committees in relation to additional annual salary for officers on parliamentary committees. Provision is made for additional annual salary as follows:

	Percentage of basic annual salary
Presiding Officer of the Economic and Finance Committee	17
Other members of the Economic and Finance Committee	12
Presiding Officer of the Environment and Resources Committee	17
Other members of the Environment and Resources Committee	12
Presiding Officer of the Legislative Review Committee	14
Other members of the Legislative Review Committee	10
Presiding Officer of the Social Development Committee	14
Other members of the Social Development Committee	10

No additional annual salary is provided for membership of the Industries Development Committee. The Planning Act is amended so that it provides for supplementary development plans to be referred to the new Environment and Resources Committee rather than, as at the present, the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

Finally, the Subordinate Legislation Act is amended by incorporating into that Act provisions currently contained in Joint Standing Orders for the reference of regulations. Under these provisions, every regulation that is required to be laid before Parliament is, when made, referred by force of the provisions to the new Legislative Review Committee.

The committee is required to inquire into and consider all regulations referred to it. The committee is required to consider all regulations as soon as conveniently practicable after they are referred to the committee and, if Parliament is then in session, to do so before the end of the period within which any motion for disallowance of the regulations may be moved in either House of Parliament. Under the provisions, if the committee forms the opinion that any regulations ought to be disallowed, it must report the opinion and the grounds for the opinion to both Houses of Parliament before the end of the period within which any motion for disallowance of the regulations may be moved in either House. If Parliament is not in session, it may, before reporting to Parliament, report the opinion and the grounds for the opinion to the authority by which the regulations were made.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I move:

That the following Address in Reply to Her Excellency's opening speech be adopted:

May it please Your Excellency—

1. We the members of the House of Assembly express our thanks for the speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

The program for this session of Parliament, as outlined in Her Excellency the Governor's speech, indicates that the Bannon Government has retained its zeal for social and economic reform. Although the Government has been in office for almost nine years, although we are in the depths of a severe recession, although we face a squeeze on revenues rarely faced in the State's history, and although the Government does not have a majority in its own right in either House of this Parliament, it is proposing a program of reform which is substantial by any measure. Indeed, it is appropriate that we should do so, as the enormous problems we face will be solved only by major restructuring right across the economy.

While most of our public and private sectors have to adjust to performing their traditional functions with less, the Government has recognised that we must also look forward and seek out new opportunities, such as the MFP, to provide employment and social advancement for future generations.

Mr Speaker, it is not just because we are in a recession that economic issues have come to dominate political debate in Australia. Over the past decade there has been a huge increase in the number of economists employed in State and federal bureaucracies. These graduates have diligently applied those teachings of economics which were fashionable over the decade to almost every area of policy. The more traditional economic approaches to public finance and public interest have given way to new creeds which emphasise the virtue of the market and free trade, user-pays rather than ability to pay, and government failure rather than market failure. The distribution of wealth and income is no longer a consideration in most economic debates.

While the value of Government intervention and regulation has rightly come under the microscope, the failure of private economic markets to deliver fair outcomes has tended to be forgotten. Thus privatisation and deregulation came

into vogue, not just for situations where government presence in the economy had not lived up to expectations, but as a panacea for all the ills of society. The fact that much government regulation had originated in response to anti-competitive behaviour, or to balance the interests of consumers with those of large corporations, was ignored.

So extreme was the shift by some economists away from the notion of government involvement to support for a totally unconstrained market place that the idea that 'greed is good' was seriously promoted in many quarters. Unbounded faith was shown by some of the economic think tanks which arose in the 1980's in the ability of the market to resolve any problem. I well recall reading arguments in the early 1980's from one such institution to the effect that takeovers of companies should not be subject to any restraint; shareholders and competitors would apply whatever discipline was necessary to corporate behaviour. Unfortunately, generations of Australians to come will pay for the consequences of the entrepreneurial takeover boom which so impressed these economic gurus. They have now moved on to advocate a consumption tax as the solution to all our troubles.

While the recent influx of economists and their ideas into public policy making has made an important contribution to improving the efficiency of Government and exposing Government regulation and activities to proper scrutiny, I believe concern with market failure needs to be restored as a major policy consideration. This highlights a major weakness of economics which is its inability to come to terms with questions of morality. It is not just the economic costs of unethical behaviour which are important; the corrosive impact on society of a system which encourages greed and tolerates unscrupulous conduct may be far more damaging in the longer term. If everything comes down to a price, what price do we put on honesty? It follows, Mr Speaker, that I believe we need to treat much economic policy advice with caution.

For the whole of the autumn sitting of Parliament, the Liberal Opposition was scarcely able to contain its pleasure at the problems facing the State Bank. Because the Opposition asked questions in the 1990 budget sittings based on the many rumours about problem bank loans which were circulating at the time, they seem to believe that this makes them financial experts. Of course it does not.

At a time when financial institutions throughout Australia, Europe and North America were plagued with non-performing loans, when the failure of a bank somewhere in the world was almost a daily event, when property values had fallen by unprecedented amounts, and when we were entering a recession, it was not especially astute of the Opposition to target financial institutions in their attacks upon the State Government.

In any case it is likely that much of the State Bank's—and more particularly Beneficial Finance's—non-performing loan portfolio would apply to loans which were made long before the second half of last year when problems first became apparent. I wait with interest for the State Bank Royal Commission to consider this point.

If members of the Opposition did possess financial wisdom, they would point to the resolutions and Bills they had introduced to amend the State Bank Act or the SGIC Act to improve the accountability of those institutions. They would tell of the changes they had suggested should be made to accounting systems, the structure, and the general direction of these institutions and their subsidiaries. Of course there were no such Bills or suggestions, and there are none now.

In all the thousands of words that have been spoken by Opposition members about the State Bank or SGIC, in all the obvious delight that Opposition members have expressed over the bank's loan problems or the put option on 333 Collins Street, there has only been one thought I have heard from the Opposition about the future of our State owned financial institutions: that is their intention to sell them. I have waited in vain over the past 12 months to hear just one Opposition member make a constructive analysis of the future of our statutory corporations. It is obvious the Opposition has no idea on what should be done; it can only criticise. I am pleased to see that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, are in the Chair, because I know that that is a criticism that certainly could not be levelled at you.

The cost of ensuring the stability of the bank is also a matter which has been distorted by the Opposition. The ultimate loss from non-performing loans with the bank will only be known when the assets held as security against those loans are realised or the debtors are liquidated. This will obviously depend on such factors as the state of the property market and the economy in general at the time of the sale. The Opposition must know that the number of non-performing loans is likely to peak in the trough of a recession or at the bottom of a property market slump, but the extent of any loss may fall as markets recover. It is hypocritical to demand that the State Bank should not foreclose on failed rural loans, as Opposition members repeatedly did in the last session of Parliament, and then criticise the bank because its exposure from non-performing rural loans has grown.

The loss of the bank's capital from non-performing loans needs to be considered against past returns by the bank to the taxpayer, and the accumulated assets of the bank. In 1988-89, for example, the bank returned \$88 million to the Treasury and \$211 million over the past five years. If we have no SGIC or State Bank, which is Liberal policy, apparently, then there may be no losses. But there would be no profits and accumulated assets either. And there would be no financial institution in the State to correct market investment distortions which act to the detriment of South Australia.

The Opposition's attack on State enterprises has also neglected the condition of the market in which those corporations are trading. Take for example the Life Insurance Division of SGIC. The Government Management Board report concluded on page 49:

In general the Life Division performs satisfactorily. It has had a positive, although declining, contribution over the period under consideration. It has controlled its costs and appears to operate efficiently.

Contrast those comments with a recent report on the wider life insurance industry in the *Financial Review* of 1 August. The article began:

The powerful life insurance industry has come under attack from the Insurance and Superannuation Commission for its woe-full performance in the key areas of expenses, investment returns, agent regulation, portfolio risk control and statistical returns.

In relation to the control of costs the Deputy Commissioner of the ISC, Mr Glading, is reported as saying:

All in all I would say that the overall performance of the industry in this vitally important area of expenses has been poor.

In that environment, the Government Management Board's judgment on SGIC is praise indeed. This is just one illustration of how many attacks on State corporations by the Opposition are ill-informed, unfair, and misleading. The Opposition does not seem to understand that there are major deficiencies in the regulation of corporation behaviour in this country, and until these deficiencies are corrected the performance of all State or publicly owned

financial institutions will suffer. We should not forget that there are several components to the multi-billion dollar losses spread through the Australian financial system over the past few years. On one side is imprudent lending practices on the part of financial institutions. On the other side is outright fraud or deception, or the lawful rip-off of shareholders, on the part of corporate borrowers. It is both sides of the equation which need to be fixed to restore the integrity of the Australian financial system.

Once the solutions to these problems are in place there is no reason why trading enterprises should not be a legitimate activity of State Government in certain key sectors of the economy, provided the role of such corporations is carefully defined, and provided such corporations are fully accountable. In determining the future role for State owned corporations there are many questions which need to be raised in the light of the changing corporate environment since deregulation of the financial sector.

Are State banks an anachronism and can they survive in what has increasingly become a global financial market? What range of activities should be involved—a 'supermarket' financial institution catering for the full range of financial transactions such as trading in stocks, insurance, real estate and so on, or should we have specialist institutions?

In a speech reported in the April *Reserve Bank of Australia Bulletin*, the Deputy Governor of the Bank, Mr Phillips, made this observation:

Banks will need to continue to tailor their growth and the extent of their diversification, not just to the available capital, but also to the capacity of management to direct and control all the activities in which they are engaged. Around the world, institutions which have tried to be 'all things to all people' have distinguished themselves more by their failures than by their successes. Those that have identified their comparative strengths and have stuck to them have done rather better.

Given that the collapse of Finance Corporation of Australia destroyed the Bank of Adelaide, and that Tricontinental destroyed the State Bank of Victoria, is there a need for limits on the exposure of subsidiaries, or special accountability provisions when subsidiaries are involved? Should limits be placed on commercial and property exposure? Should State trading enterprises have social, as well as commercial, functions and how should these be funded and defined? What relationship should the Government have to boards, particularly in the flow of information and ultimate responsibility for decisions?

To what extent should board members be legally liable for their actions? What level of geographical diversity of risk should apply? That is, what proportion of its activity should State institutions have in the other Australian States and overseas markets? What rates of growth are appropriate and how can these be defined and accounted for? How do we ensure that State enterprises have and retain adequately trained staff to cope with new ventures and rapidly changing environments? Again, I quote from Deputy Governor Phillips of the Reserve Bank, who states:

Recently, I was among a group who had also been closely involved in the deregulation of the financial system. We were debating whether there were things we had got wrong. The suggestion that attracted most support was that we had severely overestimated the capacity of banks, their managements and their boards to cope with the changes that were unleashed by deregulation. I think the evidence would support this view, not just in respect of banks; it applies to other parts of the financial system as well.

What should be the relationship between board and management, and who should have control over the all important audit function? Most importantly of all, how do we ensure that Government and Parliament are fully informed of the true financial position of State corporations? These are some of the important questions which have been or

will be addressed by the Government, and no doubt by the various inquiries into the State Bank. They are questions which have never been seriously addressed by the Opposition. One approach to the role of statutory authorities is that of the Greiner Government in New South Wales, which altered legislation covering its State Bank and other institutions in 1989. The Greiner Government's corporatisation legislation followed the corporatisation of Commonwealth trading enterprises, such as Australian Airlines, Telecom, Qantas, OTC and the Australian National Line.

Under the N.S.W. State Owned Corporations Act, Government business enterprises were incorporated as companies limited by shares under the Companies Code. The role of voting shareholders, that is, the nominated N.S.W. Ministers, was defined in relation to the operations of the corporation. Voting shareholder Ministers have final responsibility for setting the commercial objectives of State-owned corporations in that State and for appointing their boards of directors. The prior written approval of the voting shareholders is required before a State-owned corporation can form or acquire subsidiaries, acquire or dispose of shares of a company, or participate in any other transactions resulting in the company becoming or ceasing to be a subsidiary. The acquisition or disposal of assets or investments without the prior written approval of the voting shareholders is also closely regulated. The boards of State-owned corporations are required to supply to the voting shareholders such information relating to the affairs of the corporation or any of its subsidiaries as the shareholders request from time to time.

In addition to the accountability imposed by the Companies Code, State-owned corporations are accountable to Parliament through the tabling of their statement of corporate intent, which sets out corporate objectives; main undertakings; the nature and scope of activities; accounting policies and performance targets; the tabling of six-monthly reports, which detail actual performance against targets for the half year as set out in the statement of corporate intent; the tabling of annual reports; the tabling of copies of directions to boards by responsible Ministers in order for them to undertake specific actions, such as acquiring or disposing of substantial assets and liabilities; the report of the Auditor-General into a corporation's accounts; the application of the Public Accounts Committee; and the application of the Independent Commission Against Corruption.

In order to accommodate social or non-commercial objectives, the N.S.W. Act provided for specific agreements or social contracts to be negotiated between the Government and the relevant corporation. These contracts were intended to be negotiated on an arms-length basis and be specifically funded from consolidated revenue. The corporatisation of State-owned corporations in N.S.W. was pursued to the extent that even their obligations were not to be guaranteed by the State, except where a specific guarantee was purchased by the corporation. In the case of the N.S.W. State Bank, for example, provision was made in the legislation for the removal of the Government guarantee for State Bank depositors after a certain date. Not surprisingly, the Greiner Government has not proclaimed that provision.

In my view it is impracticable and unwise to take corporatisation to that ideological conclusion. Would the Greiner Government, or any Government for that matter, really refuse to assist its bank and depositors if it faced difficulties? As we saw with the collapse of the Pyramid Building Society in Victoria, where there was no statutory responsibility for the State to protect depositors, there are overwhelming pressures in the community for governments to protect all financial institutions. Nevertheless, I believe that other pro-

visions relating to greater accountability to Parliament in the New South Wales State Owned Corporations Act, which, as I said earlier, was modelled on the legislation of the Federal Labor Government are worthy of emulation.

Indeed, the key issue in making any enterprise fully accountable to its shareholders is the adequate disclosure of information. It also follows that the information so disclosed must be in a useful form. It is a sad situation that so many expensively produced Australian company reports are next to worthless in terms of the information they convey. Part of the problem is the absence of, or enforcement of, accountancy standards. A particular problem seems to occur with consolidated balance sheets, and many financial journalists have commented on the intractable veil of secrecy over such groups of companies as Adsteam. We tend to overlook the fact that the vast majority of shareholders and the public do not understand company balance sheets, but a small percentage do—and it is they who are the real corporate watchdogs. However, to perform their task they require accounts which are meaningful.

The recent report of the Government Management Board into SGIC is an important step in resolving these key questions of disclosure and accountancy standards. The report states on page 81:

Not only does a failure to comply with accounting standards deny the Government access to information available to investors in private companies but it also causes suspicion in the community. The public suspects that if SGIC uses non-standard accounting procedures or discloses less than its private sector counterparts, then it must be concealing something. We are of the opinion, therefore, that SGIC should conform with private sector accounting procedures and disclosure policies. This should better inform the government and allay public fears that crucial information is being concealed.

We recommend, therefore, that the legislation be amended to require SGIC to conform to the relevant Australian Accounting Standards. In addition, we recommend that the various funds of SGIC should conform to the disclosure and revenue requirements specified in legislation covering private insurers. It is our opinion that compliance with private sector requirements will reduce accusations of unfair competition, provide more protection for the Government as guarantors and allow a better assessment of the performance of SGIC.

I trust that the Government will apply the principles on accounting and disclosure contained in the GMB report to other State trading enterprises.

Another important recommendation of the Government Management Board is that an audit committee be formed to 'enhance the communication and overall effectiveness of the internal and external audit functions and ensure the board is involved in matters normally dealt with by an audit committee.' The primary functions of an audit committee are, first, to act as a committee of the board of directors in discharging the board's responsibilities as they relate to financial reporting practices; business ethics policies and practices, accounting policies, and management and internal controls; secondly, to provide, through regular meetings, a forum for communication between the board, senior financial management, and both the internal and external auditors; and, thirdly, to enhance the credibility and objectivity of financial reports with other interested parties, including shareholders, regulators and creditors.

Such committees are mandatory for listed companies in the United States and Canada and widely used in the UK and Europe. The committee must have unrestricted access to the chief financial officer, the chief executive officer, the internal auditors and the external auditors. Similarly, the committee should also be able to consult independent experts as required.

Anyone who has followed the reports of the royal commission into Tricontinental in Victoria would be aware of

allegations that the board of directors was either not given information or fed filtered information by management. It is clearly desirable that the head of internal auditing of any large corporation, State or publicly owned, should have direct access to the board of directors and not be subjected to interference by management.

This afternoon I have raised some questions about the future of State owned corporations and I have suggested some approaches to resolving them. What is important is that this Government be allowed to continue the complex task of restructuring the management of our State trading enterprises to make them more efficient and accountable. If the Opposition wishes to put forward alternative policies on such issues, let it do so, but its negative and destructive attacks on State corporations only confirm that it is bereft of ideas and ability. In spite of the continual knocking by the Opposition, the Government will reform our State corporations and it will continue to advance the welfare of the people of South Australia through the detailed program of legislation outlined in Her Excellency's speech.

In the time remaining to me I will address some of the matters raised in the Governor's speech. First, I am very pleased to see that the Government will be taking action in relation to crime. There is no doubt that this Government has led Australia in many areas of crime prevention and in dealing with crime. I was particularly pleased to hear the Minister of Youth Affairs outline in this place this afternoon the steps that the Government will take to combat the problem of graffiti. I am also pleased to note in the Governor's speech that the Government will take steps to keep it in the forefront with respect to dealing with victims of crime. Later this session legislation will be introduced to amend the Wrongs Act to ensure that negligent parents are responsible for the actions of their children.

Traditionally, South Australia has been at the forefront in consumer affairs, and I am pleased that the Government will move to ensure that we stay at the front. It is also pleasing to note that during the term of this Government work will begin on the final stage of the water filtration plant. The South Australian Government needs to be congratulated on the steps that it has taken with respect to water supply. As the driest State in the driest continent we have difficulties that are not faced by any other State, yet we have been able to deal with them effectively. Although there are problems with water quality and we have had to embark on a very expensive program of water filtration, we should be very proud of the record of this Government in the provision of water. Indeed, we should be proud that we have not had to impose water restrictions on our population, as other States have done.

The South Australian Government has led in the area of environmental protection. We were the first State to set up an environment ministry and since that time—the 1970s—we have led all the way in many initiatives and I am pleased to see in the Governor's speech that later this session an environment protection authority will be formed to bring together all the various environmental functions of the Government.

I am also pleased to see reference in the Governor's speech to the steps taken at the Premiers Conference to improve the constitutional governance of Australia. Because we have a number of Labor Governments at Federal and State level, we have made progress in resolving some of the problems that have plagued us since federation—indeed, for over 100 years. I believe that the Premiers and the Federal Government should be congratulated on achieving more at the recent Premiers Conference and at the conference held last year than has been achieved at all the con-

stitutional conventions over the past two or three decades. I conclude by welcoming the Governor's speech and congratulating the Government on the legislative reform program that has been put before Parliament.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I have great pleasure in seconding the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech to mark the opening of the third session of the Forty-Seventh Parliament. The Governor's speech outlined the future direction of this Government, highlighting a range of policies underpinning the vision the Labor Party holds for this State. In fact, the appointment of Dame Roma Mitchell to the position of Governor for the State of South Australia is in itself visionary, both in recognition of her contribution to the law and the community and that of all women. Further, Dame Roma's appointment should act as a catalyst to break down those few remaining pockets of resistance lingering in our community towards a better understanding that a contribution by all our citizens can only be worth while and beneficial.

I mentioned the word 'vision' in my opening remarks because it is vision that has underpinned the formulation of policy by the Labor Party for 100 years. It has been that vision that has led the Labor Party to create the Commonwealth Bank, the Australian Navy and the Snowy Mountains scheme, and it is that vision that has given this Government the commitment to the multifunction polis. I must admit that, at the beginning of discussions surrounding the multifunction polis, I, like many people in the community, lacked an understanding of the concept. Initial media reports did nothing to dispel that lack of understanding.

With the release of the third report by the MFP Adelaide Management Board, strongly recommending to the State and Federal Governments that the project go ahead, I arranged through the French embassy in Canberra to visit the city of Montpellier, the site of its own MFP or Technipol. The Montpellier Technipol began only five years ago with the view of being at the forefront of research and development suitable to the changing needs of Europe. Montpellier is a medieval city with a 1 000 year history. Whilst Australia does not have that particular sense of history, nevertheless, similarities exist. Montpellier Technipol, like our MFP, is built around an existing city. Basic infrastructure to lend initial support was already there, as it is in Adelaide.

Montpellier Technipol decided on five main areas that have culminated in its becoming the leading university city of France with three universities and six university colleges educating some 50 000 students for the future. It is important to dwell on Montpellier for a moment because it may help others as it did me to formulate in their mind a concept of what the MFP can do, not only for South Australia but for the nation. However, it is important that we do not copy Montpellier but use what it has to offer to provide assistance to the public to conceptualise the project.

As I said, Montpellier decided on five areas or pols best suited to its future needs. The first is the medicine pol, consisting of different areas of medical research, which attracts thousands of professionals each year from all over the world to participate in and exchange knowledge on matters of human health. The second pol is entitled the Agropolis, specialising in research in Mediterranean and tropical agriculture. It also explores the future of agro-industrial business activities. Communicatique, the third pol, is involved in data processing, robotics and artificial intelligence. It has already led to new companies being

founded and other companies being attracted to the area because of students graduating from the universities with the expertise required by those companies.

Antenae, the fourth pol, deals with research and development in the advanced telecommunications zone, putting Montpellier in the forefront of the future of communications. Finally, the fifth pol—the Heliopolis—has the dual role of underpinning the cultural needs and activities of the city, with research into future tourism needs that is already leading to new businesses and employment in that area.

All this activity is culminating in the largest town planning scheme in the area's history; it will project Montpellier into the twenty-first century. As I said, whilst a direct copy of Montpellier is wrong, the principles underlining that project are correct. I might also add that the planners of Montpellier have taken into consideration the changing face of Europe: citizens can gain entry into other European countries much more easily. For example, while I was there, there was a debate about the introduction of one currency. The Eastern Bloc trading facility Comecon has been officially wound up, giving rise to many new trading opportunities.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr McKEE: Just on that point, I understand that while I was in Montpellier the member for Mount Gambier was there the same day. I hope that he either picked up something from here or learned it from there.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Is this the honourable member who interjects out of his seat?

Mr McKEE: That is correct. The MFP Adelaide project has begun correctly, with the prime objective being to ensure Australia's successful participation in the industries that will dominate the twenty-first century. Information, technology and telecommunications, environmental management, and education are examples of the key industries through which nations will generate their future wealth. MFP Adelaide is a means by which Australia's future commercial prospects will be enhanced. Key structural elements that will provide the framework for MFP Adelaide activities include: urban and community development; management and innovations; education and skills development; information and information technology; communications and networking; and environmental management.

If the objectives of national prosperity and enhancement of the quality of life are to be achieved, the MFP concept must be approached in the context of the Asia-Pacific region and the global economy. MFP Adelaide must have a strong focus and an emphasis on Australia's regional position. It may come as a surprise to some of those people in our community who oppose this project that Australia's geographical position is nowhere near Europe. If we are to be successful with the MFP project, we must aim to be involved in the growing markets of Asia.

The Federal Labor Government has, I believe, taken a major step forward by calling for the formation of an Australian Pacific trading pact, which will not only bring the Pacific rim countries closer together but form a trade bloc to secure a future market for Australian business, also offering protection to our companies, producers and manufacturers against the emerging American trade bloc and the European trade bloc.

There are at least half a dozen MFPs in Europe besides Montpellier, including in the Republic of Ireland (which, I might add, is commencing its activities around the aerospace industry). They will lead those countries into the twenty-first century, providing an economic, educational, social and cultural future for their respective populations.

Australians cannot afford to delay. This Government is doing something about it.

Her Excellency referred to the planning review, another example of forward planning, another example of the visionary approach this Government has taken to policy formulation. The report '20-20 Vision—Ideas for Metropolitan Adelaide' has undertaken a thoughtful, methodical view of the future needs of a changing Adelaide.

The review has had to take into consideration such matters as:

- A city of quality, whereby the city's essential character and appeal can be enhanced and preserved, where people can have access to an enviable quality of life, where learning and creative expression and mixed cultures are matters of community pride.
- A productive city, where people should be able to work productively, creatively and with due reward; where the city's children should be able to build their lives in a community that continues to prosper, generating income and wealth and offering meaningful employment opportunities.
- A sustainable city, where clean air, less industrial pollution and better energy efficiency should also be identifiable qualities.
- A fair city, where planning must recognise all the public—the rich and poor, the old, the young, migrants and the disabled.

The review has also considered:

- an affordable city: whilst retaining the envied capacity still to supply land and housing cheaply, Adelaide should give the community real choices between residential locations, designs and tenure.
- a healthy city, where we can continue not only to provide a good affordable health service but be able to provide basic resources that promote and underline good health, such as safe food and water, clean air, sanitation, shelter, freedom from poverty, recreation space, and activity.

It is important to realise that 150 years of cumulative investment, growth and change cannot be altered overnight, but when we consider that community attitudes and values often do change we see that the importance of '20-20 Vision' is underlined. The process of planned research, coupled with ongoing community consultation, can be the only equation to enable us to achieve the required result.

Reference was also made in the Governor's speech to the commitment that this Government had made and continues to make in the areas of consumer affairs and protection generally. Particular reference was made to the introduction of uniform trade measurements and legislation. Further, the Government is committed to protecting consumers from unethical business practices.

It is this question that I wish to examine by way of a comparison between the Government's policy and that of the Opposition. I must admit that making that comparison was somewhat difficult, because I have had great difficulty in finding the Opposition's policy. That could be either because it does not have any, or because the policies that it does have will have such a devastating impact on the Australian people that the Opposition is too frightened to divulge them so that they can be examined by the public.

However, I did locate, in last week's *Bulletin*, the first indication of what a Liberal Government has in store. Admittedly, those are Federal spokesmen and Federal policies, but they are the same philosophies and principles that run the State Liberal Opposition. First, I quote the *Bulletin* in relation to Mr Peter Costello, Federal Liberal spokesperson for business, as follows:

He [Costello] opposes the drift to a more litigious environment through class actions and increased product liability that are supposed to benefit consumers and quite bluntly states that consumer protection is going too far.

Nothing has changed for the Liberals. They are returning to their old ways of relying on market forces to raise the standards of products. Where is the vision in that? One of the most important attitudes that has changed in recent years has been the attitude to the environment, and one of the cornerstones of the Government's policy has been an enlightened and visionary attitude to the environment, which is clearly demonstrated at the MFP with the intention of the Federal Government to establish a centre of environmental studies. This is what the Liberals have in store for South Australia's environment. I quote Tim Fischer, Liberal Opposition spokesperson for resources and energy:

We will sweep away red tape [bureaucratic], green tape [environmental] and black tape [Aboriginal] impediments.

In other words, those facilities that are in our community to allow the people to debate these sorts of issues are regarded by the Opposition as 'impediments'. He continues:

The Coalition is committed to go the path of uranium enrichment which would be an obvious extension to the South Australian economy.

Where in South Australia? He continues:

—a uranium enrichment plant operating on Spencer Gulf.

Mr Fischer goes on to suggest that the Liberals have not ruled out the possibility of nuclear reactors. Where is the vision in that? No wonder they are not telling the people what their policies are.

In terms of local government, the Liberals would move away from specific purpose grants to general grants to enable councils to contract out to the private field. This, claims their spokesperson Warwick Parer, is not for ideological reasons but because:

When you get [economic] ups and downs, as you do in this world, if you contract out, you don't have the problem of carrying staff and people in a downturn that you can't get rid of, or you have to pay big redundancy payments to get rid of.

Where is the vision in that? Equally as important, where is the social justice in that? One can couple that attitude of being able to 'get rid of' people when you want or when you feel like it with the statement of the Liberal's shadow Minister for welfare, Richard Alston, who said:

[There is] considerable scope to reduce the numbers of people who are needlessly on welfare . . . welfare is not a one way street . . . You don't just receive a benefit because you are out of work and you think you are entitled to it because you paid some taxes at some stage.

What happens to the people that the Liberal policy would get rid of and deny unemployment benefits? Where is the social justice in that? Where is the vision?

The Governor's speech makes reference to developing innovative employment and training programs, embarking on expanded regionally-based employment and training strategies extending to all of South Australia over three years. This will require the cooperation of private employers, local government and community groups, as well as the State and Federal Governments. Local communities will plan needs-based employment and training programs for their own areas and be provided with the funds and resources to do so.

Well, what have the Liberals got to say about that? Peter Costello, the Federal Liberal spokesperson for business, would immediately scrap the program, claiming as follows:

. . . if Government cannot train people in 10 years of compulsory schooling, why should failed social obligations be loaded onto business?

Where is the vision in that? I would have thought that educating and training people to gain a worthwhile place in

our society that offers dignity to them and their families was a right, not a failed social obligation. Education under Liberal policy, according to Liberal spokesperson, David Kemp, is as follows:

. . . would only have schools funded by their capacity to attract students. States would be encouraged to cooperate to allow new private schools to set up, and there would be more privately owned universities.

What that means is that education will return to the days when access to it will be the sole privilege of the wealthy where, instead of education being available to all our citizens, regardless of money, it will return to the old days of narrow, stifling elitism. Where is the social justice in that? Where is the vision?

By stark contrast, the Governor's speech outlines a direction to be taken by this Government that has vision, not just for several years, but for several generations, and underpinning that direction is the commitment to equity and social justice. I am pleased to second the motion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): It is with great pleasure that I rise to speak in this Address in Reply. I congratulate the new Governor on the way in which she delivered her speech. The Government handlers have had a very hard job dressing up this speech with the political overtones, as they are always wont to do, to put the best gloss on the Government's performance and on their hopes for the future. Of course, they have had a mammoth task this year, because there is not much for the Government to crow about and there is plenty for the taxpayers of South Australia to rue.

I recall one of the political journalists compiling a scorecard of marks that he would allot for Government and Opposition performance. I trust that in the short time available to me I will be able to refer in detail to the activities of some of those Ministers. If the Labor Party has its way, by the turn of the century the Governor's job will be no more. At the recent Labor Party conference in Hobart the major contribution by our Premier, as the National President of the ALP, was to sweep under the carpet every issue which required leadership by those running this country.

Mr S.G. Evans: It was a moth-eaten carpet.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Was it ever! That Labor Party conference, as happens daily with the Labor Party now, was a damage control exercise. If damage control—coming to grips with divisions right down the middle of the Party—means doing nothing in government, that is where it goes. The Labor Party does not face the difficult issues, because it is divided on them.

Mr Atkinson: We are still here.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: For how long? If we had a fair electoral system, the honourable member would be over on this side of the Chamber.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He might have been elected in a safe seat, but the fact is that the Liberal Party would enjoy a substantial majority in this place if the argument mounted by former Premier Dunstan, by backbencher Dunstan from the day he came in here, was the thesis that the Party gaining majority support should govern. He squealed like a stuck pig because he got over 50 per cent once in the life of the Dunstan Government and the Labor Party did not win. The Liberal Party had a substantial victory under the terms enunciated by Dunstan. I do not want to waste too much time on the honourable member; let him just think about the fact that he is a member of a minority Party that deserves to be sitting over here when the Liberal Party, which enjoyed a substantial majority, should be in Government. Do not let us mount this sort of

argument. The Labor Party is there because it won in an unfair system. That is the only reason.

The only thing that came out of the Hobart conference—which was a non-conference—was that Senator Schacht of South Australia got the Party to agree to educate the public that we need a republic. That was the big event. The rest was a non-event. Prime Minister Hawke was going to lead the debate on changing the uranium policy. Hawke was going to have his say. But, when he got there he was mute, because he had other things on his mind—former Deputy Prime Minister and Treasurer Keating was well and truly foremost in his mind. If I have the time I will get back to that.

This republic move is a diversion by the Labor Party—unfortunately, it is likely to be a divisive diversion—to take the minds of the public off the massive problems the Labor Party has inflicted on Australia. It will be a divisive debate, there is no doubt about that. This republican thing was given a bit of a fillip when Sir John Kerr had the courage to sack the Whitlam Government, and no constitutional lawyer of any repute can credibly argue that Kerr did anything outside the powers which were vested in him.

Mr Atkinson: Unlike Malcolm Fraser.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If there was any argument by those who are bleating from the Labor Party, it would be with the powers of the Senate. It is a constitutional fact that Kerr had the power and the courage to use it. The Labor Party thought it had a tame cat in the Governor-General's House when in fact it had a man with some courage. So, let us put that to rest. The point I am making is that that gave the republican cause a bit of a temporary fillip.

Mr S.G. Evans: It got cross because the people were given the chance to make a decision.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is right, but the fact is that Prime Minister Whitlam wanted to carry on when Supply was being denied. No Government can carry on when Supply is denied, and Kerr did the right thing. The point I am making is this: it will be very difficult for the Labor Party—in fact in my judgment impossible—to achieve this aim. It might achieve the aim of dividing the community but, in my judgment, it has two chances of getting up a republic by the year 2001, the centenary of Federation—Buckleys and none.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not the slightest bit worried. There are only two ways by which Australia can be turned into a republic: either by revolution or by significant constitutional change. Those are the only ways. Any view of what has happened overseas in relation to this matter would not encourage Senator Schacht and those of his ilk. Let us look at some of those republics around the world, particularly the so-called socialist republics that must be dear to the heart of the socialists. Certainly, communism is now a dirty word with members opposite but socialism is still in vogue. If we look at the socialist republics and the fate of some of their presidents and the ensuing turmoil, I would have thought that members opposite would lose their enthusiasm for republicanism.

The Canadians were keen until President Nixon went bad in a big way and they seemed to lose their enthusiasm for republicanism. The history of constitutional change in this century has been that, unless there is pretty well unanimous support throughout the nation for a change, it does not occur. All the opinion polls indicate that the majority of South Australians still wish to retain the monarchy. If members of the Labor Party believe they can convert the vast majority of Australians to the view that this ought to be

changed between now and the end of the century, they are more foolish than I thought they were.

If the Labor Party sought to change the Australian Constitution, it would require a change to State Constitutions. I have raised all this material in the context of the fact that, if the Labor Party has its way, we will not have a Governor delivering the Governor's speech. However, I want to get to material in the Governor's speech because the Government's handlers would have been hard pressed to include the usual sort of cheerful optimistic gloss of the Government's record and its hopes for the future. This is because we have had a disastrous period in South Australia during the past 12 months—the most disastrous I can ever recall.

I wish to turn now to the Ministers who head this Government for the Labor Party. If we took out a score card and gave them marks, not many of them would score points at all. I ought to start with the Premier, but I will not. Instead, let me start with those Ministers who sought to have a bit of fun in this place this afternoon. I refer to two of my favourite Ministers, Ministers Rann and Lenehan, who got up and sought to make fun of a member of this place and of the Liberal Party simply because we happen to be a democratic organisation. We do not run conferences like the Labor Party does and as happened some time ago in Hobart. At Labor Party conferences all the deals are stitched up behind closed doors and a few factional heads are lopped off.

They do not pick the best ministry but the ministry that the factional bosses decide between themselves. They sack Peter Duncan and put in Nick Bolkus, because the Left has to have a representative and it is his turn. Get rid of Duncan and put in Bolkus! It is all stitched up in factional deals. If anyone thinks that the hatred between the factions is not intense, they are kidding themselves. Labor Party conferences are simply to an increasing extent an exercise in damage control.

The Liberal Party happens to be a democratic organisation. One of the branches in the Liberal Party mounted a resolution to do something about unemployed youth. That resolution goes to the State Council where it will be debated and possibly be thrown out or modified. Do members believe that that could happen in the Labor Party? There is no way that that could happen in the Labor Party. What about the so-called democratic one vote one value, where a union official can lob at a meeting with 100 000 votes in his pocket to vote for one of his mates. What nonsense this is about the democratic Labor Party.

The way they have hammered out the factional deals explains why the honourable member is now in the Chair: because the bloke with the 100 000 votes in his pocket supported some left-wing Party hack in Elizabeth but the public would not wear it. Even their plans came unstuck.

The Minister who sought to have fun at our expense this afternoon was not called the 'fabricator' for nothing. As someone interjected today, he ought to be called the 'Minister of Unemployment'. He is the Minister in this place responsible for looking after the youth of South Australia. Could our youth be in better hands? We have 30 per cent record unemployment involving young people in South Australia, and these figures are the worst since the Great Depression of the 1930s. This is the Minister who made a buffoon of himself here this afternoon trying to score some cheap political points when we have 30 per cent unemployment—one in three young people cannot get a job—yet he is in charge of that section. The Minister ought to hide his face in shame, instead of showing all that bravado and front, and slink out of this place and hide himself.

The Minister has had the temerity to criticise democracy in the Liberal Party. The 'fabricator' has the gall to criticise democracy in the Liberal Party. While I am talking about this aspect, I point out that the Labor Party is doing a wonderful thing about the redistribution of boundaries. Supporters of one vote one value even have their factions fighting about where the new boundaries should be.

I turn my attention now to the Premier, who leads this bunch: he is the leader of the pack, and what an appalling record from him and his Ministers we have. I know of no period in the history of South Australia with a more appalling record that has affected so adversely every man, woman and child in this State. When they do their factional dealings for preselection, who is it that gets the push? Who was kept out of the ministry? It was the poor old member for Hartley, because they turned his seat into a Liberal seat.

I understand that the member for Hartley had the temerity to say that he would not join one of the gangs. He said, 'I do not like this gang business and this business of doing deals behind closed doors involving the centre left, the left, the far left, the right, the middle and so on. You name it, they have it. There are so many Labor Party factions that one runs out of fingers on which to count them. The real battle here is between the centre left and the left, but the left is gaining fast.

I have my money on Frank. The time is coming when the Premier will have to be expendable but, when factional deals come down to where they are going to draw the boundaries, the game is up. What about the hypocrisy of Terry Cameron, the Labor Party's State Secretary, who said, 'I would rather not win than win on unfair boundaries'? That stretches the bounds of credibility. My friend the member for Henley Beach has come in, but he got the push because he had the temerity to stand up to the Premier.

The poor old member for Hartley said that WorkCover was no good: that was his crime. Well, those chickens have come home to roost. The Premier is on the telephone again and poor old Groomie has no show of getting into the Ministry.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Hartley. It is a term of affection, because I rather like some of these people. Unfortunately, he is now going to be pushed out of the place. Luckily for the member for Henley Beach, they could not fill up his seat, or they would have got rid of him as well. The telephone ran hot because they committed the unforgivable sin of showing a bit of independence in a Party where that is just not allowed to exist.

Is it not ironic that the leader of the left pack, the Minister of Transport, Mr Blevins, now presides over the cuts in the Public Service? He is doing the dirty work for the left. That seems ironic to me. He is given the dirty work to do. He has to slice into the Public Service. This is the leader of the left, mind you, on whom I have my money. The time will come when the Premier will be exposed, in my judgment, and he will have to go. The Deputy Premier is looking pretty tired on it. He is probably not all that interested. So, we come down the bench to the Minister who spoke in the debate last week. It was nothing to do with him, but he spoke. In fact, he is likely to talk himself out of a job—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He has verbal diarrhoea. My money is on Frank—sorry, the honourable Minister. My money is on the one who has a bit of guts. My money is on the Minister who is doing the dirty work. It all depends on whether the left will get the numbers in this factional game. They managed to get the stoic Ms Kirner

up in Victoria. She is up there battling against the odds. So, it can happen here.

Mr Quirke: Jeff Kennett is her best ally.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: You win some, you lose some, but I will put my money on the Liberals cleaning up in Victoria any day. So, the Treasurer has presided over the SGIC. Really, he presides over all financial affairs of this State. When a financial matter goes wrong in a department, as Treasurer he has to pick up the tab for that.

Mr S.G. Evans: He says 'Me no know.'

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He is not responsible for anything. He is just Premier of the State!

Mr S.G. Evans: If it is good, he is.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier is not responsible for anything, if you listen to him. His response is, 'Go and ask the department.' Let me press on. The Minister of Recreation and Sport is another favourite of mine.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What do you mean by 'favourite'?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a racing term. Although I am not well up in racing terms, he is a favourite of mine. You will notice also that I am interested in conservation as I have my copious notes written on recycled paper. I think that the Minister of Recreation and Sport was crying wolf, quite frankly. He said that apparently some Minister fronted up at the entertainment centre with two tickets for three bodies. I know the way he operates, and I have a sneaking suspicion that it was the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

Mr S.G. Evans: Methinks you are right, too.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is the sort of thing he would do, as bold as brass. For instance, he takes on the Unley council. The council has a sphere of operation, but that is not good enough for the Minister, and if he thinks there is a vote or two in it he tells it to get nicked and off he goes. I notice that my premiership candidate has just appeared. Anyway, I have a sneaking suspicion that the honourable Minister is crying wolf. If I am wrong, I will say to him that I am sorry, but he is the sort of chap with that much gall who would turn up at the entertainment centre with two tickets and three behinds to sit on seats. That is the way he operates. I must mention the Minister of Forests. He is one of the real success stories of this Government! The first thing to hit the deck was the Grey-mouth timber mill in New Zealand which cost the taxpayers \$12 million, no less.

The Hon. H. Allison: And in the process lost \$20 million.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He is responsible.

Mr Brindal: That is a wonderful result—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Gone!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left cannot share the debate. The honourable member for Kavel has the floor.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Then he closed down the timber mill in my electorate after it had been deliberately run down, in my judgment. I think he was completely snowed by the people advising him. As we heard today, he does not visit many of these places. He is one of these non-visiting Ministers. He thinks if he goes there he might not be able to ask some intelligent questions. I always found that it was a good idea to go and have a look and ask some questions. It would benefit all these people who are anti-uranium to go overseas and see how the real world is living. I did so to answer any queries that I had in my mind, but not the Minister of Forests. It was no good going down to Scrimber. They would not be able to tell him anything.

An honourable member: He doesn't understand much.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, he did not understand much, but he is the non-visiting Minister. If he did visit the Williamstown mill, he did not inform me. He believes everything he is told. The manager was getting full pay for part-time work. I know that as a fact. He tells me that his advisers told him that it was not the fact. However, the mill closed and it cost us a lot of money. Now we have this \$60 million Scrimber debacle. There was a time when \$1 million or even \$10 000 was important to this State. Here we have the Minister presiding over the biggest debacle, any one of which would be enough to sink a Minister in a normal government. Any one of these things would be enough. But for these factional deals and the fact that the Premier really does not have control (although he gets on the telephone when he wants to keep somebody out), the Minister would be sacked, and so he ought to be. Not only that, he has made a mess of mines and energy. From my contacts, and I have plenty, he is no good at that either. So, what is he good at?

Mr Brindal: What about the Police Force? Is he any good at that?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have not found that he is good at anything. Look what the Director of Mines and Energy said in his latest report. Mr Johns stated:

The marked decline in the level of mineral exploration (excluding petroleum) in South Australia since 1984 is a matter of grave concern because of its implications for future economic development.

Economic development is what running the State is all about, I thought. He continued:

Compared to the national average expenditure on exploration of \$100/km² South Australia's share is less than \$8/km². If this trend continues, the State will be disadvantaged in what should be a principal source of new wealth.

If members opposite were interested in the history of the development of South Australia, they would discover that primary production and mining have been the backbone of our economy, and they still contribute very significantly to it. But no, the Minister is not interested in generating activity in the mining area. He has made a mess of that also. From my contacts in the department—and elsewhere in the industry, more importantly—they hold him in very low regard.

I would also mention the other Minister who took part in the debate last week, and I refer to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. Of course, we know that he was involved in the Marineland fiasco, which cost the taxpayers about \$8 million. Members should total all this up. If I have time, I will read a letter from a fairly alarmed citizen which sums it all up. Marineland cost us about \$8 million. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology had his sticky fingers in that. I was interested in the following comment on page 5 of the Governor's speech:

South Australia has been in the forefront of developing innovative employment and training programs. My Government will embark on expanded regionally-based employment . . .

I think all members received a copy of this letter, and I must read it into the record. It is from one of my councils on what it has done in regional development in South Australia and it states where the Government will expand its regional activity. The letter reads:

Dear Sir,

Regional Economic Development in South Australia

On Tuesday 2 July 1991, representatives of the South Australian Regional Development Association met with the Hon. Lynn Arnold, M.P., Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, and presented a submission to the Government calling for the provision of adequate funding to enable regional economic development committees in South Australia to employ full-time development officers . . .

The submission was prepared by the South Australian Regional Development Association following widespread concern in regional areas of South Australia that the State Government has neglected to take steps to encourage economic development in the regions, while committing enormous sums on the promotion of economic development in metropolitan Adelaide.

The Department of Industry, Trade and Technology, which is the Government department responsible for the economic development of South Australia, currently employs 90 public servants, of whom only two are engaged full time to promote economic development in the whole of regional South Australia.

It mentions two out of 90, yet we hear this garbage that the Government will expand its regional activity. The letter continues:

The rest of the staff work on projects promoting development in Adelaide. Out of a total operating budget for the 1990 financial year of \$7 686 000, DITT allocated only \$114 000 to broad-based regional economic development policy. Consequently, the regions have great difficulty attracting industrial and commercial development. Adelaide continues to grow rapidly while the regions are declining. The SARDA submission calls on the Government to take steps to provide the regions with a fair share of the resources which are being put into economic development. Regional areas account for 27 per cent of the population of South Australia.

They get less than 5 per cent of the investment from the Government. So it goes on, with some interesting statistical material indicating that the country has been starved by this Government. So, the Minister for Industry, Trade and Technology wants to lift his game markedly if paragraph 21 of the Governor's speech is anything but a bit of puffery which, I suspect, it is.

Running down the score card, if we gave the Minister of Forests marks out of 10, he would have to get a negative score; nought out of 10 would be too much for him. Now we have the Minister of Labour getting up here. If I had time I would quote what the leaders of industry are saying about his much-vaunted WorkCover scheme. Let us see what the *Business to Business* publication has to say about the Government in general and about the Minister's compulsory unionism:

We've seen Government tacitly condone 'union-only' work rules. Consider Labour Minister Mr Gregory, when he stated for the record that 'A State Government contract to force cafeteria staff at a technical and further education college to join a union complies with Government policy.' No thank you, Mr Gregory, this type of thinking was outdated 50 years ago.

It then goes on to have a slice of the Premier. Then, of course, there was an interesting article on WorkCover in which a business leader says it ought to be scrapped. In fact, the article states that, under private sector management, workers compensation was covered by 200 employees spread over several insurance companies. Now there are 550 employees working for WorkCover. Two hundred employees could do the job in private enterprise, yet there are now 550 working for the Government. No wonder premiums are ballooning. So, the Minister of Labour would have to get nought out of 10 because, if anything is inhibiting development in this State, it is the activities of this corporation.

So it goes on. We have the Minister of Water Resources talking about social justice. We do not pay for water now; we pay for social justice. I know young people in my electorate. The aim of young people nowadays is that both husband and wife work. They work hard to get a nice home and to furnish it; they delay having a family, unfortunately, but that is what happens. My neighbours are paying over \$100 for social justice. The Government judges that this young couple, both of whom work to get a nice home and to set themselves up, must pay over \$100 to look after the poor and needy in this community, or wherever this money goes. Of course, it is frittered away on pet Government projects. So, the Government is now selling social justice.

The Minister is spending \$60 000 to try to flog this dead horse to the public.

Mr S.G. Evans: The dead horse is saying 'neigh' as far as the public is concerned.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. Sixty thousand dollars does not grow on trees. It is not possible to convince the public by rational argument. This social justice stuff is the last fling of the left. The Minister of Water Resources is breathing down the neck of the Minister of Transport in the leadership stakes, but I have my money on the Minister of Transport. But I tell you what: she will have to do better than trying to sell this social justice instead of selling water.

An interesting article appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald* under the headline 'Labor Government no longer the bastion for the battler', as follows:

A Labor Government is supposed to be about social justice and equity, giving the little people a chance. Right? So why did the richest 10 per cent of Australians get almost 30 per cent richer and the poorest 10 per cent get almost 25 per cent poorer during six years of ALP Government?

That is not a bad question. Then today we see this wonderful Labor Party, where the Premier is saying—

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

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the Address in Reply. I congratulate Her Excellency on the fine job she is doing. I would also like to congratulate the newer members of the press on their zeal in seeking the truth. I have been very impressed with the quality of journalism and the quality of radio and television in recent times, particularly in the past 12 months, and I believe that we now have a press contingent in this town that will take up the major issues in a fearless fashion. I wish we could compare the style of our new, perhaps younger and more truth seeking journalists with those who prevailed during the 1980s and who had almost fawning acceptance of the Bannon Government. There has been a stark change and I would pay tribute.

The Premier's style has not changed, but a new demand for truth is emerging. I do not believe that any Government can hold itself up purely with fabrication—purely with glitz and glamour and a reliance on major events—because, ultimately, if there is no substance, the Government must eventually fall. It did not fall at the last election, and that was not the fault of the people of this State. It was the fault of the electoral system, but that is water under the bridge. Perhaps the beginning—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Indeed, the Labor Party would have it over again if it could have its time with boundaries that could assist its cause. Perhaps the advent of Piers Ackerman heralded the change in Adelaide; perhaps he decided that the Government had been resting on its laurels and that the press contingent in this State had not put it under a great deal of pressure or questioned it on the most basic matters that were being raised by the Opposition at that stage. I put it to you, Sir, and to the rest of the House that many of the disasters that have befallen this State could well have been avoided if we had had a decent press contingent in South Australia. Whilst there are still a number of those who have kept the Government in power, most of them are now realising that the 1980s are a bad memory, and it is now a question of getting on with the 1990s and changing attitudes and the way in which the world operates.

We can no longer suffer Governments that really do not care about the damage they cause; that really prop themselves up with various instruments and large press contingents and with daily meetings at luncheon spots. Those days

are gone and they will not be mourned. I would only ask that members of the press corps check the headlines of the 1980s and contrast them with the headlines of the 1990s. It is the same non-caring Government we have today, yet it has become very much error-prone, and the problems associated with this socialist administration are obvious now and coming more to the fore.

While I am handing out one or two accolades and brickbats, I would like to remember the grubby member for unemployment, who poses as a Minister. He is fortunate that he was not born 100 years ago, because he would have been shot for cheating. His record speaks for itself. His latest outburst is a reflection of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture replaced the Deputy Premier in the debate on the recent no-confidence motion and, in some way, a suggestion was made that indeed there had been a recognition that the Minister of Agriculture would be the next Deputy Premier of this State. I would just make a point about the Minister of Employment and Further Education. He has a lot in common with some women who rely on falsies. We know that the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Water Resources, the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Employment and Further Education are involved in a scramble for the position of Deputy Premier.

We know that the Minister is running a bad last and is trying to make up ground at the expense of everyone else. If he really wants to be a major part of Government in this State, at least until the next election, it is time he concentrated on the truth and on his own performance rather than on the current path that he is following.

I will reflect on a number of matters contained in the Governor's speech. The Government's program is typically lacklustre at this time in the election cycle. The main game is not expected for two years, so why expend too much effort? That is the attitude of the Government. Premier Bannon's attitude is to let the peasants bleed provided there is time to apply the tourniquet before the election becomes due. That is reflected in everything that we see in the program announced in the Governor's speech. There is no substance, there is no future and there is nothing to enthuse the population of South Australia to think that they have much of a future, at least in the next year or so.

If one goes through the program that has been presented, one finds a brief mention of manufacturing, but it is purely a bit of window-dressing to say that there is a manufacturing division. The manufacturing sector of South Australia is under enormous stress because of the huge problems facing the motor vehicle industry and the inflated dollar.

It comes as no great surprise that the MFP assumes pride of place in the program. If members want to look at the number of lines that have been devoted to each area canvassed in the speech, they will find that the MFP features most prominently of all matters. It reflects the fact that the Government is unable to grapple with what it faces today, so it grasps what it thinks it might be able to achieve in the future. It is appropriate to look to the future but it is far more appropriate to get what you are doing today right.

I note mention in the speech of the micro-economic reform that the Premier is undertaking. He must have choked on his Weeties when that was written because there is no such thing as micro-economic reform. What does it mean? Perhaps to Premier Bannon it means that the unions shall retain total control and continue to have a say in what contracts are let to outside contractors, because that is what prevails today. Perhaps micro-economic reform means that unions can prevent departments from accepting tenders where those tenderers do not have a fully unionised workshop.

The Premier has shown no commitment to changing the way in which labour relations are conducted within the State Government. Rather than being at the forefront of change, the Premier props up old-established practices which were in place 10 or 20 years ago and have no functional relevance to the needs of today. There is still a great reluctance within the public sector for permanent part-time work, and there has not been any reform in that area. At the same time, a number of industrial relations experts have suggested that this is a positive way to provide work and get the expertise that is required for the desired time in the week. There has not been any micro-economic reform.

As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out on a number of occasions, 'reform' to the Labor Government is to get rid of a few blue collar workers and strengthen the white collar base. It does not mean that you change work practices or that you try to keep sick leave under control. As was noted in the Auditor-General's Report, sick leave is out of control. In fact, the State Public Service still does not have a management system to control sick leave. Even the most simple tasks are not being done well.

There has not been any reform on the workers compensation front with respect to those people who take time off because of illness or injury in the workplace. We find that the accident rate in the Public Service is higher than it is in the private sector. There is a very good reason for that: slack management and no reforms whatsoever. In addition, there have not been any reforms in working practices with respect to service to the public. How many times have members of this House rung up departments and found that no-one is answering telephones or that everyone is on a lunch break? There is no commitment to service, yet there is a demand for improved service. That relates to any endeavour, except with respect to the Bannon Government. If the Premier wants to talk about micro-economic reform, he must start with the State Government, yet the whole working relationship remains untouched.

I nearly choked on my Weeties when I read about social justice. To Premier Bannon, social justice is simply a matter of words; it means nothing. The most important thing you can do to give people social justice is to give them a job, to give them safety in their environment, to give them a clean environment and to ensure that they have opportunity. None of those elements of what I call social justice prevails, and everything that this Government and the Hawke Government have done has taken away from that notion of social justice. It is not proper that the Premier isolates certain elements of his budget and says that they are being devoted to social justice, because over the past 8½ years the gap between the rich and the poor has widened dramatically. The problem of escalating unemployment has befallen South Australia in a way that is highly regrettable but is a function of the policies that have been pursued at State and Federal level by Labor Governments.

Nine or 10 years ago, how many people would have said that they could not walk the streets in safety? Day after day we are regaled with stories and read in the paper about normal people who can no longer depend on the security they once felt because someone out there wants to take advantage of them. We cannot even offer people security, as we could when the Bannon Government came to power. We cannot even offer them security or freedom with respect to having their property rubbished with graffiti, and that is another innovation of the Bannon regime. We do not have any guarantees on a fair and proper charge for Government services. In the last budget, there were huge increases in certain taxes and charges to prop up a Government that has no commitment to economic efficiency.

Despite all the words and rhetoric, there has been no improvement in our environment because, while a lot of money has been expended on reports and on setting up committees, there has been no real change. We have not seen a turnaround, and the environment continues to be degraded. All the matters relating to social justice—a person's right to have a job, to be educated, to walk the streets freely and to pursue a career with a fair chance of opportunity—have been eroded, yet the Premier talks about continuing to fight the good fight for social justice. The rubbish has to stop and the Premier of this State has to be accountable for the actions of his Government and that of the Hawke Government, because he was President of the Australian Labor Party for a large part of the period when its policies started to bite into people's pockets and their future.

I will place the Governor's speech into context. Today we have the highest inflation of all the States, and that is a product of the taxes and charges imposed by this Government. Unemployment is over 10 per cent but heading towards being the highest in the country, and it suffered the largest increase in the past month. We have a Premier who has presided over the worst financial disaster ever to beset a State Government. I noted that in his contribution the member for Mitchell said, 'Don't blame the Premier; the problem is world wide.' The problem is not world wide; the problem relates to certain Administrations, but the institutions that we are talking about for which the Premier is responsible have a certain set of rules and laws that have been set by this State, and the Premier has deliberately broken those rules and those laws.

He is culpable for his own negligence and for his participation in this grand plan to make money. He has been an abject failure. I should like to read to the House a list of the Labor failures, so that there are no excuses when it comes to budget time and so that everyone is well aware of exactly what the Premier has done to the State.

We have a recent update on the State Bank situation, and there has been a suggestion that, rather than \$1 billion, the loss could be as high as \$1.5 billion. I am not in a position to judge, but it has certainly been reported. Looking at the increase in employment that took place during the 1989-90 election year, after previous promises of no increase in employment, we find that if the 2 400 public servants who were employed during that period had not been put on we would have saved \$72 million per annum.

We know that the cost of the put option for SGIC on the 333 Collins Street site will be of the order of \$200 million. We now know that the Scrimber project losses will approach \$60 million. We know that the loss on the investment in the New Zealand timber mill is \$12 million. Even with the small timber mill in the District of Kavel, at Williamstown, there is a cost of \$1.4 million.

We know that the inept handling of the Justice Information System, originally costed at \$21 million, has meant that it is now expected to reach \$75 million, an increase of \$54 million. We know that if the Government had been interested in some minor reform such as taking up the recommendations of the Fielding report on the State Transport Authority, with very simple changes it would have been able to achieve a cost saving of at least 10 per cent per annum, or \$20 million per year. We know that, if proper management systems had been put in place, Premier Bannon would have been able to save his Treasury approximately \$10 million per year in lost time from sick leave.

We know that SGIC invested \$10 million in 102FM, and that is unlikely to be repaid. We know that SGIC has made a loss on commercial operations of \$1.8 million in the last financial year. Everyone is well aware of the tragedy of the

Marineland project, where a further \$7.6 million was lost. What about the St John Ambulance Service, a service which we all love so dearly and which provided a cost effective 24-hour service to the people of South Australia and, particularly, to metropolitan residents. That has, effectively, been destroyed.

We know that the response time will blow out, and there has been a huge cost to the budget. In the first year it was \$2.5 million, and the ultimate cost will be at least \$4 million to \$5 million extra per year because the Government does not happen to like volunteers and is more prone to support unions. We have looked at the Government's interest in SAA, where there has been a write-down of \$3.3 million.

We are pleased to note that the SAMCOR loss of \$1.7 million last year will be turned around this year and that SAMCOR will make a profit. However, we cannot afford a Government instrumentality of that nature continuing to make the losses that it has incurred over most of its very troubled history. We note the marvellous additions to Yatala Labour Prison's F Division, which were put in place at a cost of \$10 million. As far as I can recollect—and I have not seen any announcement to the contrary—that area has still not been occupied, because a dispute exists as to whether or not the premises are appropriate for the need for which they were designed.

We have heard about the Tandanya Institute and its appalling management, which has chalked up a bill of \$1 million. We know that the cost of free student transport, which was originally estimated by the Minister of Transport at \$7 million, has blown out by another \$2 million. One could question whether it was worthwhile in the first place.

Previously, we have raised the question of the overpayment of swimming instructors, and stated that the Government could save itself \$1 million per year if it contracted at the same rates of pay as normal swimming instructors were paid at a private pool. Year after year we have instances of teacher salary overpayments. Over the past two financial years the overpayments have totalled almost \$600 000, and that is the amount that was not recovered. The overpayments were well over \$1 million in total.

In relation to empty teacher housing, \$450 000 was wasted because the houses remained vacant for some considerable time. They should have been either filled or sold, but they were left vacant, which increased the cost. We noted the awful bungling associated with the upgrading of the Kensington campus of TAFE. One million dollars was spent on that upgrading, and those premises were subsequently sold. I can guarantee that the sale price in no way did justice to the extra \$1 million that had been spent.

We note that the Health Commission, which is always strapped for cash, was making lease payments for an empty building. Those payments cost the Health Commission \$1 million. In the Film Corporation there was a shortfall in the *Ultraman* production of nearly \$900 000. I have been informed that the Department of Road Transport, attempting to get its budget in order in this past financial year, was prevented from selling off \$500 000 worth of assets because of a union ban.

Year after year the State Clothing Corporation makes a loss, and one can only assume that it is because of the Minister's interference, the local member's interference, that that anomaly continues. Yet it continues to take money out of the State budget. From the Auditor-General's Report and the information supplied, we note that there was a computer purchase error due to State Supply of the order of \$1 million.

The Department of the Arts has excelled itself, of course, by buying buildings and leaving them vacant, and \$2 million

is tied up in that area. At the end of the list is the unfunded liability from WorkCover, which runs into hundreds of millions of dollars.

It is not as if the Government has had one or two failures. Governments cannot always be right, but this Government has proved that it is totally fallible by getting most things wrong. If we add up the cost of servicing the debt associated with all those failures, the annualised cost would be in excess of \$250 million per year—and I make that point very strongly.

If we had somehow contained the disasters that were the product of Premier Bannon's mismanagement it would have saved the business sector from being taxed savagely in the last budget. The Premier cannot now claim that he has been treated unfairly because it is a product of his own endeavour. This long list of failures is a true reflection of a Government that simply does not care and has not lived up to its responsibilities.

The Premier has presided over the most alarming escalation of crime in this State's history. Recent examples have been provided in both the *News* and the *Advertiser*, and by my colleague in another place, the Hon. Jamie Irwin, about the massive increase in crime and the contributions of young people in that crime. It is something that has to stop; it is something we have to get hold of. Year after year we have seen crime statistics increase at a rate which will destroy us unless we get on top of it. The Premier cannot be proud of his record in this area.

The State is going through its worst rural crisis ever, and that is very much a function of the high interest rate policy that is being pursued by the Hawke Government with the support of the Bannon Labor Government. Indeed, the Premier of this State has a great deal to answer for.

Our manufacturing industry is in particularly bad shape. I have seen the survey results of the Engineering Employers Association. When asked, 'Do you expect your orders to improve next month?' over 80 per cent say 'No.' When asked, 'Are your order levels satisfactory?' again 80 per cent say 'No.' It is a terrible situation, and that situation has been visited upon that industry by the Hawke and Bannon policies.

Despite all the money that has been spent on education and on all these so-called 'services' to meet the demands that are perceived by this Government, who can say that the quality of education in 1991 is better than the quality of education in 1981? If someone came up with some facts about the quality of our education system for the dollars that are spent, serious questions would be asked about how well we are providing for the needs of our children and their ability to operate in a very difficult world where greater and greater skill is required. It is not tolerable that many of our children are leaving school without the basic skills that we expect them to have. They can leave school after, say, 11 years of education and still cannot read the paper properly or go into the supermarket and add up the price of a few goods without getting it wrong. That is an indictment on this Government: it is an indictment of the way in which it has approached its job.

The Governor's speech represents a program by a Government that has lost its way—a program that is not enhancing this State's future possibilities. It represents a reprehensible derogation of responsibility by Premier Bannon and his Ministers in all the areas of endeavour, whether that be in Treasury where the Premier has completely botched his financial responsibilities, in the health portfolio where the number of people waiting for operations escalates daily, in agriculture where farmers are going broke because of the policies of the Premier's mates, or in transport where we

are closing down railway stations and losing people off the buses. One can go through every portfolio. In every area the Bannon Government has failed. I see no light whatsoever in this speech, and that is a great shame.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I acknowledge this traditional debate to which we are presently attending and I pledge my support to it. I also pledge my support and allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen and ask how it is that the republicans opposite have deleted 'God save the Queen' from the proclamation and the documentation directly associated with the parliamentary system.

Mr Ferguson: She doesn't need to be saved.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: That is an interesting comment, Mr Deputy Speaker, from the honourable member opposite who is out of his seat. It shows just how clear is the difference between members on that side of the Chamber and members on this side when they can bandy around a tradition that has been part of the system for so long without explanation or public announcement, and against the best interests, I suggest, of the parliamentary system.

I also give my allegiance to Her Excellency the Governor who, I believe, has in the very short time that she has occupied the position very clearly endeared herself to many people who knew her only as a name or as a person before whom people did not wish to appear, for the very obvious reason that she happened to be a member of the Supreme Court bench.

Her Excellency, in moving around the countryside, taking on completely new roles, meeting people and being sympathetic towards them, recognises and appreciates, far better than Ministers opposite, just how difficult it is for people out there in the community at present. She has clearly identified herself with a number of the difficulties that the ministry has failed to recognise, and it has failed to recognise those difficulties in this tragic speech, particularly page one of it.

I want to address only one page of this speech before going on to make other observations about what is happening out there in the real world. First, I acknowledge the loss of three former members of this House, two of whom were here while I have been a member and the other, Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles, who transferred to the Federal scene. There was earlier opportunity to make mention of, and participate in, the condolence motions relative to those three former members.

Paragraph 3 of the Governor's speech states:

The task of government is shadowed by an unprecedented range of issues that impact on most South Australians.

'Shadowed' is not the word: the South Australian public is being submerged by a Government that has not taken heed of the vital knowledge and information that was there for all to see. It has not accepted the questioning raised both in Estimates Committees and in Question Time. It has taken no heed at all of the motions which have been put before this House over time and which alluded to the diminishing advantage of being a South Australian, because of the activities not only of this State Labor Government but the Federal Government of the same ilk. Whilst the diminution of opportunity that has arisen in South Australia is recognised, we should also take heed of the fact that the person who was in charge of the Federal Labor Party in respect of its public wing was none other than the Premier of this State, as the Party's Federal President.

We do have a problem—it is not shadowed, it is real—and it has submerged the hopes and aspirations of so many South Australians, as I hope to demonstrate later. The third subparagraph of paragraph 3 states:

However there are encouraging signs in key areas of activity, including private dwelling construction, consumer confidence and retail sales . . .

What do we have on the airwaves this morning? What has been before us in recent days: the worst retail history in living memory over the first weeks of August? Yes, there was an improvement in July, but why? People were being enticed to buy at discounted values. Last Friday or Saturday in the *Advertiser* we saw the photograph of large numbers of Commodores on grass out at Elizabeth with nowhere to go because no-one was buying them.

A number of car sales are being undertaken and there is no argument about that, but the vitality of the industry has been shot and, in part, it has been shot by the fact that a number of people were enticed to buy ahead of time by the discounting that was taking place. A number of people in the retail area were invited to buy ahead of time and, worse than that, a number of people were invited to buy and pay up to three and four months later, and there is another tragedy in the waiting. That tragedy will beset us later this year when people have to pay for those goods that they were enticed to purchase.

It is fact that the retail industry has never been in worse shape in the memory of any of us who are in this Parliament. Even those of us who can go back to the depression time and to the various recessions can readily understand a number of the difficulties that exist out there based on our previous experience but, for any of us who are in this place now (and one of our colleagues has been here for 23 years and others for 21 years), never has the situation been as bad as it is now, and with little or no sign of improvement.

On the front page of its business section the *News* picks up the point 'Recovery doubts grow'. People who read that article by Simon Jemison will see that it spells out why doubts are growing. On that same page the next item is headed 'Share market drops'. Why has it dropped? Share markets go up and down over a long period and there is no argument about that.

Mr Ferguson: It has gone up 25 per cent this year.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: And in the past two or three days it has been on the slide down again. I make the point that there are clear indications that all is not well with these recovery programs that have been put in place. To face reality is something that this Government fails to do. Anyone who faces reality and who looks at just what is happening and comments on a number of those actions, is told that they are talking doom and gloom and they are told not to dwell on those matters.

If we do not face reality, then we are putting the people of South Australia and Australia in worse circumstances than currently exist, and I will not be party to that. That is why I repeat the comment in the third paragraph, as follows:

. . . there are encouraging signs in the key areas of activity.

They are not there: they come and go like the breeze and most certainly, when it comes to consumer confidence and retail sales, anyone who has been in touch with small or larger businesses will know just what difficulty exists.

They will recognise the number of people on shorter time; they will recognise the difficulties that are starting to come into play for an increasing number of schoolchildren who make pocket money after school and at night in the local supermarket. I am talking not about employment as such but about that assistance that allows many students to live in the world that we as politicians and adults have made for them. I draw the attention of the House to just what an unfriendly environment is being created at the moment.

There is mention of the Government's recognising the vital need to take account—recognising the vital need! The Government has been implored for months—indeed, years now—to take heed of what is taking place in relation to so many instrumentalities, and we have not seen the last of it yet. There are other instrumentalities that quite obviously, with the cross-referencing and cross-financing that have taken place, are yet to be part of the unfortunate disaster that has beset us. We only have to note the revelations coming out on a daily basis from royal commission sittings—not only in this State but also in other States—to see how Government greed, when the Government is a Labor Government, has led to the disasters with which we must live. To make matters worse, we find that the last point in paragraph 3 is just a motherhood statement:

The economic climate has added urgency to my Government's efforts in micro-economic reform and this has seen the development of a plan for long-term industrial development.

What long-term industrial development is involved when we have the current WorkCover situation and when the add-ons being demanded by the Government are making such inroads into effective employment in so many areas of industry? I refer to water rates, land tax, and so it goes on. Anyone who has their ear to the ground will know just how difficult it is becoming on a daily basis for people to stay in business, let alone develop an enterprise.

Whilst I do not knock the initiative of those who get up and go because circumstances are favourable at a particular time and who are ahead of the pack because there is a sudden demand for their product or initiative, even a number of those people are telling me when I see them in my electorate that the 'up and go' benefit that was there six months ago is currently decreasing. I make these statements not to be labelled a doom and gloom person, but to be a realist. I only hope that members opposite, particularly those in the Ministry, become realists.

The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of the document states:

My Government and industry are cooperating in many areas, with energies focused on increasing productivity, minimising costs . . .

There is a laugh if one wants it—minimising costs! We look at the situation with the current water rating debacle—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Members opposite suggest that there is no water debacle.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: They are living in a different world altogether. It does not matter whether they live at Burnside, North Haven, the Barossa Valley or on the west coast: people are hurting, and people are being denied the opportunity to offer employment to others because of the niggling add-ons that are constantly besetting those who would seek to give opportunities to others to work. We talk here of cooperation. Go out and talk to industry about how much cooperation they feel when the FID tax has gone up.

Go out and talk to the people who happen to be super-annuants. Go out and talk to the pensioners, who have suddenly found that they are now paying on their fairly meagre sums a special stamp duty because the Government has decreed it. Where was it outlined to the public, to the pensioners, that they would have to pay these additional sums?

I remember standing in this place on an earlier occasion, when the FID tax was first under review following its introduction, and telling the House the story of the old lady who came into the office, sat down and said, 'I believe that there is a mouse in my bank account, because every time I go into the bank somebody has nibbled a bit more away.'

When the amount was increased 2.5 times to .1c in the hundred from .04c, I drew attention to the fact that the mouse had grown into a rat, and that is the view coming from so many people in the community. They are going backwards instead of forwards because of the Government's impositions. For members opposite to gloat over this does them no credit. The Government deserves no credit, because it has caused this effect on so many in our community.

This afternoon, in a very lacklustre defence of SGIC and certain of its activities, and in response to questions posed in this place, the Premier indicated that he had issued instructions to SGIC to do certain things. I suggest that the instructions were given in a very soft whisper, because it is quite clear that they were not heard and that the activities of SGIC and others who are currently in trouble have resulted because the organisations concerned were not being properly monitored or taking the Government into their confidence, or because the Government through the responsible Minister was not seeking to ascertain what was taking place.

When I realised that these instructions concerning SGIC and others were being given obviously in a very soft whisper, I was reminded of the old story of the currant buns. I remember my father saying on occasions, 'Obviously the baker stood on Mount Lofty today, because not too many currants got into the currant bun.' The Premier was scattering his shot and not too many bullets were hitting the spot.

I indicated at the outset that I would talk about the real problems of the people in the community who are hurting at the moment, because we are all supposed to be considerate of their requirements. Whilst we are debating the contents of the Governor's speech, as I indicated earlier we have to recognise that we are talking about not only the State Government but also the effect that the Federal Government of the same ilk has had on the misery being felt out there at the moment.

How many members opposite can say that they have not had people, particularly widows between the ages of 48 and 55, in tears in their office who, their youngest child having reached 16 years of age, are being told by the Social Security Department that they must show a real effort in getting a job. They will go out into the workplace and seek to compete against younger people with education which they were unfortunate never to have had to the same degree. If they happen to be living in a matrimonial home some distance from public transport, they will be counselled to give consideration to selling or giving up that family home so they can be closer to where the work might be, not necessarily where the work will be.

How many members opposite can say that they have not had an experience with people in recent weeks coming in and indicating that, on the loss of a husband who had been receiving the benefits of a breadwinner, looking after the family and the home, they are suddenly thrown into the position of being harassed (and I use that word quite deliberately) by various Social Security Department officers and being told, when they go in to plead for a little bit of consideration, that they must either get out and get a job or show that they have been looking for a job or their benefits will be cut off next week? That is happening. It is happening in my electorate and in the electorates of my colleagues on this side. I cannot believe that it is not happening in the electorates of members opposite, particularly those adjoining my area. I know that it is happening.

The situation constantly comes to the fore of people who are not able, for a variety of reasons, to remain in Housing Trust homes. There have always been those who have abused

the privilege of being in a Housing Trust home and those who have been prepared to allow funds to be utilised in the areas other than where they ought to be, namely, in paying the rent. However, they might have been unfortunate enough to have children with a great number of health problems and have got behind the eight ball in trying to do the right thing as a parent and taking those children to hospital appointments or whatever. They may have been unfortunate enough to be a resident in Gawler (and I say this in this particular context and want it to be fully understood) when it was isolated for nearly 30 days by a rail strike contrived by the Government for its own purposes. They may have been unable to get down to the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the Children's Hospital and forced into a position of having to use taxis or make arrangements to provide funds for petrol for people to get them where they had to go and subsequently got behind with the Housing Trust rent, the baker, the milkman or whatever. They are the sorts of problems being experienced out there at the moment.

I noticed a couple of members nodding their heads with regard to young people with an after-school job which has helped in the family sense as they have been able to put a bit of money aside for school excursions and other activities. Teachers around the countryside can tell us about the number of children who are unable to go on school excursions because parents cannot find the \$6.50 or the \$5 for transport and entry fees to the public performance or whatever it might be. That is happening in our State because of the inroads and lack of attention and diligence from this Labor Government over a long period and, more particularly, because of its activities over the past two years, resulting in so much money being used to prop up Government instrumentalities and not allowing funds to be made available where necessary.

The member for Napier is sitting opposite me. He should talk to the lady from Munno Para who is still waiting to have a hysterectomy at Lyell McEwin Hospital after three attempts in the past fortnight. She attended at the hospital on the first occasion, received a telephone call only five minutes before she was to leave home on the second occasion and I am not sure of the circumstances on the third occasion.

Mr Ferguson: At least we are not going to abandon Medicare, which is your policy.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: That is the sort of triviality that we get from the member for Henley Beach. It is the third occasion on which he has made inane remarks throughout the course of my address this afternoon, Mr Speaker. Those things are happening and I can see no evidence whatsoever of members of this Government coming to grips with those realities—none whatsoever. I wonder how many of those children might have been able to go on some of those excursions had there not been so much freeloading last Friday night down at the Entertainment Centre. I wonder how much opportunity there would have been for some of those additional funds to go into our hospitals if we were not paying so much and at such premium prices for—

An honourable member: Didn't you get an invitation?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: No; I did not, nor did I seek one. However, there are many people now on the staff of the Ministers chasing around putting articles in newspapers and chasing around trying to build up the ego of people opposite when in actual fact those funds should be going into those areas where people are hurting. It is all very well for people to say, 'Oh yes, but we have to do these things.' We do not have to do these things. I was always taught that one cuts one's coat according to one's cloth and, in the

circumstances that exist in 1991, with the deprivation that has come from the activities of so many of our statutory bodies and with the loss to Government and the loss to the people, I believe that those real matters ought to have been considered.

Members should go out into the countryside and talk to the people who have been unable to get any assistance from the banks. Many of them are not in the statistics contained in the document that I have called a tragic document, because they have been forced to bypass the banking system, which normally would have given them the traditional assistance, working on the basis of highs and lows of the seasons. They have been forced to seek assistance from relatives, aged parents, aunts, uncles and others. Members should go out and look at the state of some of the fences on a number of those properties and at the state of some of the equipment that is being used.

I do not cry poverty for everybody in the community at all, but I am disgusted by the words that have been given to our Governor to present to the people of South Australia in her address given at the opening of Parliament. I believe it was an attempt—a deliberate and contemptible attempt—by the Government to gloss over the real world; the world which we all know is out there but which we are not doing too much about. I am fully appreciative of the fact that often no-one can keep a person from the destiny that they plan for themselves. No-one can be responsible for all the folly that so many people in the community are responsible for, but I do believe that the Government, which is the operative force on this occasion, ought to be doing a heck of a lot more.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to speak in the Address in Reply debate because it gives me the opportunity to raise a number of matters that are of concern to me and to the people of this State. I congratulate Her Excellency the Governor on the manner in which she presented the speech to Parliament and the manner in which she is conducting her duties as Governor. I wish her well in her term of office and sincerely hope that it is enjoyable and productive for her.

The speech which she delivered and which was prepared for her by her Government completely skirts over the issues that are having such a devastating effect upon the South Australian community. Unfortunately, there is scant regard for the problems. From my time in Parliament and in public life, I am of the view that the economic situation facing South Australia at present is the worst that I have experienced. Few people clearly understand the difficulties that people in rural Australia are facing. If there is one group in the community that has been singled out more than any other section, it is rural Australia.

The economic recession, high interest rates, the common agricultural policy and the subsidies of the EC are having a devastating effect across rural Australia. They are ploughing across those communities gutters that will never be levelled out, and young people from rural South Australia are being driven from those areas never to return. The communities, the services available and the small businesses in the towns are being affected.

What is the role of Government in all this? Is the role of Government to make life as difficult as possible for the community? Is it the role of Government to take whatever it can from the pockets of the community, or is it the role of Government to try to cushion the effects of the difficult economic situation? The high interest rate policy has had

the effect of taking away the incentive and ability of those people to pay their way. If there was ever a time in the history of this country that the community should be encouraged to work, to produce, to develop and to employ, it is now, and Government taxes, charges, red tape and confusion must be done away with.

It is absolutely scandalous that nearly 30 per cent of our young people are unemployed. There is no chance in rural South Australia for many of those people to get a job, so they have to go away. We are currently in the midst of an economic debate that I believe has lost its sense of balance. Some people are advocating that we have to operate on a level playing field, but I do not quite understand what they mean. We live in the real world and we have to be prepared to accept that there is a need—in many cases an urgent need—for Government to intervene in the marketplace and to use certain of its financial resources to assist industries over difficulties so that those industries can continue to operate on a regular basis.

I believe that those people who are critically examining our statutory marketing boards should look over their shoulder and see how well those statutory marketing organisations have served this State and this nation. During the greatest long-term prosperity this country has ever had (during the Menzies-Playford era), more people were employed, we exported more, we built more homes, cars and television sets—and we did it because the Government intervened in the marketplace by way of tariff protection.

It protected our primary industries by having a sensible and responsible system of statutory marketing boards; the orderly marketing of primary products. I am not one of those who believe that Government should not re-examine the criteria under which those boards operate. I believe that, where it can be justified, they should remain. That does not mean that we need to keep unnecessary Government bureaucracies and committees, but this Government has done nothing in that area. The Tonkin Government had a program in line but, unfortunately, scrapped it.

Earlier, I mentioned the effects of the Common Agricultural Policy. I believe that few people understand the effect that subsidies are having on the agricultural sector of this country. I want to quote from the *Australian Farm Journal* of August 1991 as follows:

The EC leads the subsidy push with payments worth about \$A94 billion in 1990, made up of \$A66 billion for livestock industries and \$A28 billion for cropping industries.

The \$A47 billion worth of US subsidies comes from \$A81 billion for livestock industries and another \$A16 billion for the cropping sector.

The other really big player is, predictably, Japan, which forked out about \$A40 billion to its farmers—a large part of which went into the rice industry.

It goes on to say:

Hence the OECD counts the Government's \$2.8 billion guarantee on wool industry debt, and boosted Rural Adjustment Scheme spending, in assistance calculations—and comes up with a 5 per cent increase in producer subsidies for 1990 . . . Even so, the OECD costed Australian farm assistance for 1990 at . . . \$A1.7 billion, representing an 11 per cent producer income subsidy . . . By contrast, an American farmer in 1990 was taking fully 30 per cent of his farm income from the Government—and passing on an effective food tax of 19 per cent to his consumers.

A European farmer had it even softer with 48 per cent of his income courtesy of subsidy and . . . European housewives paid an extra 40c in the dollar for their food.

Our farmers do not want this subsidy. We recognise that the nation cannot afford to provide the subsidy. What we want is a fair go from our competitors and a fair go from Government. I believe that, if we are given a fair go, we can compete better than anyone. But, if this unholy alliance between the EC and the United States continues, it will have the effect of destroying agriculture not only in Aus-

tralia but in many developing countries, and will breed hatred and resentment towards the Americans.

The rural people of Australia have been very pro-American, but I can tell you now that that is waning on a daily basis. If the President of the United States comes to this country, there will be the inclination to have public demonstrations, because the people will have no other method of expressing their anger.

Mr Ferguson: Like the Vietnam demonstrations?

Mr GUNN: I don't know: I wasn't part of that, nor did I support it. However, that is another subject. That will be the only way for them to vent their anger. They have no other means at their disposal. I believe that most members are fair and reasonable. We must bring home to the Americans the folly of this exercise. In the long term, it cannot do any good for the American economy. If those industries have to survive on the basis of being subsidised, they are finished in the long term, and so is the EEC.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

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

Mr GUNN: I sincerely hope that we can come forward with soundly based alternative policies to put before the President of the United States when he visits this country. Otherwise, the unfortunate decline that is taking place in my electorate and in electorates across the country will continue. What concerns me is that young people are leaving the most productive and well run farms and are competing for jobs in country towns which normally they would not be seeking, whether it is work in a quarry, for the council or in a garage—and there are not too many garages left—or trying to get a job on a fishing boat.

Mr Venning: Or at Roxby.

Mr GUNN: Or at Roxby, Leigh Creek or elsewhere. The older generation is being left to run those farms. In many cases there is a need for those young people to stay to keep the properties fully operational. What concerns me is that our agriculture sector will deteriorate. The fences and the sheds will deteriorate, because there is only so much that an individual can do in the daylight. As people get older, the ability to sustain themselves with hard work diminishes, as we all know. I know from personal experience. When I go home to the farm on a rare occasion, I find I am not as fit as I used to be. I cannot grab a sheep and throw it over the fence as I used to do; nor can the rest of the community when they reach 50 years of age. That is the sad thing that is taking place in rural Australia.

I am aware that the Government is concerned, but there are many things that ought to be examined. Otherwise, the situation will get worse. I am concerned that there appears to be a lack of understanding about the need for the Government to get out of the way of industry. Recently I have been involved with people who want to develop oyster industries at Ceduna and Thevenard. If ever a group of people has been subjected to the greatest degree of hogwash and nonsense, it is those people.

The Premier should take the lead and say that it is finished, and to those public servants who are causing the trouble he should say, 'You no longer have a job.' There are three Government departments involved and they want to charge them the world. These people merely want to develop their leases. We have got to the situation where one public servant wants to restrict the number of oysters per lease. It does not matter whether there are 1 000, 100 000 or one million. What does it matter? It is nonsense. We have these people racing around causing trouble.

The Government's latest decision to transfer the assessment branch of the pastoral areas to the Department of

Environment and Planning is another ill-conceived, short-sighted and foolish decision. The Lands Department has been very efficient in its administration and management of matters relating to the farming community. When I first became a member of Parliament, the local Lands Department officers were regarded as friends of the farmers. I never had one complaint about them, but today we have a new breed of academic, anti-farmer, basically socialist outlook on life people and they are causing trouble. The Government has appointed to this assessment branch people who may be well meaning and who have a desire to help, but they do not understand, or know anything about the industry. Therefore, they are causing trouble. Their line of thinking is more akin to the Department of Environment and Planning, which is a non-productive department. Really, it is nonsense. The Liberal Party will have to change this immediately it comes into office. It is not necessary to have all those assessment officers. They are a waste of taxpayers' money and they are impeding proper agricultural and pastoral development.

The time has come for the State as a whole to make some decisions. Do we want centralised development? Do we want to get out of the way of people who want to do things? Do we want to allow these people to continue to run roughshod over the rest of the community? If we do not want to have employment or to build anything we can hand over to the Department of Environment and Planning. But, if we want something to happen and if we want to create employment, the heavy hand must be put on the bureaucracy firmly and quickly. That time has long since passed. They may be well-meaning people but they have never been involved in private industry, and that is the problem. If we do not do something about it the community at large will miss out.

Commonsense must prevail, and if it does not the State will have no hope. I could give chapter and verse of people in my electorate racing around interfering, causing trouble and doing nothing constructive. It concerns me that this sort of activity has been allowed to continue.

We are currently going through an interesting exercise looking at the electoral boundaries of this State. I believe that we should have fair electoral boundaries. However, I am concerned about the deliberate attempt to gerrymander electoral boundaries, the main protagonist being the Corporation of Port Augusta. I was surprised to read of that exercise. When one examined it one would think that we were living in Queensland; it was the best exhibition of attempting to gerrymander boundaries since the Hanlon Government, which eventually governed on 40 per cent of the vote—worse than anything that Gair or Bjelke-Petersen had done. It was in line with what the Hanlon Government did.

The Port Augusta Corporation had the audacity to take umbrage when that exercise—which was designed to keep the Liberal Party in opposition forever—was criticised. It may have been an attempt to get the Mayor of Port Augusta or someone else into Parliament, but certainly it was not going to allow isolated communities to be represented. A member of Parliament has lived in Port Augusta for over 50 years. As I said to the Boundaries Commission, if the Liberal Party's suggestion is adhered to, it should continue to have a resident member of Parliament and that will most likely be the present member for Stuart.

I was particularly concerned about and annoyed by that exercise. I believe it is appropriate to bring these sorts of activities to the attention of the Parliament. In my view we already have had a situation where the Parliament was less than wise when it rejected the stance taken by the member

for Flinders, the Speaker and me when we were keen to increase the size of the Parliament. If the current electoral process continues into the future the whole meaning of having a representative Parliament will go out the window because electoral boundaries will be drawn in such a way so as to make no sense whatsoever.

We need boundaries that will allow people reasonable access to their member of Parliament. I believe that the appropriate size of electorates is between 18 000 and 19 000 constituents. In the not too distant future I intend bringing into this Parliament another proposal that will give members of this House the opportunity to reconsider what they did a few months ago. I then might name a few of those people who were keen to support me privately but were ready to duck under the desk when they were called upon. Unless something is done, and unless State Parliaments remain relevant, the ability of State Governments to play an effective role in the community will disappear.

They will disappear if the State Government and State Parliament become the preserve of just those in the metropolitan area and rural Australia will be the first sector to start campaigning to get rid of State Parliaments. Nothing is surer because, unless people have the ability to exert some reasonable influence, they will no longer want to participate in State politics. People living in isolated areas already feel out of it, and the Parliament should give careful consideration to that process in the future, because this is an important matter.

There are a number of other matters facing my electorate about which I am concerned. One is the discussion paper on hospital boards, and I believe firmly that local communities should have the right to manage their own affairs when they so desire. I do not believe in the concept that big is beautiful or that by amalgamating boards and committees we necessarily achieve savings. True, decision-making becomes remote and insensitive to local needs.

Also, I do not agree that it is either wise or sensible to have regional boards. Why should people, whether it be at Jamestown, Port Augusta, Port Pirie or anywhere, have outsiders telling them how to run their hospitals. There is no logic or commonsense in that.

Mr Blacker: It will cost more.

Mr GUNN: As the member for Flinders rightly says, it will cost more. I say to the Government now that I am totally opposed to that concept, which I believe is another attempt to deny local communities the power to manage their own affairs. It is similar to the amalgamation of local government. One can take that concept too far and start denying sections of the community the opportunity to participate. One can talk about efficiency but, if one puts into effect amalgamation proposals that create huge organisations, the capacity of individuals to participate is restricted and the 'I' goes out of local government.

This Parliament ought to look closely at those concepts because, at the end of the day, people should have the opportunity to make decisions that will affect them. If we want to continue with the role of centralisation in the name of efficiency, we will do a great disservice to the community in general. Further, a constituent has raised with me his concerns about people who consign property for sale with business people whom they believe are honest. My constituent put a caravan for sale on consignment with a business organisation in Adelaide believing that his money was safe. The businessman sold the caravan, and a number of other caravans belonging to other people who were not aware that he was a villain and a rogue—

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I will tell the House who this man is in a minute. These unsuspecting people were not paid. This villain ended up being convicted, but unfortunately the court refused to order the person to make restitution and not only did my constituent lose his caravan and all his money but also 11 or 12 other people were placed in the same position. We have taken the matter to the Attorney-General, and I find it hard to understand why the Crown did not appeal against the decision and why the law has not been changed.

I believe firmly that people who consign goods in good faith to others for sale on a commission basis should be covered in some way and we need to look carefully at some form of trust fund arrangement. Something must happen, because this person did not have to make restitution.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Who was it?

Mr GUNN: I will tell the House. My Jamestown constituent in his letter states:

I am writing to confirm my telephone conversation with you yesterday. I phoned your office . . .

He goes on to state:

My query was:

When Odgers was sentenced to imprisonment for defrauding me and others, he was not ordered to pay me or others, the money back. Could you please investigate any avenues in respect to the matters of non-payment to see if this criminal can be ordered to pay me and others.

This gentleman states:

My resources have long since been exhausted with respect to any more civil action. I simply cannot afford the exorbitant lawyers' fees any more.

This particular person also states:

Odgers has defrauded me of \$10 500 and I have spent nearly \$4 000 in trying to gain restitution. I believe that my presence in this matter, e.g., appointment with Mr Sumner, wrote to Police Commissioner, phoned Ombudsman [and went on and spoke to a number of other people], had a bearing on bringing Odgers to justice. As I have stated, my persistence was also costly. I therefore appeal to you to have a critical look at this matter and to please keep me informed.

My constituent does not mind being named. He is a Mr Kittel from Jamestown. He and others were defrauded, and what they cannot understand is why the court did not issue an order that goods that this person owned be seized to make some restitution to these people because they are honest citizens.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr GUNN: And at considerable cost. They are just hard working people from all around the State. There is nothing to stop this fellow, when he comes out of gaol, from setting up another business and starting again, because such people are quite slick at this sort of operation. Either we have to say that we will not allow such a person to register his business name, prevent him from operating, or there should be some system whereby the Commissioner of Corporate Affairs can say, 'You must put aside a bond or carry compulsory insurance', or there must be some other method to protect these people.

The real problem is that most people engage in only one or two of these sorts of transactions in a lifetime and they are not really equipped to deal with these people, who are most devious; they are professional scoundrels and, in my view, they ought to be brought to justice. This matter has taken a great deal of my constituent's time and effort and he is most distressed, as he ought to be, about this whole matter. He has my total sympathy. I have raised this matter today and I have named him because I want to give a warning to other people who may be unfortunate enough to be affected by the sort of activity in which this person has been involved.

The other thing I am concerned about is that the registration of the caravan was transferred without the owner's permission. That is a matter we ought to look at very carefully, that is, when the registration is transferred from one owner to another. Mr Acting Speaker, I know that you would feel concern about that matter. I sincerely hope that the Attorney-General's Department and his legal officers will have another look at this matter, because it is of great concern to me and because, if it has happened to this constituent, it will happen to others.

I look forward to this session, because I believe that the Parliament will have to keep a very close watch on the finances of this State. This Government has created, or has been allowed to create, more financial disasters than any other Government in the history of this State. Therefore, it is incumbent upon this Parliament to examine closely and monitor its operations. I believe that the time is long since past when the Government should be made to account for its actions. It was unfortunate that last week the Parliament did not agree to that course of action, but I believe that in the not too distant future the choice clearly has to be made whether members will vote to stay in this place—it is rather cosy and comfortable—or whether we will allow the people to make a judgment and elect a Government that will have a new direction, new policies, new aims and more energy.

That is a decision that has to be made. I would say to the member for Semaphore and the member for Elizabeth that they can no longer afford to keep in power a Government which does not have the confidence of the people of this State. I say that not in a purely political sense but because its economic policies have been such that it has brought the nation to the verge of financial bankruptcy.

What really concerns me is that, if all the money that has been spent and wasted had been invested in capital and other projects around South Australia, it could have done so much good. It could have employed so many people and relieved some of that terrible hardship, strain and stress which is out there in the real world. That is the decision which the member for Semaphore and the member for Elizabeth have to make. No longer will they be able to hide behind the fact that their people want this Government to stay in power, because 52 per cent of the people did not want it at the time of the last election.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): It gives me great pleasure to support the motion which is before the Chair. I take the opportunity to express my admiration of Her Majesty the Queen, the Queen of Australia. I do resent the suggestions made by members opposite, particularly the member for Kavel, that members on this side of the House should be in any way disrespectful to Her Majesty the Queen of Australia. Until the Australian public take the opportunity for constitutional change, members on this side of the House will be found giving Her Majesty her due respects. I find it absolutely out of bounds that any member opposite would suggest otherwise.

What really rankles is the suggestion from members opposite that the Australian public should not have the opportunity from time to time to change their own Constitution to make up their mind whether or not there ought to be a monarchy. The fact that members opposite are trying to bully members on this side, when we support the fact that the Australian people should have an opportunity to say what their future should be so far as the monarchy is concerned, is something that I find incomprehensible.

I support the address given by Dame Roma Mitchell. So far, no member opposite—and seven or eight have contrib-

uted to this debate already—has referred to the fact that this is the first time we have had the opportunity to hear a speech delivered in the Legislative Council by a woman Governor. I believe that the Cabinet has to be congratulated for inviting Dame Roma to take over this position. I must say that I thought she did an admirable job, and it was refreshing to see a woman in the Chair.

Dr Armitage: She speaks highly of you, too!

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Adelaide is tending to be sarcastic. It is the first time we have had the opportunity to listen to a woman Governor, but this has not been recognised so far by members of the Opposition. We are getting snide remarks from the member for Adelaide about what he thinks of the appointment of a woman Governor, and I find that absolutely disgraceful. I support everything that she put before us, and I congratulate her on the way in which she handled the occasion. I believe that it is fitting that the Parliament should be honoured by her presence, particularly in view of her record.

I extend my condolences to the families of the members of Parliament who have passed away since my last Address in Reply speech. I refer to the Hon. Dr Victor George Springett, member of the Legislative Council from 1967 to 1975, who died on 8 September 1990; Mr Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles, member of the Legislative Council; and the Hon. Clarence Ross Story, member of the Legislative Council. I came into the Parliament long after these people had left, so there is not much that I can say about them other than to express to their families my condolences, as is fitting in this Address in Reply.

I turn to a matter that has bothered me regarding the conduct of the Parliament since our return. It has nothing to do with the Chair but rather with the way in which the Opposition has handled the situation. Over the past 18 months this House has been subjected to one of the most irresponsible performances ever displayed by a political Leader. Since the member for Victoria took over the reigns of the Liberal Party he has continuously resorted to cheap political point scoring, opportunism and sensationalism in his failed attempt to discredit the Labor Government in this State. His performance shows us that as a political Leader he is ineffectual and inept. He lacks credibility and leadership qualities. Neither he nor his Party has what it takes to govern. He is always the first the criticise, but I have yet to hear him come up with any viable alternatives. He attacks the Government only to destabilise and undermine the confidence of people in the future of South Australia.

When things go wrong his Party calls for the resignation of Government Ministers. Members offer no constructive criticism or solutions. They have no policies or ideas. It appears that the only answer the Liberal Party has when the going gets tough is to resign. How can anybody take the Leader seriously when he is not clear about what he believes in. His allegations of mismanagement lack substance and proof. He tries in vain to link the Government with the State Bank losses and describes the Government Management Board review of SGIC as 'the most damning report ever written of a Government'. Professor Henderson of the SGIC inquiry finds the Opposition claims quite inappropriate. He says 'that the majority of SGIC's operations are well managed and conducted efficiently'.

In his attempt to gain a sensational headline the Leader of the Opposition once again has been counterproductive. His comments are likely to do more harm than good. He operates on the premise of where there is smoke there is fire. If he sees a wisp of smoke he whips himself into a frenzy in an endeavour to fan it into a roaring flame. He

tries to destabilise the Government, but in fact he is disrupting the workings of the State, and that impacts on the people that he claims to represent. He falsely accuses the Government of implementing policies designed purely to raise revenue and misleads the public with his statements. For example, since the introduction of speed cameras, deaths on South Australian roads have been reduced. In the first six months of their operation road deaths have been reduced by 11.8 per cent and the number of accident injuries have been reduced by more than 10 per cent over the same period.

In spite of this success, and the millions of dollars saved on medical costs and car insurance, the Liberal Party accuses the Government of only trying to raise revenue. In his attempt to gain the upper hand, the Leader of the Opposition has even stooped so low as to say that law and order is out of control in the streets of South Australia. He also resorts to desperate measures to try to create a situation of chaos in the administration of this State. His accusations are absolute rubbish, and they are nothing more than an insult to the intelligence and integrity of the voting public. The latest poll results show that the Leader of the Opposition remains publicly unpopular. His antics have not fooled the people of South Australia. They know that a vote for the Liberals is a vote for social upheaval and chaos, and they are not prepared to place their future in the hands of somebody whose scruples disappear when it comes to fighting for power.

During the parliamentary recess I had the opportunity to visit New Zealand and to test the new industrial relations laws in that country. We have already been promised—and, the week after my visit, the Leader of the Opposition visited New Zealand and told the conservative New Zealand Government—that whatever their proposals were he would do better. He thought those proposals were absolutely superb and he would follow them to the last iota. In addition, the member for Bragg, who is the Liberal spokesman on industrial relations, has told us in this House that, if given the opportunity, he intends to deregulate industrial relations in this State.

In New Zealand the Opposition was captured by the far right in the form of the Business Round Table. Because the Labor Party had moved to the centre ground, the Opposition believed that it had to take up the far right, and a group calling itself the Business Round Table took over and captured the conservative Opposition in New Zealand. When the conservative Opposition became the Government it found itself in an impossible position. It had to support the right, because it was this right wing organisation that had carried it on to power. The Business Round Table is leading the conservative Government in New Zealand by the nose and the laws that it is introducing in that country are nothing short of disgraceful. The introduction of the new Employment Contracts Bill significantly reduces the power of unions in New Zealand. The right wing conservative Government in New Zealand has reduced social security payments by 10 per cent to 25 per cent and it has driven the economy through the floor.

We know that the Federal Leader of the Liberal Party has also stated that in his opinion social security payments should be reduced. So, already the promise has been made that the conservatives in Australia will follow the conservative Government in New Zealand and reduce social security payments. What has that done in New Zealand? It has brought absolute poverty to some areas. The amount of money that has been taken out of the economy has closed down the middle class; it has hit the very people who normally support the conservative Government in New

Zealand, and the small businesses there are far worse off than they are here. If members think there is a recession here in South Australia, I invite them to go over to New Zealand to see what the conservative Government has done to the middle class in that country.

It is absolutely devastated. It is no wonder that the conservative Government is 20 points behind in the opinion polls in that country. If the conservative Opposition here in South Australia, together with its Federal colleagues, does what it has promised to do, I feel sure that it will also reduce unemployment benefits. New Zealanders are just the same as Australians and, if they think they are getting robbed, if they think they are working for nothing or for a pittance, like Australians they will tell the employer what he can do with his job. In order to make sure that does not happen in New Zealand, unemployment benefits have been cut severely, making sure that someone losing his job cannot get back on unemployment benefits for six months.

This morning's *Advertiser* carried the Opposition's proposal for forced labour camps and they will become a reality so far as our culture is concerned because that is the only way that we will be able to support the unemployed if unemployment benefits are cut, and that is the way the conservatives have gone and are going. There has also been an attack in New Zealand on Medicare, workers compensation and insurance—the very things that Dr Hewson is promising us. Dr Hewson is promising us that he will abandon Medicare and he has—

Dr Armitage: Howe is already doing it.

Mr FERGUSON: I am glad that we are getting an interjection from the good doctor because this is something that the good doctor ought to be terribly concerned about.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will refer to members opposite by their correct title.

Mr FERGUSON: I beg your pardon, Sir. The member for Adelaide, who is trying to shout me down at the moment, ought to be concerned about this proposition from the Hewson Opposition that it abandon Medicare. If he has not read the position paper that has been put out by the good Dr Hewson, I suggest that he does so. He is trying to abandon Medicare in Australia and give everyone a little coupon. With that little coupon we will have to race around to all the hospitals to try to get the best deal. All the doctors will go into competition with each other, which is a good private enterprise solution to the problem, but it will mean the end of Medicare. That is the proposition that Hewson is putting up and it is the proposition that conservative Governments throughout the world are following. In the UK, Margaret Thatcher almost destroyed the medical system, and that is the sort of thing that we are faced with.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Tell them about the consumption tax.

Mr FERGUSON: My colleague mentions the consumption tax. I had the opportunity of testing out the consumption tax in New Zealand. I compared prices and found that, in New Zealand, the prices for goods and services are on a par with the prices for goods and services in South Australia, yet the New Zealand dollar is worth about 65c to the Australian dollar. New Zealand wages, which have been driven down by the conservative Government, are nowhere near the wages in this country. The reason is that there was a huge inflationary increase when the goods and services tax was introduced.

The Conservative Government in New Zealand is boasting about the fact that it has inflation down to 2 per cent. Anyone could get inflation down to 2 per cent if they sacked half the people. The point is that that huge inflation rate that originally came about when the first goods and services

tax was applied is still there, and the good public of New Zealand is paying for it—and paying through the nose. It is interesting to note that in the United Kingdom the goods and services tax has gone up by another 2.5 per cent, which means 17.5 per cent on everything.

Every time you go to a supermarket; every time you buy a bottle of milk; every time you buy a block of chocolate and every time you go to the football, another 17.5 per cent. Imagine going to Football Park and dishing out your money for a seat, then, as far as Hewson is concerned, you have to whack on another 17.5 per cent. Imagine the inflationary spiral that would ensue. I was privy to negotiations between an employer and an employee in a hotel, under the new legislation that was introduced in New Zealand. They did not know who I was: I did not volunteer the fact that I was a politician from Australia, I did not volunteer the fact that I had an interest in the industrial movement. I just sat there and listened while these negotiations were taking place.

This is the sort of thing we will be faced with if we have a Liberal Administration in this State. Here was a manager of an international chain of hotels, with all the power of the hotels behind him, negotiating with a 16-year-old girl who had no representative, no help and no knowledge of the industrial system. This was her first job, and they were negotiating a contract. This manager made it extremely clear to her that he was going to work her on low wages, that he was going to call her in at any hour of the day or night—and this was part of the contract—and that she would receive no penalty rates. The farmers opposite are nodding their heads: what a good idea—no penalty rates. A 16-year-old girl called in to work until 1 o'clock in the morning on a Saturday and a Sunday night, and she gets no penalty rates. That is fair? That is what would occur in this State if we had a Conservative Administration. That is what we would be faced with.

Those people who leave their jobs voluntarily or who are sacked for misconduct cannot receive the dole for 26 weeks, under this legislation. Unemployed people who do not take a job deemed suitable by the employment service, no matter how low that wage rate, how bad that position or how temporary the work, do not receive the dole for 26 weeks.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Hanson says that that sounds all right to him. Well, what do you do?

Mr BECKER: On a point of order, I ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark. It was total misrepresentation. I said that it sounds like there will be a lot of crime.

The SPEAKER: I must apologise to the House, as I was in conversation with the Clerk. What was the actual remark?

Mr BECKER: The honourable member said that I said that that was all right. It is absolutely not true. I did not say anything like that at all.

Mr FERGUSON: I apologise. I have no problem with that; if the honourable member did not say that, then I totally, absolutely and humbly apologise. I thought that the honourable member was cheering when I said that, but, if he was not, I take it back absolutely. The age at which one can obtain the lower paid youth dole of \$NZ105.17 per week (with a value of 65 per cent of the Australian dollar) has been raised from 20 to 25.

I had the opportunity of meeting the New Zealand Council of Trade Unions. That body did its best to stop this legislation going through, but the Conservative Government in New Zealand had a huge majority and it could do nothing about it. However, it got 250 000 people out on the streets in Wellington protesting about what the Conservatives were doing to their country. Those who know New Zealand

would realise what a huge crowd that is—250 000 people on the streets. The Prime Minister of New Zealand has a lower popularity rate than the Leader of the Opposition, and that never occurred during the Labor Administration, even though people were saying very harsh words about the Labor Government. I hope that they have only one term to go.

One would have thought that only the trade unions would be complaining about this legislation, but the New Zealand Catholic Bishops Conference had a lot to say about it. With reference to the legislation, it states:

It redefines the internationally understood terms, freedom of association and right to organise in trade unions, thus hampering the right to form unions. It also restricts the right to strike.

There is no doubt that it restricts the right to strike. This legislation, which the Conservatives would love to see in this State, restricts anybody from withdrawing their labour for the time that a contract lasts. The only time that a strike can occur is when the contract ends and the next contract starts.

The bishops in New Zealand said that the legislation was proposed in a depressed economic climate and that the Government was taking advantage of the fact that the economic climate was so low. They said that the Government 'also proposes that the welfare state has had its time.'

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: We get agreement from the other side. So woe betide those people in marginal seats who intend to vote for the Liberal Party who are now on unemployment benefits and who are now receiving social security benefits or who are now on the bottom of the ladder, because this is the sort of noise that we are receiving from the other side. They agree that the welfare state has had its day. The Catholic bishops say:

This is an economic approach which the Church views with grave concern, because it puts capital and resources alone at the centre of economic activity and considers human labour solely according to its economic purpose.

This legislative change is not simply a technical issue. It involves ethics and morality. The question must be asked what the new legislation does to people and society, to human dignity and the common good. As bishops of New Zealand we must speak against this proposed legislation as its underlying ideology is contrary to the social doctrines of the Church. . . . The underlying ideology of the new industrial legislation is unacceptable for two reasons: firstly, because it emphasises free choice without balancing this concept with concern for the . . . public good; and, secondly, because it emphasises the rights of the individual without their accompanying duty to act in solidarity and without giving any corresponding rights to the group.

I hope that we do not see a conservative administration in this State that would be prepared to take over the same policies and ideology that have been proposed by the conservative Government of New Zealand.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I am amused by some of the remarks made by the member for Henley Beach during the course of his dissertation to which we have just been treated. They were clearly meant for entertainment rather than to be taken seriously. There was one that I think he expected that we would take seriously, and that was the general tenor of the remarks with which he began his speech. If members recall, the member for Henley Beach asked us all to respect him and other members opposite, including the member for Napier who chimed in by way of interjection, and to continue to respect Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Queen of Australia.

If members opposite felt so strongly about retaining respect for the head of State, the Monarch, being separate from the head of Government, in the fashion that they now are, why on earth did they say nothing when we were confronted

with this creeping republican approach whereby the term 'God Save the Queen' was omitted at the conclusion of the proclamation, as it has also been omitted from the conclusion of all proclamations made and printed in the *Government Gazette*—it no longer appears there.

No decision was made in this place to omit that. No decision was made by way of consultation with any member on this side of the Chamber or any of our colleagues in the other place. Therefore, I draw attention to the hypocrisy, as I perceive it, of what the honourable member protests about. I draw attention to only one other matter that the honourable member mentioned in the course of his remarks, and that is, to quote him exactly:

A vote for Liberals is a vote for social upheaval and chaos.

I wonder what the voters of this State would think if the member for Henley Beach, prior to the 1982 election, had told them (by way of a promise in the certain knowledge of the outcome) that we would today have youth unemployment approaching 30 per cent, and that we would today in South Australia have the highest unemployment (over 10 per cent) of mainland States. Would members opposite be saying that a vote for the Liberals is a vote for social upheaval and chaos? Would they describe their own achievements as anything less than social upheaval and chaos?

As has been illustrated in recent times in daily newspapers, with the number of people who are dependent on drugs and the number of young people who are increasingly finding their way into crime statistics in South Australia, had the Labor Party made that promise and made it as a statement of fact in 1982, I doubt whether it would have won Government. I am quite certain that the promises it has made and broken along the way mean that it deserves to be thrown out of office at the first opportunity.

Mr Venning: And it will be.

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, it is my belief that it will be. Unlike the member for Henley Beach, that is not a hope—it is a certainty. The Labor Party will deserve that treatment from the electorate for the way in which it has deceived them about what is possible as opposed to what it has delivered. I now wish to draw the attention of the House to a matter which concerns me and which arises from my portfolio of responsibilities, that is, the practice we now have of importing power from the Eastern States.

I propose to read into the record a statement I have made on this matter, as follows:

A draft report by the Federal Government Industry Commission claims that the SA Government is examining importing electricity and exporting ETSA jobs as a supply option instead of power generation in South Australia.

The three volume Industry Commission report on energy generation and distribution released last week states that 'potential exists within the existing (SA-Victoria) link for SA to receive contract energy transfers of up to the equivalent of 250MW of annual generation. The SA Government is addressing this in its consideration of supply-side options [in the State's power generation and delivery]. . . . The Government is also planning to import electricity from NSW. The draft report states that the NSW electricity authority estimates that it will sell an extra 35 percent more power interstate in 1990-91 and the Industry Commission reports that 'this would be equivalent to 5.5 per cent of ETSA's load'. It is now clear that the Liberal Party was right to say that the Bannon Government is planning to import electricity at the same time as it reduces ETSA employees.

While I support improving labour productivity in ETSA, the deception surrounding these secret Government plans is totally unacceptable—the Minister should come clean immediately and tell ETSA staff and the public of the Government's plans.

The Government has not done that. Moreover, in recent times the Premier has also been to a Premiers Conference at which he went on the public record as saying that he was happy to share an interconnection involving ETSA's power

grid and the electricity grids of south-east Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. That is all very well, and where it is rational it is valuable and sensible, but what the Premier was saying, I suspect, was that he would again put South Australia in the position of becoming dependent for its base-load supply of energy on the supply of basic sources of energy from the eastern states in an industrial relations milieu over which the South Australian Parliament and Government have no control.

I mention this because the then Premier of South Australia in the late 1940s, the late Sir Thomas Playford, decided to cut that umbilical cord and make sure that we were independent in our basic supply of energy from the eastern States. At that time we had been subjected to brownouts and blackouts in consequence of coal miners strikes, which went on week after week and month after month in their intransigence. It was an industrial relations problem over which we had no control.

We could not step in to solve our own problem. Sir Thomas Playford then recognised that South Australia and its Parliament needed to have some control over this vital resource in our community and our industry if we were to develop a diversified manufacturing base from what had been a largely rural economy, as we emerged from the Second World War. He set about not only nationalising the Adelaide Electric Supply Company but also developing a basic source of energy in the form of the Leigh Creek coalfield to supply the new powerhouses that he built in consequence of taking that decision.

We again find ourselves unwarily and unwittingly, and certainly foolishly (if that is what the Premier intends), exposing our capacity to diversify and expand our manufacturing base in the State's economy to industrial relations problems in the eastern States over which we have no control. A power workers strike in the eastern States would again leave us with brownouts and blackouts if we become dependent for base-load capacity on power from the eastern States.

It would be foolish in the extreme for us not to negotiate simultaneously, not only for deregulation of the labour market but also for the guarantees of supply so that we were not the last party on the end of the line, and, if there were to be any industrial problems in other States from which we were expecting to be able to get supplies of electricity under that contract, we would be at least assured of our fair share, according to the terms of the contract from the authority generating and selling it to us.

Having made that point emphatically, let me go on to address another problem that arises in the context of the two portfolios for which I have responsibility, namely, energy and mines. Controversy is raging at present about the need to address the demand side options available to us to reduce the amount of electricity we use in South Australia and thereby avoid, in this high interest rate regime, the necessity to find the capital to expand our generating capacity in some way or another to build another power house somewhere to be fuelled by whatever basic source of energy it may be—gas, coal or whatever else.

To do that, to address the question of reducing demand side utilisation of electricity, we must use smart technology, the kind of technology that we speak about when we discuss the MFP—if it ever comes to fruition or gets off the ground. It is the kind of technology that the world is seeking to embrace, and it depends upon one very important natural resource. South Australia has quite a deal of that important natural resource and the Government also has plans before it for the establishment of a processing plant of that vital natural resource. It is minerals, and it is the kind of minerals

known as rare earths. Why they are called rare earths, goodness knows. Perhaps it is because they were not readily and easily identified early in the time of discovery of elements and the establishment of the Periodic Table. However, they make up more than 1 per cent of the mass of the earth's crust.

These rare earths provide us with the capacity to build micro-magnets, which are very much stronger per unit weight than anything we can otherwise manufacture using ordinary ferrous materials. They also provide us with other means by which we can save our energy needed for lighting. They also have very hard, sharp cutting edges, which go on wearing, almost forever by comparison with the amount of wear we can get from conventional cutting edges in industry. Rare earths, then, are an important part of the future, and they are an important part of this State's future development—its economy. They have the capacity to lead to the generation of hundreds of jobs and to bring into this State exports worth hundreds of millions of dollars.

It is technology which is now well known and which would be easily and readily put in place in Port Pirie. I hope that this Government recognises the great benefits available to us, not only through the establishment of that refining process at Port Pirie but also through the use of the end product and the value added to it. The current fear being whipped up by those people who choose to keep members of the general public ignorant of the facts ought to be exposed. The public needs to know, as I have said before in this place, that refinement of monazite sands, for instance, does not produce any more radioactive material than is already present in that sand in the natural environment. Monazite sands occur in the natural environment in considerable quantities on our southern metropolitan beaches.

For instance, for the next couple of months, if one were to visit Moana after two or three days of steady onshore winds during this equinox period, in the morning light before dogs and human beings had stirred up the sand, one would notice a pink glow in the sands. That is a consequence of the wind having shifted those finer and lighter grains of sand back off the beach, leaving behind the heavier radioactive grains of sand which have more of the monazite sands in content and which contain a radioactive compound apart from rare earths. The radioactive substance is a radioactive element known as thorium.

We are not increasing or decreasing the amount of the radioactive substance present. People can go and lie on the beach at Moana and get a sun tan top and bottom without having to turn over after such a phenomenon of onshore winds lasting two or three days. The tan which could result from exposure to the radioactive compound in the monazite sand enables that to happen. There is no reason for anyone to be afraid. There is no recorded evidence of surfers contracting cancer from going to Moana compared with any other beach. Indeed, there is no difference. So, one can expect that there will not be any difference by refining the monazite sands that are presently left in the tailings dams at Port Pirie.

However, if the Government is foolish enough to leave those materials where they are, they continue to represent whatever hazard they involve in that state, and the Government continues to deny us the valuable potential export-earned income from allowing them to be refined and finally placing in a safe mix, out of harm's way, underground somewhere, the radioactive material that is found in those grains of sand after they have been refined from the rare earths.

Having dealt with those two matters, let me address a matter that is more relevant to the concerns of my portfolio as shadow Minister of Lands. We learnt on 6 August, in an announcement by the Minister, that she intended to shift the Outback Management Branch from the Department of Lands to the Department of Environment and Planning, without so much as 'beg your pardon', 'by your leave' or anything else. We know the Minister's form: she does it first and fixes it later, as do a good many other Ministers of this Government. They do not seem to mind. They do not bother to consult anyone who will be affected. They do these things for the quaintest of reasons, such as the nonsense she put in this news release about this transfer, as follows:

... as part of the process of seeking more efficient use of Government resources ...

The Minister has decided to transfer the functions associated with the administration and management of pastoral leases from the Department of Lands to the Department of Environment and Planning. Nobody in the pastoral industry or in the United Farmers and Stockowners section dealing with the pastoral industry had any consultation whatsoever from the Minister about her plans. Why on earth she would want to strip that from the Department of Lands and place it in the Department of Environment and Planning, and then claim it as a more efficient use of Government resources, is beyond me. There does not seem to me to be any reduction at all in expense. Quite clearly, there is a partisan political agenda afoot, and the Minister is trying to obscure it by making these (what I would call) deceitful statements about the impact of the decision.

This portion of the department is the Outback Management Branch. She stated that programs undertaken by this portion of the Department of Environment and Planning include also—I presume she means—the coastal management program, the native vegetation management program and the Aboriginal heritage program. The outback is not the coast, and the outback is not the agricultural lands to

which native vegetation management controls have been put in place. Its Aboriginal heritage program in the Department of Environment and Planning might well be moved from there to the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, using the trite reasons given by the Minister for this move.

She emphasised, in making the announcement of the changes, that the opportunities for increased efficiencies in the delivery of Government programs were associated with natural resources management. I fail to see where they occur. She said that there were a number of activities undertaken within the Outback Management Branch of the Department of Lands, which is supposed to have been associated with the activities of those other divisions within the Department of Environment and Planning to which I have just referred. I fail to see the sense of it, and it is arrant nonsense on the part of the Minister and has caused a great deal of concern amongst the pastoralists—and quite understandably. She says that pastoralists know better than anyone how important is good land management and that they appreciate the need to use the land in a sustainable fashion. I agree with her utterly and cannot understand why she says it is necessary to then put it into the hands of the Department of Environment and Planning. It is just so much nonsense.

I now turn to the concerns that I have for my own constituency and, indeed, for the most important enterprise undertaken by the people and communities that I represent, namely, farming. Over the years we have seen an erosion in the terms of trade of farmers, a reduction in the number of people involved in farming, an increase in the personal debt of each of those people and an alarming rise in the increasing debt since the early 1980s. To illustrate my point I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a table from the *Agricultural and Resources Quarterly* entitled 'Business Income' which illustrates the net value of farm production from 1983-84 to 1989-90. The table is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

	Business income						
	1983-84 \$m	1984-85 \$m	1985-86 \$m	1986-87 \$m	1987-88 \$m	1988-89 \$m	1989-90(p) \$m
Farm							
Net value of farm production	3 508	2 971	1 211	1 914(r)	3 500(r)	4 305(r)	3 961
Company profits in selected industries(a)							
Mining							
Metallic minerals	442	497	555	760	1 264	1 501	2 039
Other	2 294	2 632	3 256	2 720	2 552	2 039	3 004
Total	2 736	3 129	3 811	3 480	3 816	3 540	5 043
Manufacturing							
Food, beverages and tobacco	709	797	904	965	1 108	1 172	1 314
Textiles, clothing and footwear	209	142	182	232	261	324	264
Paper and printing	453	479	391	378	551	331	418
Chemicals, petroleum and coal products	514	528	546	765	1 246	1 206	1 023
Basic metal products	546	464	246	372	858	1 905	1 454
Other manufacturing	1 551	2 040	1 843	1 938	2 591	3 678	3 343
Total	3 982	4 450	4 112	4 650	6 615	8 616	7 816
Other industries (excluding farm and community services)	2 634	2 877	2 594	3 483	4 224	5 037	3 348
Total (excluding farm and community services)	9 352	10 456	10 517	11 613	14 655	17 193	16 207
Mineral resources sector(b)	3 282	3 593	4 057	3 852	4 674	5 445	6 497

(a) Company profits before income tax. (b) Sum of mining and basic metal products industries. (p) Preliminary. (r) Revised. Sources: Australian Bureau of Statistics; Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics.

Mr LEWIS: We see from the table that the net value of farm production in 1983-84 was \$3.5 billion or so; in 1984-85 it came down to \$2.971 billion; in 1985-86 it came down further to \$1.2 billion; in 1986-87 it rose to \$1.9 billion; in 1987-88 it further rose to \$3.5 billion; in 1988-89 it rose to \$4.3 billion; and last year it was \$3.9 billion. This year it

will be disastrously lower. If we look also at other industries, we see that they have not suffered such violent fluctuations in income, nor have they had the dramatic downturn that we have seen in the farm sector. In fact, in 1983-84 the total business income, excluding farm and community services, was \$9.352 billion, in 1988-89 it was \$17.1 billion and

in 1989-90 it was \$16.2 billion. I have another table illustrating farm indebtedness to financial institutions. It shows what has happened since 1970, in 1980 and up to 1990, as at 30 June in each case. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard*

this table showing farm indebtedness to the various kinds of financial institutions and the total institutional indebtedness. The table is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

	1970 \$m	1980 \$m	1986 \$m	1987 \$m	1988 \$m	1989 \$m	1990 \$m
Major trading banks(b)							
Term and farm development loans(c)			1 965	1 502	1 296	1 230	1 146
Other(d)			1 944	1 997	2 385	3 639	4 417
Total(c)			3 909	3 499	3 681	4 869	5 563
Finance companies (c) (e)			717	1 327	1 195	1 503	1 523
Commonwealth Development Bank(c)			685	743	766	805	750
Life insurance companies(g)			74	89	71	61	77
Other government agencies (including state banks)(c)			1 891	2 295	2 498	2 857	3 223
Primary Industry Bank of Australia(c)			695	599	636	587	568
Total instutional indebtedness(e) (h)	2 082	3 769	7 971	8 552	8 847	10 682	11 704

(a) At 30 June of year indicated. (b) Figures for the major trading banks refer to the second Wednesday in July. (c) PIBA commenced lending operations in November 1978. the data shown for PIBA include both loans made directly to PIBA and loans refinanced through a network of prime lenders comprising banks and other institutions. The data for these institutions have been adjusted to exclude their loans refinanced by the PIBA. (d) Includes overdrafts and other advances but excludes bank bills. (e) Break in series between 1986 and 1987—earlier data refers to pastoral finance companies only; further break in series between 1989 and 1990, due to the inclusion of some loans not identified prior to 1990. (g) Includes only mortgage loans. (h) Excludes lease agreements and indebtedness to hire purchase companies, trade creditors, private lenders and small financial institutions.

Sources: Reserve Bank of Australia; Australian Bureau of Statistics; Primary Industry Bank of Australia; Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics.

Mr LEWIS: If members look at the table they will note that in 1970 just over \$2 billion was the total farm indebtedness to all financial institutions; in 1980 it had risen to \$3.769 billion. Then, six years later in 1986, it was \$7.97 billion, and last year at 30 June the farm debt had risen to \$11.7 billion. Bear in mind that it used to be \$2 billion just 20 years ago. It is now \$11.7 billion.

Farmers are few in number; they are more heavily in debt, to the tune of 5.5 times the previous level; and their terms of trade, to which I will turn, have fallen dramatically by comparison. That is why my constituents find themselves in this terrible predicament of having negative income. I am not talking about negative income after they make allowance for the food and clothing they need for their families. Before they allow for one thread of clothing or one crumb of bread on the table, farmers will have negative incomes in more than 60 per cent of instances in my electorate this year. At the end of the day, after having worked all year, they will be further in debt than they were at the beginning of the year. The only problem with that is that, if they were not to work, they would be even further in debt, so they would go broke more rapidly if they did not work.

They are going broke; that is what it amounts to, and it is not their fault. It is the fault of the economic and industrial relations policies and arrangements that have been pursued by this Government and the Federal Government—especially the Federal Government. This is the recession we had to have and these are the consequential high interest rates that the Treasurer we really did not need gave us—interest rates which, he said, would damp down total demand. Those interest rates do damp down total demand but they also adversely impact on farmers and increase the rate at which they go into debt, because they cannot generate sufficient income to meet those interest rates.

When they took their loans in 1985, 1986 and 1987, the interest rates were nowhere near the levels of the past 12 months, and farmers had no idea they would be as bad as they are. After all, Bob Hawke promised us that they would fall and continue to fall, even before the election before last, but that did not happen. It has also meant that the dollar has remained high as hot cash comes into Australia from around the world, chasing those high interest rates and lifting the value of the Australian dollar as a consequence. So, I seek leave to insert into *Hansard* a table, which is purely statistical, which shows farm returns, costs and prices and which illustrates these points.

Leave granted.

Year	Gross value of farm production \$m	Farm costs \$m	Net value of farm production \$m	Index of real net value of farm production (a) (b)	Index of prices received (b)	Index of prices paid (b)	Farmers' terms of trade (b) (c)	Consumer price index (b)
1952-53	2 331	1 154	1 177	163(r)	41	20	209	23
1957-58	2 256	1 553(r)	703(r)	85(r)	38	22	169	26
1962-63	2 990	1 861(r)	1 129(r)	126	37	26	143	29
1967-68	3 342	2 472	870	84(r)	39	30	129	33
1972-73	4 957	3 132	1 825	141	52	36	147	41
1977-78	6 991	5 697(r)	1 294(r)	54(r)	65	74	88	77
1978-79	10 264	6 521(r)	3 743(r)	144	79	79	100	83
1979-80	11 778	7 604(r)	4 174(r)	145(r)	94	88	107	91
1980-81	11 550	8 407(r)	3 143(r)	100	100	100	100	100
1981-82	12 644	9 880(r)	2 764(r)	80	99	111	89	110

Farm returns, costs and prices
1980-81 = 100

Year	Gross value of farm production \$m	Farm costs \$m	Net value of farm production \$m	Index of real net value of farm production (a) (b)	Index of prices received (b)	Index of prices paid (b)	Farmers' terms of trade (b) (c)	Consumer price index (b)
1982-83	11 627	11 052(r)	575(r)	15	104	123	84	123
1983-84	15 435	11 927(r)	3 508(r)	85(r)	109	134	82	132
1984-85	15 533	12 651(r)	2 882(r)	67(r)	112	141	79	137
1985-86	15 515	13 834(r)	1 681(r)	36(r)	112	153	73	149
1986-87	17 302(r)	15 388(r)	1 914(r)	49(r)	122	165	74	163
1987-88	20 187	16 687	3 500	70	142	172	82	174
1988-89	22 956	18 651	4 305	72	153	185	85	186
1989-90(p)	23 944	19 983	3 961	—	159	197	80.7	—
1990-91 est.	21 269	20 100	1 169	—	—	—	—	—
1991-92 forecast	19 619	19 350	269	—	—	—	—	—

Mr LEWIS: We should note that in 1980-81 the indices were at 100 and that the gross value of farm production was \$11.5 billion. That was 10 years ago. Gross value of farm production in 1989-90 was \$23.9 billion. That has more than doubled. In 1991 it is \$21.26 billion so, without increasing the land area very much, farmers have doubled the dollars they get in spite of the fact that they have adverse terms of trade with respect to their costs and the currency values imposed on them. Yet, no matter how hard they work, they are still going backwards. That is not fair. It is not fair that, just because the Government finds it convenient to make a sleazy deal with its industrial relations mates in the ACTU (which endorses each member separately and which the Government members have insuffi-

cient stomach to do the right thing about and to take on), such a heavy debt burden is imposed on the families I represent.

If we look at the figures we find that, whereas the farmers' terms of trade were 100, say, in 1980-81, they were down to 80.7 last year. The index on prices received is 159, as opposed to the index of prices they must pay—that is costs—namely, 197 for the same year. That is the year in which income was greatest. The trend is obvious. We have fewer farms and that is illustrated in another table of a purely statistical nature entitled 'Number of farm establishments and farm employment' for the years 1951-52 to 1987-88. I seek leave to insert it in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Number of farm establishments and farm employment

Year	Farm establishments no.	Farm employment				Total '000	Total Australian employment '000	Farm employment as a ratio of total employment %
		Employers and self- employed '000	Wage and salary earners '000	Unpaid family helpers '000				
1951-52	203 350	na	na	na	476.8	na	na	
1956-57	204 500	na	na	na	480.7	na	na	
1961-62	202 200	na	na	na	453.0	4 195.0	10.7	
1966-67	198 400	251.9	139.4	25.7	417.0	4 871.4	8.6	
1971-72	187 650	239.6	144.8	22.8	407.1	5 539.9	7.3	
1976-77	173 650	248.3	107.1	17.6	373.0	5 965.5	6.3	
1977-78	176 150	237.0	107.1	19.8	363.9	6 018.3	6.0	
1978-79	177 220	233.1	113.9	14.1	361.1	6 054.0	6.0	
1979-80	179 080	239.5	124.4	14.7	378.6	6 193.1	6.1	
1980-81	175 760	243.9	124.9	13.6	382.4	6 361.2	6.0	
1981-82	174 470	236.0	132.1	11.9	379.9	6 439.9	5.9	
1982-83	175 730	253.4	120.6	16.8	390.8	6 329.0	6.2	
1983-84	174 030	249.0	121.5	12.2	382.6	6 387.9	6.0	
1984-85	171 440	248.1	116.8	11.2	376.0	6 564.4	5.7	
1985-86	169 700	259.9(a)	124.2(a)	18.4(a)	402.5(a)	6 826.8	5.9	
1986-87	167 200	249.4	118.3	25.3	393.1	7 018.3	5.6	
1987-88	na	241.9	122.2	26.9	390.9	7 231.9	5.4	

(a) The growth in each category of farm employment (7 per cent growth in total farm employment) in 1985-86 is unexpectedly strong. It may reflect factors such as a shift to more labour intensive farm industries, and a changing perception of work roles of women on farms. na Not available. Sources: Australian Bureau of Statistics; Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics.

Mr LEWIS: The number of farm establishments has fallen from over 200 000 to 167 000. The number of employers has fallen quite considerably from 251 000 and the number of wage and salary earners has fallen from 140 000 to 120 000 (and the table shows other interesting information). The Government has been derelict in its duty in failing to recognise the consequences of its policies and their adverse impact upon the people whom I represent.

Farm costs, terms of trade and net returns are included in the last table that I seek leave to insert in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER Order! The honourable member's time has expired but, if it is a purely statistical table, the Chair will allow the honourable member to seek leave to incorporate it in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Farm costs, terms of trade and net returns

	Unit	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90(p)	1990-91(s)	1991-92(f)
	Unit	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90(p)	1990-91(s)	1991-92(f)
Price indexes (a)							
Index of prices received by farmers	index	85	100	112	110	95	90
Index of prices paid by farmers—							
Materials and services	index	93	100	106	111	115	120
Labour	index	96	100	107	115	123	132
Overheads	index	101	100	118	134	129	124
Marketing	index	95	100	110	114	121	128
Total	index	96	100	109	116	119	123
Farmers' terms of trade (b)	index	89	100	102	94	80	73
Returns							
Gross value of farm production	\$m	17 302(r)	20 187(r)	22 956(r)	23 944	21 269	19 619
Increase in farmers' assets held by marketing organisations (c)	\$m	-105	-637	398	227	-192	29
Gross farm cash income (d)	\$m	17 407(r)	20 824(r)	22 558(r)	23 717	21 461	19 590
Costs							
Materials and services	\$m	8 573(r)	9 604(r)	10 500(r)	11 225	11 705	11 110
Other cash costs (e)	\$m	4 026(r)	4 304	5 422(r)	5 926	5 485	5 320
Total cash costs	\$m	12 599(r)	13 908(r)	15 922(r)	17 151	17 190	16 430
Depreciation	\$m	2 789(r)	2 779(r)	2 729(r)	2 832	2 910	2 920
Total farm costs	\$m	15 388(r)	16 687(r)	18 651(r)	19 983	20 100	19 350
Net returns and production							
Net value of farm production (g)	\$m	1 914(r)	3 500(r)	4 305(r)	3 961	1 169	269
Real net value of farm production (h) (k)	index	42	71(r)	82(r)	70	20	4
Net farm cash income (i)	\$m	4 808(r)	6 916(r)	6 636(r)	6 566	4 271	3 160
Real net farm cash income (a) (j)	index	58	78	70(r)	64	39	28
Gross farm product							
At current prices	\$m	9 255(r)	11 342(r)	13 541(r)	13 981	11 185	10 133
At average 1984-85 prices	\$m	8 744	8 214	8 343	9 086	9 492	9 180

(a) Base: 1987-88 = 100. (b) Ratio of index of prices received by farmers and index of prices paid by farmers. (c) Value of payments still to be made to farmers for their output. (d) Gross value of farm production less increase in farmers' assets held by marketing organisations. (e) Wages, net rent, interest paid and third party insurance transfers. (g) Gross value of farm production less total farm costs. (h) Net value of farm production deflated by the consumer price index. (i) Gross farm cash income less total cash costs. (j) Net farm cash income deflated by the consumer price index. (k) Base: 1980-81 = 100. (p) Preliminary, (s) ABARE estimate. (f) ABARE forecast. (r) Revised.

Sources: Australian Bureau of Statistics; Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I am pleased to support the motion before the House. In doing so, I would also like to congratulate the Governor on the way in which she presented the opening speech to the third session of this Parliament. I am sure I speak on behalf of a large number of people in the South Australian community when I say how much we appreciate the way in which Her Excellency is carrying out her responsibilities. She has made herself known to many people in various parts of the State and I believe that she has been accepted very well wherever she has gone. Her Excellency's sense of humour is very well received and her ability to express her own views on behalf of the community and to represent Her Majesty the Queen are very much respected. I am sure that she will enjoy her opportunity to serve as Governor of South Australia in the years to come.

I want to pay my respects to three members who served this place and another place in recent times. I refer to the Hon. Dr Victor Springett, Mr Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles and the Hon. Ross Story. I knew those three gentlemen very well. When I became the member for Murray in 1977 I relied very heavily on Dr Springett. He knew the Murray area very well, having lived in and served that district over time. Even after he left Murray Bridge to move to Adelaide, I found him always willing to assist in so many different ways. Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles was a friend of my family. He spent a lot of time in our home and was a person for whom we had considerable respect. In addition, we respected the way in which he carried out his responsibilities as a member of the Legislative Council and subsequently as a member of the House of Representatives.

It was probably the Hon. Ross Story whom I knew best. I had tremendous respect for Ross, particularly in the time he served as an administrator in the Tonkin Government.

He had a keen sense of humour. He was willing to counsel when requested, and always able to provide advice for new members and for those who had accepted new responsibilities, as was the case with those who had become members of the Ministry in 1979. There are a number of things for which we will particularly remember Ross Story. He was a person whom I respected. So, I express my sympathy to the relatives of these three past members, all of whom made a very notable contribution to the conduct of Parliament and of government in this State.

In recent times we have been experiencing some interesting activity in this place. I refer particularly to the problems that have recently been recognised regarding the Government's new water rating policy, a policy that we opposed very strongly when it was introduced into this House earlier this year. I do not intend to go into that matter in much detail at present, because I will have that opportunity when I speak to a Bill that I will introduce at a later stage.

I am aware that the member for Napier intends to have a bit to say about the way in which this very serious matter has been handled recently. I can say only that it is quite obvious that the member for Napier has no understanding at all of the feeling in his or any other electorate. He has no understanding of the concern and anger in the community about that water rating policy, which is grossly unfair. When the time comes, I look forward to being able to refer to a number of pieces of correspondence that have come from people concerned about this issue. A vast number of the community share that concern.

I hope that, when that opportunity is provided, the member for Napier and other members of the Government will recognise just how many people are being affected by this iniquitous tax: this property tax, tax on the family home, land tax or wealth tax—call it what you like. Certainly, it is a tax that will affect young people, young marrieds with families, many of whom have taken out very hefty mortgages to pay for their houses.

Many elderly people who are not able to receive rebates from the E&WS Department will be affected. We have an idiotic situation in which we have one arm of Government encouraging elderly people to stay in their family homes while another—in this case, the water rating policy makers—is doing everything possible to make them leave their home, when that would be the last thing that they would want to do.

I will be interested to listen to the member for Napier when he has his say later on, and I hope that the Government will be able to support the Bill that I will introduce in an attempt to do away with this grossly unfair policy and to provide the opportunity for the Government to bring down a much fairer scheme, based on a true user pays principle. I will have more to say about that a little later.

I recognise that many people in the community are affected by this particular tax and are concerned about so many issues, not just water, but the disastrous financial mismanagement by this Government. We are concerned about all of those things and we recognise the concern in the community, so is it any wonder that every now and again all of us make mistakes? I want to say something about what happened earlier in this place, talking about making mistakes. I believe that all members of this House will recognise the confusion that surrounded the entertainment centre as the issue passed through the Public Works Standing Committee and this place.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Tell us your lies.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, I request that the member for Napier withdraw that term, which is unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: The Chair heard that and I would ask the member for Napier to withdraw it.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: I am sorry. I got carried away by the hypocrisy. I apologise for using the term—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the member for Napier to withdraw.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: I withdraw, Sir.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I want to go back to *Hansard* of 17 August 1989. On that occasion we were debating a motion put before the House by the member for Alexandra. The motion states:

That the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the Adelaide Entertainment Centre dated 5 July 1989 be remitted to the committee advising that, in the opinion of the House, the report is in breach of section 8 (5) of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927 and requesting that the report be corrected in accordance with the Act and relodged with the Speaker for tabling in the House as a matter of both urgency and importance.

That debate took up quite some time of the House. I do not want to refer to what the member for Napier said at that time or what the present Minister of Employment and Further Education said or what was said by many other members. I just want to bring to the notice of the House what I had to say—partly. On 17 August 1989, I said:

The accusations and allegations that have been made by the member for Briggs require an absolutely detailed reply. The member for Briggs and other members of the committee are now intent on making this a purely political exercise—

I suggest that that is still happening—

that is all they are interested in. The Opposition will continue to say that it does not oppose the entertainment centre; it has made that clear. Indeed, the Opposition members on the Public Works Standing Committee supported 27 of the 28 findings made in the report.

I then went on to say:

The Government then had the audacity to stand up in this House and say that the Opposition was against the project. I intend to reply in some detail to the allegations that have been made by the member opposite. I repeat: the Opposition concurred with 27 of the findings. It was concerned, with very good grounds, about the 28th finding.

The 28th finding was as follows:

The committee expresses its concern on the following:

The committee is aware of inconsistencies in evidence given by witnesses on the financial viability, zoning and operational matters associated with the BASA proposal and the committee urges early resolution of these issues.

Some written communication between the Government and potential users of the facility agreeing on 'principles' of participation may have shortened the hearing process and assisted the committee.

Because I want to spend my time on other matters, I do not want to go through all the other findings that we supported. We supported 27 of the 28 findings and, because we were concerned about the viability of the project, the funding that was being made available at that time and a number of other issues, it appears that on the final finding I voted against it.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I refer to the personal explanation that the member for Heysen made today which related to my answer to a question from a member during Question Time. I believe, under Standing Orders, that if he has not apologised to the House he has breached parliamentary privilege. On my analysis of his remarks on this matter, I do not believe that he has responded.

The SPEAKER: The Minister has made his point. The only observation I make at this stage is that the member for Heysen has not yet finished his contribution and, as a matter of fact, has 15 minutes left. I am not in a position to know what he will do. I take the point of order and suggest to the Minister that we hear what the member for Heysen has to say and act on it if he is not satisfied at the end of the honourable member's speech.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker, and this is a point of clarification. This afternoon in his personal explanation the member for Heysen said, 'If anyone wishes to look at the minutes of the report, he or she will see that I voted for the entertainment centre.' I think that you, Sir, have been furnished with evidence that says otherwise.

The SPEAKER: I have the gist of the point of order. At this stage there appear to be inconsistencies. I ask the member for Heysen to finish his speech. I will take the point of order at the end of the speech if that matter has not been satisfied.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Are the minutes wrong?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: On a point of order, Sir. The member for Kavel has just said that the minutes are crook. I was the Minister, Sir—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kavel is out of order. To my very clear hearing the member for Kavel did not say that the minutes were crook; it was a question. I took the remark to be in the same nature as that often observed from the member for Napier in this place, that is, a barb across the Chamber. If the member for Napier wishes me to jump on the member for Kavel I am afraid that I will have to apply the same principle to him.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have a lot that I want to bring to the notice of the House in the next 13 minutes. I have indicated that there was a lot of confusion on this particular subject. I have referred to all that. I apologise to the House if I indicated this afternoon that I opposed it. I again remind the House that we supported 27 of the findings and we voted against it on the 28th finding.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have just said that, and I have apologised to the House for doing so. I now refer to the Governor's speech.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The apology given to the House by the member for Heysen contained a proviso, which I object to.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier will resume his seat. The member for Heysen has apologised as requested in the point of order raised by the Minister. The Chair is satisfied that an apology was tendered.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In her opening speech, the Governor referred to the MFP and stated:

In pursuing the MFP proposal, my Government intends to introduce legislation for a development corporation responsible for the overall management of MFP-Adelaide.

The opportunity will be provided in this place for us to deal with that legislation at an appropriate time. However, I recognise some of the concerns that are being expressed by people in the conservation movement. I, too, am concerned, along with many of those people, about the future of the mangroves, which will face certain destruction if the MFP proceeds. I am also concerned that the advocates of this project have, to some extent, shown their ignorance of the environmental significance of the mangroves by offering a 100 metre buffer zone for the mangroves while, at the same time, acknowledging that what have been referred to as 'fragile forests' have been moving inland at a rate of 17 metres a year at, for example, Swan Alley Creek. That has occurred there for more than 50 years. If we take that into account, we can recognise that with the 100 metres and this movement their survival will be cut off in just six years.

I recognise that concern along with the need to protect the ecosystem that sustains the gulf fishing industry, which is far too important to put at any sort of risk. I am just foreshadowing that, when legislation comes before the House, they are some of the issues that I will be keen to ensure are protected under the legislation. That can happen: these areas can be protected, but I know that there are a number of people who belong to various conservation organisations and other individuals who have concern about the effect of the MFP on the fishing industry, the impact on the mangroves and other matters such as soil contamination. They are all areas that need to be looked at. Also, I am aware of the problem that has arisen regarding the MFP and, in particular, the Conservation Council, concerning consultation, and I want to talk about that later as well.

The Governor also referred to the Planning Review and, as I have indicated in this House on a number of occasions, the Opposition has given bipartisan support to the Planning Review and has watched it with considerable interest. Indeed, we have participated as much as we possibly could. In her speech, the Governor stated:

Another area of forward planning instigated by my Government is the Planning Review, with its strategies for development over the next 30 years.

Following the release of '2020 Vision—Ideas for Metropolitan Adelaide', it is now planned to incorporate the review's findings in a strategic plan.

We are told that it is intended that a green paper be released for comment early next year. Many people on this side of

the House and people in the community—I would suggest the vast proportion of people in this State—will be interested in the proposals put forward in that green paper.

I will be particularly interested to see what is recommended as far as the legislative process is concerned. The people who are very much involved in the review to whom I have spoken have suggested that it is likely that there will not be significant changes to the present Planning Act. Certainly, there will be recommendations regarding the implementation of that legislation, with a change in emphasis as far as the implementation of the legislation is concerned, but we will wait to see what happens. I am most interested in the detail that I have just been given by the Joint Industry Committee on Planning and its submission that has been forwarded to the review committee 2020 Vision and, when the time is appropriate, I will refer to that in more detail.

I was interested in the Governor's reference in paragraph 12, as follows:

The current climate of national economic restraint has reinforced the need for the social justice principles introduced by my Government four years ago.

Briefly, we have heard a lot about social justice, particularly in relation to the water rating policy. We are told that this whole policy is based on so-called social justice. I have argued and I will continue to argue, as will other members on this side of the House, that that is not the case. It is nothing like social justice. Again, when I have the opportunity to refer to correspondence, I will make that perfectly clear, because certainly much evidence has been received to suggest that that is not the case. How can it be? How can it be social justice when we are having people in different areas paying different prices for the same commodity? There is no way that that can equate to social justice.

I made reference yesterday to the problem that people are facing in relation to strata title car parks. I referred particularly to one instance where the owners of a 231 strata title car park in Adelaide are paying \$64 218 in water rates. Since then I have received another three examples of this situation, which certainly seems not to be following what the Minister refers to as a 'user-pays principle'. I refer to the case where the owners of a building in the city are paying \$40 598 in E&WS rates. Interestingly, land tax is \$123 655, which relates to a single holding, and council rates are \$73 474, giving a total of \$237 727. As the writer says, it is small wonder that we have so many empty shops and offices in the city of Adelaide at the present time. The interesting thing that I found, when looking at the actual water rate notice, is that consumption at this particular property for the first half year period up to this date was 360 kilolitres and the owners of the property were advised that they have 22 461 kilolitres of their allowance remaining. If ever there was a farce, this is it. Again, when the opportunity is provided I will say more about that.

I also want to refer to the article in this morning's paper concerning the water quality in this State and, in particular, the high level of what are potentially cancer-causing trihalomethanes in our water supply. I believe that it is essential that the Minister now provide, as a matter of urgency, details of action being taken by the Government to reduce this level of trihalomethanes. We have been told that Adelaide's water supply has the highest level of trihalomethanes in Australia. I point out to the House that when I raised this issue 14 years ago in this place and indicated that trihalomethanes were recognised as a potential cause of cancer I was branded by the Labor Government as being irresponsible.

Fourteen years later, we find that this problem has increased and that it is now a matter of urgency that the

Government indicates to us the priority that it is giving to this problem, the funding it is providing to enable work to be carried out, and for the House to be told exactly what the Government is doing in regard to this particular issue, along with many others. I support the motion.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I do not think there would be one member in this House who does not receive a complaint from a constituent from time to time in relation to noisy parties, loud radios, stereos, revving cars, etc. Over the years, with the cooperation of the local constabulary, and by issuing newsletters throughout my electorate, I have been able to educate some of those people in the community to be aware of the fact that noisy parties, revving cars and motorcycles, particularly trail bikes, can and in fact do have an adverse effect upon the quality of life of those people living adjacent to and in close proximity with those people who seemingly are not prepared to take into account the feelings of other people.

Because of recent complaints directed to my electorate office, I believe it is about time that the Government addressed this problem. There is no doubt in my mind, as I understand the position, that the police should be given additional powers to walk in and stop rowdy parties, particularly at midnight or 2, 3 or 4 a.m. None of us is prepared to accept raucous or loud music or abusive language in the early hours of the morning. I for one am not prepared to accept that situation, and nor do I believe that the electorate at large should accept it. As I understand the current Act, I believe that a constituent must make a statement and lodge a complaint before the police can take action and have the matter dealt with in the courts. That may or may not be the case, but that is my understanding.

I believe that the Act should be changed so that the police can, in certain circumstances, lodge a complaint themselves and take action without having to drag, if you like, some people into the courts, because I believe there are instances where there could be retribution. That is particularly sad. As I indicated, I believe that the Noise Control Act needs to be reviewed. I understand that a working party is looking at this matter. I would hope that its report can be brought down quickly to make it easier for our Police Force, which certainly does not have an easy job acting in situations such as that which I have described to the Parliament. It is a very annoying situation.

While I was working late in my office recently, a 70 year old gentleman from Royal Park rang me and said, 'Mr Hamilton, I do not believe that, at my age, I should have to put up with noisy parties at 1 or 2 a.m.' I have encouraged my constituent to write to me and I intend to forward his letter to the Minister in support of a review of the Act. It is very important, and it may well be that other sections of the Act need to be addressed in relation to such matters as complaints about noise from pets—even roosters—from time to time. I would like to be in a position in the near future to advise my constituents that the Act has been amended, and I would certainly circularise such informations throughout my electorate.

Another matter that I addressed last Thursday evening in the grievance debate was the question of fines. My attention

has been drawn to an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of 11 August headed 'Backlash over fines jump'. The article, written by Peter Haran, states:

The RAA wants many of the fines reduced, claiming the jumps in parking tickets—some up to \$50—are revenue-raising and cannot be 'substantiated as a deterrent to offenders.'

He is quoting the RAA. The article continues:

No Standing Zone fines have jumped from \$12 to \$33, no parking zone offences from \$12 to \$25, and parking at intersections—considered a leading factor in chain collisions—from \$12 to \$33.

I may be brutal in what I am about to say, but I do not have a great deal of sympathy for people who deliberately choose to ignore the law. If it means that the regulations and the penalties are increased quite dramatically, I do not have a great deal of sympathy for those people. As I stated last Thursday evening, in and around my electorate constituents have had it right up to their neck with ignorant people who constantly park anywhere and who are totally oblivious to the rights of other people in the community. As a member of the RAA for 32 years I take issue with its traffic engineering spokesman, Mr Chris Thompson. I pose the question to Mr Thompson: how would you like someone to park in your driveway, across the driveway or on your property?

Mr Ferguson: He would not like it at all.

Mr HAMILTON: Absolutely; he would not. Illegal parking in areas set aside for the disabled will now attract a fine of \$50, up from \$12. I would not care if they towed away the cars and impounded them. Anyone with a disability (and I had one but mine has been fixed up) has to get in and out of cars in parking lots and shopping centres, and yet these bird brains with no disability park in spaces allocated for the disabled. If I had my way, tow away provisions would be given to the police and to parking inspectors throughout South Australia. It would take only a few of these people to have their cars towed away and locked up to remedy the problem. I can imagine someone coming out from Football Park and saying, 'Where is my Mercedes?' or whatever and racing up to the police station and saying, 'Someone has stolen my car' and the police saying, 'Sorry, sir, it has not been stolen—you parked it illegally across someone's driveway where signs are up and you would have to be blind Freddy not to see them'. These people would soon get the message. The article further states:

There is no evidence we know of that shows fines like this have a deterrent effect and will stop people illegally parking.

I have news for this gentleman from the RAA because it does have an impact and certainly has had an effect in my area, particularly around Football Park.

That is because of the parking inspectors, and I applaud them for the number of parking fines they have imposed on that ignorant minority who do not care about my constituents. If it means locking up cars with a device so they cannot be driven off, towed away or anything of that nature that will hit offenders hard in the pocket, I am all for it. As I indicated, I will be asking the Minister for Local Government Relations to make tow-away provisions available, not only to the police but also to the local councils. From the support that has been directed to my office in the past couple of weeks, I have no doubt that, if I am here in this Parliament long enough, I will succeed with this as with many other issues, and I look forward to your support, Sir, in that proposition.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The great Australian dream is certainly under challenge in South Australia, and I am bitterly disappointed to think that last session we passed

legislation to amend the Engineering and Water Supply Act to alter the water supply rating system. During that debate I expressed my concern about and objection to that legislation. My constituents have continually bombarded my electorate office in the past few weeks. They have now received the first quarter's water and sewerage rate bill and they now find that the legislation which, I believed, came into effect on 1 July, was in actual fact retrospective.

I cite the example of a constituent who saw me today and who complained that he has paid \$139 for water for the first six months of this financial year, only to be advised that he has used his allocation of 136 kilolitres, has actually exceeded it by 18 kilolitres and has been charged an additional \$15.30 for that excess water. In other words, he was paying his quarterly water accounts as they fell due, when the price of water was 80c a kilolitre. However, because of the changes to the Engineering and Water Supply Act, the Minister and her department have made this person's water allocation retrospective. He was not aware of this, and now he finds that he is in deficit with the department.

What has really happened and what has transpired in checking the debate again is that (I believe) Parliament was misinformed. I also believe that the department has erred in the assessment of the water accounts for people in the metropolitan area, particularly in my electorate. The legislation should have stated that, as from the first quarter of the new water rating period, the price of water would be 85c a kilolitre and that the water allocation would be a minimum of 136 kilolitres, which would cost \$116. Whichever way it is looked at, it works out at 85c a kilolitre. From there on the public would have known, but to make this legislation retrospective means that bills are landed suddenly on people's doorsteps, when they find that, instead of meeting their normal quarterly water and sewerage rates, in many cases they now have to pay excess water or they find that their water allocation for the rest of the year has been removed.

While everyone admits that the quarterly water rate has been reduced under this new scheme, it means that no-one really knows what they will have to pay until they get the bill. It is a bit like the telephone account. A minimum charge is imposed and we wait until we get the bill before we know exactly what has gone on. We have a rough idea, but nobody has ever bothered to monitor the number of phone calls they make, and nobody has really gone out on a regular basis and monitored their water consumption.

The Government has forced people to regularly check their water meter. I have been suggesting to my constituents that, on a Sunday afternoon or Sunday evening, they read the meter and keep a check on it so they have a rough idea every week how their water consumption is going. They can plan accordingly on their water use and anticipate within a reasonable degree what their account will be.

The public is furious. I have never known a reaction like this in the 21 years that I have been involved in Parliament. The public believes it has been gypped. With all the economic crises that this State is suffering and with all the difficulties and problems, the recession that we had to have, high interest rates and the dampening of consumer confidence—issues that have hurt the public—this has hurt more than anything else. I relate this situation to 1979, when property values were increased significantly. We still had land tax and people were hurting. They were furious. There was a series of public meetings around the metropolitan area. We had one at Henley Beach and over 500 people turned up. It changed the Government. I believe that we are in exactly the same climate now.

This has resulted because of the improper handling of the portfolio by the Minister. She has totally misread the perception of this issue by the people. It is an absolute tragedy that we have a Government, a Cabinet and a Minister who have so little regard for the feelings of the people in the metropolitan area. The people of South Australia are very proud to own their own home. They are very proud to develop that property and to set a fine example of maintaining it. But, when you hit people without warning with a new rating system that has not been explained to them and when they are hit with retrospectivity, no matter what it is, whether it be the use of water allocated to them or an excess water bill, you engage the wrath of the people, and this Government has done exactly that. It will take a tremendous amount of public relations to try to reverse that attitude.

I believe that it is irreversible and that the Government will pay the price come the next election, no matter when that is. The people who own residential properties will not forget what this Minister has done in relation to water rates. If the Premier has any nous, ability and leverage in Cabinet or Caucus, he will certainly take action against this Minister. What really galled my constituents was the article at page 3 of the *Advertiser* of Monday 5 August with the heading, 'E&WS bid to defuse water row'. It states:

The State Government has engaged a leading public relations company in an apparent effort to defuse the public backlash to the new water rating system . . . Michels Warren Managing Director, Mr Darryl Warren, last night confirmed that his company had been engaged by the Engineering and Water Supply Department . . . At Michels Warren's going rate, the State Government could see itself paying \$280 an hour for the private consultancy service.

That is an insult to the intelligence of the average working person in this State. A lot of people today are lucky to net \$280 a week, let alone earn \$280 an hour. Many people would dearly love to be able to earn that for a couple of days work and keep it, let alone have to meet their expenses. I have no doubt about the competency of Michels Warren to do a good job, but it is estimated that this public relations contract will be worth somewhere in the vicinity of \$60 000.

In the overall term of the budget, particularly that of the E&WS Department, that is small change. Once again, it is the principle that the ratepayers are having to contribute to the Engineering and Water Supply Department coffers and then having the department, through the agency of the Government, tell them that the system that has been introduced is fair and reasonable.

Sir, it is not fair and reasonable. It has been grossly unfair. It has been grossly misrepresented by the Minister, who has failed to tell the people what it is all about. To add insult to injury, the majority of property owners to whom I have spoken are very hurt by the little pamphlet which came out with the water rates and which mentioned 'social justice'. That is one phrase that the public does not like. If the Labor Party wants to learn a lesson, I suggest it steer clear of that terminology, because the people dread the thought of being forced to pay for someone else for whom they do not want to contribute.

Secondly, this pamphlet entitled 'Tap Topics' mentions the water rate for 1991-92 with the additional water rate charge of 85c per kilolitre for all water consumed over a fixed annual allowance of 136 kilolitres. I make mistakes: we all make mistakes, but in a document as important as this I should have thought that the department would have paid a lot more attention to detail.

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

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Ten minutes is not really enough, but I will endeavour to use the 10 minutes available to me to make some brief comments on the sorry state of the Opposition as revealed in its performance to date in this session. I make clear that, in doing so, I do not try to sheet home any particular blame to the current Leader, because in some ways he is a vast improvement on his predecessor.

For a start he has had enough sense not to be moving urgency and no-confidence motions every few weeks, thereby devaluing that particular parliamentary procedure. He has also set a higher standard—with occasional lapses—for his demeanour in the Parliament, his predecessor being rather prone to thumping the desk and screaming interjections almost from the moment he entered the Chamber, thereby setting a very poor example to his colleagues.

But somehow or other, the current Leader has an even weaker team given to him by the Liberal Party to lead than the one the 1985 election bequeathed to his predecessor—and that was weaker than the one the 1982 election bequeathed to his predecessor the previous time. Indeed, he has my sympathy. How can he soar like an eagle when he is surrounded by turkeys?

Obviously, his team does not give him the loyal backing that he deserves. What has happened in recent years is that, because of the performance of the Opposition, the press in this State has taken it upon itself to play that role. On public occasions, after seeing the editor of the *Advertiser* with him, people have been known to comment, 'Oh look, there's the Leader of the Opposition, and he's got Dale Baker with him.'

It is not really his fault: it is the material he has to work with. Consider, for example, the Deputy Leader. Well, he is unspeakable, so I will not speak of him. He is certainly not a likely heir to the leadership. Neither is the member for Heysen—he with the amnesia. One cannot be sure how much of him is heir-apparent and how much is not apparent. But he certainly cannot seem to remember how he votes.

The balmy member for Bragg was seen to doze off during the no-confidence motion last Thursday, so much so that he is often referred to as the recumbent incumbent. Apparently, he was minding the store in the absence of the Leader and the Deputy Leader some weeks ago and snapped out of a siesta to launch an attack on the MFP without even having read the report, much to the embarrassment of the Leader when he returned.

Then we have the garrulous but gracious member for Goyder. His main contribution to debate is to propose catfish farms. I know that one man's meat is another man's *poisson*, but I bet that that is his own idea and that it did not come from John Scales. Perhaps for the Entertainment Centre he could choreograph his proposal as 'Poisson Boots'!

Then we have the member for Coles, who did not contribute at all during the no-confidence debate, despite having upstaged her Leader somewhat disgracefully by getting herself suspended from the House during the discussion of State finances some time ago. As for the member for Murray-Mallee, enough has been said for one day about his particular gifts to political thought. But it must have been a most wonderful experience this morning to have been able to hear and see the Leader of the Opposition when he woke up and saw the front page of the *Advertiser* with this proposal of the gulag for the unemployed.

Further along the bench, of course, we have the member for Morphett, who is regularly in the arms of Morpheus. The Premier himself pointed out earlier today the farce whereby a written question came from someone in the

gallery, was passed to the Leader of the Opposition, who passed it to the member for Heysen, who then passed it to the member for Morphett, who was the poor bunny who ended up having to deliver that particular one.

Most of the members on the other side are as lazy as Ludlum's dog.

Earlier I mentioned the role of the *Advertiser*, and I will return to that now, in particular to the role of its political writer, Mr Jory, formerly the political brains behind Premier Tonkin and Opposition Leader Olsen. He wrote an article a few days before the recent no-confidence motion, and I should like to quote some paragraphs from that.

The article, entitled 'Plenty of Political Knives for Baker to Sharpen', opens with some weird remarks about the annual parliamentary Labor Party seminar, and his source must have been at a different seminar from the one that we attended.

Members interjecting:

The Hon J.P. TRAINER: However, leaving the magic mushrooms bit aside, as the member for Albert Park has pointed out, Mr Jory said:

If the Opposition is half as good as it claims it should be able to tear the Government to pieces when Parliament resumes next Thursday.

He goes on to say:

For the Opposition it should be a simple exercise to embarrass and humiliate the Government.

Further on he says:

What the public wants now is not only confirmation that its disenchantment with Labor is justified but that the Liberals under Opposition Leader Dale Baker have the policies and capacity to govern. Rarely has an Opposition in Australia had greater ammunition to denigrate a Government.

The Opposition thought that it had the Government in its sights. With the world economy in a spin, with Australia's financial structures in both the private and public sectors struggling, creaking and groaning from deregulation, they thought they had an easy shot at us. Talk about the gang who could not shoot straight! Nevertheless, Rex Jory goaded them on. He concluded, in effect, by calling them wimps if they did not move a no-confidence motion. He said:

The danger for the Liberals is they might fumble the chance to stamp their authority on the Parliament. Or worse, they are too frightened of failure to try.

Up out of the trenches, he said, and out into no-man's land. But what did he say the day before the no-confidence motion was due? He said:

The House of Assembly must defeat tomorrow's vote of no confidence in Premier John Bannon and his Government... It is not time now for some premature and ill-considered rejection of the Government which was elected only 20 months ago for a 50-month term. South Australia needs stability, calm and continuity to work its way out of the present slump, not crisis and uncertainty.

The other critical factor is that the Opposition... has not yet demonstrated it has the capacity, the personnel, the philosophy, the unity or the right to govern...

How can they be when the Liberals are yet to reveal their critical policies on the economy, industrial relations, welfare, health, education and transport?

That is apart from a couple of delightful examples that I mentioned earlier of catfish farms and industrial gulags.

After having goaded them to take on the Opposition, after having pushed them out on to the stage, Mr Jory then pulled the carpet out from under them with that article. The no-confidence motion was obviously not supported by the *Advertiser*. In this case it was to be a pursuit of power without Jory.

What did the *Advertiser* say the next day after that particular debate? The editorial pointed out:

At least a couple of members on his benches appeared to be yawning off as he addressed his motion.

Further on, it states:

Yet the Opposition has not yet the principles, the policies or the personalities for power.

That is a nice bit of alliteration, but it sounds very much to me as though one can make a good guess as to who wrote that particular editorial, because it seems to be the same phrase almost to a word that I read from an earlier article. The *Advertiser* says:

This newspaper, for one, has no confidence that Mr Baker could form a better Government at the moment.

A great deal of stress was laid on people sleeping, in that editorial, and I presume that Rex Jory wrote that editorial, because he also made some remarks in another article that led to the member for Napier trying to explain his post-prandial noddings in a letter in this morning's *Advertiser*, which I have not got time to quote.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: It may be possible. However, I should like to quote from Rex Jory's article, the day after the no-confidence motion, in which he referred to one of our attendants saying that there was high tension developing about the whole day. He said, 'This is more popular than Torvill and Dean.' Mr Jory then went on to say:

Just 19 minutes after the Opposition Leader, Mr Dale Baker, began reading his prepared attack on the Government's record of financial management, a woman wearing Dame Edna glasses in the public gallery had slumped into a deep sleep.

She apparently didn't think Mr Baker was very light on his debating skates.

It wasn't long before others were also dozing, some of them quite prominent members of the business community.

Then there is the item that provoked the member for Napier:

The Labor member for Napier, Mr Hemmings, gave the appearance of having a post-lunch snooze and he wasn't the only member to lose interest.

Dame Edna woke with a start as Mr Baker was winding up in minute 37 with a rowdy finale of lifts and spins.

When the Premier, Mr Bannon, glided across the ice to rebut the Leader's attack the woman sat on the edge of her seat, taking in every word . . . The debate came alive.

He said:

Mr Baker's speech was full of detail and information, some new, some rerun, but his performance was predictable, almost pedestrian.

I suppose it is a bit difficult if you are a pedestrian on ice, but it was obvious that he had a great lack of support from his troops. That could be, as Mr Jory suggested, attributed to a style of delivery which was more soporific than sudoripic, though he did attempt to whip himself into a lather. In summary, I would say that on Thursday the Leader was like the good Lord in the garden of Gethsemane; he must have felt like turning to his dozing disciples and asking, 'Can you not stay awake one hour with me?'

Motion carried.

At 10 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 14 August at 2 p.m.