

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 20 August 1991

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

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 38 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to decriminalise prostitution was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: GAMING MACHINES

A petition signed by 38 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to introduce gaming machines into hotels and clubs was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: POLICE PRESENCE

A petition signed by 35 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase the police presence in the Mount Barker and Stirling areas and increase penalties for vandalism, larceny and assault offences was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

PETITION: WATER RATING SYSTEM

A petition signed by 39 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to revert to the previous water rating system was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
Medical Practitioners Act 1983—Regulations—Fees.
- By the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Australian Industry and Technology Council—Annual Summary of Proceedings, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Justices Act 1921—Rules—Fees.
Regulations—
Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act—1988—Forms.
Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Regulation—Local Court Fees.
Supreme Court Act 1935—Regulations—
Probate Fees.
Fees.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—Flashing Lights.
- By the Minister of Finance (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Friendly Societies Act—General Laws—Mutual Community Friendly Society of South Australia.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Racing Act 1976—Greyhound Racing Board Rules—
Manager Registration and Stewards.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Corporation of Naracoorte—By-law No. 9—Liquor Control.

Rough Cut—Service to Youth Council—Cheques.

Rough Cut—Correspondence—Minister of Employment and Further Education to State Director, Department of Employment, Education and Training; Director, State Youth Affairs; Acting Chief Executive Officer, Department of Employment and Further Education.

By the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, Royal Commission into—
Final Report.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 36 and 37.

BUS TICKET SALES

36. Mr **MATTHEW (Bright)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What was the total ticket sale revenue collected at locations other than on buses and trams or at bus stops during—

(a) the 30 days to 11 June;

(b) the period 12 June to 6 July; and

(c) the 30 days from 7 July 1991?

The Hon. **FRANK BLEVINS**: The replies are as follows:

(a) \$2 158 790;

(b) \$1 433 958;

(c) \$1 826 775.

GRAFFITI

37. Mr **MATTHEW (Bright)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: How many instances of graffiti became known to the STA during—

(a) the 30 days to 11 June;

(b) the period 12 June to 6 July; and

(c) the 30 days from 1 July 1991?

The Hon. **FRANK BLEVINS**: The State Transport Authority does not keep records on individual instances of graffiti. During the period of the train stoppage, 10 June to 4 July 1991, the opportunity was taken to remove graffiti from railcars. During the same period a small increase in graffiti attacks on STA buses was noted.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ROYAL COMMISSION INTO ABORIGINAL DEATHS IN CUSTODY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. **M.D. RANN**: I lay on the table a copy of the report and recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. The royal commission was established in October 1987 and inquired into the deaths

of Aboriginal people in the custody of police, in prison or in youth detention institutions. Twelve of these deaths occurred in South Australia. The Royal Commissioner's individual reports into the South Australian deaths have already been tabled in Parliament during the course of the inquiry. The final report is a historic, hard-edged, report dealing with some of the most crucial issues affecting Aboriginal people in this country. It is a call to action directed at all sectors of our community—Aboriginal—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, it is customary in the House that the Opposition be given copies of ministerial statements.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: If the honourable member sitting next to the Deputy Leader had advised him, he would have realised that, rather than spending many thousands of dollars for each of these copies—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order. Leave has been granted to the Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will return to this very important issue, in which I would have thought the Opposition was genuinely interested. This report is not about blame. It is a positive framework for action aimed at addressing the real problems. Instead of looking just at the symptoms and the individual tragedies it probes the fundamental reasons why a disproportionate number of Aboriginal people are in custody around Australia. The report does not, in fact, confine itself to important criminal justice and custodial issues. It addresses underlying issues such as racism, ignorance, cultural breakdown, employment, education, training, housing, health and justice. It also addresses land rights issues, where South Australia is the clear national leader. I have met with Commissioner Elliott Johnston on several occasions to discuss his five volume national report and its 339 recommendations.

No State has equalled South Australia in its commitment to implementing the recommendations of the interim report of the royal commission, known as the Muirhead report, but there is more that we can do and the State Government is keen to take up Commissioner Johnston's challenge. The State Government agrees wholeheartedly with the Commissioner that Australia must move firmly away from strategies that reinforce welfare dependency and, instead, encourage independence through employment and training, and that Governments must consult with Aboriginal organisations in implementing the report's various recommendations.

South Australia has already announced that it is willing to work with Aboriginal groups and other levels of Government on developing a comprehensive Statewide strategy to combat alcohol abuse amongst Aboriginal people. Last year I introduced into Parliament legislation to give Aboriginal communities the power to ban or control alcohol on Aboriginal Lands Trust lands. That legislation has now been proclaimed. Alcohol abuse is causing devastation in Aboriginal communities around Australia. Commissioner Johnston's report will assist our planning enormously. We are also delighted that the Commissioner recommends that the Northern Territory review its liquor licensing legislation with a view to reducing the availability of alcohol. Northern Territory liquor laws have, of course, created many problems in South Australia's neighbouring Pitjantjatjara communities. I applaud the recommendation for the establishment of a national task force on alcohol abuse in Aboriginal communities.

The State Government supports the recommendation for a review and extension of the Community Development Employment Program. Our 1 per cent challenge employ-

ment initiative, designed to massively increase Aboriginal employment across the public sector, is exactly in line with Commissioner Johnston's recommendations. I can announce to this House today that the South Australian Government has already implemented or is in the process of implementing about 60 per cent of the 339 recommendations of the final report.

We have also undertaken a comprehensive survey of all State Government agencies affected by the recommendations, and I am proud to be able to inform members that more than 90 per cent of the recommendations have already been endorsed by this State Government. No other Australian government—Federal, State or Territory—has made this level of commitment in such a short time. We have introduced Aboriginal police aides in city, rural and outback area. We have introduced the highly successful Aboriginal Visitors Scheme, in which Aboriginal volunteers provide support for Aboriginal people in custody. We have introduced the Mobile Assistance Patrol, which provides 24 hour assistance to Aboriginal people under the influence of alcohol to find shelter and protection.

There have been major improvements in the training of officers to properly care for prisoners at risk and in cell design and construction; and the vastly improved training of correctional and police officers in Aboriginal cultural issues. An Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee has been established for some time to monitor preventive programs and to ensure that the opinions and views of Aboriginal people are taken into account by our justice system.

At a recent ministerial forum in Canberra to discuss the final report, I put forward the point that the South Australian Government saw a community-based crime prevention initiative in South Australian Aboriginal communities as a priority. We are currently working with Aboriginal community groups to develop programs for consideration. The highest priority is to reduce the numbers of Aboriginal people falling into the criminal justice system.

I have also signalled to the Commonwealth Government that the South Australian Government would seek matching funds from the Commonwealth for crime prevention initiatives and would support additional funding to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement to ensure adequate legal representation for Aboriginal people. I also told the forum that I hoped that the royal commission recommendations regarding the media would be taken up as a matter of urgency. I will be meeting again with my colleagues from other States and Territories to ensure that a coordinated national response will be prepared by March 1992. I commend this report to the House.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: I inform the House that any questions normally directed to the Minister of Emergency Services will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

STATE TAXES

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer give an assurance that there will be no new taxes or increases in the rates of existing taxes in the 1991-92 budget?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I will not. I suggest that the honourable member wait until next week when the

budget will be presented, in which case everything we are doing in connection with the finances will be laid out for the Parliament and will be open for debate.

GUN LICENCES

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Deputy Premier, representing the Minister of Emergency Services, outline the steps that the Government is taking in relation to the granting of gun licences in this State?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I suppose that the first thing to be said is that, in some ways, South Australia is in advance of most other States in relation to the control of firearms. This is something that I more or less lived with for some period as Minister of Emergency Services. Members will recall that there was a select committee of the last Parliament which brought down a number of recommendations, notwithstanding the fact that that select committee was tendered evidence which suggested that, in many respects, the old legislation was in advance of what was happening around the country.

What has now been revealed, of course, is that the absence of national legislation—something we thought we came fairly close to at one stage—has meant that there are a number of holes in the system around this country. For example, I know that certain pressures are being brought to bear at present on the Tasmanian Parliament with a view to closing one of the loopholes in relation to some of those weapons which are seen as being totally inappropriate in civilian hands for any purpose whatsoever.

The more recent initiatives of the South Australian Government relate to the carrying through of some of the recommendations of the select committee, including the computerised data base system, and also to the introduction—and I seem to recall some media comment on this in the past couple of days—of TAFE courses in relation to the proper use and care of firearms. I would commend that initiative to members and to the people of South Australia. I think it is important that, where people are given charge of these very dangerous weapons, they should have the necessary information with which to use them properly. Nobody is suggesting that we should take guns away from people who are, for example, involved in Olympic competition, and such people have brought considerable fame and lustre to this country in relation to the way in which they have been able to perform at the Olympic and Commonwealth Games levels.

I am not aware that anybody is suggesting that the appropriate firearms should be taken away from primary producers in relation to their use as a management tool in certain circumstances on their properties. Obviously, these forms of use will continue. Nonetheless, tragedies such as we have seen in the past couple of days, which are by no means unique to this country, remind us that this is an extremely dangerous weapon with which a person is entrusted when they obtain a licence. It also reminds us, as legislators, that one way in which the State has been defined is as that agency which has a monopoly of the use of coercive violence, and I am sure that we would all underline that. When that monopoly is breached, we are opening ourselves not to freedom but to criminal anarchy.

BUDGET

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Will the South Aus-

tralian Government follow the example set by Tasmania and include three year forward estimates of Government income, spending and borrowing requirements with this year's State budget?

The Tasmanian budget which was introduced last week contained a first for the States, with three year forward projections of spending, revenue and borrowing requirements. This issue was first raised by the South Australian Auditor-General in his 1987 report to the Parliament when he proposed that the budget papers should carry full year projections of the cost of new major revenue and spending initiatives. He stated:

It would enable Parliament to be better informed about the longer term consequences of proposed budget initiatives when passing the Appropriation Bill.

The practice was adopted for the 1988 and 1989 budgets. However, it was abandoned for the 1990 budget, despite the suggestion by the Auditor-General in his 1989 report that 'this approach could be expanded and become a step towards the concept of, say, two year budget forecasts'.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I note the Deputy Leader's praise of the Tasmanian Labor Government in its budget approach, which certainly is a contrast to its predecessor Liberal Government in that State. So I thank him for drawing this matter to the attention of the House. I am sure his colleagues will thank him for showing them what is being accomplished against a very difficult background in Tasmania.

Of course, economic conditions and financial requirements are extremely volatile in the current environment, and one therefore must recognise the fact that, while attempting to plan ahead, there can be considerable variations which may render such projections meaningless in the long run. Certainly we need to have an idea of where we are going: for instance, in capital works programming, that has certainly been the case of our Government. As to how we will be treating these accounts in the budget, I suggest that the honourable member wait until next week.

USSR COUP

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Can the Minister of Agriculture report to the House whether the trade impact on the South Australian economy from yesterday's coup in the USSR is likely to be as severe as the consequences for South Australian agriculture which flowed from the Tien-anmen massacre and the Gulf War?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Certainly the trade impact on Australia will be quite severe. I am sure that all members in this place are very concerned at the events that have taken place in the Soviet Union, with the process of liberalisation and democratisation that has been set in train apparently being abruptly curtailed and forcibly going back in the other direction towards despotism.

The actual trade impact on Australia will be quite significant, for two reasons. The agricultural commodities of this country's supplies to the USSR have been a major part of various producing groups in Australia. For example, over the period 1988-89, 86 per cent of all Australia's exports to the USSR were wool and, in 1989-90, 61 per cent were wool. The figures in both areas have shown marked declines due to the various issues involving the Soviet Union's access to foreign currency and exchange. In the period to April 1991, USSR's purchases of wool from Australia saw a decline of 58 per cent on the corresponding period in the previous season, and that represented a major problem for our wool growers in this country.

With respect to wheat, in the 1990-91 wheat selling season, Australia sold nearly 746 000 tonnes to the USSR, representing 7.8 per cent of Australia's wheat exports over that period. The situation for South Australia is that, while the USSR represents a destination of 6 per cent of our exports, it accounted for 33 per cent of our wool exports in 1988-89 and 3 per cent of our wheat exports in the same year. The wool figure has dramatically declined since that time due to the foreign exchange problems. What is now happening will clearly exacerbate those very serious challenges facing the wool and wheat industries in this State. I am advised that the Federal Government has today cancelled the line of credit for wool until the situation is clarified in the Soviet Union. That means there will be further instability in the wool auctions taking place, and that must have an effect on wool producers in this State, especially as they are entering the season for preparing their budgets for the coming year.

The broader question is whether there will be further economic destabilisation as a result of the flow-on effect on world stock markets and general confidence in the world economy, and it is too early to predict what the outcome of that will be. Suffice to say that already there have been impacts involving the international currency exchange variations. For example, Australia's dollar has held up remarkably well in the circumstances, but that presents a problem for our exports because it suddenly means we are earning less cash for this country. In addition, the G7 Ministers—the group of seven Ministers as has been reported—are presently meeting to determine what impact might be expected. There is the further problem of what destabilising effect this may have on the economies of the countries that were referred to as Eastern Europe and their capacity to regenerate or grow again as quickly as might have been hoped.

WATER RATING SYSTEM

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Has the Premier full confidence in the Minister of Water Resources for her handling of the new water rating system?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, Mr Speaker.

WEST COAST FISHERMEN

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I ask the Minister for Environment and Planning whether the failure of the prosecution of three West Coast fishermen for the mutilation and killing of a sea lion pup will affect the administration of the National Parks and Wildlife Act?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question and his continuing interest in matters relating to the whole concept of animal welfare in this State and, indeed, in the maintenance and protection of our protected species within our parks and wildlife system. I can confirm that the stipendiary magistrate, Mr Fred Field, yesterday dismissed the case mounted by the National Parks and Wildlife Service against three fishermen who were charged with taking and illegally possessing a sea lion pup. I can assure the honourable member that the failure of this prosecution will certainly not deter my officers from mounting further prosecutions under the National Parks and Wildlife Act where sufficient evidence of cruelty to native animals exists.

In his judgment, the magistrate, Mr Field, expressed particular concern about forensic evidence relating to hair sam-

ples from the sea lion pup and the lack of evidence of enzymes or digestive juices from the shark on the carcass of the young sea lion.

I believe this case has highlighted the fact that very few experienced forensic experts and scientists are capable of providing the type of expert evidence required in relation to sharks and marine mammals. This case particularly highlights the difficulty in policing certain aspects of the National Parks and Wildlife Act when there are no direct witnesses to the alleged offence. This case is important because it highlights the absolute necessity for members of the community to immediately report any acts of cruelty, either to marine mammals or to any other form of native wildlife, so that the National Parks and Wildlife staff can act quickly and decisively to bring prosecutions against those who persist in maltreating and killing protected species of Australian wildlife.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Premier table the report by the Crown Solicitor relating to the Chairman of SGIC, Mr Vin Kean; and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The findings of the Crown Solicitor were published. They were also considered in detail by the Committee of the Government Management Board into the SGIC and are referred to in that report. I think the findings are, therefore, adequately canvassed. I was asked an identical question on this matter by the *Advertiser* a couple of days ago: that is the answer I gave there, and that is the answer I give the honourable member.

NANGWARRY SLAUGHTERHOUSE

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether he has granted a slaughterhouse in Nangwarry permission to kill stock for a nearby butcher? I have seen a media release from the shadow Minister of Agriculture (the member for Goyder) headlined, 'Bureaucratic bloody-mindedness slaughtering small business' and claiming that the Department of Agriculture has stopped the slaughterhouse from killing stock for the butcher. The release states:

The disdain by the Bannan Government bureaucracy for small business is reflected in its attitude to a small livestock slaughterhouse in the South-East.

Will the Minister clarify the situation?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am aware of the press release put out by the shadow Minister of Agriculture last Friday. I was aware of the issue, because the Leader of the Opposition, who was always very concerned about this issue, brought it to my attention in a responsible way and said that this was not the sort of thing that was meant to be in the spirit of the meat hygiene legislation. He did that early last week and, as a result, I went into action immediately, and the necessary exemption was given on Wednesday of last week—two days before the press release of the shadow Minister, a day before his Address in Reply speech, but the same day as the shadow Minister of Agriculture was told by my own executive assistant that this had actually happened. He had a case of the Wotton memory disease that seems to be affecting that side of the House.

I then indicated that the right attitude had been taken by the Leader of the Opposition on this matter, that we had gone through this issue without wanting to drag this small business into the headlines but, rather, actually get something achievable done—and did it. Maybe the shadow Min-

ister should offer an apology not only to me but also to his own Leader. In fact, he issued a press release of sorts last Monday, but, frankly, it is not worth the paper on which it is written. He attempts to have it all sorts of ways by saying that he makes no apology for putting maximum pressure on the Government. By the time he put pressure on the Government, the decision had been made. It had been made two days before and he was aware of it, or at least he had been told of it.

The fact is that the issue that was presented here deserved ministerial attention. The Act provides for ministerial attention to be given to it, it was given to it, and the most appropriate answer was made, which I know met the satisfaction of the Leader of the Opposition. Once again, I appreciate the way that he raised this matter. I call on the shadow Minister of Agriculture either to get himself a better memory or, if he cannot do that, at least not to raise issues in this House unless they are of real substance.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Does the Treasurer believe that the SGIC is run 'in the same way as any large private business enterprise', including the observance of all Commonwealth laws and regulations; and, if not, will he refer to the Attorney-General the recent SGIC pamphlet in the form of a message from its General Manager, Mr Denis Gerschwitz, which includes these claims so that the Attorney-General can determine whether there is a breach of the Misrepresentation Act 1971?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that the honourable member is drawing a long bow here.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will certainly look at the point that the honourable member raises, but it is a fact that SGIC operates under a commercial charter and that, where it is appropriate to do so, it observes all business and other requirements. The way in which it does that was the subject of examination by that very comprehensive report, and some of the conclusions in that report I think are referred to in the pamphlet quoted by the honourable member.

To be fair to SGIC, it was clear that the way in which that report was publicised in the media picked out all the most negative things that could be found in the report and did not draw attention to some of those positive points. As will be recalled, Professor Henderson, when eventually questioned at length about the report, said that he was staggered at this interpretation.

That has already been canvassed in debate in this place and there is no need to go over it, but one can understand SGIC trying to make that case to its policy holders who could have reason to be concerned about the sort of publicity that followed that report and inquiry and about the sort of statements that had been made by members in this place. It is only reasonable that it should defend itself and its commercial interests to its policy holders and others who do business with it.

I should have thought that it was in the interests of all of us—in fact, in the interests of South Australia—to ensure that SGIC did remain viable and active and was able to fulfil its purposes. We do not want it sitting there tacitly taking and accepting every criticism and, by so doing, if those criticisms are unfair, undermining the effective work that it can do and its commercial operations. I will certainly look at the matters raised by the honourable member, but

that is the context in which that pamphlet has been issued, as I understand it, and I think that is quite legitimate.

MARALINGA

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Is the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs aware of allegations that an official Australian Government report into radioactive contamination on the Maralinga lands has been sanitised? In a documentary on SBS's *Dateline* program at the weekend, it was alleged that a major Australian Radiation Laboratory scientific report on Maralinga isotopic ratios had been 'sanitised' by Australian Government officials following pressure from British intelligence. The program also detailed the devastating impact of the atomic test series on the Maralinga Aboriginal people. It claimed that the Federal Government will make its decision on the Maralinga clean-up in the next few days and that negotiations with the British will begin later this year.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I saw the *Dateline* program and, quite frankly, I was astonished by the allegations. My first reaction was one of disbelief, but I am mindful that the documentary was produced and researched by the highly respected British journalist, Robert Cockburn, the Australian correspondent of the BBC and the Murdoch Group's *Times* newspaper in Britain. The BBC has also been in South Australia recently making a documentary, which I understand will also deal with these issues, to be shown on British television in October.

My negotiations with the Federal Government and with the Maralinga people have been on the basis that the scientific reports we were given were the truth and the whole truth, I certainly hope that the claims made on the program are incorrect. The *Dateline* program alleged that the Australian Government had acceded to Britain's request not to publish the full details of those radiation level tests in the report. The documentary claimed that at first the report was 'suppressed' by the Department of Primary Industries and Energy which was involved in a running battle to stop the Australian Radiation Laboratory publishing. The documentary indicated that ARL defended its policy to publish its research and the findings were quietly released last year, but in a censored version to spare British embarrassment.

I note reports in today's press saying that a spokeswoman for the department has denied these claims, but earlier today I wrote to the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs asking him to report on whether or not the allegations made on the *Dateline* program about the role of British intelligence are correct. The South Australian Government supports the Maralinga people's view that a clean-up of the contaminated area must occur and that compensation be paid for areas that cannot be cleaned up and permanently fenced.

ROUGH CUT

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education indicate on what date he was advised that his \$30 000 cheque to Rough Cut had been lost, when was that cheque cancelled and when was the second \$30 000 cheque to Rough Cut finally presented and honoured? In an 'on the record' discussion in the office of the Hon. Rob Lucas, requested by the Minister last Thursday, the Minister claimed that his original \$30 000 cheque to Rough Cut had been lost and that a new cheque had been drawn. The Minister also indicated that the money had been given to Rough Cut Inc and not Rough Cut

Skillshare. The Liberal Party has in its possession copies of records relating to the Rough Cut Enterprise bank account and the Rough Cut Inc bank account. A scrutiny of those bank accounts for 1989-90 clearly demonstrates no deposit of any cheque for \$30 000 during that period.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am delighted with this question; the problem is with putting this in context. I will be tabling a copy of the cheques to show where they were deposited. However, the problem is that the member for Coles, the member for Kavel and the member for Light last week got caught with their political pants down, as was shown by the media. It was a bit like Operation Hydra because they suffered from a collective case of mistaken identity. They thought that I was the member of Parliament on the board of the Skillshare sponsoring management committee dealing with Rough Cut, dealing with the finances. They thought that I was the member of the board of the organisation that is currently being investigated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN:—following these allegations of misappropriation and diversion. However, it is not me. I am not being investigated by the Australian Federal Police or by anybody. The member of Parliament on the board—the case of mistaken identity—was the Hon. Legh Davis, MLC. Quite frankly, before I table these cheques, I must say that it is enough to make a good looking young bloke like me go and see a plastic surgeon, or at least give up wearing bow ties.

Along with Terry Plane from Channel 7, I was asked by Rough Cut whether I was prepared to be on this advisory committee, and all of those other bodies. However, as far as I am aware, that advisory committee has never met. I was not a member of the administration board. That board, which administers the organisation's money, is being investigated by the Australian Federal Police, and among its members is Legh Davis. He is a member of the group, the sponsoring Skillshare board.

As to the other matters, let us deal with the cheque. None of this relates to the time during which I have been the Minister, so some people may ask why I am answering the question, but the former Minister of Employment and Further Education approved grants—plural—totalling \$30 000 to Rough Cut Skillshare in June 1989. These grants were made to cover the cost of the employment of sessional instructors for a range of training programs in the audio and visual industries for young, unemployed people.

Members will be aware (and here is the problem) that Rough Cut Inc—a bit like Lib Inc, although that is with a k, and we will talk about that at another time—and Rough Cut Skillshare are two different organisations. There is the problem. The Opposition got it wrong. There was never a single cheque for \$30 000: there were two cheques, one for \$12 000 and one for \$18 000, and these cheques were drawn and presented at different times. Rough Cut Skillshare, in fact, had received and cashed the two cheques by 6 October 1989. I should like to table those two cheques.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Members opposite do not want me to table the cheques, Mr Speaker. Rough Cut Skillshare received and cashed the two cheques by 6 October 1989 so, again, the Opposition got it wrong. Let me give some more detail. I am informed that cheque number 1356420 from the Office of Employment and Training, made out to the Service to Youth Council, was drawn on 1 September 1989 and cashed on 6 September 1989. I am informed that cheque number 1356749, again made out to the Service to Youth

Council—the organisation of which the Hon. Legh Davis had been a board member—this time for \$18 000, was drawn on 5 October 1989 and cashed on 6 October 1989.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: They've stopped. There was nothing shonky or bogus about these cheques, just as there is nothing shonky or bogus about the assistance that the State and Federal Governments had given to Rough Cut over the years. Members should be aware that my press release was issued on 6 October 1989 and sent to the Messenger Press. It is interesting that Rough Cut decided that it wanted a big promotion about the grants and wanted to try to maintain its high profile in the northern suburbs.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I beg your pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I understand that in November 1989 Rough Cut again contacted the Messenger Press and asked it to try to get an article in the local paper (the *News Review*) promoting Rough Cut. I am told that, initially, it wanted someone with a high profile to attend its promotion, so it did not consider members opposite; it considered a rock star. That could not be arranged, so they had to settle for me, someone who also had high credibility and a high profile in the northern suburbs. Rough Cut organised a photographic session with the media, resulting in the article published by Messenger Press of 22 November, which was many weeks—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair wishes to make two points. One is that members will direct all their remarks through the Chair. Secondly, this is a very long answer. If it is to take much longer, I suggest that the Minister make a ministerial statement instead of using up Question Time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No-one from our side of Parliament asked this question: this is a very serious matter concerning misappropriation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: However, I can say that I was very happy to be involved in that promotion. The article did not have a photograph of me handing over a cheque: it had a photograph of me sitting at the console with the Skillshare people. A cheque was presented, however, and was photographed with me back in 1986, and that money was paid by my wife and me to Rough Cut, because we believe in supporting young, unemployed people—unlike members opposite. So, Rough Cut organised a photographic session with the media, resulting in the Messenger Press article of 22 November, many weeks after I had issued the press release announcing the grant and many weeks after the cheques had been presented and cashed.

One cheque, for \$12 000, No. 34039, was temporarily lost in the system (as I told the Hon. Mr Lucas) before being passed on, and my department has informed me that this cheque was cancelled, so it was hardly a problem. It was subsequently replaced by cheque No. 1356420, to which I referred previously. I understand that Frank Kinnear pinned the cancelled cheque to his wall for a brief period. His judgment, in doing so, should be questioned to him, not to me.

HOUSING TRUST TENANTS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise what new initiatives are being devel-

oped to deal with disruptive Housing Trust tenants? Last week, on 15 August, the Minister provided the House with a summary of the existing steps that the Housing Trust takes in dealing with disruptive tenants. However, these have not always proved to be successful in the past, and I would be interested to hear of the latest developments for dealing with this most difficult and complex problem.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Price for his question, because the matter of disruptive tenants has been of overwhelming interest to him and to a number of other members. Of course, in answering questions of this sort, one cannot ignore the fact that there are many substantial and reliable Housing Trust tenants who are having their emotional and social environment somewhat disrupted by very small numbers of people who are not meeting the tenancy agreement. As a consequence, I referred earlier to the report of the working party that comprised senior officials from the Housing Trust, the police, the Department for Family and Community Services and, of course, the Health Commission. Subsequently, I wrote to my colleagues, which I hope will bring from them agreement for the implementation of the recommendation of the working party.

I think it is important to note that, subsequent to the report of the working party, it has been decided, in full consultation with the Office of Fair Trading—and I am sure the honourable member is interested to know this—that the whole process of tenancy management, in the sense of disruptive tenants, will be dealt with under the jurisdiction of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal. We believe that that will bring a number of benefits, first, because of the existing practices and structures of the RTT. In fact, we can offer a much more efficient and economic process and, I believe, a more sensitive way of assessing the situation of each tenant. I believe that we can then implement certain efficiencies in the system which will, in fact, result in less cost and more money going back into what we do most and best, that is, building houses.

From the point of view of members and, of course, their constituents, the situation is better dealt with through the Residential Tenancies Tribunal rather than through the Supreme Court process, because that involves a much more efficient and local environment. It is very difficult to find an ultimate and complete solution. The eviction of disruptive tenants is often very traumatic not only for those involved but also for the surrounding neighbours and, of course, for those who are actually involved in the eviction. It is not something that anyone enjoys; certainly, the officers of the courts do not enjoy it. Quite often the police are involved, and that puts them in a bad light in the eyes of the disruptive tenant. We believe there must be a better way of dealing with this issue in a more efficient and complete manner, rather than the present somewhat disjointed process. So, we will be working in cooperation with the police in relation to disruptive tenants. We will also be working with all the other agencies to ensure that we can intervene at an early stage. We offer counselling and support but, in the end result, when it comes to the crunch, unfortunately and sadly we will have to evict some of these tenants. Those situations will have to be dealt with in the most efficient way, and I hope that this working party report will be implemented fully so that we can achieve a much more efficient system that is better for everyone—the neighbours, the members of Parliament and the community as a whole. I hope to be working with my colleagues and, of course, the members involved to see this system implemented so that we can deal with this issue in a much better way.

ROUGH CUT

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Why did the Minister of Employment and Further Education tell the House last week that his first knowledge of allegations about the Rough Cut project was on 21 June this year when he was personally advised of these allegations in August 1990 and a senior officer in his department was also advised in August 1990; and why did he take no action at that time? The Liberal Opposition has a copy of a statutory declaration from a former member of Rough Cut Inc. that in August 1990 he phoned the Minister and raised concerns about financial mismanagement in Rough Cut Skillshare. We also have another statutory declaration from Ms Jennings, former Chairperson of Rough Cut Inc., that a delegation of six persons raised similar concerns in August 1990 with a senior officer in the Minister's Youth Initiatives Unit, Ms Karen Versteegh.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Let me go through this once again. I first received a delegation from a group of people which included Messrs Bluey Fisher, Alan Bone and Steve Sutton. I should advise you, Mr Speaker, that I understand the sources of the Liberal Party's allegations are currently being investigated on a number of issues. I should also tell you that, following receipt of that information—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —I immediately wrote the following letter to Ms Helen Swift, State Director of the Department of Employment, Education and Training:

This morning I received a delegation in my electorate office in Salisbury from representatives of Rough Cut Inc. The delegation included Messrs Bluey Fisher, Alan Bone and Steve Sutton. During our interview a series of allegations were made about the operations of the Sound Vision (formerly Rough Cut) Skillshare in Elizabeth. As you are aware, the Rough Cut Skillshare was established in 1985 to assist young people gain skills and employment in the entertainment industry. Rough Cut participants produced a number of videos, some of which won State film awards. As a local MP in Salisbury I strongly supported this initiative to assist young unemployed people in the northern suburbs—

as did many other members of Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will get on to that. The letter continues:

This morning unspecified allegations were made about the possible misappropriation of funds and the illegal division of funds and equipment, improper financial procedures, and lack of accountability. I understand that DEET is conducting an inquiry into allegations made by Rough Cut members . . . DEET [the Federal department] is conducting an inquiry into allegations made by Rough Cut members—

which have been going on for some months and of which everyone was aware—

I would be grateful if you could inform me of the progress of this inquiry and its outcome. Allegations were also made this morning about a 'cover-up' of problems involved with the Skillshare and that Federal and State officials were not vigorously pursuing these and other allegations because of the embarrassment that would entail if they were proven correct. Allegations also concerned the conduct of officers in State Youth Affairs and it was suggested that people were being protected because of friendship and other associations. Claims of personal threats were also made.

I am writing a similar memo to Bronwyn Webster, the Director of State Youth Affairs, and to Barry Grear, Acting Chief Executive of DETAFE, so that the allegations concerning State officers and funding can be more accurately identified and investigated. I have also asked my electorate office staff to inform the Elizabeth police about these allegations.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Rob Lucas was given a copy, and I am surprised that he has not bothered to send it to

you, although I know there are a few leadership problems on the other side.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am very happy to table these documents, which include confidential memos to the Director of State Youth Affairs and the Acting Chief Executive Officer of DETAFE, and which I gave to the *Advertiser* last Thursday.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The date was 21 June 1991.

Mr S.J. Baker: That's the whole point, isn't it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: When I was given this information about Rough Cut Inc. by the members involved, apart from ensuring that those processes happened, I asked the people making the allegations about the DEET funding whether they had taken their concerns to the police. They indicated some considerable reluctance and hesitancy in taking this course of action, stating that they wanted to handle the matter properly and just wanted to sort it out. I stressed that the police were the proper body to handle their allegations and further urged them to contact the police, because they were talking about criminal matters. Despite their reluctance, I instructed my officer to telephone Inspector Presgrave, the officer in charge of the Elizabeth CIB, to advise him of allegations made.

I am advised that Inspector Presgrave gave an undertaking to arrange for members of Rough Cut to make statements relating to their allegations. However, Rough Cut members still maintain their reluctance to provide information to the police. These were the people making the allegations, but they did not want to take their allegations to the police. That is how shonky they are. I understand that both the State Anti-Corruption Squad and the Federal Police are being kept fully briefed on these matters. Unfortunately, a pattern appears to be developing in relation to these allegations. When push comes to shove, only one or two people at most are prepared to put up their hands and be counted. Their allegation seems to come easily but, when they are required to make a formal or written statement, they disappear into the woodwork.

Something else needs to be said to this House. On Thursday, I went, in good faith, to see the source of these questions—the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, the Hon. Rob Lucas. I gave him copies of confidential correspondence from me detailing the action I had taken within an hour or so of my being informed in my electorate office of allegations against the Service to Youth Council and against Government agencies and individuals. That action, as I have explained, included my instructing my assistant to call the police. The Hon. Mr Lucas was quite clearly very uncomfortable. My impression was that he did not want the facts to spoil a good story. One could see the shivers on his back searching for a spine to run up. That might seem harsh, but Mr Lucas has a record in the Upper House—ask the Attorney-General—of gutless, baseless attacks that he gets others to deliver.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. This is a serious matter, implying that the Minister could be accused of misleading the Parliament. Among the interjections, I have heard some things said that I do not want to hear again, and I think the members concerned know the statements to which I refer. As important as this matter

is, I ask the Minister to try to be as precise as possible with his answer and not to provoke the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It seems to me that the Hon. Mr Lucas is prepared to give credence to anyone who comes in his door with any bit of information without bothering to check. Operation Hydra shows the damage that people such as Rob Lucas can do to our community, and that approach debases public life.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister cannot reflect on another member and, certainly, not on a member of another place.

The SPEAKER: I accept the point of order and remind the Minister that no member of this House can reflect upon a member of the other House. I ask the Minister to remember that when making his response.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am aware that allegations were made against DEET, the Commonwealth department, prior to 21 June. Indeed, Helen Swift, the Director of DEET in South Australia, had had an inquiry under way for some considerable time.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES BOARD

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Health say what is the composition of the newly set up board of the South Australian Mental Health Services and what functions and purpose that board will have, given the closure of the Hillcrest Hospital?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member indicated to me yesterday that he wished to have this information placed on the record, and I have it before me. The members of the SAMHS Board are: Mrs Yvette Amer, who has been a member of the Hillcrest Board since 1981 and Deputy Chairman of that board since 1988; Dr David Ash, who is the Clinical Director of the Hillcrest Hospital and a representative of the medical staff; Mr Peter Bicknell, who is the Director of the north-eastern metropolitan region, Family and Community Services Department; Mr Greg Box, who is the Director of the Port Adelaide Central Mission; Ms Dolly Costello, who is a member of the Public Service Association and who has been a member of Glen-side Board since 1986; Ms Liz Dalston, who is Executive Director of the Mental Health Association and Resource Centre, and the consumer representative; Ms Mary-Louise Hribal, who is a solicitor; Professor Ross Kalucy, who is the professor of Psychiatry at Flinders University and the University of South Australia; and Mr Colin Parkin, who is the Nurse Manager of Hillcrest Hospital and who is on the board as a representative of the nursing staff.

MEDICARE

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Does the Premier support the Federal Government's introduction in the Federal budget, just announced, of a charge to be introduced in two stages, that is, \$3.50 rising to \$5, for non-card holding bulk billed Medicare patients?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The proposal to implement such a charge has been widely canvassed in the lead up to the Federal budget. I should like to look in some detail at the reasons given and the actual proposal that the Commonwealth has included in its budget before I comment on it. The member for Adelaide, as Opposition spokesman on health, and as a medical practitioner, would know about the problems of overservicing, of oversupply of doctors and the cost effects that will have. I should have thought that

he would have been supporting a much higher charge in line with those statements.

I would be very reluctant to support any increase in health impositions on people. I need to examine it because I want to know where it will fall, whether it is comprehensive, whether it is means tested and what the implications are. If one can afford to pay it, one should pay it. If one cannot afford to pay it, one should be looked after. All of those who pay the Medicare levy in a comprehensive health care system are entitled to medical services. The extent and the incidence of them are part of a very complex system, because we have public and private health systems sitting side by side in this economy. I am not prepared to make an off-the-cuff comment on something that I have not even seen.

WATER RESOURCES

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Water Resources provide information on the study commissioned by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to examine options for the management of stormwater in metropolitan Adelaide? This question is extremely important to my electorate because it is on the upper reaches of the Port River. Until recently stormwater has been considered a problem by local and state authorities and work has been concentrated on the direction of stormwater run off to the drainage system as rapidly as possible. The mitigation of potential flooding and the protection of life and property were seen as paramount. The potential resource value of stormwater was generally ignored, as were environmental considerations, and I believe that the study to which I refer places a new focus on these issues.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question as I believe the improved management of stormwater, which would include the reuse of this valuable resource and the protection of our marine environment from pollution, to be one of the most important environmental challenges facing our community. I thank the honourable member for raising this question in the House because of his involvement with his electorate both in terms of the reuse of stormwater and the protection of the marine environment.

As the honourable member has indicated, the E&WS Department has commissioned an independent study to identify the scope for improving urban stormwater management in metropolitan Adelaide. The report will address key factors, including the reuse of this potential resource, the cost effectiveness of alternative works and measures and institutional arrangements. It will also recommend legislative changes and the ownership of assets. The issue will require community input and detailed consultation with local government on the options which will be available to us as a community. I hope to receive the report early next month, and I look forward to keeping the House informed about progress on this vital matter.

FINNISS SPRINGS PASTORAL LEASE

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Will the Minister of Lands treat other pastoral leaseholders whose leases she intends to resume for national parks in the same way as she has treated the proprietors of Finnis Springs? The Minister went to Finnis Springs recently without advising the proprietors, their accountants, business advisers or lawyers. The proprietors have been trying to resolve a number of internal problems for a long time but had agreed to sell the lease by auction this Friday.

The Government has been aware of the date of the auction for three months since 21 May; however, I have been informed that, acting on the Minister's advice, Cabinet decided last week to acquire the property. The proprietors are all local Aborigines. They have yet to be informed of the constitution of the property or the amount of compensation that the Government will pay. However, they were also told in an arrogant letter received from the Minister this morning that the resumption will not occur until next year.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I normally thank members for their questions, but I think that the way in which the honourable member has asked that question defies normal courtesy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: A point of order, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear the point of order. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: I think it is legitimate to ask whether the Minister wishes to impugn my reputation by making that statement and, if so, I ask her to retract it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not uphold the point of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I shall refrain from making any comment about the last comments from the honourable member. It is correct that Cabinet did make a decision with respect to the Finnis Springs pastoral lease. I believe that many of the purported facts, which the honourable member has put before the House, have been clouded by the way in which he has presented them. I assure the honourable member that this issue has been the subject of much discussion and negotiation. In fact—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As many members opposite know—in particular, the local member for that area—I do not use jackboots in the way in which I negotiate with people. This is a very complex issue about which my department and I have been approached by a number of the owners of Finnis Springs. There are a number of owners, some of whom have approached the department requesting that the pastoral lease not be sold because they wish to continue with Aboriginal pursuits on this particular land.

The honourable member said that I visited the area. That is correct; it was public knowledge that I visited the area. In fact, when I visited the Witjira National Park, I flew over the area and I drove past the area, but I did not go into the Finnis Springs area. I had the opportunity to look at the area from the road and also to look at some of the mound springs, which I commend to the House.

I am prepared to provide members of the House with a full report on the matters raised by the honourable member, because I think that it will transpire that not only has this been a very sound decision taken by the Government but it is one that will be welcomed. It will be welcomed not only by the Aboriginal people who own the lease to Finnis Springs but by Aboriginal communities right throughout South Australia. It will be welcomed also by the conservation movement and, I believe, by many pastoralists, not only in that part of South Australia but right across the State.

I reject the kind of allegations that the honourable member is making and I reject the way in which he made them. I do not intend to lower myself to answer those allegations in the way in which he made them. I will provide a report

on the matters that have been raised by the honourable member.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Leader is out of order.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning provide a summary of the proposals announced by her in July for the establishment of an environmental protection agency and an indication of when this authority might be established? On 29 May 1991, the Leader of the Opposition released to the media a document entitled 'A key issues statement on the environment', in which it was stated that a Liberal Government would establish an environmental protection agency—when this has already been announced by the Government.

The **Hon. S.M. LENEHAN**: I thank the honourable member for her question.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable Minister.

The **Hon. S.M. LENEHAN**: The Government had made it very clear that it was looking at establishing an environmental protection authority in South Australia, and much work has been done to bring that promise to fruition. On 22 July I released the discussion paper on a proposal for the establishment of a South Australian environmental protection authority and a charter of environmental quality. The State Government is planning vital reforms to improve South Australia's environment protection laws. This is yet another case of the Opposition's announcing a policy the same as that which we as a Government are already implementing. I can assure members that the proposals more than adequately cover all—and, in fact, more—of the issues raised in the Opposition's direction paper.

Following a major review of South Australia's laws dealing with pollution and waste management, the Government has concluded that existing legislation should be revamped and consolidated into a single Environmental Protection Act. The new Act would cover air and water quality, land contamination and noise, as well as solid, liquid and other wastes. It is also proposed that there will be a community consultative forum representing a wide range of interest groups including industry, unions, local government and the environment movement.

It is important to point out that the proposed environmental protection authority would be compatible with the proposed national environmental protection agency or authority and would not duplicate the work of this agency. Following the consultation period, I expect legislation to be drafted for introduction during the autumn session of Parliament, and I look forward to absolute rock solid, bipartisan support on this legislation from the Opposition, both here and in another place. We will see whether members are able to give us that support.

JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Government decide not to legislate for either security or privacy for the Justice Information System, despite a recommendation in a 1983 report to the Government by Touche Ross Services that legislation needed to be formulated? The recently tabled report of the House of Assembly Select Committee on Privacy refers to the number of persons recorded on the Justice Information Service, and

the member for Hartley has been using this information to gather support for his privacy Bill.

In the 1983 report to the Bannon Government by Touche Ross Services, recommendations were made that the Government should proceed to formulate legislation governing certain matters. In fact, the report states:

The type of data to be maintained on the offender database and other databases.

The relevance of all data for the purposes defined.

The procedures to ensure the accuracy of data maintained in relation to the data subject.

The access to data by authorised individuals within the justice agencies.

The data subject's right to review data.

Use of data by non-justice agencies.

Specialised security in relation to juvenile data.

Purging policies in relation to historical data.

Sanctions and penalties for misuse.

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFT**: The honourable member's question indicates the importance of support for the recommendations of the select committee into the need for legislation for the provision of privacy rights in our community. I will obtain a report from the Attorney-General on this matter for the honourable member.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES BOARD

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Health)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: I find that, in detailing to the House the membership of the new South Australian Mental Health Services Board, I shortchanged the House. Three other people have a guernsey on this prestigious body, in addition to those I have already announced. They are Mr Reg Perkins, currently the Chairman of the Glenside board; Mr Donald Sanford, Director of Psychological Services at Hillcrest Hospital, who is on the board as a staff representative in the category 'other than medical or nursing'; and Ms Irene Towler, who is on the board as a consumer representative.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. On the last day of sitting I asked the Minister for Environment and Planning to confirm that faeces, used condoms, soiled toilet paper and hazardous waste were being carted through the streets of Adelaide in uncovered trucks. In her answer the Minister tried to deflect the question by twice assuring the House that night carts and pan services ceased last century. However, she also stated quite clearly that 'we are not carting any of these substances through the streets of Adelaide in uncovered trucks'.

An excellent report by Chris Kenny on television clearly showed the situation as it currently exists in Adelaide. I also have—and if you would care to peruse it, Mr Speaker, I will supply it—documentary and photographic evidence to substantiate the reason for the question. Publicly, the Minister accused the Opposition of scare tactics over this matter. The Minister has had ample time to withdraw or correct her statement to this House. I therefore ask you to rule on this as a matter of privilege and to decide whether the Minister has deliberately misled this House.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair will certainly consider the case, as presented, and I am sure that the honourable member will present the Chair with any information he has.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SEWAGE DISPOSAL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I seek leave to make a personal explanation. Leave granted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: On 15 August the member for Hayward asked two questions concerning the transportation of waste on behalf of the Department of Engineering and Water Supply. In my response to the first question I indicated, as was quite clear to all members of the House, that effluent was not being carted in uncovered trucks, as I understood the honourable member's question to refer to raw sewage which is sometimes transported by tanker.

Indeed, a reading of *Hansard* will indicate that I talked about the establishment of the Aldinga sewage treatment works and referred to the Public Works Standing Committee, because I was under the impression that that was, indeed, the matter to which the honourable member was referring.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, I have a copy of *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENAHAN: As a result of the additional information provided as part of the second question, it became apparent that the honourable member might have been referring to the transportation of something other than raw sewage, and I undertook to have the matter investigated. I also made clear in my response that, indeed, if a person has encountered this unusual occurrence, I would be pleased to have the matter investigated. I can inform the House that, since last Thursday, the honourable member has not contacted me, my office or the E&WS Department with one shred of information to support what he was saying. Nevertheless, I wish to inform the House that I did have the matter investigated, as I had said I would, and I can inform the House that grit and screening materials collected at the Glenelg sewage treatment works has, indeed, been transported off the site in bins—and these are covered bins—and disposed of at the Wingfield dump, using a licensed waste disposal contractor, since November 1988. The material is disposed of in accordance with approval given by the South Australian Waste Management Commission.

Since last Thursday I have instructed the E&WS Department to remind the contractor, who is licensed, of his obligations under the terms of the contract, and he has been advised that failure to cover all bins—which, of course, is specified in his contract—these bins containing grit and screenings, before they are transported from the Glenelg site will result in immediate termination of the contract. Furthermore, procedures have now been put in place at the Glenelg sewage treatment works which will ensure that, in future, every bin containing grit and screening material will be physically inspected by treatment works staff to see that it is covered before leaving the plant.

In conclusion, I want to make clear that the question I was asked was whether sewage was being carted in open trucks. The answer to that question was, 'Not' at that point and, as I have been briefed, it is now still 'Not', but the bins which are used by this licensed contractor must at all times be covered. I have not received any information from the member for Hayward. If he had that information, surely he had a responsibility to the South Australian community to draw that to my attention so that I could have it investigated. I have done that anyway, and I find this whole matter to be quite distasteful and not worthy of the honourable member.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move: That the time allotted for completion of the Address in Reply and Supply Bill (No. 2) be until 6 p.m. on Thursday 22 August. Motion carried.

FISHERIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Fisheries) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Fisheries Act 1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill provides for a number of amendments to the Fisheries Act 1982 to enable both the Government and the Department of Fisheries to more effectively meet the objectives of the Act as set out in section 20. Specifically, the amendments recognise the dynamic nature of fisheries management and the need to provide measures for the proper management and conservation of South Australia's aquatic resources.

Details of the various amendments are as follows:

1. Definition of 'take'.

The Fisheries Act 1982 provides a mechanism for the management of South Australia's fisheries resources. Fishing activities are regulated through various restrictions or limitations aimed at ensuring the resources are not endangered or overexploited.

The definitions outlined in the Act do not differentiate between the taking of live fish or dead fish. In particular, the definitions of 'fishing activity' and 'take' give no indication of whether or not it is an offence to take dead fish. The Department of Fisheries has always administered the Act on the basis that it applies to all fish, regardless of whether the fish is dead or alive when it is taken. The rationale for this is because some fishing activities will kill fish in the process—for example, gill netting. In order to ensure the legislation is upheld, fishers removing dead fish from the water should observe management controls such as size limits and bag limits and return to the water all fish (including dead fish) which exceed the prescribed limits. By not including dead fish within the scope of the Act, the Department of Fisheries will not be able to apply effective management controls to the fisheries.

The Crown Solicitor's Office has advised that whilst there are provisions in the Act which are clearly intended to relate to dead fish or parts of fish, a dead fish is not taken in the sense in which the Act defines the word 'take'. The definition presupposes that the fish are alive and in the water to start with. In a recent case, the Department initiated prosecution against a person who took a considerable quantity of undersize fish. The defendant claimed that the fish were returned to the water by another person who observed the legal minimum length requirements of the Act. During the hearing, argument was put forward that it is not an offence to pick up dead fish. The Stipendiary Magistrate upheld the argument, ruling that the provisions of the Fisheries Act and regulations must refer to live fish only. As such, there was no case for the defendant to answer. Such a defence could be mounted in all similar cases where a person is found in possession of undersize or over the bag limit fish

but where the prosecution cannot prove that the fish were alive when taken.

It is proposed to amend the interpretation provisions of section 5 of the Act so that the definition of 'take' involves the taking of fish, irrespective of whether it is alive or dead.

2. Sale of fish taken from inland waters surrounded by land.

The intent of the Fisheries Act 1982 is to provide for the conservation, enhancement and management of marine and freshwater fisheries resources. However, section 5 (5) states that where inland waters are surrounded by land in the ownership, possession or control of the same person, the Act does not apply except where those waters are used for fish farming activities.

In some situations, this definition limits the ability of the Department to discharge its statutory obligations to properly manage the State's fishery resources. For example, during periods of high water flow in the River Murray, fish are carried into many backwaters and lagoons. When the river level drops, stocks of fish are left in these lagoons etc, many of which become surrounded by private property. Advice from the Crown Solicitor indicates that such a situation is not considered to be a fish farming activity on the part of the land owner and therefore the land owner may take and sell those fish without a licence because of the exclusion provision in section 5 (5). Size and bag limit controls also would not apply.

Similar situations occur elsewhere such as in the Cooper Creek system and to some degree the Leigh Creek retention dam. The Electricity Trust of South Australia has requested the Department of Fisheries to police the retention dam which was cleared of carp and restocked with native fish at public expense. However, such matters are outside the scope of the Fisheries Act 1982 as it stands.

There is a means of avoiding the current legislation which would enable a person to sell fish taken illegally and claim that they were taken from 'private' waters. This matter is becoming more widely known. The Fisheries Act makes a clear distinction between commercial and recreational fishing whereby it is unlawful for a person to sell fish not taken pursuant to a licence. The distinction between commercial and recreational fishing cannot be maintained if unlicensed persons sell fish taken from private waters or are able to claim that they did.

To allow such situations to occur would provide for increased fishing effort as well as conflict between licensed and unlicensed persons. Enforcement officers who receive complaints relating to such activities are powerless to act and public confidence in the integrity of the Act is eroded.

The purpose of the amendment would not be to prevent persons from taking fish from private waters (that is, waters surrounded by private land) for their own use. However, persons taking fish from private waters for the purpose of business or trade would have to do so under either approved licensing arrangements or as registered fish farmers.

It is proposed that section 5 (5) be amended such that fish cannot be taken for the purpose of trade or business from inland bodies of water surrounded by land in the ownership, possession or control of the same person, unless the fish are taken pursuant to an authority.

3. Waters surrounded by Crown land and private land.

Section 5 (5) of the Act excludes application of the Act in waters surrounded by land in the control of one person—that is 'private' waters except where they are used for fish farming. However, there is a need for the Act to apply in situations where 'private' waters are surrounded by Crown land and in relation to the introduction of exotic fish and fish diseases in 'private' waters.

The first instance arises primarily in the case of waters surrounded by land under the jurisdiction of the National Parks and Wildlife Service—for example, a conservation park. Similar instances could apply to dams or reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. In these instances, the Department of Fisheries is not able to prevent illegal fishing activities such as netting in inland waters, taking undersize fish, exceeding bag limits or using non-permitted gear. Under the existing legislative arrangements it would appear that recreational and commercial fishers can take fish from 'private' waters and sell those fish without regard to the Fisheries Act. Such activities would compromise established fisheries management arrangements. It is evident that more people are becoming aware of this means of avoiding the legislation.

With regard to the placement of exotic fish in 'private' waters, the existing legislative provisions cover situations where the fish are introduced for fish farming purposes. Commercial and non-commercial fish farmers are required to observe certain standards aimed at preventing and controlling disease outbreaks and, importantly, possible translocation of diseased or exotic fish to areas that do not have such a problem. The placement of exotic fish in 'private' waters is not covered by the Act if the individual does not engage in fish farming—that is, simply introduces exotic fish (without regard to disease control) and takes no action to nurture or cultivate those fish. As such, the Department is currently unable to address its management responsibilities relating to exotic fish and fish disease matters.

Without adequate control over the release of introduced (exotic) fish species, many of which have adverse environmental and disease characteristics further damaging changes to the local ecosystem will occur. A particular example is the damage caused by the introduction of European carp into the fresh water system. Exotic fish species of this nature inflict the same kinds of damage on the aquatic systems of South Australia as the rabbit and other introduced pests have done to the land.

It is believed that when section 5 (5) of the Act was originally proposed and implemented, it was not intended to remove jurisdiction over important inland fisheries nor to create means of avoiding the legislation now becoming more widely known. The amendments as proposed still maintain the spirit of allowing private individuals to keep fish for personal use on their property (in farm dams etc) providing they do not introduce exotic fish or fish diseases.

In short, section 5 (5) of the Fisheries Act should be amended to ensure that the Fisheries Act would apply to waters surrounded by Crown land, and that people would not be permitted to introduce exotic fish into private waters without a permit from the Director of Fisheries. The proposed amendments would not change the status of 'private' waters such as farm dams, or other impoundments surrounded by land owned by a single private person, other than to control the use of exotic fish (and possible introduction of fish diseases) into such waters.

It is proposed that section 5 (5) be amended so that the Act applies:

- in waters surrounded by Crown land;
- in waters surrounded by land in the ownership, possession or control of the same person, in respect of the introduction of exotic fish and fish diseases into those waters.

4. State/Commonwealth arrangements.

The Fisheries Act provides for arrangements to be made with the Commonwealth whereby the management of a fishery can be implemented in accordance with state legislation or Commonwealth legislation or both.

In June 1987, arrangements were implemented for the marine scalefish, abalone, rock lobster and west coast prawn fisheries to be managed according to South Australian fisheries legislation. In addition, arrangements were implemented for the tuna fishery to be managed according to Commonwealth fisheries legislation.

Since these arrangements were promulgated, the Crown Solicitor has advised that there is some uncertainty as to the Commonwealth's authority to manage fisheries in waters within the limits of South Australia. The Commonwealth Fisheries Act provides for arrangements in respect of fisheries in waters adjacent to a state being a fishery wholly or partly in waters on the seaward side of the coastal waters of the state. Coastal waters are defined in terms which exclude waters which are within the limits of a state.

It is generally accepted that waters within the limits of South Australia (coastal waters) are waters within three nautical miles of:

- low water mark of the mainland coast;
- low water mark of any island adjacent to the coast;
- baselines proclaimed under section 7 (1) of the Seas and Submerged Lands Act 1973 and published in *Commonwealth of Australia Special Gazette* No. S29, 9/2/83 and No. S57, 31/3/87.

Waters within the limits of the State are waters within baselines and include bays, estuaries, river mouths etc.

Baselines include the waters of Fowlers Bay, Denial Bay, Streaky Bay, Anxious Bay, Spencer Gulf, Gulf St Vincent, Investigator Strait, Encounter Bay, Lacedpede Bay and Rivoli Bay.

It is also accepted that the limits of the state apply from low water mark to the closing lines of Sceale Bay, Coffin Bay, Avoid Bay, Vivonne Bay and Guichen Bay, or three nautical miles of low water mark (whichever is the greater). In these instances the limits do not extend for a further three nautical miles from each closing line.

With regard to the tuna fishery, licensees often operate in waters within the limits of South Australia, usually to take bait for subsequent tuna fishing activities in Commonwealth waters. However, all operations are conducted pursuant to a Commonwealth licence, subject to the management arrangement between South Australia and the Commonwealth.

An amendment to the Act would clarify the existing arrangement which applies to the tuna fishery, and simplify any future considerations for state managed fisheries to be managed by the Commonwealth.

It is proposed that Part II of the South Australian Fisheries Act be amended to provide that where an arrangement is in force whereby a fishery is to be managed in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth, then in waters within the limits of the state, Commonwealth law is to apply as state law.

5. Appointment of fisheries officers.

The Department of Fisheries has established a system of co-operation and information exchange with its counterparts in other states. Such action enhances the enforcement capabilities of the respective agencies.

At present, fifteen South Australian fisheries officers are authorised as fisheries officers in Victoria, and eight in New South Wales. It is proposed that South Australia reciprocate and appoint Victorian and New South Wales fisheries officers as fisheries officers in this State. Officers from other states would be considered for appointment as South Australian fisheries officers if and when the need arises.

Such appointments would effectively increase the number of officers who could assist with surveillance and enforcement operations. For example, South Australian officers

would be able to call upon their interstate counterparts to assist with investigations into illegal fishing operations where fish taken from one state are sent to another state for sale.

South Australian fisheries officers' operational capabilities would be enhanced by having additional expertise readily available as well as knowledge of local fish catching areas and methods, particularly around the South Australia/Victoria border area.

A co-operative approach such as this would assist in the successful apprehension and prosecution of offenders. However, any enforcement activities the interstate officers may conduct in South Australia would be in conjunction with and under the instruction of South Australian officers.

Section 25 of the Fisheries Act 1982, empowers the Governor to appoint an officer of the South Australian Public Service as a fisheries (enforcement) officer. However, this provision cannot be used to appoint an officer of an interstate public service to the position of a South Australian fisheries officer.

It is proposed that this provision be amended so that fisheries officers from other States or Territories may be appointed as South Australian fisheries officers.

It is also proposed that this provision be amended so that an appointment be made by the Minister of Fisheries instead of the Governor. This would be consistent with section 68 of the Constitution Act 1934 which provides for a minor appointment to a public office to be vested, by statute, in 'Heads of Departments, or other officers or persons within the State'. Such a provision would facilitate the appointment process and eliminate the need to submit each proposal to Executive Council.

The appointment of interstate fisheries officers would be subject to the following conditions (which were formulated on the advice of the Crown Solicitor):

- they would not receive or be entitled to receive any remuneration from the South Australian Government in respect of their office;
- they would hold the office only whilst accredited as a fisheries officer in their respective state;
- they would be subject to the directions of the Director of Fisheries with regard to their exercise of power pursuant to the Fisheries Act 1982;
- they would not be entitled to the rights and privileges of employees granted by the Government Management and Employment Act 1985.

It is proposed that section 25 be amended to empower the Minister of Fisheries to appoint South Australian public servants as well as fisheries officers from other States or Territories of the Commonwealth as fisheries officers in South Australia.

6. Assistance to enforcement officers.

Section 28 enables fisheries officers to exercise various powers in their role of fisheries enforcement. Provision is made for a fisheries officer, while exercising his/her powers, to request voluntary assistance from any person and to request the person in charge of any boat to voluntarily make the boat available for his/her use. Where a boat is used by a fisheries officer in such circumstances, compensation may be paid to the person who had charge of the boat at the time.

Enforcement operations are also conducted on land, requiring the use of four wheel drive as well as two wheel drive vehicles. In the majority of situations, fisheries officers have an appropriate vehicle available with back-up facilities. However, some enforcement operations may require the use of additional vehicles when and if the situation arises. Calling for departmental support vehicles to attend may not be a viable consideration when immediate

action is required. Provisions which enable a fisheries officer to request voluntary assistance from a person in charge of any vehicle would enhance the department's operational capabilities. It should be noted that a request does not translate to commandeer in these circumstances, the boat (and vehicle) owner has the right to refuse.

It is proposed that section 28 be expanded to allow a fisheries officer to request—and pay compensation for—the use of any vehicle voluntarily offered to assist with enforcement operations.

7. Licence conditions.

Section 37 enables the Director to impose conditions on licences. Conditions must be directed towards conserving, enhancing or managing fishery resources, or related to matters prescribed in the scheme of management regulations for the fishery.

In order to reduce total fishing effort on some species, conditions may need to be imposed on some licences that would effectively stop a licensee or class of licensees from having access to that species of fish. Also, a species of fish may be selectively targeted by using one type of fishing device. Reductions in fishing effort may require a limitation on where the device could be used (area exclusion) or a limitation on the dimensions of the device. It could be argued that such action, by effectively denying the licensee from taking a species of fish that is permitted to be taken pursuant to the licence, be construed as derogation of the grant of a licence and therefore not legally tenable. The Crown Solicitor has advised that in order to overcome such a situation, it is necessary to amend the legislation.

It is proposed that section 37 be amended to empower the Director to impose a condition on a licence notwithstanding that the condition would prevent a licensee from taking one or more species of fish or from using devices that could otherwise lawfully be used pursuant to the licence, providing that condition is directed towards conserving, enhancing or managing the living resources so that they are not endangered or over exploited.

8. Fisheries licences as security for loans.

The South Australian fishing industry and financial lending institutions have expressed interest in having procedures established for commercial fishery licences and endorsements to be used as collateral for loans.

In response to this interest, the Department of Fisheries, with Cabinet approval, issued two green papers on the topic. The first paper was released in May 1988, followed by a supplementary paper in July 1989. Both papers attracted wide ranging comments from the fishing industry and lending institutions. A number of responses suggested schemes which would involve considerable departmental involvement and possible compromises to effective management of the various fisheries.

The Government proposes to implement an arrangement which recognises that licences and endorsements can be used as security for loans, but at the same time maintaining management prerogative to vary legislative, policy, administrative or procedural matters to meet the responsibilities of properly managing the fisheries resources of South Australia. This could be achieved as follows:

- the licence holder to advise the Director of Fisheries that a lender has a financial interest in a licence;
- the Director of Fisheries be required to withhold his consent for the transfer of a licence/endorsement/quota without the written consent of the lender who has put the director on notice;
- the maintenance of a public register which identifies licences subject to a financial arrangement;
- the collection of a fee for providing such a service.

Also, the Director of Fisheries would undertake to provide the lender with information relating to prosecution action initiated against the licence holder under the Fisheries Act bearing in mind that such prosecutions may affect the status of the licence. Such an obligation could be incorporated into the proposed legislation.

The Department of Fisheries will implement procedures to minimise administrative errors, but the fact remains that persons wishing to utilise the scheme would do so at their own risk. Unforeseen circumstances or events over which the Department of Fisheries has no control may occur. In this regard it is proposed that no liability lie against the Crown.

It is proposed that sections 30, 38, 61 and 65 of the Fisheries Act be amended to: require the Director of Fisheries to withhold his consent for the transfer of a licence, endorsement or quota without the written consent of a lender who has previously informed the Director that a licence is subject to a financial arrangement; and require the Director to advise a lender of any legal action undertaken against the holder of a licence in which the lender has an interest; provide that no liability lie against the Crown for any loss arising from the Director of Fisheries not meeting his responsibility; require the Director to maintain a public register identifying licences subject to a financial arrangement; provide for the collection of a fee for such a service.

9. Fishery closure notices.

Section 43 empowers the Minister of Fisheries, by notice in the *Government Gazette*, to impose a temporary prohibition on certain fishing activities. In the majority of cases, these prohibitions are applied in response to an agreed need to vary harvesting strategies in the prawn fisheries, or in response to chemical/toxic spills or outbreaks of algal blooms.

The requirement to gazette such notices severely limits the Minister's obligation to properly administer the requirements of the Fisheries Act. In the case of the prawn fisheries, a strict harvesting regime is imposed on licensees so that the prawn stocks are not endangered or over exploited. In practice, management decisions are made on a daily basis, requiring immediate action to prohibit fishing in certain waters. In the case of chemical/toxic spills and algal blooms, the government has an overriding responsibility to safeguard public health. This also requires immediate action to prohibit the taking of fish from contaminated waters.

The obligation to urgently respond in these situations is limited by the requirement to publish notices in the *Government Gazette*. It is extremely difficult to arrange gazettal at short notice, particularly at night, during weekends or public holidays.

In the interest of proper management of the state's prawn fisheries and in view of the urgency associated with safeguarding public health, it is proposed that the Act be amended such that a section 43 notice, issued by the Minister (or his delegate) in respect of the commercial prawn fishery or in response to chemical/toxic spills and algal blooms, take effect immediately. An appropriate media release would be issued where public health/safety could be at risk. The Department of Fisheries would advise prawn fishery licensees of the issue of a closure notice. Gazettal of these notices would still be made at the earliest opportunity. Other temporary prohibitions on fishing activities would continue to be gazetted, and appropriate information disseminated to those affected by such notices.

It is proposed that section 43 be amended so that a fishery closure notice issued in respect of protecting the living resources of the State, or in the interest of safeguarding public health, take effect immediately.

10. Possession of Protected Fish.

Under existing provisions of the Act, it is an offence for a person to take protected fish. Examples of protected fish include seals, dolphins, whales and leafy sea dragons.

Under the evidentiary provisions of the Act, if it is proved that a protected fish was in the possession or control of a person in proximity to waters, it shall be presumed, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that the fish was taken by that person. The evidentiary provisions do not assist in situations where a person is not in proximity to any waters. In such circumstances, the department's ability to successfully prosecute offenders could be compromised by not having a specific provision which makes it an offence to be in possession of protected fish. Given the serious nature of taking protected fish, the legislation should make it quite clear that not only is the taking of protected fish an offence, but also being in possession of such fish would be an offence.

It is recognised that in some instances, persons would be in possession of fish that were not taken unlawfully at the time, for example, a leafy sea dragon taken prior to such fish being declared as a protected species. Defence provisions have been included to cover such situations.

It is proposed that section 44 be varied to make the possession of declared protected fish an offence.

11. Possession of Undersize Fish.

Section 44 has provisions which make it an offence to be in possession of undersize fish where those fish were taken from waters within the limits of the state.

Fisheries officers actively monitor size limits on fish whilst conducting their enforcement operations. This involves checking fish at the point of landing and at wholesale and retail premises. Being in possession of undersize fish at a point of landing or where those fish were obtained from a registered fish farm is not a contentious issue as it usually can be established where the fish were taken.

The main problem arises where undersize fish in a person's possession in South Australia may be claimed to have originated interstate or where the Department cannot prove that they were taken in contravention of the Act. The Department has had experience in more recent years where prosecution has been jeopardised or unsuccessful because of the onus of proof which the department must comply with to satisfy the court that undersize fish in possession were taken illegally in waters under the jurisdiction of the Fisheries Act 1982. Such proof may be difficult to provide where undersize fish are located in trading premises away from the water.

The existing provisions which prohibit the possession of undersize fish are limited because of the scope of the Act. In order to overcome this problem without undue interference upon established marketing arrangements, it is proposed that the Act be amended to prohibit the sale, purchase or possession of undersize fish irrespective of the origins of the fish. This would not deny fish wholesalers or retailers the right to purchase fish from whatever source they choose provided those fish comply with the legal minimum length in South Australia. Such variations to the legislation would ensure that fisheries management arrangements are not undermined.

The enabling legislation would require the making of regulations to give effect to the proposal. It is intended that initially, such regulations apply to commercial operators only, that is, licence holders and fish processors.

It should be noted that section 47 of the repealed Fisheries Act 1971 prohibited the sale of any undersize fish. Advice from the Crown Solicitor in 1983 confirmed that any importation of undersize fish for sale would be an offence under

that provision of the Act. Unfortunately that provision was not carried over from the 1971 Act to the current Act.

Such a prohibition can be sustained by virtue of the High Court decision in *Cole v Whitfield* (1988) which enables a state to impose a legal minimum length on fish irrespective of where the fish was taken. Other states already have implemented such controls in their fisheries management arrangements.

It is proposed that section 44 be amended to prohibit the sale, purchase or possession of undersize fish.

12. Marine parks.

The Fisheries Act places an obligation on the Minister and Director of Fisheries to ensure proper conservation measures are applied to the living aquatic resources of South Australia—that is, protect the aquatic habitat.

To date, fourteen aquatic reserves have been proclaimed pursuant to the Act. The reasons for their establishment encompass factors such as:

- conservation/protection/preservation
- fisheries management
- scientific research/education
- recreation.

As well as managing renewable resources, the Department must also ensure that endangered species and unique habitats are afforded adequate protection.

The existing fisheries legislative mechanism allows a flexible approach towards the management of aquatic reserves. Once proclaimed, activities may be permitted within the reserve by making regulations or by a permit issued by the Director of Fisheries.

Since the current legislation was formulated, it has become apparent that there is a need to have a legislative framework within the Fisheries Act which is compatible with the requirements of other government managers of (terrestrial) parks and wildlife. This is particularly so where an area of water has considerable conservation and preservation significance, both within the Australian context and internationally (for example, world heritage listing) such as the proposed Great Australian Bight marine park. Other areas may also be identified for such recognition. It is a basic tenet of conservation management that conservation reserves have a legislative framework which provides security of tenure. In the case of a conservation reserve, the government is the manager of the public land and water and is therefore publicly accountable. Security of tenure and public accountability may both be maintained such that proclamation and revocation of reserve status can be achieved only through the parliamentary process as is provided for under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. Under the Fisheries Act, an aquatic reserve may be proclaimed by the Governor and regulations made (or a Director's permit issued) to manage activities within the reserve.

Ongoing management of an area such as the Great Australian Bight marine park would need to be subject to an approved management plan, identifying matters such as:

- objectives of management
- provision for recreational and commercial use
- management of visitor activities
- provision for research
- policing/protecting the reserve.

Legislation which addresses such matters exists in the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. Whilst this legislation was formulated mainly to manage terrestrial reserves, the amendments proposed for the Fisheries Act would be similar to the National Parks and Wildlife Act, but aimed at managing, protecting, conserving and preserving the aquatic flora and fauna resources of South Australia.

In order to afford a higher degree of security of tenure (than at present) to significant aquatic reserves (marine parks), an amendment to section 48 of the Fisheries Act would be required. Such an amendment should be additional to the provisions that are already in place, so that a marine park could be proclaimed and be managed by regulations if additional status such as world heritage listing is required.

Under existing provisions contained in the Fisheries Act, otherwise prohibited fishing activities or activities which interfere with the aquatic habitat within an aquatic reserve can be approved by regulation or by a permit issued by the Director of Fisheries. Section 48 (3) enables the Director to:

‘... issue a permit to any person authorising that person to engage in any activity, or do any act, specified in the permit during such period and subject to such conditions as may be specified ...’.

In the case of a marine park which the government recognises as having significance such as world heritage listing, such powers should be vested only in the Minister of Fisheries. This would reflect the provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife Act when implementing a management regime to a reserve such as that proposed for the Great Australian Bight.

With regard to joint management, where a constituted marine park is adjacent to a reserve constituted under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972, it is envisaged that management of the marine park be undertaken by the Minister of Fisheries in consultation with the Minister of Environment and Planning. Similarly, where a marine park is adjacent to a marine park administered by the Commonwealth, it is envisaged that management of the South Australian marine park be undertaken by the Minister of Fisheries in consultation with the relevant Commonwealth minister.

In addition, it is proposed that the objectives of the Fisheries Act as set out in section 20 require an amendment to reflect the concept of ‘preservation’ of the living aquatic resources of South Australia. This would be consistent with the intent of the Act.

It is proposed that section 20 be amended to incorporate reference to ‘preservation’ in the administration of the Act; and section 48 be amended so that a marine park can be proclaimed and be managed by regulation.

13. Fish farming regulations.

Section 51 empowers the making of regulations relating to exotic fish, fish farming and disease in fish. Such regulations have been made, but there are limitations as to how fish farming can be regulated because section 51 is not as comprehensive as section 46 (which includes general management regulation making powers). Also, the exotic fish, fish farming and fish diseases regulations are complex because the provisions contain a large amount of information on fish species permitted to be introduced into South Australia and subsequently farmed, as well as detailed information on disease identification and control; and disposal of diseased fish and contaminated water.

In order to simplify the combined exotic fish, fish farming and fish disease regulations, it is proposed that section 51 be amended to provide for the making of fish farm regulations which would provide a specific legislative category for the regulation and monitoring of fish farming activities; including a provision clarifying licensing requirements for conducting fish farming operations. Such action would enhance public understanding of the regulations.

Existing provisions enable the Director of Fisheries to grant registration of a fish farm. However, registration can-

not be refused if inspection shows a site to be inadequate in respect of matters such as water quality or good farming practice. In addition, a registration cannot be revoked if the operator fails to observe required standards relating to exotic fish, fish diseases or the proper disposal of water used for fish farming.

Also, there is no provision for the Department of Fisheries to charge a fee for the registration of a fish farm. As the Department provides an administrative, enforcement and research function associated with aquaculture/fish farming, the Government may wish to recover some of the cost of providing the service. This would be in line with the principle of collecting fees from commercial licensees.

It is proposed that section 51 be amended to make it an offence to conduct a fish farming operation without an appropriate authority and to empower the making of regulations:

- that regulate fish farming;
- prescribe matters of which the Director must be satisfied before granting a licence;
- prescribe matters that may be the subject of conditions on a licence;
- prescribe the term of licences and provide for renewal of such licences;
- prescribe matters of which the Director must be satisfied before renewing a licence;
- authorise the transfer of licences;
- prescribe matters of which the Director must be satisfied before consenting to the transfer of a licence;
- prescribe fees for the granting, renewal or transfer of a licence;
- provide for the payment, refund and recovery of fees or parts of fees payable;
- restrict or regulate the treatment, handling, storage, movement or dealing in farmed fish;
- require licensees to furnish the Director with returns (in a form fixed by the Director) outlining production and value details.

14. Fish processors/shark certification.

Most of the shark taken by South Australian licensees is processed and sent in fillet form to the Victorian market.

The Victorian Government has implemented controls which limit the species of shark that may be brought into the State.

Following extensive negotiations, it was agreed South Australia would implement controls which would satisfy the Victorian requirements. Since then, Victoria has decided not to continue with its most restrictive measure (prohibition on shark fillets entering Victoria), subject to South Australian shark processors voluntarily complying with a code of practice such that:

- only approved species of shark may enter Victoria;
- packages of shark to be accompanied with certification that the shark is an approved species;
- fillets to be consigned in sealed containers.

Notwithstanding Victoria’s decision not to activate its controls at the present time, it is proposed to proceed with enabling legislation in the South Australian Fisheries Act in the event Victoria reintroduces more restrictive measures or there is a problem with the voluntary arrangements. A change to the South Australian Act would enable this State to implement regulations, at short notice, to satisfy Victorian requirements.

In order to provide the means of addressing Victorian requirements (when and if necessary), a number of regulatory provisions for certifying processed shark have been identified. However, such regulations are not within the scope of the Fisheries Act provisions which deal with fish processing. The introduction of a formal South Australian based shark certification program would require legislative provisions as follows:

- a registered processor would not be permitted to process shark unless he was the holder of an appropriate endorsement issued by the Director of Fisheries;
- the endorsement may, upon application to the Director of Fisheries be issued subject to conditions which limit the species of shark that may be processed;
- the Director of Fisheries may refuse to issue such an endorsement if the processor has been convicted in South Australia or elsewhere in Australia of a fisheries-related offence within the preceding three years;
- the Minister of Fisheries may suspend or cancel a shark endorsement if the processor has been convicted in South Australia or elsewhere in Australia of a fisheries-related offence;
- such an endorsement be subject to an annual fee;
- shark processed pursuant to the endorsement only to be consigned in a sealed container/package appropriately identified;
- the container/package to have attached to it a seal or other mark identifying it as having been issued by the Department of Fisheries;
- the issue of sealed or marked packages be subject to a fee;
- officers of the Department of Fisheries may take and retain shark product for the purpose of sampling and analysis (without compensation).

The fish processor regulations have provisions which outline the documentation that must be completed by a registered fish processor. The proposed amendments, together with the existing provisions, would assist industry in processing and selling fillets of shark taken from approved species by ensuring their continued access to traditional markets.

It is proposed that sections 54 and 55 be amended to provide for a shark processing and certification program as outlined above.

15. Suspension of Licence.

Section 56 of the Act provides for a court, following a conviction for an offence, to suspend the offender's licence for a specified period. In addition, section 56 provides for the mandatory suspension of a licence for a period of not less than three months where a person is convicted of a prescribed offence within a three year period.

In the managed fisheries such as the rock lobster and prawn fisheries, there are seasonal limitations on fishing operations. In particular, the rock lobster seasons are fixed at seven months in the northern and southern zones whilst the prawn seasons vary according to management strategies. It is not uncommon for prawn fishing to be limited to 3-4 nights of trawling followed by an extended period (for example, from 10 days to 3 months) of no permitted activity.

Following a recent prosecution of a prawn fishery licence holder, the court imposed a 10 day licence suspension. The Department of Fisheries sought to split the suspension into two periods which were within predetermined fishing days because the next fishing period was expected to be no more than 8 days. However, the magistrate was of the view that section 56 does not authorise a non-consecutive suspension period because the word 'period' as used in section 56 means a time that runs continuously. As a result, the full 10 day

suspension of the offender's licence could not be realised because the last 2 days of the suspension period were not predetermined fishing days.

In order to restore the intent of the provision to serve as a deterrent to those persons who contemplate fishing in contravention of the Act an appropriate amendment should be made to the legislation.

It is proposed that section 56 be varied to provide for a licence to be suspended for a period or periods of time over non-consecutive days.

16. Additional penalty—undersize fish.

Section 66 states that where a person is convicted of an offence against the Act involving the taking of fish, the court shall, in addition to imposing any other penalty, impose an additional penalty equal to—

(a) Five times the amount determined by the convicting court to be the wholesale value of the fish at the time of which they were taken;

or

(b) \$30 000,

whichever is the lesser amount.

During prosecution action initiated by the Department against fishery offenders, argument has arisen as to whether undersize fish have a value. It has been intimated that because it is illegal to take undersize fish (except where taken from a jetty, pier, wharf or breakwater abutting land), there can be no market for them and consequently they have no value. This argument would erode the deterrent and actual effect of section 66 because if undersize fish had no value, no additional penalty could be applied.

In one recent instance (*Crown v Ferraro*), the Department attempted to secure an additional penalty against the defendant, who was able to argue that as undersize fish did not have a value, the additional penalty should not be applied. Although this judgement was upheld by the court at the time, the department successfully appealed the judgement in this particular case. The Crown Solicitor has advised that the relevant section be amended to avoid any misunderstanding in this regard.

It is proposed that section 66 be amended to remove any uncertainty in this matter to recognise the fact that undersize fish have a monetary value.

17. Catch and effort data.

An essential component of fisheries management is the collection of data from licensees. This information is submitted on a monthly basis, and includes details such as:

- species of fish caught;
- total weight of catch for each species;
- type of fishing gear/method used;
- number of days fished;
- areas fished.

Once this information is assembled, collated and analysed, research staff (biologists) use it to monitor the state of the fisheries resources. This is supplemented with information obtained first hand from sampling conducted in the field.

The results of research activities indicate trends in fish mortality and fishing effort, which are two of the important factors which must be addressed by fisheries managers. It

is of paramount importance that over exploitation of any fish species not occur, and management decisions must be based on reliable and accurate data.

Individual licensees, and the fishing industry in general, have been adamant that the catch and effort information they provide monthly be treated confidentially by the Department of Fisheries. As business persons operating in a highly competitive commercial arena, individuals do not want their personal business details made public. Such action would obviously be to the detriment of their established fishing practices. The Department of Fisheries has always recognised the need to maintain confidentiality, and always resisted attempts from courts, government departments, businesses or individuals to make personal details available for whatever reason. The Department has on numerous occasions given an undertaking to the fishing industry that it would uphold the confidentiality of licensees' catch and effort details. Statistical details are only ever released when the information is of a general or aggregate nature or an average for a particular fishery, without identifying individual licensees. By maintaining this approach, licensees have confidence in the Department and are more likely to submit reliable data. However, if personal details were made public, then licensees would tend to under-report their catches in an effort to conceal their true levels of fishing activity. Such action would undermine the integrity of research data and erode the ability of the department to make sound management decisions.

On a number of occasions, the Department has been requested to supply personal details to the Taxation Commissioner and to courts as a result of actions between the department and licensees or licensees and third parties. All requests have been strenuously resisted, notwithstanding that the Taxation Commissioner has wide ranging powers.

Whilst an amendment to the Act to maintain confidentiality would not overrule the Commonwealth taxation legislation, it would enable the Director of Fisheries to refuse requests for access to catch and effort data from others claiming an interest.

It is proposed that the Fisheries Act contain a provision such that the Minister or Director of Fisheries not be required by subpoena or otherwise to produce catch and effort information which identifies an individual licensee to any court, or to any other person; unless that information is made available with the prior consent in writing of the person to whose activities the information relates.

In providing the above explanation of proposed amendments to the Fisheries Act 1982, I would inform the House that the South Australian Fishing Industry Council, representing the interests of commercial fishers, and the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council, representing the interests of amateur fishers, have been consulted and support the proposed amendments to the Act.

In addition, other interest groups have been consulted and their responses indicate agreement in principle to the proposals.

In preparing the draft Bill, the Parliamentary Counsel has taken the opportunity to incorporate statute law revision amendments.

I commend the measures to the House.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement of the measure on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act.

The amendment—

- (a) inserts definitions of 'fish farming licence' and 'marine park' (two new terms used in provisions inserted into the principal Act by this Bill);

- (b) amends the definition of 'take' to include the taking of dead fish;

and

- (c) substitutes a new subsection (5) which sets out in which cases the principal Act does not apply.

The effect of new subsection (5) is to extend the application of the Act—

- (a) to the taking of fish for the purpose of trade or business and to the introduction of exotic fish or fish disease in inland waters that are surrounded by land that is in the ownership, possession or control of the same person;

and

- (b) to activities engaged in in relation to inland waters that are surrounded by land in the ownership, possession or control of the Crown or an instrumentality of the Crown.

Clause 4 inserts new section 14a into the principal Act. The section provides that where there is in force an arrangement that provides that a particular fishery is to be managed in accordance with the law of the Commonwealth, that law applies within the limits of the State as a law of the State.

Clause 5 amends section 20 of the principal Act which sets out the principal objectives that the Director and the Minister must have regard to in the administration of the Act to include a requirement that the objective of ensuring that the living resources of the waters to which the Act applies are not endangered or overexploited is achieved through proper 'conservation, preservation and fisheries' management measures rather than through proper 'conservation and management' measures.

Clause 6 repeals section 25 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. At present the Governor is empowered to appoint officers of the State Public Service to be fisheries officers for the purposes of the Act.

New subsection (1) empowers the Minister to appoint any of the following persons to be fisheries officers for the purposes of the Act: Public Service employees, officers under the Commonwealth Fisheries Act and interstate and territory fisheries officers.

New subsection (2) provides that the Director and each member of the Police Force are fisheries officers for the purposes of the Act.

New subsection (3) provides that an appointment under subsection (1) may be made subject to conditions limiting the area within which, or the purposes for which, the appointee may exercise the powers of a fisheries officer.

New subsection (4) empowers the Minister, by notice in writing served on a fisheries officer, to vary or revoke conditions imposed under subsection (3) or to revoke the appointment.

Clause 7 amends section 26 of the principal Act to require an identity card that is issued to a fisheries officer whose appointment has been made subject to conditions under section 25 (3) limiting the officer's powers to contain a statement of those limitations.

Clause 8 amends section 28 of the principal Act to empower a fisheries officer to request a person in charge of a vehicle to make the vehicle available for the officer's use for the purpose of enforcing the Act and to empower the Minister, where a fisheries officer makes use of such a vehicle, to compensate the person who would otherwise have been entitled to the use of the vehicle at that time for any loss incurred as a result of the vehicle being made available for use by the fisheries officer.

Clause 9 repeals section 30 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision.

New subsection (1) provides that a person engaged in the administration of the Act incurs no liability for an honest act or omission in the exercise or discharge, or purported exercise or discharge, of a power, function or duty under the Act.

New subsection (2) provides that subject to subsection (3), a liability that would, but for subsection (1) lie against the person lies instead against the Crown.

New subsection (3) provides that no liability lies against the Crown for any loss arising from—

- (a) the granting of consent by the Director to the transfer of a fishery licence without the consent of a person nominated as having an interest in the licence (where that interest is recorded on the register pursuant to section 65);
- (b) the acceptance by the Director of the surrender of a fishery licence without the consent of that person having been obtained;

or

- (c) a failure on the part of the Director to record an interest in a licence pursuant to section 65, to notify the person recorded on the register as having an interest in a fishery licence of any proceedings for an offence against the holder of the licence or to remove a notation of an interest from the register.

Clause 10 amends section 34 of the principal Act to make it clear that only a natural person may be registered as the master of a boat.

Clause 11 amends section 36 of the principal Act to prevent a person other than the person nominated as the proposed master of a boat from being registered as the master.

Clause 12 amends section 37 of the principal Act to make it clear that the Director has power to impose a condition of a licence even though the effect of the condition is to prevent—

- (a) the taking of one or more species of fish that could otherwise be lawfully taken pursuant to the licence;
- or
- (b) the use of any device or equipment that could otherwise be lawfully used to take fish pursuant to the licence.

Clause 13 amends section 38 of the principal Act to provide that the Director cannot consent to the transfer of a fishery licence which is subject to an interest recorded in the register of authorities pursuant to section 65 unless the person specified in the register as having that interest has consented to the transfer.

Clause 14 amends section 43 of the principal Act by inserting several new provisions.

New subsection (2) empowers the Minister or a fisheries officer authorised by the Minister to direct any person or any persons of a specified class to not engage in a fishing activity of a specified class during a specified period where, in the opinion of the Minister, it is necessary to take urgent action to safeguard public health or protect living resources of the waters to which the Act applies.

New subsection (3) requires such a direction or authorisation to be given in written form unless the Minister or the fisheries officer considers that impracticable by reason of the urgency of the situation, in which case it may be given orally.

New subsection (4) provides that where an authorisation is given orally, written notice must be given as soon as practicable.

New subsection (5) provides that where a direction is given under subsection (2), notice of it must be published in the *Gazette* as soon as practicable.

New subsection (6) (which incorporates the existing subsection (3)) provides that a person must not engage in a fishing activity in contravention of a declaration or direction under the section. The maximum penalty is, for a first offence—a division 7 fine (\$2 000), for a second offence—a division 6 fine (\$4 000) and for a subsequent offence—a division 5 fine (\$8 000).

Clause 15 amends section 44 of the principal Act to—

- (a) make it an offence to sell, purchase or have possession or control of fish of a class declared to be protected for the purposes of section 42;
- (b) to ensure that regulations made for the purposes of subsection (2) (b) (that is, to prescribe classes of fish) may prescribe a class of fish comprised of or including fish taken elsewhere than in waters to which the Act applies (this will make it possible to make it an offence to sell, have possession of, etc., undersize fish taken anywhere);

and

- (c) to provide an additional defence to a charge of an offence against the section if the defendant proves—

- (i) that he or she did not take the fish in contravention of the Act;

and

- (ii) that he or she did not know, and had no reason to believe, that the fish were, as the case may be, fish taken in waters to which the Act applies but not pursuant to a licence, fish taken in contravention of the Act, fish of a class declared protected for the purposes of section 42 or fish of a prescribed class.

Clause 16 amends section 46 of the principal Act to extend the regulation-making power—

- (a) in respect of fisheries subject to a scheme of management—to the making of regulations that provide that no further licences may be granted in respect of the fishery, and, in respect of a miscellaneous fishery—to provide for licences of different kinds by empowering the Director to impose licence conditions limiting the class of fishing activities that may be engaged in pursuant to the licence, limiting the term for which a licence may remain in force or imposing any other limitation or restriction;

and

- (b) to the making of regulations that provide for returns to be furnished to the Director by licensees to contain such information as the Director may, with the approval of the Minister, require (rather than information prescribed by regulation).

Clause 17 repeals section 48 of the principal Act and substitutes new sections dealing with marine parks and the protection of the aquatic habitat.

New section 48 deals with the constitution of marine parks.

Subsection (1) empowers the Governor, by proclamation, to constitute as a marine park any waters, or land and waters, specified in the proclamation, that the Governor considers to be of national significance by reason of the

aquatic flora or fauna of those waters or the aquatic habitat and to assign a name to a marine park so constituted.

Subsection (2) empowers the Governor, by subsequent proclamation, to abolish, alter the boundaries or alter the name of, a marine park.

Subsection (3) requires the Minister to submit any proposal to constitute, or alter the boundaries of, a marine park to the Minister who has jurisdiction over any land that is to be included in a marine park for that Minister's approval and to submit any such proposal to the Minister of Mines and Energy and consider the views of that Minister in relation to the proposal.

Subsection (4) provides that a proclamation constituting, abolishing or altering the boundaries of, a marine park must not be made without the approval or approvals required by the section.

Subsection (5) provides that a proclamation abolishing, or altering the boundaries of, a marine park must not be made except in pursuance of a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament.

Subsection (6) requires notice of a motion for such a resolution to be given at least 14 sitting days before the motion is passed.

Section 48a deals with the control and administration of marine parks.

Subsection (1) places marine parks under the control and administration of the Minister.

Subsection (2) empowers the Minister to grant on appropriate terms and conditions a lease or licence entitling a person to rights of entry, use or occupation in respect of a marine park.

Subsection (3) provides that any lease or licence granted in respect of waters or land and waters constituted as a marine park under the Act and in force immediately before the constitution of the marine park continues, subject to its terms and conditions, in force for the remainder of the term for which it was granted as if it had been granted by the Minister under this section.

Section 48b deals with plans of management for marine parks.

Subsection (1) requires the Minister to propose a plan of management for a marine park within two years after constitution of the park.

Subsection (2) empowers the Minister to prepare, at any time, an amendment to a plan of management or a plan to be substituted for a previous plan.

Subsection (3) requires the Minister—

(a) to invite (by public advertisement) members of the public to make representations as to matters that should be addressed by the plan of management;

and

(b) in the case of a marine park that is adjacent to, or contiguous with, a reserve constituted under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 or land that the Minister administering that Act has informed the Minister is proposed to be constituted as a reserve under that Act, consult with that Minister as to the matters that should be addressed by the plan of management,

and to consider all representations made by members of the public and the views of the Minister administering the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 when preparing the plan of management.

Subsection (4) requires a plan of management to set out the proposals of the Minister in relation to the marine park and any other proposals by which the Minister proposes to accomplish the objectives of the Act in relation to the marine park.

Subsection (5) requires the Minister to incorporate in the plan of management for a marine park such measures as the Minister considers necessary or appropriate for—

(a) the protection, conservation and preservation of the flora and fauna of the waters included in the marine park and their habitat;

(b) regulation of fishing, mining and research activities in, public access to, and other use of, the marine park to prevent or minimise adverse effect on the flora and fauna and their habitat;

(c) coordination of the management of the marine park with the management of any adjacent reserve, park or conservation zone or area established under the law of this or any other State or of the Commonwealth;

(d) the promotion of public understanding of the purposes and significance of the marine park.

Subsection (6) requires the Minister to give notice by public advertisement of the fact that a plan of management has been prepared.

Subsection (7) provides that such notice must specify an address at which copies of the plan of management may be inspected and an address to which representations in connection with the plan may be forwarded.

Subsection (8) permits a person to make representations to the Minister in connection with a plan of management.

Subsection (9) requires the Minister to make copies of all representations made by members of the public under the section available for public inspection and purchase (other than those made in confidence) and to give notice of the place where those copies are available.

Subsection (10) empowers the Minister to adopt a plan of management either without alteration or with such alterations as the Minister thinks reasonable in view of the representations made by members of the public.

Subsection (11) requires the Minister to give public notice of the fact that he or she has adopted a plan of management. Subsection (12) requires the Director to furnish a person who applies for a copy of a plan of management adopted under the section and pays the prescribed fee with a copy of the plan.

Subsection (13) defines certain terms used in the section.

Section 48c provides that the Planning Act 1982 does not apply to development undertaken in, or in relation to, a marine park pursuant to a plan of management adopted by the Minister in relation to that marine park.

Section 48d deals with the implementation of plans of management.

Subsection (1) provides that subject to subsection (2), where the Minister adopts a plan of management, the provisions of the plan must be carried out in relation to the marine park and activities must not be undertaken in relation to the marine park unless those activities are in accordance with the plan of management.

Subsection (2) provides that where a mining tenement has been granted in relation to land that forms part of, or has, since the tenement was granted, become part of, a marine park, the management of the marine park is subject to the exercise by the holder of the tenement of rights under the tenement.

Section 48e deals with agreements as to conditions.

Subsection (1) provides that the Minister and the Minister of Mines and Energy may enter into an agreement with the holder of a mining tenement in relation to land that forms part of a marine park imposing conditions limiting or restricting the exercise of rights under the tenement by the holder and his or her successors in title.

Subsection (2) requires the Minister of Mines and Energy, at the request of the Minister, to serve notice on the holder of a mining tenement in respect of which conditions imposed by agreement under subsection (1) have been contravened or not complied with, requiring the holder to rectify the contravention or failure in the manner and period set out in the notice.

Subsection (3) empowers the Minister of Mines and Energy to cancel a mining tenement held by a person who fails to comply with a notice under subsection (2).

Section 48f deals with rights of prospecting and mining in marine parks.

Subsection (1) provides that subject to subsection (2), rights of entry, prospecting, exploration or mining cannot be acquired or exercised pursuant to the Mining Act 1971, the Petroleum Act 1940 or the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act 1982 in respect of land forming part of a marine park.

Subsection (2) empowers the Governor, by proclamation, to declare that, subject to any conditions specified in the proclamation, rights of entry, prospecting, exploration or mining may be acquired and exercised in respect of land forming part of a marine park.

Subsection (3) provides that a person must not contravene or fail to comply with a condition of a proclamation under subsection (2). The maximum penalty is a division 5 fine (\$8 000).

Subsection (4) provides that a proclamation under subsection (2) has effect according to its terms.

Subsection (5) empowers the Governor, by proclamation, to vary or revoke a proclamation under subsection (2).

Subsection (6) provides that rights of entry, prospecting, exploration or mining acquired by virtue of a proclamation under subsection (2) must be exercised subject to the plan of management for the marine park except where those rights were vested in the person seeking to exercise them before the commencement of the section or where those rights are exercised pursuant to an agreement with the Minister (or with the Minister and the Minister of Mines and Energy), in which case implementation of the plan is subject to the agreement.

Section 48g deals with the protection of the aquatic habitat.

Subsection (1) provides that except as provided by the regulations or pursuant to permit under the section, a person must not enter or remain in an aquatic reserve or marine park or engage in any fishing activity in an aquatic reserve or marine park.

Subsection (2) provides that except as provided by the regulations or pursuant to a permit under the section, a person must not engage in an operation involving or resulting in disturbance of the bed of any waters or removal of or interference with aquatic or benthic flora or fauna of any waters.

The maximum penalty for contravention of subsection (1) or (2) is, for a first offence—a division 7 fine (\$2 000), for a second offence—a division 6 fine (\$4 000) and for a subsequent offence—a division 5 fine (\$8 000).

Subsection (3) empowers the Director—

- (a) to issue a permit to any person authorising that person to engage in activity, or do any act specified in the permit, in an aquatic reserve, during such period and subject to such conditions as may be specified in the permit;

and

- (b) to vary or revoke a condition of such a permit or impose a further condition.

Subsection (4) empowers the Director to revoke a permit under subsection (3) if a condition of the permit is contravened or not complied with.

Subsection (5) empowers the Minister, if satisfied that the carrying out of a particular activity or the doing of a particular act in a marine park is in accordance with the plan of management for the park, issue a permit to any person authorising the person to engage in that activity or do that act in the marine park during such period and subject to such conditions as may be specified in the permit.

Subsection (6) empowers the Minister to vary or revoke a condition of a permit under subsection (5) or impose a further condition.

Subsection (7) empowers the Minister to revoke a permit under subsection (5) if a condition of the permit has been contravened or not complied with.

Subsection (8) provides that a holder of a permit under the section must not contravene or fail to comply with a condition of the permit. The maximum penalty is, for a first offence—a division 7 fine (\$2 000), for a second offence—a division 6 fine (\$4 000) and for a subsequent offence—a division 5 fine (\$8 000).

Subsection (9) defines 'aquatic or benthic flora or fauna'.

Section 48h empowers the Governor to make regulations prescribing and providing for the recovery of fees and charges payable for entry to a marine park or for the use of facilities provided in a marine park.

Clause 18 repeals section 51 of the principal Act and substitutes new provisions.

Section 51 provides that a person must not engage in fish farming unless the person holds a licence issued by the Director in accordance with the regulations or the person is acting as an agent of a person holding such a licence. The maximum penalty is a division 6 fine (\$4 000).

Section 51a sets out the regulation-making powers with respect to the regulation of fish farming and the control of exotic fish and disease in fish.

Clause 19 amends section 54 of the principal Act which deals with the registration of fish processors by inserting several new provisions.

New subsection (7) provides that, subject to the regulations, a registered fish processor must not process fish of a prescribed class unless authorised to do so by the Director.

New subsection (8) requires such an authorisation to be endorsed on the certificate of registration.

New subsection (9) provides that an authorisation remains in force for such period as may be specified in the certificate of registration.

New subsection (10) empowers the Director to limit the species of fish that may be processed pursuant to an authorisation and to vary or revoke any such limitation.

New subsection (11) empowers the Director to refuse to grant an authorisation unless satisfied as to the matters prescribed in the regulations.

New subsection (12) provides that if the Minister is satisfied that the holder of an authorisation has been convicted of an offence against the Act or against any other Act relating to fishing (whether it be an Act of the Commonwealth or of another State or a Territory of the Commonwealth), the Minister may by notice in writing to the holder revoke the authorisation and require the holder to return the certificate of registration at a place and within a period specified in the notice.

Subsection (13) provides that a person must not fail to comply with a requirement imposed by notice under subsection (12). The maximum penalty is a division 8 fine (\$1 000).

Clause 20 amends section 55 of the principal Act which sets out the regulation-making powers with respect to fish processing to extend those powers and to require fish processors to furnish to the Director returns containing such information as the Director may, with the approval of the Minister, require (rather than information prescribed by regulation).

Clause 21 amends section 56 of the principal Act to make it clear that a court has power to suspend fishery licences and other authorities for non-consecutive periods.

Clause 22 amends section 58 of the principal Act to give a person aggrieved by a decision of the Minister to revoke an authorisation under section 54 the right to a review by the District Court of the decision.

Clause 23 repeals section 61 of the principal Act which deals with the surrender of authorities and substitutes a new provision.

New subsection (1) provides that the holder of an authority may, subject to subsection (2), at any time surrender the authority to the Director.

New subsection (2) provides that where the register of fishery licences includes a notation made pursuant to section 65 that a specified person has an interest in the licence, the licence cannot be surrendered without the consent of the person specified in that notation.

New subsection (3) provides that where an authority is surrendered to the Director the authority ceases to have any force or effect.

Clause 24 amends section 65 of the principal Act by inserting several new provisions.

New subsection (3) requires the Director, on application by the holder of a fishery licence and payment of the prescribed fee, to make a notation on the register of authorities kept under the section that a specified person nominated by the holder of the licence has an interest in the licence.

New subsection (4) provides that where the register includes a notation made pursuant to subsection (3) and proceedings for an offence against the Act have been commenced against the holder of the licence, the Director must give or cause to be given to the person specified in the notation written notice of the particulars of the alleged offence.

New subsection (5) provides that where the register includes a notation made pursuant to subsection (3) that a specified person has an interest in a fishery licence, the Director must, on application by that person, remove that notation from the register.

Clause 25 amends section 66 of the principal Act to provide that a fish taken in contravention of the Act is to be taken to have a wholesale value equivalent to a fish of the same species taken not in contravention of the Act.

Clause 26 inserts new section 66a into the principal Act.

Subsection (1) provides that a person must not divulge information obtained (whether by that person or some other person) in the administration of the Act except as authorised by or under the Act, with the consent of the person from whom the information was obtained or to whom the information relates, in connection with the administration of the Act or for the purposes of any legal proceedings arising out of the administration of the Act. The maximum penalty is a division 6 fine (\$4,000).

Subsection (2) provides that notwithstanding any other law to the contrary, the Minister or Director cannot be required by subpoena or otherwise to produce to a court any information contained in a return furnished by a licensee to the Director under the Act.

The schedule further amends the principal Act to bring it into conformity with modern standards of drafting (to substitute old 'legalese' language with modern expressions and to substitute 'shall' with the now preferred plain English words 'must', 'is' and 'will', as appropriate), to remove obsolete and spent provisions (such as commencement provisions and references to repealed Acts) and to convert all provisions into gender neutral language.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 15 August. Page 248.)

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to be able to support the motion. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate, as have others in this House, Her Excellency the Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell, on her address to Parliament, and also to wish her well in the performance of her duties in the future. I am sure that she will continue to perform those duties with a freshness, warmth and compassion that will endear her to all South Australians.

This was a very historic opening, as I am sure you will agree, Mr Speaker, performed by Australia's first woman Governor. I was very proud to be part of that history. I would agree with the member for Coles that Her Excellency the Governor provides a wonderful experience and example for all of us to follow. I would also like to support the comments made in Her Excellency's speech, that is, that we cannot consider South Australia's economic situation in isolation of the national and international situation. To do so would, I feel, be totally irrational and economically irresponsible. South Australia, unlike the other States in Australia, has weathered the difficult economic situation remarkably well. That is because of previous good economic management of the Bannon Government. How else, I ask, could we have coped with the problems that have arisen in the interim period?

I would like to point out to the member for Kavel that this Government does have a lot to crow about, and I will speak further about that a little later. There has been constant carping and criticism by members opposite, particularly about the Government's revenue raising measures. If this were constructive criticism, they would be offering viable and realistic solutions apart from a one-off asset sale. They would be acting as a responsible Opposition. In fact, there has been a dearth of ideas from the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite. Let us bring some reality into this debate. South Australia is the second lowest taxing State in the nation: it is second only to the Northern Territory, and taxpayers in South Australia pay 40 per cent less than their counterparts in New South Wales, which is the highest taxing State in the nation. I would have thought that that was something we should be looking at with a great deal of pride, and I would like to quote some figures with regard to taxing per capita in each State in this nation.

In New South Wales people pay \$1 399; in Victoria \$1 248; in the ACT, \$1 126; in Western Australia, \$1 106; in Tasmania, \$1 021; in Queensland, \$942; in South Australia—here we are, second last \$939; and Northern Territory, \$913. Why are we not acknowledging this and why are we not holding up our heads with pride that we South Australians are the second lowest taxing State in this nation? In answer to allegations by the member for Coles, I point out that we

also have the second lowest debt level in the nation, at 9.5 per cent of gross revenue, with Queensland being the lowest. I am amazed that members do not have a sense of pride about that fact also. It is one of the reasons we are so much better equipped to weather the economic circumstances, which no one will deny are extremely difficult, but they are worldwide, and we do not operate in isolation of that worldwide situation.

I now turn to the housing market in South Australia. Again, South Australia has held up, and recent figures indicate that the number of new home approvals has reached its highest level since 1985. Again, that is something of which we should be proud. That was against an actual national trend. Undeniably, South Australia has had to cope with a large number of problems, notably the collapse of Adsteam and problems with the State Bank. Not only that, there has been a collapse in wool, wheat, grape and citrus prices as well as a downturn in motor vehicle sales at the national level. All these things have hit us hard, but no-one can deny that we have held up well, because we still have the second lowest tax level and debt level due to the past good economic management of the Bannon Government.

Unfortunately, unemployment has increased, and this was actually prophesied by both the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and the Premier when they were holding negotiations with the Federal Government prior to the release of the Federal Government's Industry Statement. The arguments promoted by this State were very strong in favour of a longer phase-in period. Unfortunately, that was not agreed to but, nevertheless, this State argued very strongly and very vehemently for that longer phase-in period. It was not agreed to, but the Government did not receive any support from the Liberal Opposition in its arguments with the Federal Government. That also I would like to record.

Given that Industry Statement and knowing that South Australia was to face a very difficult situation, did this Government start carping and criticising the Federal Government? No, it did not. It actually got together with the unions and industry to try to minimise the effects of the Federal Government's decision on the State. Together they are trying to make decisions to benefit this State. They are not sitting back on their heels doing nothing: they are trying to minimise the losses that will accrue to this State because of the unemployment which will be generated by the decisions made in that Industry Statement. The fact that all those bodies are working together is a very good and positive sign that this Government is not a negative Government but a very positive one, and it is proving that in trying to work with these bodies to overcome the problems which are facing them.

I turn now to some other positive aspects of what this Government has been doing, and I refer to the area of law and order. As you would be aware, Mr Speaker, in your electorate, as in all our electorates, law and order is a very big issue, and rightly so. Because of that, two very good select committees were set up with respect to law and order. One dealt with self defence and the other dealt with amendments to the Wrongs Act. I believe that the recommendations brought down by those two committees were extremely positive and will be of great benefit to the electorate. I applaud the work of those select committees, to which members from both sides contributed substantially and made decisions for the benefit of all constituents.

In particular, the self defence committee made recommendations on clarifying and strengthening the rights of persons to protect themselves in their own homes. They were realistic recommendations and, to some degree, will attempt to allay some of the fears currently held by people

in their own homes. I will deal a little later with the work of the committee dealing with the Wrongs Act.

The Attorney-General has also been very busy in his portfolio area and, because of public concern and confusion surrounding many areas, a number of decisions have been made in his area of responsibility. In particular I refer to court reforms to streamline procedures and to improve efficiencies within the courts system. In fact, the Attorney-General has introduced nine Bills to Parliament to amend court procedures, to alter jurisdictions and to vastly improve efficiencies within the court system. Speaking as a justice of the peace and one who has done quite a bit of court work, I think that these are extremely good Bills. As far as I am concerned, there has long been a need to streamline courts procedures. They have been unwieldy and lengthy, and people have a right to expect that those procedures will be streamlined as far as possible.

The reason given by the Attorney-General for the introduction of these Bills was that the courts were currently working within the framework of antiquated legislation. We are all aware that some of the legislation goes right back to the dim dark ages, if I can put it in those terms. An extensive review of the courts system was set up, and the appropriate legislation has been developed to ensure a more efficient and effective delivery of justice in this State. I applaud that. The structure of the South Australian courts system would be as follows: the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should remain unaltered and continue to deal with the more serious and complex trials, and that stands to reason. Secondly, the District Court constituted by its own Act should be the main trial court for both civil and criminal matters, and should hear appeals from various administrative decisions. The Magistrates Court, constituted by its own Act, would deal with committals, summary proceedings and other matters presently exercised by the courts of summary jurisdiction, the local courts and the small claims courts.

This legislation will allow more flexible use of the total judicial resources available and will ensure that the courts system can become less congested and more efficient. In the past justifiable concern has been expressed by a variety of people and institutions about delays in the criminal justice system, and I touched briefly on that matter earlier. As I said, that is quite rightly so. Although delays in South Australia's courts were not as great as those in most other States, it was still the Government's responsibility to ensure that cumbersome and outdated procedures were done away with, and that will be achieved adequately under the legislation introduced by the Attorney-General.

A moment ago I referred to the select committee that dealt with amendments to the Wrongs Act. One of that committee's recommendations was that we should consider a system which is currently in use in New Zealand. I refer to the family group conference.

I recently visited New Zealand to have a look at the system because I was impressed with the information we had received on it. I met with the associate Minister, Roger McLay, and his departmental heads who were in charge of implementing the family group conference. I was very impressed because it was a system whereby justice could be seen to be done as well as justice being done, in that the victim and the offender were both involved in the family group conference, and the victim was able to put across their point of view as to how the offender had affected them.

It appeared to be a method by which the victim could make the offender aware of the importance of a correct decision being reached with regard to a penalty for that offence, and how that offence had really affected the vic-

tim's whole lifestyle. I was able to look at two very good videos with regard to that, and I am looking forward to having those videos so that other members can see the importance of this system.

One of the great benefits of the family group conference was that it also had a good effect on Maori offenders (and this could transpose to Aboriginal offenders) in that it enabled those offenders to have present at the family group conference not only their family but also their extended family, so that those members of the family were present and could ensure that the penalties imposed were abided by. It was very important that they be part of the discussions with regard to the setting and implementation of those penalties.

As part of my New Zealand visit, I had a look at the contracts employment legislation. I dread to think what would happen if that legislation were ever introduced here, and I would certainly be arguing vehemently against any attempts to do so. I believe that, if the Liberals were elected, they would try to implement that legislation here, but I would fight it all the way. It is a retrograde step, and it is aimed—and not very covertly, either—at eliminating unions and drastically reducing the price of labour and taking advantage of those who are less able to negotiate contracts. Therefore, I believe it will put at risk an enormous percentage of the population.

The short-sightedness of that legislation is that, by depressing the price of labour, one is giving people less money to spend and also making it more difficult, for example, for small businesses to exist, because people are not paying people enough to be able to buy goods and services from those businesses.

I think this is a very short-sighted piece of legislation, and it has not been thought through properly. The churches and all the various groups were so much against the legislation that they had enormous numbers of people marching down the streets against it. This legislation also whittles away at the rights people have negotiated through their unions over the years. For that reason alone, I think that anyone in this House who thinks about this legislation should condemn it: I do because I think it is diabolical and it should be condemned by anyone who supports any form of social justice for people.

In relation to the employment and training area, the Minister, the Hon. Mike Rann, is coming to grips with issues and is positively addressing them in this regard. All of us have a high percentage of unemployment in our electorates and, although we do not want that situation, we have it nevertheless. I think that Mike Rann, as Minister of Employment and Further Education, is trying to train all our young, middle-aged and old people so that, when the jobs become available, we will have a work force equipped to cope with that situation.

I refer to the Kickstart program, which is one of the mechanisms by which the Minister is trying to foster training in this area to make sure that we have a well trained work force for when this upsurge comes. I know that the member for Hanson questioned whether there were adequate training facilities for youth. Kickstart is one of those mechanisms which this Government has examined to train youth. I am sure that the member for Mount Gambier will also be able to be satisfied further down the track when the Kickstart program comes to his electorate, although he did mention that matter earlier.

Kickstart involves three major initiatives: that is, taking a new regional approach to employment and training; almost a doubling of the pre-vocational places available in TAFE; and, with the support of the Commonwealth, moving to

protect and support apprenticeships threatened by the recession. That is a matter which is very personal to me because of the effect that the lack of apprentice training opportunities has had in my electorate of Stuart.

The main thrust of the three-point strategy of Kickstart involves taking a regional approach to the State Government's employment and training programs so that regions with differing needs, opportunities and problems can work with Governments to generate local jobs and training opportunities. I am pleased to note that initially, of the four regions, Port Augusta in my electorate is one. I am pleased that we have been invited to take part in that program. I am sure that our local government will be delighted to be part of those negotiations, as will the Port Augusta Training Committee and a number of other organisations within the electorate of Stuart.

With the pilot programs, the Government will seek to establish an employment and training body in each region which will work with the State Government in devising innovative local employment and training initiatives, the emphasis here being on 'local'. So I believe it should be, because the local people know the local issues and they can provide ideas on what should be the local solutions.

Throughout the State about an extra 1 000 pre-vocational places for this year and the beginning of next year have been created through a \$4.5 million Federal funding boost. This is in addition to the 1 146 places the State Government is funding for this academic year. That is a major increase in that area of training.

The Hawke Government has allocated South Australia some \$917 000 in special assistance programs funding to maintain the training and/or employment of apprentices cancelled out of trade and of apprentices whose contracts of training are placed in jeopardy by the current recession. This also has a major impact on my electorate, where the Spencer Gulf regional group training scheme has also been having some problems in the recent past. I am sure that this program will be of major benefit to them as well.

Kickstart has been said to aim to inject new energy and effort to employment and training activity in the various regions by harnessing significant local community support and involvement. The four broad objectives of Kickstart are: enterprise development through the encouragement of new enterprises or businesses; employment development by fostering new employment in existing businesses across regions by seizing new opportunities; employment retention through strategies designed to counter the cyclical effects of economic downturn and industry restructuring; and maintenance of the training effort to prevent skill shortages in the post-recession period. This would have to be one of the major benefits of the training program set down by the Minister of Employment and Further Education.

Allied to that, I also mention the video conferencing technique. That facility was recently opened, and the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins), together with the Premier, the Minister of Employment and Further Education and myself, were all very impressed with this technique, which offers so much to country and rural South Australia in the area of training. At my own local launch of this program, I was very pleased to have many people attend from surrounding areas, which is the outreach area of the Port Augusta College of TAFE. There were people from Roxby Downs, Woomera and Leigh Creek at that opening. They all had a very great interest in the implications of this video conferencing technique. The Woomera people were keen to look at it as a conference mechanism.

If there were to be conferences in Canberra, they could come to Port Augusta and link up through the video con-

ferencing technique. There are endless ways in which it can be used, and that was pointed out at the launch. Constituents have already approached me with regard to their children staying in Port Augusta and taking courses, such as accounting, which could be linked up to an Adelaide college, or even the university, which would mean they would not have to come to Adelaide. It has enormous potential for making training so much easier for people in rural South Australia. I compliment the Minister and the Premier on the launch of that program. With regard to the video conferencing technique, I look forward to Port Lincoln coming on stream, as I am sure do the members for Flinders and Eyre, because it will have a major impact on their electorates. I can assure them that they will be very impressed, as I was, with the way it operates.

The member for Kavel said that this Government does not have anything to crow about. I think that it has a lot to crow about. I will point to some relevant issues in my electorate that I should like to crow about with regard to what this Government has achieved. A major issue has been the redevelopment of the Port Pirie Hospital, which will have a major effect on the provision of services to people in Port Pirie and that region. Prior to the redevelopment, theatre facilities were antiquated. They were not able to perform a large amount of surgery which they will now be able to perform in that theatre. The outpatient facilities were very bad. I am sure that people coming into the new redeveloped area will be amazed at the wonderful facilities the hospital now has.

Also, there were no day surgery facilities. I congratulate the Minister of Health on this initiative. Day surgery facilities are new to the country areas, but they have been needed for a long time. They will certainly streamline the efficiency with which hospitals provide their services, and in that regard I am sure that the people of Port Pirie and the region have much to be grateful to this Government for, because it has honoured its commitment to this redevelopment. As a result of the honouring of that commitment, the people will receive an enhanced quality of services delivered from a first-class redeveloped hospital with the possibility of attracting specialist services. One of the problems faced by country areas has been the lack of resident specialist medical services. To have a good facility for them to work from will be an added incentive for them to come to those areas.

The redevelopment of the Port Augusta gaol has been much needed, particularly in this climate. The project will be a major employer, and I hope that it will be able to take up some of the slack which will eventuate through the restructuring of Australian National, which has been very severe and has had a detrimental effect on Port Augusta constituents. The development of the gaol will play a major role in taking up some of that slack in employment. It presents a very good image to people as they approach Port Augusta. The aesthetics of the construction are excellent.

I congratulate the Minister of Correctional Services and all those involved in that project, because it offers to people coming over the overpass into Port Augusta a very good view of that development. It is a very green lawned area with trees, and it looks nothing like a gaol. It looks very nice as an approach point for the residents of Port Augusta. That is another positive commitment that has been honoured by this Government. In this current economic climate it will have a major effect in combating some of the unemployment—I stress only some—in my area. I should like to see more development in the area, mainly from private enterprise, to take up the rest of the slack, which I am sure we would all like to see.

Another positive development on the State scene—it has been mentioned before, but I should like to mention it again—is the MFP and the dedicated team, including the Premier and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, who successfully negotiated that project at Federal level.

As regards the 1998 Commonwealth Games, I pay a tribute to the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the member for Hanson for the time and effort that they have put into those negotiations. I know that it has entailed many visits overseas, many negotiations and a lot of talking to the people who will be voting on the site for the Commonwealth Games. We had a very able team of negotiators and I place on record my congratulations to them. Irrespective of the decision, I think that they put their best efforts into making sure that this State gets the Commonwealth Games, and I would applaud that. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion before the House.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I congratulate Her Excellency on opening this session of Parliament. It was a privilege for all of us to be present at her first opening of Parliament. It is fitting that we should have Dame Roma as our Governor. I noted that the member for Henley Beach hoped that the lack of recognition accorded to Her Excellency was not because of her gender. I can assure the member for Henley Beach that there is no suggestion of that at all. Dame Roma has been appointed on her outstanding abilities and service to South Australia over many years. I commend the Government for her appointment. It comes at a time when people in our community are questioning the role of the Governor and of the Governor-General, although I do not agree with their sentiments. It also comes at an interesting time when not only is the monarchy being questioned but this Parliament is being led by a minority Government, so Dame Roma may have some interesting constitutional matters to deal with. However, I am sure that she will deal with them with the utmost aplomb and dignity.

Referring to the vice regal appointment and to what has been said about some of our institutions being called into question, I must say that the reputation of our public institutions has been called into question lately, and that is one of the themes that I want to address today. Public confidence in the State Bank has been severely shaken. There are continuing questions about law and order and whether we provide sufficient protection for the citizens of South Australia. It is widely considered that our educational institutions are inadequate, that they do not face facts in a competitive world and that we need to put education at the forefront of a State Government instrumentality that delivers a service.

Health institutions are again in question. There are long waiting lists. There is no doubt that, because of bureaucracy in health, many people who require a service are on abnormally long waiting lists and, of course, this is affecting the people of South Australia. Unfortunately, much of this questioning relates to State Governments. The State Governments of South Australia, Western Australia and Victoria are in financial chaos. I will deal further with that matter in a moment. That is one reason why some people say that we should get rid of State Governments altogether. I think it is very dangerous that, because of lack of Government management with the bureaucracy overriding Ministers and their ability to control State finances, people have lost confidence in State Governments. That leads to a mistrust of all politicians generally. I do not think that is good for the

democracy in which we live, and it is something on which we must all work together to try to improve.

I believe that we must avoid the concentration of power in Canberra. This crisis of public confidence must be addressed with respect to the Governments that are managing the financial affairs of the States to make them more accountable to the people. Parliamentary responsibility has gone out the window since I have been a member of this Parliament. One of the things that we can do to restore parliamentary accountability is to get some ministerial responsibility back into the system. Members of the media love to come into this place at Question Time. They want to see some theatre—they want five, eight or 15 second grabs or a performance of members hurling abuse at each other across the floor. If they get that, they report the drama of it all and how ridiculously we perform. If they do not get it they say, in the cynical way in which they report matters, that Parliament is flat and that there is no use going in there because there is no action.

One of our great problems is that that sort of comment implies to the community at large that politicians are an irresponsible lot and are not taking their duties as seriously as they should. That is why I welcome some of the discussions that have occurred in this Parliament about parliamentary proceedings. There is no question in my mind that what we saw last Thursday was Parliament working at its best. Since becoming Leader of the Opposition, I and all members of the Liberal Party have endeavoured to keep questions as short as possible. We have been very critical of the Government of the day, which continues to bat out time by filibustering, thus making a joke of Question Time. That is not what Question Time is supposed to be all about. One has only to go to the House of Commons to see how well supplementary questions can be used. Last Thursday we got through 46 questions because the Opposition kept its questions brief and Ministers—and it now appears to have been only a stunt—answered those questions briefly and concisely or said that they would come back with the answers.

I thought that last Thursday rated highly as far as the parliamentary democracy of this State is concerned. In fact, it is something that we should all applaud. However, today the Government went backwards. Once again one Minister in particular—the member for unemployment, innuendo and fabrication—seemed to think that he could give ministerial statements during Question Time. He read out, *ad nauseam*, replies to questions that had been asked, and he had to be pulled up on three or four occasions.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I think he was pretty embarrassed, though.

Mr D.S. BAKER: If I were the Premier, I would have been more embarrassed, because the Minister of Employment and Further Education wants to take his position on the front bench. The Minister of Water Resources went from about 50:1 to 6:4 today. I think the member for Hartley is running an unofficial book as he knows that he is the only one who does not have a chance because he is right out on the back bench.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: That's right. When we look at the parliamentary process, I think it is important that we look at it responsibly. Whether we like it or not, one of the things we have to do is provide incentives for Ministers to perform. In the past couple of years we have seen some of the greatest financial disasters that have happened in this State. In each case, the Ministers responsible have blamed someone else. That is an abrogation of the parliamentary process. It means that they do not believe in accountability. Above

all, I think it is time that we looked at basing a component of a Minister's salary on the performance of the department. That would give Ministers some incentive to keep their eye on matters—unlike the Minister of Forests and the Treasurer whom we have seen running away and hiding in a hole hoping that their problems would all go away. The worse matters have become in their portfolios the more they have hidden because they do not want to know about it. In that way they can blame someone else when problems arise.

That is something we all have to look at. Whether we like it or not, we have to justify our salary. I know that it is more difficult for country members who cannot be here all the time because of their country electorates, but I think all members of Parliament have to do more work. I was somewhat surprised to receive a letter from the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee in which he said that the Opposition refused to grant pairs earlier this week to allow the committee to sit during parliamentary time. Members of the Public Works Committee are adequately compensated. Parliament is paramount. If we allow committees to interfere with the sittings of Parliament, I believe we will go downhill very quickly because that is not how the system was designed. Members of parliamentary committees have to justify to the taxpayers of South Australia the extra remuneration they receive.

I believe it is time that we looked at Estimates Committees sitting longer. It is quite ludicrous that the Estimates Committees looking at next year's budget will sit for only one day per Minister irrespective of the size of his or her portfolio. I have one day in which to question the Treasurer on his financial performance over the past 12 months. I admit that we have questioned the Treasurer during Question Time, but that amount of time is not adequate for the Premier and his advisers to answer some of my questions.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: And you don't receive prepared replies for over eight months!

Mr D.S. BAKER: That's right. As the honourable member said, some of the Ministers duck their responsibility. However, I believe that we should face up to the fact that we have a very long winter break. I suggest that budget committees should meet during July. There is no reason why Ministers should not report on the performance of their departments for the past 12 months so that all members can scrutinise it. They are being adequately paid to do so and it would give Parliament, which is paramount, time to look at and evaluate how departments are working. We would still keep the Estimates Committees going when we look at future budgets, which are, of course, just as important.

One of our greatest problems concerns statutory authorities. There appears to be no accountability for many of them. Already we have seen that the State Bank has failed to meet its profit target over the years, but its growth has been significantly above budget. If we had had the opportunity to look at both these projections in a July sitting of budget and Estimates Committees and the Treasurer had shown some accountability, we might have been able to stop some of the terrible problems that we have had with financial institutions in South Australia. All Ministers must look at whom they are working for and whose money they are spending. Every Minister, departmental head and agency director should have the word 'accountability' tattooed on his or her forehead, so that every morning when he gets up and shaves or she gets up and does her hair they see this word reflected in the mirror and they are reminded of their responsibility to the taxpayers of South Australia.

At the beginning of my address I said that we needed more public participation. I want to outline some of the

things that we have done in the preparation of position papers in the past 12 months, and we will continue to prepare such papers in the future. The position paper on law and order, which will give people in South Australia an idea about how the Opposition thinks law and order should be heading—or public safety as we prefer to call it—will be released in the next few weeks.

Already we have released a paper on education; the shadow Minister of Health has released a paper on health; and the shadow Minister for Environment and Planning has released one on the environment. With respect to education, we have said, quite frankly, that the decision making has to be handed back to those closest to the classroom. For far too long in this State we have put up with a centralised bureaucratically controlled education system that does not consider the best needs of education in South Australia.

The classroom is the place for learning. It is in the classroom that the most important decisions should be made, and those decisions should be independent of the centralised control we have at present. I have said repeatedly in our education paper that we in this State are being strangled by administrative control. There is absolutely no incentive—and I make no apology for continually using that word—for people to do better or for principals and school councils to have a major say in the destiny of schools.

I am very concerned that we have seen the State of South Australia become involved in the application of corporal punishment throughout schools in this State, and that the Minister feels that that is his duty. Surely, it is the duty of the school concerned, the principal and the school council to decide what is best for a particular school. Even if the Minister wants to go further, surely it is the responsibility of the private school system in South Australia to make those decisions, and it should not be a blanket decision by the Minister of the day.

That relates not only to corporal punishment but to the sports policy, which is the most ridiculous I have ever heard. Decisions about what is in the best interests of the students have been taken away from the schools, particularly in respect of the private schools, which makes a mockery of incentive and private education. The choice of having their children educated in the private system or in the public system should always be available to the citizens of South Australia. One of the reasons for the sharp drop in the use of public schools in this State is that centralised bureaucratic control is taking the choice away from individual teachers and principals and, of course, the school committees that run those schools. Throughout our position paper on education runs the theme of handing back power, and that will be delivered when we are in government.

About two months or so ago, we handed down our paper on the centralised control of health. It showed that central bureaucracy is absolutely unnecessary, and we have given a categorical undertaking to get rid of the Health Commission and to place control back where it should be, that is, at hospital level. That paper was delivered only about two months ago, and the Minister jumped on it and said, 'We're going to do the same thing.'

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That's not what your spokesperson is telling the country hospitals.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I love the Minister of Health interjecting on this matter, because it gives me the opportunity to point out that what he is going to do is decentralise it into areas and get rid of hospital boards. Having spent 25 years on a hospital board and knowing how the health bureaucracy in this State works; knowing how inefficient it is and how tired it is in its views; and knowing the benefits of a local hospital board running a hospital in the interests

of its district, I believe it is the craziest suggestion I have ever heard from a Minister. It really shows that he is completely out of touch with the delivery of health services in this State and completely out of touch with what is best for the patients of this State. Of course, under this Administration they are the last people ever to be thought of.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Your mates said you copied it from us. It was plagiarism.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I hope that's in *Hansard*. What happened was that we said we would get rid of the Health Commission, and you jumped on it and said that you were going to go down that road. Just look at the Government's record in health. The waiting lists have become longer and longer. I had the misfortune to be in one of our public hospitals the other day to visit a patient, and I must say that it was a disgrace. This was a private patient in a public hospital. The standard of nursing care and cleanliness in that hospital was abominable. The attitude of the staff was disgraceful, and the queues of people waiting around, asking whether they could see patients, got longer and longer, and the people were totally ignored.

I have had the privilege of being in two private hospitals in the city in the past two weeks, visiting an honourable member of this House in one and my mother in another, and the difference is outstanding. In those two private hospitals, people are pleased to see you. They want to know what you want and want to get you to the patient. The standard of care in those hospitals is vastly superior to that in the public hospital system.

It is that word again—incentive. What happens with centralised bureaucratic control is that you belt any incentive out of the people working there. Once you do that, of course, people do not take pride in their job and the job does not get done well. The lack of incentive is one reason why waiting lists are getting longer and longer.

I have forgotten to bring the relevant information in with me, but I remember most of this: during Question Time an honourable member opposite on the back bench asked a dorothy dixer about enterprise bargaining and wage contracts in New Zealand. One of the great problems in this country and one of the reasons why we are not competitive is the centralised wage system, with the union movement trying to set wages across the broad base of industries and not for the individual or industry.

Mr Ferguson: Absolute nonsense!

Mr D.S. BAKER: I will deal with some of the views of the member for Henley Beach in a moment when I get further down the track. I thought that the member for Henley Beach was very succinct and a very good financier—and I will bring to the attention of the House in a moment the occasion on which he visited New Zealand but did not get much of it right. In Australia 40 per cent of the work force is in the union movement; 60 per cent is not. Therefore, 40 per cent is trying to dictate what the 60 per cent should do, and it just will not work. We must wake up to that fact that to become world competitive we must not worry about wages; we must start worrying about unit cost, as happened in New Zealand. New Zealand is one of our chief competitors in the world market.

Mr Ferguson: They're going well in New Zealand.

Mr D.S. BAKER: At least they are going a lot better than we are in this country! I guarantee members opposite that within five years—

Mr Ferguson: You won't be here!

Mr D.S. BAKER: I think that my seat is a bit safer than that of the member for Henley Beach. In spite of me, my seat is a bit safer.

An honourable member: You've scared him off.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, I've scared him off; he didn't want to debate it. All I am saying to members opposite is that, within five years, enterprise agreements, employment contracts, will be the norm in this country. That will be the only way in which we can become world competitive. Members opposite can protest as much as they like and the union movement can jump up and down, but members must remember the New Zealand experience. I have not reported this to the House before but, along with the member for Bragg, I had the privilege of speaking for 1½ hours with the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council of New Zealand. In New Zealand they have full compulsory unionism.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: You will have a chance in a minute. That gentleman said—and I thought that he was very sensible about the whole matter—'We fought but, when it became obvious, I said to the union movement that those unions that get off their bottom and represent their individual members well in their enterprise bargaining and their employment contracts will survive, but those that have been used to the compulsory levy and to closed shops, all the tuggery that goes on to get members and force people to do things, will disappear.'

He was looking at it in a very sensible light. He said, 'It will never come back. It will make us world competitive and we will be a shining example of industrial relations in the world.' I should like the member for Henley Beach, the next time he visits New Zealand, instead of getting the currency wrong, as I will point out later, to see the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council and have a chat to him.

Mr Ferguson: I saw him. I had a long talk to him.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Obviously, you did not listen to him. This is quite obviously a tired Government, led by the last Leader elected in the 1970s to retain his position. That is not a criticism of the Premier; it is a tribute to him for lasting so long. However, all the dreams and promises that were made about the 1980s and where South Australia was going to go, all the diversity in the economy that we were told to expect and all the employment opportunities we were going to have have now turned into a nightmare. As a result, I believe that, quite frankly, the Premier has been a failure.

There have been no long-term strategies at all. There has been no attempt whatsoever to achieve smaller government. The bureaucracy has continued to balloon out. Now we have this strange situation where we are supposed to have a freeze in the public sector, but, of course, there is not one, as we can see from the figures of the last election. We have had forced on South Australians a dropping off in the public sector just for survival. Never did we take on the Liberal Party policies of privatisation, commercialisation, or letting the private sector get out and do what it does best, as we advocated in 1985 and again in 1989—and we will continue to advocate it.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member for Hartley interjects. What was that? I missed it.

Mr Groom: No, I was not interjecting.

Mr D.S. BAKER: We are now seeing forced on the taxpayers of South Australia a fire sale the magnitude of which we have never contemplated in this State. However, we are still told—as we were told in the Premier's contribution to the no-confidence motion—to look at the MFP and the Grand Prix. We are told to look at all those things and what they have done for South Australia. Of course they have been good for South Australia; they have had bipartisan support in this State. But it is no good when one foul-up,

if you like, in Scrimber, which cost \$60 million, wipes out all the benefits of all our dreams in this State. Of course, the lack of management in other areas, to which I will refer later, really shows that the Premier has been hiding in a hole as Treasurer, and so have many of his Ministers.

I must say that I was privileged the other day to attend the launching of Stewart Cockburn's biography on Sir Thomas Playford. It is a very good book, and I would suggest that members on the Government side read it. It is interesting to note that it is 26 years since Sir Thomas Playford left Parliament in South Australia, and he was Premier for 26 years. The proper management, the careful use of taxpayers' money and the building of the infrastructure and the manufacturing base of this State have been slowly whittled away as our competitive edge has been lost. That competitive edge has been lost because suddenly we had a Government that was not prepared to say 'We cannot afford to do it.' All we have been prepared to do in this State is to sell the dreams and the hopes for the future without showing any economic management in the present.

The excesses of the 1980s are coming home to roost. Everyone says that they were the days when money was easy, but if Sir Thomas Playford had been in this House he would, in the same wise way, have managed the taxpayers' dollar for the benefit of the taxpayers in South Australia; we would still be a low-cost State, unemployment would not be nearing 10 per cent, and we would not be forced into a virtual liquidation sale of many of our State assets because of financial mismanagement. I think it says a lot for that gentleman not only that he was in power for that length of time but also that, in only 26 years, we have lost it all. The failure of the Government to tackle waste and inefficiency, its abject failure to control the bureaucracy, its abject failure to even consider privatisation, commercialisation, or whatever it likes to call it, and its total refusal to look at competitive tendering has really meant, in a blinkered approach, that it is not prepared to take on any good management which is normal in the private sector. It is not prepared to take on any of that—

Mr Groom: Is Skase a good manager?

Mr D.S. BAKER: I will deal with you in a minute.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I will press on in spite of the member for Hartley, and I will deal with him at a later stage in this debate. This Premier has handed down eight budgets. He is about to hand down his ninth budget, and South Australians will see, in the next couple of weeks, just what his financial management over the last eight years has meant for them. We asked him explicitly today about any increase in taxes or charges, and he said that he would not say anything about that. We are about to see the biggest slug on the taxpayers of South Australia in the history of this State squarely, because of the financial mismanagement of this Government over the last eight years.

For a moment I turn to honesty in Government charges, and I will cite a couple of newspaper articles which I think really say it all. Of course, some of the comments were made before elections. In the 1989 election campaign the Government's policy on charges was announced by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. An article in the *Advertiser* of 21 November 1989 stated:

Announcing the State Government's small business policy, Mr Arnold said the Government would seek to reduce the impact of Government taxes and charges on small business—

I underline the word 'reduce'—

and maintain the real value of payroll tax exemptions.

That sort of promise can be construed in only one way—that he would keep taxes and charges at CPI or less. That is quite clear. Then the Premier was quoted in a front page article in the *Advertiser* of 14 May 1990 which stated:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, committed the Government last night to holding rises in taxes and charges to increases in the consumer price index, despite a blow-out in the State's budget deficit.

Later in the article the point was repeated as follows:

Mr Bannon said the Government remained committed to its long-term strategy of keeping any increases in charges and State taxes at or below the CPI.

This is what we have; these are the two promises that were made. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a statistical table of the taxes and charges that have risen and been gazetted this year. They occurred under 59 Acts of Parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are they purely statistical?

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes.

Leave granted.

Charge	Number	Date of Increase	Date of Last Increase	Range of Increases	Number of Increases Above CPI
Associations Incorporation Act (Application and Licence Fees)	17	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	Five fees not increased—remaining increases between 4 per cent and 7.4 per cent	3
Bills of Sale Act (Registering or Filing Bills of Sale)	4	8 August 1991	17 July 1990	6.25 per cent	—
Births, Deaths and Marriages Act (Search and Registration Fees)	11	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	One new charge—remaining charges increased by between 15.4 per cent and 233.3 per cent	10
Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act (Inspection and Licence Fees)	40	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	5.5 per cent to 30.8 per cent	36
Builders Licensing Act	15	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	15 per cent	15
Business Names Act (Registration Fees)	9	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	One fee not increased—eight increased by between 5.1 per cent and 11.1 per cent	4
Clean Air Act	74	15 May 1991	18 May 1989	14.3 per cent to 33.3 per cent	74
Commercial and Private Agents Act (Application and Licence Fees)	7	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	16 per cent	7
Commercial Tribunal Act (Inspection and Certificate Fees)	12	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	5 per cent to 10 per cent	1
Consumer Credit Act	10	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	16 per cent—four new fees—10 fees increased by 16 per cent	10
Consumer Transactions Act	8	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	Two new fees Six fees increased by 16 per cent	6
Controlled Substances Act (Pest Controllers Licences)	2	30 May 1991	1 July 1988	20 per cent	2
Co-operatives Act	28	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	Six fees not increased—other increases between 5 per cent and 26.9 per cent	6
Credit Unions Act (Inspection and Registration Fees)	32	1 July 1991	12 April 1990	Seven fees not increased—other increases between 4 per cent and 35.7 per cent	9
Cremation Act (Fee for a Cremation Permit)	1	1 July 1991	22 December 1988	300 per cent	1
Crown Lands Act (Leasing Fees)	21	8 August 1991	17 July 1990	8.1 per cent to 175.3 per cent	21
Dangerous Substances Act (Licence Fees for Storing Substances such as LPG and Autogas)	17	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	15 increases between 19.7 per cent and 30.8 per cent and two new fees	15
Explosives Act (Licence Fees to Manufacture, Store and Sell Explosives)	42	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	25 per cent to 33.3 per cent	42
Fees Regulation Act (Places of Public Entertainment)	3	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	5 per cent	—
Fisheries Act (Various Licence Fees)	20	27 June 1991	Most last increased during 1990	Two new fees—one fee reduced by 5.5 per cent—remaining increases in the range—4.9 per cent to 429 per cent	16
Gas Act (Examination Fees)	5	1 July 1991	1 July 1989	6.6 per cent to 102.7 per cent	4
Goods Securities Act	1	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	15 per cent	1
Health Act (Examination of Plans for Septic Tanks)	1	1 July 1991	3 September 1987	100 per cent	1
Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act	14	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	13.3 per cent to 16 per cent	14
Landlord and Tenant Act (Application Fee)	1	1 July 1991	20 August 1987	4.5 per cent	—
Lifts and Cranes Act (Inspection and Licence Fees)	13	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	5.3 per cent to 11 per cent	9

Charge	Number	Date of Increase	Date of Last Increase	Range of Increases	Number of Increases Above CPI
Liquor Licensing Act	25	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	6 per cent to 233.3 per cent	21
Marine Act (Certificates of Competency)	20	1 July 1991	5 July 1990	19 increased by 100 per cent plus one new fee—\$30 for an optical examination conducted by the Department of Marine and Harbors	19
Marine Act (Survey Fees)	17	1 July 1991	2 August 1990	No increase—215 per cent	15
Meat Hygiene Act (Licence Fees)	2	1 July 1991	1 July 1984	50 per cent and 100 per cent	2
Mining Act (Exploration Fees)	44	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	6 per cent	—
Mines and Works Inspection Act (Permit Fees)	9	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	5.5 per cent to 6 per cent	—
Motor Vehicles Act (Licence and Registration Fees)	76	1 July 1991	11 July 1990	3.7 per cent to 32.9 per cent	17
(Tow-Truck Certificates)	14	1 July 1991	1 December 1990	6.2 per cent	—
Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act (Licence Fees for Removal of Asbestos)	2	1 July 1991	1 April 1991	33.3 per cent and 30.3 per cent	2
Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act (Licence Fees for Construction Safety)	2	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	4.2 per cent	—
Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act (Lease Fees)	13	8 August 1991	18 April 1991	8.3 per cent to 175.3 per cent	13
Physiotherapists Act (Licence Fees)	3	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	4.8 per cent to 6.9 per cent	—
Places of Public Entertainment Act (Licence Fees)	11	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	4.5 per cent to 14.3 per cent	1
Private Parking Areas Act	13	27 June 1991	17 December 1984	Two new fines—11 existing fines increased by between 55 per cent and 150 per cent	11
Radiation Protection and Control Act	21	1 July 1991	1 February 1989	40 per cent to 166 per cent	21
Real Property Act (Land Division Fees)	2	8 August 1991	17 July 1990	7.5 per cent and 8.2 per cent	2
Real Property Act (Fees)	21	8 August 1991	17 July 1990	Four new fees—other increases between 7.4 per cent and 25 per cent	17
Registration of Deeds Act	3	8 August 1991	17 July 1990	12.5 per cent to 25 per cent	3
Roads (Opening and Closing) Act	3	8 August 1991	17 July 1990	7.8 per cent	3
Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act (Licence Fees)	8	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	15 per cent	8
Sewerage Act (Fees for Connections, Disconnections and Inspections)	7	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	One fee has not risen—the remaining increases between 1.4 per cent and 13.3 per cent	2
Sewerage Act (Examination Fees)	16	1 July 1991	July 1989	Nine fees not increased—other increases between 6.2 per cent and 8.1 per cent	3
South Australian Health Commission Act (Hospital Fees)	24	1 July 1991	1 December 1990 or 1 January 1991	Three fees not increased—others increased between 1.4 per cent and 60.2 per cent	17
Strata Titles Act	11	8 August 1991	17 July 1990	7.7 per cent to 25 per cent	11
Summary Offences Act (On-the-Spot Fines for Traffic Offences)	133	1 July 1991	1 January 1991	16 fines reduced—five new fines—remaining increases between 9.3 per cent and 150 per cent	112
Surveyors Act (Registration Fees)	10	8 August 1991	17 July 1990	One fee not increased—others between 5.5 per cent and 8.3 per cent	8
Trade Measurements Act	5	1 July 1991	1 July 1989	10 per cent to 14.3 per cent	5
Travel Agents Act	6	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	13.3 per cent to 16 per cent	6
Valuation of Lands Act (Fees for Land Valuations)	6	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	New basis for fees—not comparable with former fees	—
Waste Management Act (Licence Fees)	6	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	5.3 per cent to 50 per cent	5
Water Resources Act (Fees for Water Recovery)	17	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	10 new fees—existing fees increased by between 7.5 per cent and 18.5 per cent	6
Waterworks Act (Fees to Connect Water to Land)	36	1 July 1991	1 July 1990	One fee has not risen—the other increases are between 2.5 per cent and 31.4 per cent	18
Waterworks Act (Examination Fees)	2	1 July 1991	1 July 1989	6.2 per cent	—
Worker's Liens Act	3	8 August 1991	17 July 1990	7.7 per cent to 25 per cent	3

Mr D.S. BAKER: So far this year changes under 59 Acts of Parliament have been increased, almost 1 000 being affected. Of those, 658 have been increased by more than the CPI; more than 65 per cent of those increases have involved broken Government promises to keep all charges within CPI. One of the Government's excuses was that the charges had not gone up for more than a year, so therefore they had to catch up. But, in fact, that applied to only 143 charges, or 15 per cent, and at the same time 172 charges were gazetted that were increased at least twice in the past year. Many of these increases were approved by the last Executive Council meeting of the financial year, but so desperate was the Government for extra taxes that there has been a further Executive Council meeting to correct the mistakes and to keep those taxes and charges rising.

I believe it is quite a blatant attempt to mislead the public of South Australia. It is a blatant attempt to stop them from understanding the true impact of the rises and charges. We must stop this deceit that has been going on and, before the Parliament rises for its winter break, the Premier should be able to table where he wants to increase charges in the following budget. It does not depend on the Premiers' Conference. In fact, he has the ability to do that and come clean through the Parliament to the taxpayers of South Australia. What we have had is a Government that has been in office for nine years, but its financial management is coming home to roost. It goes without saying that this State will face a crisis that will be the biggest in its history because of the financial management of the Government.

Mr S.G. Evans: Mismanagement!

Mr D.S. BAKER: Both—mismanagement and the lack of management. I want to refer to the consumption tax. I have flicked through some of the contributions—

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Well, if the honourable member listens for a minute, he might understand a bit. Some of the contributions made by members opposite in the Address in Reply debate are to the point of being laughable. I will refer to the contribution of one member opposite and also to a letter that he put out to his electorate. I question whether being a JP means that you are allowed to tell porky-pies. The honourable member to whom I will refer is a JP, and I will refer to his newsletter and the nonsense that is being spread.

First, I refer to a document which states what the Federal Opposition's consumption tax, or goods and services tax—or however members opposite refer to it—is all about. Let us get it into perspective. I welcome this Government's assertion that it wants to get out into the public arena and argue the issue because it will be a millstone around our neck. I welcome the opportunity to argue the benefit of a consumption or goods and services tax, because I can assure members opposite that, if they were prepared to tell the truth as to its effect, and if they were prepared to look at the best interests of Australia and South Australia, they would end up eating their words.

Mr Groom: What is their?

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member for Hartley may have difficulty in telling it, but I will enlighten him in a minute. This tax package contains the following elements: a major reduction in personal income tax to provide more incentive to work and save; an elimination of the unfair and inefficient wholesale sales tax—and that is something omitted by members opposite when they talk about it; the introduction of a broad-based single rate goods and services tax with minimum exemptions; and targeted compensation for groups in the community initially disadvantaged by the tax that is charged. I invite members opposite to get up and argue

against those principles, and the principles are that we must reduce the burden of income tax on all Australians if we are to provide the incentive that is needed to pull this country around and get it world competitive again.

Mr Groom: Why are you putting on a consumption tax?

Mr D.S. BAKER: The honourable member will have a chance in a minute, and I will be interested to hear his views. However, they are a little irrelevant, because he cannot even get onto the front bench. Many members on this side run businesses, and the biggest cry that they hear from their employees relates not to how much they are paid but to the amount of salary and wages that goes out in income tax and the fact that there is no incentive for them to do more or perform better in their job because it all goes back to the Government. The Federal Government has a vested interest in the income tax system, and this Federal Government does not want to introduce that tax.

Those members opposite who saw the television spectacular on Paul Keating last night would have heard him lauding what a wonderful thing the goods and services tax was and saying that he totally supported it. I do not know why he is not allowed to lead the country. By the next Federal election, he will probably be there whether his Party likes it or not. Then we will see. He has the ability to understand and to address the situation. We will see whether or not he is fair dinkum and has the interests of all Australians at heart. There is no doubt that the incentive has been lost for those people on salaries and wages, and there is no doubt that that is resulting in many people becoming tax cheats because of the cash economy.

There is no doubt that a goods and services tax will reduce that problem. It is rather interesting to note, when listening to members opposite, that we would be the only people in the world who paid a goods and services tax, but the fact is that 21 of the 23 OECD countries—and many are our competitors—have a goods and services tax. It appears that that form of tax reform is universally accepted, but it is being opposed by members opposite who are trying to live in the last century and, because of their union mates, are not prepared to bring Australia into the twenty-first century and make it a world competitive country once again. It was also interesting to hear one Government member listing the items that this tax will cover. It is obvious and simple to understand that financial services, home mortgages and rent will have to be exempted from such a tax for technical reasons.

I turn now to the contribution of the member for Playford. His newsletter—it is a beauty—is headed, 'Report to the electorate, from the member for Playford', and states:

Anti-consumption tax campaign. Be warned! If the Liberal Party get their way, a State and/or Federal consumption tax of 15 per cent may be a reality. Everything you buy will be 15 per cent dearer. Some examples—\$100-worth of groceries just becomes \$115; a \$10 000 car just became \$11 500 apart from the registration and other motor registry charges.

He forgot about the wholesale sales tax. It continues:

The house that you and your children want to buy for, say, \$70 000 just went to \$80 500—an additional charge of \$10 500 on an average house in our area.

This is the sort of rubbish that is coming from some of these members. If they considered what goods incur a 20 per cent wholesale sales tax now, they would see that the list includes bicycles, motor vehicle parts and accessories, oils and lubricants, detergents, soap powders, starches, toothpaste, non-alcoholic beers and soft drinks, pet foods for domestic pets, and all pens, pencils and stationery. Even toilet paper is subject to a 20 per cent wholesale sales tax. Those items incurring a 30 per cent wholesale sales tax include sun block-out lotions and cosmetics.

We have seen a gross misrepresentation by a member who purports to be a JP. It is about time members opposite were prepared to stand up and tell the truth on some of these issues, and argue and debate them in a sensible way without a scare campaign which does not get them anywhere.

I now refer to the contribution of the member for Henley Beach. He went to New Zealand. That is great—at least he would have seen something of the work practices over there. He said that he had the opportunity to test out the consumption tax in New Zealand. He stated:

I compared prices and found that in New Zealand the prices for goods and services are on a par with the prices of goods and services in South Australia, yet the New Zealand dollar is worth about 65c to the Australian dollar.

Well, it is about 75c, but I did not want to tell him too much. However, he compared prices. What he forgot was that everything he had spent in New Zealand had a goods and services tax on it. So, although he thought he was not paying the tax, he was paying it—and obviously paying it quite gladly, because he came back with some glowing reports on that country.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Well, I think he could crunch his numbers a bit more on the value of the dollar. A contribution was made by the member for Playford. He said:

I think the Federal Opposition's move to a consumption tax is a move on very dangerous ground. However, I must give credit when it is due: it is a bold, clear-cut and concise policy.

Thank God he realises that at the end of the day. Finally, I wish to refer to a couple of matters that really show the gravity of the situation in South Australia. An article headed, 'Western Australian Government chips in \$70 million to cover R & I losses' in today's *Financial Review* states:

The Western Australian Government was yesterday dealing with another major financial and political crisis after being forced to inject \$70 million into the coffers of the State-owned R & I bank of WA Ltd. . . . The R & I now has more than \$350 million of non-performing loans on its books and has made total provisions of almost \$300 million. In an effort to avoid panic yesterday, the Western Australian Premier, Dr Lawrence, reaffirmed the Government's intention to stand behind the bank and guarantee all depositors' funds.

Let us consider that compared with what is going on with the State Bank of South Australia. A figure of \$970 million—not \$70 million—is being pumped into the State Bank of South Australia just to prop it up. That is nearly 14 times the figure in Western Australia. The non-performing loans in the South Australian State Bank are not \$350 million: they are \$2.5 billion already, which is eight times greater than in Western Australia.

The Premier of Western Australia is saying how terrible the matter is, that it is a political crisis, and she is trying to stop panic. That is the trouble over here: the Treasurer of this State is not prepared to understand the ramifications of what this is doing to South Australia. He is not prepared to understand that the \$60 million we lost in Scrimber would cause the demise of any Minister in any other Parliament of Australia, but this Minister—as is the Treasurer—is blaming other people in the bank and, of course, it was not their fault.

South Australians will be paying for the next 10 years for the financial mismanagement of this Government. The Premier has criticised what we put on the record in the no-confidence motion. He claims to have answered all those criticisms, but he has not. I assure the Premier that we will stick to the facts, he can stick to the fairy floss, and the taxpayers of South Australia will decide who can best govern South Australia.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I am pleased to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In so doing, I pay a tribute to Dame Roma, our Governor, for the excellent way in which she is performing her duties. It is delightful to see a female in that position, particularly someone who has had a distinguished legal career, a long commitment to community service and who exhibits humour and compassion. I look forward to the day when gender is unnoticed, and we no longer see it as being remarkable that a female holds a position such as that of Governor.

I indicate my continuing loyalty to Her Majesty, the Queen of Australia. Despite scurrilous suggestions to the contrary, I reaffirm what has always been my position: continuing loyalty and affection for the Queen, who is one of the outstanding women of not only our time but all time.

One of the interesting aspects of the Governor's speech—and this is no reflection on the Governor, as some members of the media thought last time, because it is obviously the Government's speech—is that it lacks vision; it contains no challenge, excitement, flair or innovation. It is about as exciting as a plate of cold fish and chips. At least the former Premier, Mr Dunstan, had flair if nothing else.

The Governor's speech indicates that economies are under stress. I think in the case of South Australia our economy has had more than just stress: it is suffering a nervous breakdown. South Australia has inflation at the rate of 4.7 per cent compared to the Australian average of 3.4 per cent; we have unemployment of 10.4 per cent, and for youth the figure is 26 per cent. That is a disgrace for a Government that purports to represent the working people of South Australia.

All members opposite should hang their heads in shame, because they have brought about a situation which has devastated the families and lives of South Australians. Members opposite call themselves a Labor Party: they should go around with their heads hung low. It is an absolutely shameful disgrace to have brought that situation on the people of South Australia through mismanagement of a whole list of projects, namely, Scrimber, the State Bank, Marineland, Timber Corporation and so on. We have had mismanagement by this Government, and the tragedy is that the ordinary people of South Australia, who are represented in my electorate, are suffering as a consequence. We know that not only economic but also family and personal suffering is involved. This Government, like other Labor Governments throughout Australia, including the Federal Government, should be ashamed of itself.

This State should be at the forefront of economic development and progress. We have not only physical and mineral resources but also resources of talented people. We have a climatic advantage not shared by people living in other parts of the world. We should be leaders, not people trailing behind in terms of economic development. There is no excuse for the abysmal record that we see and have seen in the past few years under the Labor Government.

It is time that we had major economic and political reform. The Governor's speech refers to the need for reform: I support that. We need to be more efficient and effective in the delivery of Government services. Let us not forget that, in seeking economic reform, in making our system more efficient and effective, we are doing it for the benefit of people, not for some abstract, ideological purpose. If it is not for that purpose, we should not be seeking to do it. Often we hear about the need for economic reform, and we overlook the fact that the reform should serve the ordinary people of Australia and South Australia.

The reforms needed are at all levels of government: I believe that Federal, State and local government should all

be involved, and there is some indication that this has already started to happen. There should be no sacred cows, no self-interest and no self-preservation. We need to cut duplication, and there are some indications that at long last an effort is being made to avoid the unnecessary duplication that exists now at Federal, State and, to some extent, local government level.

I believe we need to get away from a double standard. Those of us who have been to Canberra know that the services and facilities they provide for their citizens are not replicated throughout the rest of Australia. In a Federal system, I think we should have a situation where there is no double standard but where all Australians receive equal consideration, whether it be in the provision of schools or hospitals, etc.

I believe we need to work towards a reduction in the number of local government authorities in South Australia. The way this Government has sought to do so through compulsion has been wrong. What we need to do is offer financial incentives to encourage local government bodies to come together so that we get a more efficient use of resources at local government level. I have been in local government, as I understand you have also, Mr Deputy Speaker, and one of the things that disturbs me in my contact at Federal and State level is a suspicion of local government. In my experience, the people in local government generally are dedicated people who resent the fact that they are often treated as a poor relation. In fairness to them, I think we need to get away from that attitude and treat them as equals in their own sphere of operation.

At State level we need to focus on efficiency and effectiveness. I suggest that we consider having mobile audit review teams to look at the way that Government departments and organisations operate, so that we focus not only on traditional accounting operations, but look at situations on a practical basis. I believe that the traditional way of cutting Government departments is inefficient and ineffective. The idea of across-the-board cuts of 1 or 2 per cent, or whatever, often militates against the effective delivery of services. Services are cut at the coal face rather than where they should be cut, which is often at middle or senior management levels. For the people implementing the cuts, it is human nature not to exercise those cuts against their own sphere of operations. Therefore, we see cuts at the coal face rather than where they should be made. Once again, we should be mindful that, when we cut government, it should be for the ultimate benefit of the people, not for some simple blind ideological purpose.

I come to the aspect of our Parliament. For the calendar year 1991, and assuming that we follow the scheduled sitting days, this Parliament will sit for a total of 53 days, plus seven days for Estimates. That example should not be continued. As members of Parliament we should set an example, and the ball is really in the court of the Government. The Government effectively determines how long we sit. I think that the Government should be brought to account for not using the Parliament for the purposes for which it was intended. It is no use talking about economic or micro-economic reform, call it what one will, unless we subject ourselves to the same scrutiny.

I believe that in Parliament there is often too much hot air, there is too much talking for the sake of it and there is too much unnecessary denigration of members. I notice that the member for Napier has just walked into the Chamber. I suggest that he should bear some of these comments in mind. Too often in this place we hear what I would call childish invective. It does not serve the public interest, it does not uplift Parliament, and it seeks only to denigrate

members and Parliament in the eyes of the public. How can we expect the public to hold Parliament in high regard when members engage in childish comments and invective and use opportunities in Parliament simply to attack other members on a personal basis when they are seeking to do their best?

Parliament should be a place for humour and some light hearted comment as well as the serious business, but it is not a place for childish attacks and attempts to smear people either within or without the Parliament. The disease of invective can become very infectious, and I hope that we will seek to avoid it. In the community at large people are struggling to make ends meet. At times I am ashamed to have to represent those people in a place where behaviour is often of a low standard and when I know that in my electorate schools are crying out for facilities and people are struggling to make ends meet.

I believe that a lot of taxpayers' money is wasted in the operation of this institution. I have taken out some figures, and we can calculate these using various bases. On a rough basis, the sitting time of this Parliament costs the taxpayer in members' salaries alone for both Houses about \$2 000 per hour. When that sort of money is being paid out of the taxpayers' purse, they have a right to expect some performance.

The cost, of course, goes beyond that. The general servicing of this Parliament, in addition to that, is about \$200 000 per week. That is a lot of money when talking about facilities in the community which are deficient in respect of hospitals, schools and so on. I think it is time that we in this Parliament lifted our game and performed as the people expect—that is, avoiding childish nonsense and unnecessary hot air and getting on with the job of decision making. In short, I acknowledge that Parliament is a theatre, but it need not be the theatre of the absurd.

I believe we should be moving to improve the functioning of Parliament. I am pleased that there are moves in that direction. I think that more effective use of the committee system is worth while. I believe that the Legislative Council is moving more towards a committee style of operation, and I applaud that. In general terms, I support some of the initiatives that the member for Elizabeth has brought about, but we can go a lot further and consider matters such as electronic voting and computerising *Hansard* to a greater extent to get more efficient use of the taxpayer's dollar in terms of recording the pearls of wisdom that we utter in this place.

In the Governor's speech reference is made to the creation of a manufacturing division by the State Government. I fully support that. One of the sad things in our State is that we produce agricultural materials, but often we export them in the raw form. In effect, we export jobs that we could do with here. In particular, we should be processing more of those raw materials to provide our own manufactured processed food for sale in this State. I do not know whether members realise, but the majority of processed foods sold in supermarkets here do not originate in this State; they come from interstate or overseas. It is a sad indictment that we cannot even make a complete range of things that we eat or need to purchase in the supermarket. We have the expertise in the CSIRO Division of Human Nutrition, the Waite Institute, which is part of the university, and other universities, and we have other expertise to develop foods which could be exported in the form of long life foods. We need to grasp those opportunities. I welcome the establishment of that manufacturing division and trust that it will perform some of those tasks which will help channel some

of the raw materials that we produce into finished products and halt the continual export of jobs from this State.

Reference is made in the speech to the need for policies and projects that will position South Australia to take the best advantage of new business. I would welcome that. It can be summed up in one word—incentive. We will get incentive and positive business when we address issues such as WorkCover, land tax and payroll tax.

The MFP is a project that I support in principle. It is unfortunate that the name and vagueness associated with it have triggered much concern and confusion in the community. If that project were only West Lakes 2, I think that would be worth while, but I am sure that it will be more than West Lakes 2. If it were simply converting part of the Gillman area to residential purposes, I think that would be worth while and positive, but I trust that it will go beyond that. I hope that we can come up with a name which is more indicative of what the project is really about and, therefore, allay some of the concerns in the community.

There is reference in the speech to '2020 Vision', which I applaud, but I notice one omission is any reference to cemeteries. I stand to be corrected, but I have had a good look through it and I cannot find any reference to cemeteries. Whether we like it or not, most of us end up in one of those places. I should like to think that that issue could be addressed in the planning review and that we could get away from the traditional cemetery with which we are familiar and go for something more akin to what they have in Western Australia at a place called Pinnaroo Valley. They have put commemorative plaques in a bushland setting in which they have created ponds, waterfalls and so on. It is an opportunity for us in South Australia to be a bit more innovative. I have had discussions with people in the industry who concur in that view. They would like to see us get away from the tombstone to a situation where people are remembered through things such as waterfalls, areas for water fowl, native shrubs, plantations and so on.

Social justice is the catchcry of this Government. I only wish its talk was matched by its action because I do not believe the Government can talk about social justice when 26 per cent of young people are unemployed and when it has not provided accommodation for the mentally disabled. Several people in my electorate have been driven almost to the point of ultimate frustration trying to cater for youngsters in their family, teenagers and young adults, who are mentally disabled and who need accommodation. Repeated pleas for Government assistance have fallen on deaf ears.

I could mention many issues relating to social justice, but I wish to highlight one of the absurdities of the present system that concerns concessions for pensioners, a matter which I have taken up with the Minister of Water Resources but on which I have received a negative answer. In order to get water or council rate concessions one must be in receipt of a pension on the very night on which the council declares the rate. A person who goes onto the pension the next day misses out on any concession for the whole year with respect to council and water rates or any other concession. I believe that the Minister should address that issue because of a situation involving a constituent of mine, Helen Clift, who is happy to have her name mentioned. I believe the system could be adjusted to allow *pro rata* consideration to be given. In these days of computers it would not be difficult to adjust an annual rate to a *pro rata* rate to take into account the fact that someone came onto a pension a week or a day after a particular council declared its rate.

The matter of water filtration was addressed in the Governor's speech. I welcome the announcement—a matter of

which I was already aware—that filtered water will flow to the rest of my electorate by the end of this year. This announcement is long overdue. It is a paradox that the people in my electorate, in Aberfoyle Park, Flagstaff Hill, parts of Happy Valley, Bellevue Heights and Eden Hills, live adjacent to the filtration plant yet do not get filtered water. I am glad that that anomaly is at last being addressed. When children are frightened to get into a bath because the water is dirty before they step into it, it is time for the situation to be addressed.

I turn to the question of affordable housing, or perhaps I should say 'unaffordable housing'. I realise that the blame does not lie totally with this Government but with its counterpart in Canberra. In my electorate—and in the southern area generally—people seeking Housing Trust accommodation face a five to six-year wait. I would hardly call that social justice. I refer to the area which comprises the southern suburbs plus the Riverland and point out that, in 1989, with respect to Housing Trust constructions, 270 houses or units were built; in 1990-91, there were 76; and in 1991-92, there will be possibly 88. All the construction is being done in the Noarlunga City Council area and very little in the Happy Valley council area. That deficiency needs to be addressed.

One of the major problems in the local government area of Happy Valley relates to the need for short-term accommodation for teenagers. We know that teenagers, for various reasons, leave home. They need somewhere to go where the problem can be addressed, where they can be counselled, so that hopefully in time they will go back to their family. A deficiency in terms of emergency short-term accommodation for families in the Happy Valley local government area also exists.

One of the matters that concerns me in respect of this general matter is a statement in the Hills Valley *Messenger* of Wednesday 17 July in which a Housing Trust information officer stated:

... the Trust will concentrate on building between Darlington and Gepps Cross because it is too expensive for the State Government to provide services to the outer suburbs.

In other words, bad luck for the people in Happy Valley and south of that area—they will miss out.

In her speech the Governor referred to education, a subject close to my heart. I want to address the point that in some schools in my electorate there is a serious problem in respect of overcrowding. Once again, I quote from an article in the *Messenger Hills Valley* of 14 August headed 'School space crisis: lessons in corridors', as follows:

Children are being taught in the corridors, staff rooms and photocopying rooms at two Aberfoyle Park primary schools because of severe overcrowding and a lack of space ... Over-crowding at Heysen School has forced young, disabled children into the corridors for their special learning classes, says Heysen School council chairman Rob Lindsay.

A spokesperson for the Education Department states that corridors are designed to teach groups. I do not call that social justice. Those two schools are not the only ones experiencing overcrowding, because the situation at Sheidow Park is rapidly approaching crisis point. I trust that the Government will address that matter in due course.

Similarly, Blackwood High School, which serves a lot of my area (although it is situated in the electorate of the member for Davenport), Reynella East High School and Aberfoyle Park High School are getting close to, if not at, capacity. I believe the Government must look urgently at the question of the provision of an additional high school or high school facilities in the mid-south region, that is, to serve in specific suburbs such as O'Halloran Hill, Sheidow Park and Trott Park, preferably with state-of-the-art facili-

ties focused on technology, which is what many parents seek.

Mr Becker: Has the wimpy Minister been down to look at any of your schools? He won't come down my way.

Mr SUCH: He does not come down very often. In her speech, the Governor referred to the University of South Australia. When that university was established, I wished it well and I still do. However, I must say in all honesty that I was concerned at the recent appointment of some of the professors at the University of South Australia as distinct from the appointment of professors at Flinders University, who were unfortunately criticised in the media by a person who has since apologised. I have no concern whatsoever with the appointments to Flinders University, but I do have concerns with the appointments to the University of South Australia because I know the background of some of those people. I do not want to go into great detail here, but the university must be very careful to establish a reputation based on research and teaching expertise. It should tread very carefully otherwise it will jeopardise the good name that it has derived from the former South Australian College of Advanced Education and the Institute of Technology.

In her speech the Governor indicated that there would be an efficiency review of the Flinders Medical Centre. I do not believe that that hospital has much to fear from such a review as it is a very well run and caring hospital that gives excellent service to its patients—a fact which I know from personal experience. The hospital seeks \$5 million for an accident and emergency section to cater properly for the needs of the growing southern region, and I trust that that money will be forthcoming. That hospital was promised extensions years ago but they have never been forthcoming. It needs specialist facilities to treat psychiatric patients, children, and accident and emergency patients to maintain its present standards and to ensure that there are adequate facilities for the inevitable patient growth that will take place. I call on the Government, even in these tough times, to ensure that the submission from the Flinders Medical Centre receives proper consideration.

I welcome the suggestion of improvements in the area of access to law, something which I think is long overdue. Except for the wealthy and those who receive legal aid, our court system does most people a disservice. I believe that lawyers have a lot to answer for and that they need to reassess their approach and behaviour. We in our society need to be very careful that we do not become litigation crazy, and that our lawyers do not get a bad name for themselves. I am often approached by people who hold our courts system in contempt and who believe that it denies justice to the ordinary, middle Australian, and I welcome any attempt by the Government to redress that.

In respect of graffiti, it has taken this Government a long time to get its act together. Members will appreciate that I and many other members in this place raised the issue of graffiti over many months, going back to the beginning of last year. I put out press releases that have had reasonable coverage. Long before the Minister for Youth Affairs wrote to stores and shopkeepers, I had already undertaken that action.

In October last year I wrote to the managers of all the large supermarkets and hardware chains, and obtained their support. Last week we found the Minister suggesting such an idea. He is only several months behind the times. In this Parliament, I along with the member for Albert Park called for action to be taken, and I came up with specifics, not just generalisations. I suggested that we lower the age at which a person is treated as an adult to 17; that we make

the marking, aiding and abetting of graffiti specific offences, as has already been done in Victoria; and so it goes on.

I will not take any more time on this, but I point out that, once again, this Government has been slow off the mark in addressing this costly social problem. We realise that graffiti must be tackled both from the punishment side and from the positive side to provide exciting activities for young people. Most young people are good: they need activities into which they can channel their energy. That has already been addressed in this place by me and by some of my colleagues.

Finally, I make quick reference to the environment. I believe the notion of an EPA has merit, although I question whether this State has the resources to staff one, if it is to be modelled on the lines of that in New South Wales. We should be wary of portraying the environment always in negative terms, otherwise young people become depressed and put off. We should emphasise what we can do, focus on the positive, and go from there. Time has worked against me. I am pleased to indicate my support for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): In rising to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I, with other members of the Opposition, ask that, through you, Mr Speaker, a message be conveyed to the Governor stating our loyalty as an Opposition to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of Australia, and her heirs and successors according to law. I congratulate Her Excellency on her elevation to the position of Governor of South Australia. I note that one of the members opposite deplored the fact that we on this side of the House had not acknowledged South Australia's first female Governor. Much was made of the fact that Dame Roma is a female. I believe, quite honestly, that such comments do not assist attempts to rid our society of discrimination based on the ground of gender. Dame Roma Mitchell is a celebrated jurist, a noted intellect and a respected participant in our society. By any measure, her credentials to serve as South Australia's Governor can be questioned by no-one. I doubt not that she will add as much lustre to the position as did some of her noted predecessors, such as Sir Donald Dunstan and Sir Mark Oliphant.

In this context, her gender is irrelevant and, the sooner members opposite realise that merit alone should be the basis of preferment, the sooner we will be rid of the gratuitous but, I hope, inadvertent tokenism inherent in the remarks of the honourable member. On Thursday we were treated to the unusual spectacle of the member for Spence addressing this House in a grievance debate, and berating me and the member for Coles on matters related to the Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights.

I remind the member for Spence of a quotation from Portia's speech to Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice*, when Portia said:

Though justice be thy plea, consider this, that in the course of justice none of us should see salvation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will address the Chair.

Mr BRINDAL: I am not quite sure whether or not the Speaker said that he was Omar Khayyam.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: I do this in the context of the speech of the member for Spence, because the issues the honourable member raised were very serious. He alluded to the fact that, on several occasions in this House, both I and the member for Coles have spoken about the Magna Carta and

the Bill of Rights. Just as a pedantic point, he failed to define which particular Magna Carta he was talking about. Educated members opposite will realise that there were four charters and that they varied in form.

Having said that the honourable member was imprecise in this matter, I now turn to the substance, that is, the honourable member's claim that Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights are irrelevant to this House at this time in our history. I believe that it is important, because the member for Spence did what too many members opposite so often do—he took a narrow and legalistic interpretation of Magna Carta and of the Bill of Rights. Whenever Magna Carta or the Bill of Rights has been raised in this place, it has been raised in the context of its importance to the development of the democratic process.

In its time, Magna Carta was a great step forward from the servitude of the people towards emancipation. It is what Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights symbolised that is important, not their legalistic and narrow interpretation. Even in their interpretation, the member for Spence was wrong. He said, 'What has Magna Carta to do with law and order, with red light cameras and such things?'

He completely ignored the fact that there was a system of justice presided over by sheriffs, and that there was a judiciary at the time. One of the great facets of Magna Carta, and I am sure that members opposite will correct me if I make a mistake, was that, for the first time ever, there was a move towards the separation of powers. Under Magna Carta, the legal system was better defined, and trial and judgment by peers was guaranteed within the context of the Great Charter. If that is not a step towards greater democracy and freedom of the people, I do not know what is. Unlike members opposite, I am quite prepared to be educated.

The matter raised by the honourable member on Thursday related to justice, and that is a term which, too often, the Government of this day in this State bandies around as though it has some sort of monopoly on the word. I truly believe that often it does not understand it, especially when it talks in the context of social justice.

Justice, as any member knows, has any number of meanings, and one of those meanings is to be fair, impartial, legally right and consonant with what is legal and lawful. I am afraid that I believe that the member for Spence was highlighting the general attitude of this Government in matters of justice. It is not truly about social equity: it is about impartiality, legal rights and consonance with what is lawful. It is not really concerned with equity for the people: it is concerned with balance and proportion, and not much more. I believe that often, in this context, people are forgotten.

I would remind the Government that justice was one of the cardinal virtues, that ideal justice was conceived by Plato to be obtained in perfect social harmony in beneficent activities. Aristotle, as he did with much of Plato's work, redefined the concept of justice, and held it to be a practice of virtue towards others. He, in that context, and for the benefit of the Government and in order to be helpful, distinguished distributive justice, or distribution according to merit, from corrective justice, which was designed to rectify errors in distribution, and equity from mere legality. That is the point to which I return. Too often this Government fails to distinguish equity from mere legality, and when it speaks of social justice, it speaks of social justice in terms of mere legality and not in terms of equity for the people.

I believe that those points are most important in this debate. We in this Chamber are a forum for the people,

and I have said before (and I am afraid I will probably say again) that this forum for the people is too often forgotten by this Government in this State. We are ruled in South Australia by an Executive, by a bureaucracy and by regulation. Too often this Parliament is called to answer, to debate and to consider nothing but the wishes of the Executive, and the wishes of the executive bureaucracy. Only the other day the Minister of Forests said in this Chamber that, basically, he had never been to the Scrimber plant because he had experts to keep him advised; it was their job to keep him advised, and it was not his job to know. That is what we have come to expect from this Government. We have come to expect that Government Ministers will sit on the front benches and mouth the platitudes put into their mouths by their heads of departments and public servants. As a Parliament, we are constantly bogged down with time spent on the business, not necessarily even of the Executive Government, but of the public servants who are supposed to run their departments for this Parliament.

I believe that this Chamber has become the body of the dog being wagged by the tail, which is the bureaucracy. I, for one, deplore it, as I am sure some members opposite, and certainly many members on this side, also deplore it. It is time that this Parliament was given some of the integrity that it deserves. It is time that we, who are elected to represent the people, were allowed to represent the people, and that there was more true and honest debate in the forums of this Parliament. I remind members opposite of the night we spent in this Chamber when the Speaker, the member for Eyre and, I believe, the member for Elizabeth, got up and spoke, from memory, about the numbers of members who should be in this House.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I am sorry; the member for Napier reminds me that the member for Flinders contributed to that debate. I think all members will agree that that was a very important and impressive night, because it was one of the few nights in this Chamber when the debate was honest, when it was heartfelt and when people made a contribution not based on Party politics but on what they really felt. We have been promised much by this Government, and it has given us little. Indeed, I am pleased that so many members opposite are here to at least listen to what I have to say. Nevertheless, it does not detract from the fact that, on the front bench, this Government is found sadly wanting.

We are constantly told in the newspapers that we in Australia are over-governed. I believe that we are over-governed. However, I do not believe that we are over-represented, and there is a difference.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I will attempt, for the honourable member, to define the terms. Government comes from regulations, from bureaucracy and from the Executive. Representation comes from the members of Parliament in this Chamber. I do not believe that we are over-represented in this Chamber. I would say that each and every member, no matter what his Party politics, works hard—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No matter what his or her politics, every member works hard for their constituents, does a good and honest job for their constituents, and would find it difficult to contribute any more from their working day than they already contribute. I have the privilege of representing an electorate which, unfortunately, has become a lot smaller than most, but it is a full-time job to represent that electorate, and I am sure that every member opposite has a full-time job. If we have a full-time job servicing the numbers that we now have to service, the calls from the media

that we are lazy, that we do not earn that which we are given by the Remuneration Tribunal, and that we are all sorts of other parasite are spurious and fatuous and should be countermanded at every opportunity.

I am sure that every member in this place earns their due, and I am sure that, if the circumstances were right, we could perhaps do with more members in this place, because we could better represent the people. But that does not mean that we are not over-governed, because our lives are constantly regulated not by this Chamber but by the Executive and the regulations which the Executive promulgates through the bureaucracy, which in theory, I know, come through this Chamber but which most members do not have the time to fully comprehend, study and digest.

Let us look at this Government and its much vaunted social justice policy. In the years that this Government has been in power in this State there has been a growing disparity between the haves and the have nots. The middle class has, in many ways, been truncated. Those who are wealthy are much wealthier than at any time in our history, and those who are poor are more numerous than at any time in our history. The member for Fisher reminded members opposite that 26 per cent of our young people in this State are unemployed.

Other things may be a source of mirth for members opposite, but I hope that that is one statistic that is not. I trust that that is the case. For 26 per cent of our youth to be unemployed is something that every member of this Chamber must be concerned about, and we must be concerned to help the Government of the day, whatever its complexion, do something about it. I call on this Government, in the budget that it will bring down in two or three weeks, to try to do something about it and to try to do a little more than what I believe is tokenism from the Minister of Employment and Further Education, who believes that he can wave a wand or create some sort of universal panacea to take the problem away.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The job of the Government is to develop the policy of the Government for the day. If the member for Spence wishes to chortle across the Chamber, 'Let's hear your policy', let the member for Spence move to the Opposition and let this Opposition move to the Government benches so that we can announce our policy. If not, let the member for Spence ask his Ministers what their policies are and let the member for Spence insist that his Government and his Ministers bring into this place sound policies for the better governance of the people of South Australia. We in South Australia have witnessed a tale of woe. The losses of the State Bank almost defy understanding. I have no comprehension of \$1 billion, and I am sure that that applies to most members of the South Australian community. The \$1 billion loss by the State Bank apparently was just the beginning. I interjected on my Leader in his speech that really the \$60 million loss to Scrimber is a sort of cheap fiasco for this Government.

If we consider WorkCover, Scrimber and the State Bank, we see that we have nothing in South Australia to be proud of. Members opposite consistently ask, 'What is your policy? What are you going to do about it? Why are you so negative and carping?' They accused this Opposition of being negative and carping when two years ago we were raising legitimate questions about SGIC, the State Bank and Scrimber. It gives this Opposition no pleasure to have been proved right, and it gives this State much pain because, in not listening to us and accusing us of carping and criticising, in pretending that the problem was not a problem, in the Government's burying its head in the sand in the hope that

the problem would go away, this State is paying dearly. It is paying dearly not in the macro area but in the area of the people. It is the people who are bearing the brunt of this Government's losses.

Mr Atkinson: What do you want us to do?

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Spence again interjects, 'What do you want us to do?' I have written to the Premier; I have called on the Premier to clearly explain to this State the measures that will be necessary to redress the fiscal imbalance that we are now suffering. As yet, the Premier has done nothing. We have a crisis in this State, yet we have a Premier who is prepared to wait until the normal budget is brought into this House in the hope that people might not notice the draconian measures that he will be forced to introduce. I predict that the Premier's budget will be so severe for South Australia that *Les Miserables* could be filmed on location in the electorates of Spence, Elizabeth and Port Adelaide. That gives neither me nor any other member on this side of the House any joy at all, but I believe it to be a statement of fact. Look at what has happened since the State Bank lost money.

The Minister of Agriculture, when interviewed on ABC radio, said, 'We would like to do more to help rural South Australia, but we must do that which is within our budget.' In other words, there is no money to do any more. When I wrote to the Minister of Transport about a subsidy for bicycle helmets, the answer I received was 'We have no money.' Yesterday I was contacted by a constituent who has waited for 2½ years for a knee replacement and has twice been one hour away from being admitted to the Flinders Medical Centre but has then been telephoned to be told, 'I am sorry, we do not have a bed.' That woman is in pain, and I have difficulty explaining to her that this Government has neither the beds nor the financial capacity to ease her suffering. That might be a matter of mirth for some people, but it is not a matter of mirth for me. It is not a matter of mirth for me to see people who are my age and who have been thrown on the industrial scrap heap not able to afford to buy their children or themselves bicycle helmets, while this State compels them to wear a helmet although it cannot afford to help them with a subsidy.

This Government must cut the cloth according to its means, and I do not blame it for that. We are in a mess. What I do call on this Government to do is to introduce some social justice, to really do what it is talking about and to introduce a measure of social justice into its programs. One-third of my electorate consists of Housing Trust homes. Those people have traditionally supported this Government. That is why I am a marginal seat member. This Government's reward to those people is that they will now be allowed 136 kilolitres of water but they must pay for the rest. As a Liberal, I will not shrink from the fact that we favour the 'user pays' principle. However, I am not a member of a Government who trumpets social justice but then hits the most needy in our society.

Many people who live in Housing Trust homes have not the level of income of any member of this House. Many members opposite who represent large Housing Trust areas know the great difficulties which those people face. To make light of the fact that, because of the decision of this Government, they will now have to pay substantially more for one commodity is no laughing matter. It may be this Government's decision, and it may well be the right decision, but it should not be taken lightly and it should not be laughed off, as members of the Government constantly attempt to do.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The honourable member interjects that I am having two bob each way. It is the privilege of an Opposition to have two bob each way. It is the privilege of a Government to know—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, can you give us an assurance that *Hansard* will maintain an accurate record of what is said in this Chamber?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has never had any reason to doubt the accuracy of *Hansard*, and I am sure that the debate will be recorded as accurately as always. The honourable member for Hayward.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I said it was the privilege of an Opposition to have two bob each way. I also acknowledge that, if one has two bob each way and one loses, one must still pay the two bob, and perhaps I will have to do that. The reservoir of financial funds in this State is depleted. The Premier, when he delivers the budget, will have to announce to the people of South Australia measures that strengthen the financial reserves of the State. I do not think they will be pleasant measures. I deplore the fact that they might seriously impinge on every family in South Australia. However, I do hope that, when the Premier introduces his budget, it will be done with a measure of social justice.

Opposite we have a united team, a wonderful team, a team that will show us vision, flair and light, and they seem to be doing well today. The team opposite is led, of course, by the great helmsman, who for eight years has kept this great ship of State with his hand steady on the tiller and sailed us along to his own guiding star. He has trusted his officers, and he has trusted his crew. Perhaps that will be his downfall because, in trusting his officers and his crew, no-one can doubt that many of them have let him down. The Premier may not have known some of what was going on in the engine room, but the fact that the engine is not working cannot be denied by anyone.

Those members opposite, for 100 years I believe, have always sought the light on the hill. The great cry of the Labor Party is to seek the light on the hill. I think they have been doing that a bit assiduously because, as the great helmsman has steered his ship steadily along, this ship of State is floundering. It is floundering because, in looking for the light on the hill, the Labor Party has got a bit muddled up, and it has fallen for the old Cornish trick. The Cornish used to tie lights on either side of a donkey and drive the donkey over the hill. Ships that were looking for safe passage would see the gentle undulation of the lights before them and, assuming that the lights were on the stern of a ship in front of them, they would steer the same course. Those ships would sail straight into the Lizard Peninsula and founder upon the rocks. The Cornish wreckers would then come down, plunder the ships and often murder the crew.

I would say that the Labor Party is in much the same situation as those who were on those ships: it is searching for the light on the hill; it has seen the light on the hill but it is missing the rocks on the shore. This ship of State is floundering badly. The Premier and the braying Government opposite are drowning, and the wreckers are about to move in.

Previously in these speeches I have called on this Government to resign. This Government is not fit to hold office, and it is betraying the trust of the people of South Australia. I will not waste my breath today by again calling for that to happen. The Government would take as little notice of what I said as it has done before. The clock is ticking away

and the election is getting closer. I am confident, as I am sure is every member of this Opposition, that, after the next election, we will be looking across the Chamber from where members opposite are sitting at a very much reduced Labor Party, the members of which will smile slightly less sweetly than they do today.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the speech of Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell on behalf of the Government. We know that it is a Government speech that opens the Parliament: it involves not the Governor's words but those of the Government in an attempt to allay fears or to build up hopes for the future. When a Government is in trouble it is difficult to achieve anything of a positive nature, especially if one is told untruths and given broken promises over the years, because people do not believe in it. I understand and sympathise with the Government's position.

I recognise the contribution made by three members of Parliament who have passed away: the Hon. David Springett, the Hon. Geoff O'Halloran-Giles and the Hon. Ross Story. I recognise the contribution that they made on behalf of different sections of the people and, as in the case of Dr Springett, on behalf of persons in underprivileged lands. I appreciate the contribution and sacrifices that their families had to make while their partners made a contribution to the Parliament and to the government of this State. So, like others I record my regrets at their passing and express my thanks for their service and contribution.

In recognising that the Governor makes the speech, I want to say that the member for Alexandra, Mr Ted Champman, MP, expresses his regret at being unable to speak to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to Her Excellency the Governor's speech, particularly having been the joint host during her recent visit to his electorate on Kangaroo Island. The member for Alexandra assures me that his absence from the House is only of a temporary kind and that he will be back, fighting fit in the fray, very soon. I know that all members wish him well, as it is a situation that many of us may face as we move through life to an age where some things catch up with us.

I have become disappointed by the way that television has been used in our society and the effect it has had on our society in several ways. With that, I suppose, go the print media and radio in particular, now that we do not have as many talk-back programs. I think that the loss of talk-back programs on radio is a great pity, not just for the sake of democracy and getting ideas over to Government, Opposition or those who are elected as individuals, but also for the community itself to be able to be part of the scene in the hope that some minder in a Government department or of a Minister somewhere will pick up the comments and make use of them in trying to feed them through the system.

We find now that, in the lifestyle led by some of our citizens, where in many cases both partners are working (in other cases, no-one in the home is working), people do not have the time to put into going to meetings, sitting down to write letters to Ministers or Government departments or fighting for causes. Most of those who are fighting for causes find themselves in a privileged position where they have found a way to live on the system, somebody gives them a few bob behind the scenes to keep up the cause or they are very dedicated and confine their lifestyle to one job and one other goal—to fight for that cause. That cause could be in the sporting field, the conservation field or the promotion of what some people call social justice. A lot of what people

are fighting for nowadays is not social justice, I believe; it is just for pet hates or pet loves.

So, television itself has been part of the problem and the print media are trying to stay with it. A typical example was after the no-confidence vote in recent times and the comment that appeared in the paper. I mention a couple of reporters. Whether they understand what I am trying to get at or whether they take it as a reflection or praise is up to them, but I say this in a constructive way. We know that some reporters have a leaning towards a political Party, so we know that, when we read their articles or see them on television, they will try to give things a bent in a certain direction if they can. If they can lean towards supporting one particular faction of a political Party against the other, and they can get a chance to get a little whack at the faction they do not support, they will do that.

One example—and I appreciate his dedication and his capacity as a journalist—is Randall Ashbourne. He would not lean towards my Party. He advised me once that I had made an error in saying that he had said that he would do his best to make sure the Liberal Party never won. At that time he was talking about the then Leader, and I accept that I may have misquoted him: however, it was a long time ago.

Rex Jory has been writing about politics for a long while. After the no-confidence vote he wrote in a way that surprised me, at a time when the country is in big trouble. I think it is fair to say that at one time that writer had an interest in becoming a Liberal member of Parliament. I cannot prove that, but I believe that to be the case. That was many years ago. He may have been wise not to take it on. Many who come to this place learn that the political lesson is not as easy as it appears. One cannot change as much as one would like, because others also have views.

However, it is not right for people to say that the Opposition does not have anybody who can form a team to govern the State. The Government that has brought the State to its knees is apparently great and glorious in some of its management, although he may not have said it in those terms. I find it amazing that there is no mention or indication that the public would like a change.

I believe that any person with any sense, when making a reasonable assessment of individuals, would not worry about whether a person can stand and rant and rave and point a finger, as was suggested, as far as the Deputy Leader is concerned, but would be more impressed if that person, given the opportunity, could manage a business. That is what the management and Government of the State is. However, journalists talk about performance and refer to a performance along the lines of a member being an actor, a performer, as if Parliament is a stage. I know that Parliament is a stage in a sense, and many great orators in this place use voice, hands, good English, quick comment and little cliches which are reported and remembered. Have we gone past that stage?

We could be \$3 000 million in debt? I do not say \$3 billion, because that does not register with people in the community. It is beyond them. It is like getting into a spaceship and going out into space for thousands of light years. They cannot contemplate it; they cannot understand it. This socialist Bannon Government, which continued the Dunstan experiment, through bad judgment, bad administration and improper supervision of organisations handling people's money, has gone through nearly \$3 000 million. Some journalists say that the other group—the Liberal Party—is not capable of doing the job properly, either. But have they ever stopped and looked at how many on one side have ever managed a business as against the other? I

challenge them to do it. Even you, Mr Speaker, and your colleague, the other Independent, tend to indicate the same view as a member of Parliament, not as a presiding officer.

I find it depressing that our State has more than 10 per cent of the work force unemployed. Nearly 27 per cent of people under the age of 25 are unemployed, and some of them will possibly never get a job in the next 10 years, even with proper management, placing the country or the State in greater debt. Yet we have people writing, 'It will be all right. Leave them there. Trust them there.' The member for Elizabeth says, 'The Premier is a great guy. He is a better manager than Dale Baker, the Leader of the Opposition.' Which of them has managed a business more successfully over the years? We know the answer full well.

Those who report know the answer, but do they believe that this State can go on in the Dunstan style, with the great orators, the great performers and with the cliches and smooth speeches before elections, promising the world, when possibly now we do not even own Kangaroo Island? They themselves are doing a great injustice to this State. Any person in an area of responsibility—and I do not care who it is—who does not believe that it is an appropriate time to say that the people of this State should be able to make a decision as to who they want to govern this State is not a fit and proper person to have that responsibility. If we cannot trust the people, why should the people trust us?

People out there know the situation as their children grow older, as the schools become over-crowded, when the kindergartens cannot get staff and where costs for child-care places are going up. Many people find it impossible to meet those costs and they seek other places, sometimes unsatisfactory, to leave their children, with behind the scenes payments. Further, small businesses are facing WorkCover costs that are escalating dramatically. They do not even get a fair judgment in relation to where a person got an injury. Businesses now have to pay up to 6 per cent superannuation. This is not the employee, the one who will benefit, but it is the business that must pay. Even if the business is showing a loss, under the new Federal budget it will be forced to pay up to 6 per cent. Of course, that budget comes from a Government of the same socialist ilk as the State Government here. Also, there is payroll tax; when a business employs someone the Government charges for employing them. A great socialist theory that is, with unemployment rife in the community.

People are losing their homes because they cannot keep up the payments. They might have over-committed themselves, but one can come back to television and the media: through all possible means there are these promotions that it is all right to borrow for today because things will be better tomorrow. We all know that that is not always the case. The media has created a society of people who have become working agents for money lenders and slaves to interest rates. Anyone who attacks the media industry is said to be anti business. I wrote Mr Murdoch a two page letter before the big spill. He had sent me a copy of the News annual report. I told him where I thought we were going. I might be only a backbencher and I might not have had the educational opportunity that he has had, but I wrote to him and said that I thought it was inevitable. He did not even have the courtesy to reply. Perhaps he did not like the language I used and may have found it different from his.

So, we have a Government that sits in office with that background of the Hon. Don Dunstan. I agree with the Hon. Don Dunstan on one thing, when he said that these so-called entrepreneurs, like Bond, Skase, and Elliott, were simply nothing more than paper shufflers of money. They created no wealth for the country. They shifted money

around on computers to gain half a per cent per day, or whatever. They led a great lifestyle. They took money out of our country to others and changed nationality or took out citizenship in another country to make more money in the attempt. But they created nothing. The Hon. Don Dunstan was right in that. The right honourable Prime Minister, Bob Hawke, and his colleagues, with their mates, and this Government, are the same. It has bled the people dry with taxes and, as the member for Hayward said, it has overburdened them with regulations.

I come back to this side of the Chamber. I challenge any reporter to sit down and write out the names of individual members who have been involved in or conducted their own business, including the professionals such as lawyers—the member for Hartley referred to the law as a business where usually income for hours served is guaranteed—and look at those who have been successful as against those in the ALP who have managed a business. That is what this State is about. The people have given the ALP—the socialist philosophy—the opportunity for 18 of the past 21 years. It has been the 18 year experiment. At this time, it should be coming to the age of majority, but it is not—it has failed.

The Government may have brought about some social changes, but it is not much good having a society in which you should have a particular social standing, or a particular right or so-called privilege, if you cannot earn a living or cannot export anything at a profit. In the main, we have excellent weather in which to work, we have every mineral on earth and we can grow any sort of crop; our only disadvantages relate to distance and communication. What about the countries with which we try to trade? We cannot compete. In the end, it will be even worse for us all, and every member knows this in his heart.

When the no-confidence motion was moved—and I will not seek to reflect on the decision of the House—it was moved with sincerity. However, I believe that there should have been no need to move it because action should have occurred earlier. I believe that any Premier or Government with any sense of responsibility would have stood up and said, 'We have failed', and would have stepped aside, because wherever they go in the electorate people are saying, 'You shouldn't be there; you have done us an injustice; you have squandered our money'.

Just imagine if it were only \$500 million, but we know it is over \$2 000 million. Imagine what we could have done with \$500 million to clear unemployment. Do we need roads built? There are 40 000 odd families on the Housing Trust waiting list. Do we want houses built? Our facilities such as water and sewer mains and public buildings are falling into disrepair. What wonders we could have done with that sort of money, but the Premier sat idly by and said, 'Trust me, I know what's happening.' However, when it came to the day, he said, 'I didn't know it was happening.' Does anyone believe that?

Look at Scrimber. How could a Government put \$60 million down the drain with a project such as that? The Minister did not visit the site except to open it and to say that it would be the greatest thing since sliced bread or, as far as wood is concerned, matches. Similarly, with respect to the New Zealand project, millions have gone down the drain. Now we have WorkCover, where we are looking at losing \$300 million or more. Now that the Minister has backed off from any changes, it could go to about \$400 million or \$500 million before anything occurs. How can we afford this? Something has to happen.

Do any members believe that they could not have spent \$4 million or \$5 million in their electorate, whether on school crossings, new classrooms, school painting, new kin-

dergartens or an art gallery addition that is critical in the long term? How many more people would have been employed and not collecting social services or benefits, who would have been paying full tote odds and paying taxes, with the economy running along well? Not only the Premier but the rest of the Ministry sat idly by and let this happen.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS: Before the evening break I mentioned the television and the other news media, and also spoke about the unemployed. Before I return to the subject of television in particular, I will relate an incident that happened to me recently. A young man of nearly 18 years of age came to my office and was angry because the local plumber with whom he had applied to work had said, 'I would apprentice you if it wasn't so expensive.'

The young lad blamed me for the laws of this State because I am one of the people involved. He asked, 'Why is it that if I am apprenticed to the plumber and after a short time I would be entitled to \$8 an hour in pay, my employer would have pay for four weeks annual leave, time off for study, six days sick leave, public holidays, one rostered day off a month, WorkCover and superannuation—which now in the building industry is 3 per cent—and would have to charge \$17 an hour to break even?' The young man wanted to know why we made it so difficult. I will leave that with members to think about.

If this young man could have been apprenticed to a single operator he would have learned greater skills than by working with a big gang; he would have learned from a man who is a very experienced and capable plumber of roughly 44 years of age and who has been in plumbing all his life. This local plumber said to the young lad, 'I could take you on. My children have grown up and have gone into different fields. I've got the work, but why should I lose money to employ you?' So, he cast him aside, and the young man was angry. We might want to think about that, because that is the truth out there in the workplace. Tonight when we talk about 9 per cent superannuation by the turn of the century, it will in essence add another percentage to the payroll instead of the employee paying for their own benefit.

It is unfortunate that television has not been used for the benefit of society as well as it should have been. I know the cost of operating it and its difficulties. I know that they want a one-liner or a quick grab for 20 or 30 seconds. Because it is a visual medium they are not interested in anything that is mundane, down-to-earth or that has to do with economics. If there is no emotion, they are not interested in it. The major political Parties, the Independents and the minor Parties have to be conscious of the fact that if they want to get on television they have to perform, not by way of managerial or financial expertise, but by putting on a turn with both oral and body language, clothes and colour. I think that that is a pity.

We should have learned our lesson by now that it has nothing to do with managing the country or trying to get the State back on the right path. Don Dunstan set the scene with his emotion and great acting, and others have gone on in the same vein, including the present Premier who dresses a little more conservatively but otherwise plays to the scene at the time. He does not answer questions but attacks some other area to take people away from the issue of the day.

Television is only a part of this problem. There has been another terrible massacre with a gun and a sharp instrument. Yet, Parliaments throughout Australia either do not have the courage or believe too strongly that individuals should be able to see what they want or to read what they want,

on the basis that most of us are fairly stable and know what we are doing. However, there will always be a percentage who do not. I say to society and to this Parliament, to television and to those who run theatres, produce films, write books or put on plays: if you display violence as entertainment, you need only one person out of 100 or 10 out of 1 million who has a difficulty in assessing what is right and what is wrong and who goes beserk, whether it be with an axe, a knife or a needle, and some innocent Australians or citizens of another nation die.

Why are we not prepared to grapple with that situation? Some members say that it is the times, but I say without fear or doubt in my heart that, if we have violence as a form of entertainment, a percentage of members of society will believe that it is the norm and will practise it against men, women, children or, even, animals.

I finish on this note: the Bannon socialist Government has failed the people of this State, and there is no doubt about that. Socialism has failed this State as it has failed other countries. In another State, ALP members wanted to run a store in Bourke Street; members opposite wanted to run SGIC and the State Bank, and they went through \$2 billion or \$3 billion of the people's money. The Hon. John Bannon—a socialist—has failed this State as Premier. The member for Hartley can laugh out of his seat if he likes, but he knows that it is a fact.

Members opposite have pushed their pet lines and tried all the experiments, and the confidence of the people is destroyed. I ask members to have the courage to say to the Government, 'It's time that you had a spell. If you don't believe that the people think the same thing, give them the opportunity. Put it to the test; go out and see whether they vote you back in.'

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

Mr HERON (Peake): I rise to support the motion and I base my contribution on pre-school education. The Federal Government has put in train a national review committee to look at reforms in child-care and kindergarten services throughout Australia. One interesting aspect of the findings of the committee will be the responsibilities of the Commonwealth and State Governments for children under five years of age.

Presently, the Commonwealth has responsibility for child-care and the States the responsibility for kindergartens. Parents today not only want their child minded but also expect their child to be educated. This emphasises the very fine line between child-care centres and kindergartens. The committee's final report will be presented to Federal Ministers in September and at the next Premiers Conference in November this year.

The report will be studied very closely not only by Governments but by parents, by employees and, now, by employers. Children are considered to be the responsibility of parents, but society as a whole has an interest in how children are raised. Well brought up children make good citizens. It is generally accepted that the first five years of life are very important for child development. If it is considered that high quality programs of children's services help children to develop their potential to the fullest by providing opportunities that are not available at home, it is desirable to provide access to programs so that all children may benefit from some child-care outside the home.

Over the past decade the child-care debate has made a complete about turn. This change has come about as a result not only of population growth but also of family economic problems. Two wages are increasingly necessary to sustain

a family, so child-care now becomes an everyday word in most households. In the past decade the number of women in the work force has risen rapidly. Women account for 56 per cent of the 1.5 million new jobs created since 1983, and married women now make up the fastest growing sector in the labour market. This trend is expected to continue well into the 1990s. The proportion of men in the labour force has dropped from 63 per cent in 1990 to 59 per cent, and the pool of young people entering the labour force is also contracting. This means that employers will have to compete more actively for workers.

Almost 60 per cent of all employed married women have dependent children and one-third of the working married women have children aged under four years. In addition, as equal opportunity policies are implemented—which I fully support—more women of child-bearing age will make their way into senior company ranks. This can only mean an increase of dual-income families with dependent children. So, parents will be confronted with the huge headache of finding adequate and affordable child-care. Existing child-care services mainly consist of child-care centres, play groups, preschools, toy libraries, before and after school care, family day care, occasional care services and special support services for children with special needs.

Child-care is one of the most important issues facing families and Governments at this time because of its importance in meeting the needs of parents who desire work opportunities, because employers wish to gain and retrain skilled labour and, not least, because of the need to ensure that the early childhood experiences of children are enriching, productive and safe. The major issues still facing the child-care industry are the lack of places, the quality of care and the cost to the users and to Governments.

In his policy speech on 8 March 1990 the Prime Minister said that the Government would provide 30 000 child-care places by 1992-93 and would further increase funding to provide 78 000 extra places by 1995-96, bringing the overall number of Government-assisted places to 255 300; fee relief would be available for approved commercial or employer-provided day care from January of this year. Hopefully, all these targets can be met.

Another major concern that I have in regard to child-care which has a direct and immediate bearing on young children is the high turnover of staff because of low pay and job status. Staff turnover in any type of child-care has an impact on the quality of a child's life. If a child has formed an attachment to a child-care worker, the loss of a friend can be very painful. Parents, when leaving their child at a centre, have an expectation that only qualified and well-trained staff will be looking after their child. Poor wages will not entice workers to make child-care a career. Research overseas has found that infants and toddlers who experience changes of carers were less likely to engage in play with other children or with toys than those children who had fewer changes. Many preschool children experience a number of changes of care arrangements and go from one form of child-care to another as mothers, usually those with financial problems, juggle the requirements of more than one child, their own work commitments, the location of child-care centres and the problems of transport and costs.

For these reasons, the well being of the children could be affected, so it is essential that adequate and affordable child-care is available. The Government's decision to increase places and to extend fee relief must be commended, but let us not forget the dedicated work force in the industry. Caring for children, especially in the first two or three years, is a very exacting business, requiring a high degree of devotion and patience.

Child-care has now emerged as a major issue that will continue to require resolute attention in order to best meet the needs of families, employers and, most importantly, the children. Mothers are working outside the home for many reasons, particularly because of the costs of bringing up children. Some mothers work for career reasons, or fear that their skills will become out of date if they stay out of the work force too long, others because it is difficult to re-enter the same field if they leave it and others because they like the work and the independence of earning their own money.

Whatever the reason mothers work outside the home, we must all come to understand that early childhood experiences of many children today are different from those of most children in past generations. Only a few years ago when unions approached employers about having work-based or employer-sponsored child-care, they were laughed out of the boardroom and, as I said earlier, the issue of child-care has taken an about turn. We now see a few companies providing work-based child-care for their employees and others exploring the costs and benefits that would be provided.

The benefits and advantages for employers participating in such an initiative include retention of workers, increased productivity, improved recruitment, reduced training costs, less absenteeism and lateness, greater flexibility in employees' work hours, shorter maternity leave, increased commitment and morale, enhanced publicity and taxation advantages. Appropriate and quality child-care for working parents has been the subject of increasing research and study over the past decade, and further impetus was provided by the Federal Government's 1990 Child-Care Policy, which offered tax incentives to encourage employers to sponsor child-care, and extended fee relief to parents using commercial child-care centres.

Participants at a conference called 'Work and Families' held last year in Adelaide at the Hilton Hotel were told that employers who ignored the pressures placed on their workers by family responsibilities risked being left behind in the world marketplace. Ms Irene Wolcott, research director of the Melbourne-based Australian Institute of Family Studies, said workers' family problems, caused by inadequate child-care facilities, increasingly imposed on the way they performed their jobs and could cause long-term economic costs to business. She said that in Sweden and, to a lesser extent, in the United States, society had accepted that both men and women were expected to participate equally in employment and nurturing of children and therefore resources had been made available in the workplace for that to be achieved. Employers must face up to the fact that child-care is a work issue. They find employees' work performance is suffering because of stress and worry over child-care, and as productivity suffers, employers must realise the link between the two.

Australia lags behind world trends, as only a handful of Australian companies have ever considered child-care as a potential work issue, while in the United States, 3 500 companies now have child-care policies. Research shows that American companies involved are getting a three-fold return on their investments in child-care. Yet, Mr Speaker employers in Australia are reluctant to get out of the barrier. The benefits are clear, yet corporations are taking a painfully long time to launch into these programs.

Firms which have taken the initiative must be congratulated. Four big banking and finance sector employers put aside their commercial differences and banded together to offer their employees a school holiday child-care program in Melbourne. The service will cost thousands of dollars,

but the ANZ, National Australia Bank, Colonial Mutual and National Mutual expect that the returns, in terms of reduced absenteeism and increased productivity, will be well worth it. In 1989, KPMG Peat Marwick paid for a one-third share in a day-care centre in the Melbourne suburb of Fitzroy, and is being inundated by other firms knocking on its door, wanting to know the benefits.

The list of employers joining the queue for work-based child-care is slowly growing. Pioneers such as Esso Australia, Lend Lease and IBM are being joined by a handful of others, including St George Building Society, Leighton Properties and Mobil. Other companies interested in the idea include BHP Steel, Nissan Australia, the Advance Bank and legal firm Allen Allen & Hemsley. I also understand that Lend Lease is keen to set up two more centres and is pushing hard for a building that could take 60 children.

Telecommunications giant OTC is working with the Federal Government to create an 80-place child-care centre for its employees in Sydney. Another telecommunications manufacturer, Ericsson Australia, has announced it would take a one-third stake in a centre to be built in the northern Melbourne suburb of Broadmeadows next to its manufacturing headquarters, and the South Australian-based company, Bridgestone Australia, is also investigating the issue.

Those companies are finding that providing child-care produces a range of benefits that outweigh the cost. Child-care centres can be established by one employer, or by a joint venture with other employers in the nearby area. A large amount of money is invested by employers in attracting, keeping, and training personnel. Employers do not want to see a large turnover of their work force because of that cost.

Unfortunately, Australia has one of the highest rates of labour turnover in the world. It is for this reason that companies are investigating the problems between high rates of turnover and the difficulties employees face with family responsibilities. Surveys taken show on average 22 per cent of respondents stated that they had considered leaving their place of employment because of child-care problems, and 40 per cent said that the provision of child-care would influence their decision to stay with their employer.

Dr Sandra Burud, one of the leading United States employer supported child-care consultants, explained to a conference in Australia in 1989 as follows:

Thousands of American companies are now at the 'Why didn't I do it sooner' stage. Companies who have child-care programs in place are saying, 'This is the easiest publicity I have ever gained; I have cut my costs of doing business, I am recruiting the people I need; I've got a more responsible work force; I've got a bigger applicant pool to hire from. I'm not paying vacancy rates for positions sitting open like some American businesses are; I've got a great recruitment tool; I have cut my costs of doing business'. I am viewed as the good guy; the employees feel that we have given them a new employee benefit. Employees can finally be both good parents and good employees instead of having to choose one or the other; they don't have to pick, and kids get a good place to grow up.

Another startling point is that it is estimated that in the United States \$3 billion are lost each year because of child-care related absences. To my knowledge, no surveys have been done in Australia on absenteeism related to child-care problems, but I suggest that any findings of such a survey would be substantial. Child-care services have doubled in Australia since 1983 but, still, lack of child-care is a major problem to parents entering and remaining in the work force.

As part of the national child-care strategy 1989-92, the Commonwealth Government established and funded an initiative to encourage employers to assist their employees either by providing work-based child-care or assisting them

in securing care in established centres or services. In addition, funding has been provided within South Australia through the women's employment strategy for a senior project officer to be based within the Children's Services Office. The project officer's brief will be to promote the benefits of work-based child-care to employers, specific to the South Australian work force; to liaise with unions, relevant agencies, and interested parties; to assist with planning and establishment of services to the needs of workers with family responsibilities; and to facilitate cooperation between companies, particularly smaller companies which may not wish to go it alone.

It is vital that the needs of working families for quality child-care be met. It is vital, so that parents can make the most of their opportunities to work, so that children are properly cared for and so that employers of parents of dependent children can maximise productivity and profitability. Employers who take up the issue of child-care and who take account of valued workers' family needs will have a competitive advantage, not only in keeping, but also in attracting, the best possible staff.

Employees should not be spending unproductive time at work worrying about family arrangements. We have the Federal Government's support in providing taxation concessions and exemptions on operating costs and contributions, we have the State Government's support through the Children's Service Offices, and we have the full support of the trade union movement.

Mr S.J. Baker: That's a help.

Mr HERON: That is a great help. It is now up to the employers to tackle this most important issue positively, not only for their financial gains or for having a stable work force, but especially for the children whom they could well employ in years to come. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 8 August. Page 47.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. It provides \$1.2 billion as carry-over finance to allow public sector employees and the bills to be paid until assent to the Appropriation Bill. Before debating the merits of the Government's performance, I wish to digress briefly and talk about the world situation and relate it to the situation in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is Supply, but what has happened on the Russian front, as members will realise, is the complete breakdown of relationships and it has put peace back—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will be interested to hear very quickly how the member relates this to the Supply Bill.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will indeed. I promise to relate it. There is a strong linkage, because of what we have seen on the Russian and Baltic fronts and Romania, Hungary and all those other countries which at some stage have been enveloped by the Iron Curtain. We look at the world today and think that we have advanced a long way, only to find that we have gone back to where we were perhaps five years ago. That presents a challenge in respect of what we should be doing in a world where peace is so fragile.

I should like to link what is happening on the Russian front with the Federal budget today, because in many ways

the policies of both Federal and State Labor Governments have led to the malaise of the Australian and South Australian economies. Whilst we have had extreme policies on the Russian front, or in the Soviet Union economy, we have seen some of the general policies that have been embarked on there, in terms of economic management, repeated in the South Australian and Australian context.

Let us look at the budget which has just been handed down. It is not the budget itself so much as the circumstances surrounding it which become very important. I would mention the fact, and bring it back to the Supply Bill because it is important for this debate, that we are looking at a very grave recession. The Treasurer has admitted that this will be the worst circumstance that has prevailed since the Second World War. He is now talking about unemployment peaking at 10.75 per cent.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: It certainly does relate to Supply. There are a number of important indicators to which I would refer. The budget handed down today is not such a bleak budget, but it is delivered in very bleak conditions. The estimated level of non-dwelling constructions will be down by a massive 15 per cent. We are talking about business investment estimated to decrease by 10.5 per cent during this financial year. We are talking about unemployment rates averaging out for the year at 10.5 per cent and peaking at 10.75 per cent. That means unemployment rates of at least 11.5 per cent or 12 per cent for South Australia. They are horrific levels, due to the policies pursued by both the Bannon and Hawke Governments.

It has been estimated that there will be a decrease of 1 per cent in participation rates. I believe that is a gross underestimate of the total impact of what we shall see. We have the household savings ratio declining because of unemployment problems. The terms of trade are deteriorating by 3.25 per cent. The current account balance, which we had hoped would somehow level off in difficult circumstances, as well as hoping that imports would slow down, is still predicting a massive \$14 billion overhang this financial year. Despite the fact that we are to go through some very difficult times, we still have an extraordinary problem of overseas debt escalating at an uncontrollable rate. This is the time to turn it around.

Let us consider the situation that we face today because of the policies that have been pursued by Federal and State Labor Governments. I should like to pick this up in the context of the damage that has been done to the economy by the Premier of this State and the policies that he has pursued. The Supply Bill is merely a means of ensuring that finance is provided. However, in this circumstance it is wedged between the Address in Reply and the State budget. This financing device provides the opportunity to reflect on the effectiveness of the State Government's management, which is particularly relevant to the challenge of presenting a balanced budget.

I do not underscore the problems that the Treasurer will face in presenting a balanced budget to this State. If he takes a leaf out of the Federal Treasurer's book, he will have an unbalanced budget and will be going for a deficit, but it will not be of the order of \$4.7 billion because we cannot afford the bill. I remind the Parliament of the legacy of the Bannon Government's performance in this State. Unemployment is currently travelling at 10.4 per cent. If one believes the budget predictions of an average of 10.5 per cent—

Mr Atkinson: Unemployment is travelling, is it?

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is travelling, and unfortunately it is travelling upwards and in a direction and at a speed that

we all abhor. I thank the honourable member opposite for his assistance. An enormous amount of pain is being suffered by people in our constituencies. I ask members opposite whether they have any conscience at all. What about the kids who cannot get a job? For years we have had Labor bleating—and I can remember the rhetoric post Second World War—about people not getting a fair go in this country and in this State because of Liberal Party policies. What do members opposite now say to their constituents? What is said by the member for Elizabeth, in whose area unemployment is averaging at over 20 per cent? Indeed, for the youth of the member for Elizabeth's area that figure is well over 30 per cent. They have no hope of getting a job. Why are the crime rates at Elizabeth so much worse than they are in other areas? It is because of the policies being pursued by this Government. Some 30 per cent of school leavers in the 15 to 19 age bracket will simply not get a job. They will have to either stay at school or go on to the social security benefits that have been provided.

We know that 20 000 jobs actually disappeared from the market as a result of the Bannon Government's policies in this State, at a time when we needed them most. Job vacancy figures have been running at about a quarter of the level that they were at previously, or even a year ago. What about people in the 40-plus age bracket? What about the parents of the children whom we have talked about and their capacity to get a job? How many of those very capable people are now looking for work but with very little chance of getting it—because of the Bannon and Hawke Governments' policies? People have to be reminded time and again of the inordinate damage that is being done by both Governments in this State and country.

Looking at the retail sales area, I note that the budget estimates said that domestic demand would decrease. They referred to a level of minus a quarter of a per cent. But it is going downhill. We know that retail sales are stagnant, and that in the last quarter in fact there was a drop. This reflects a lack of consumer confidence and a lack of confidence in this country. People do not know what the future will bring and they will put more money aside to save, against some further catastrophe.

Consumer debt is at record levels. We know that in South Australia per capita we have one of the worst records of all the States. The capacity of people to be able to instil some sort of confidence by spending some more, perhaps in the areas that are less import reflective, is not there, because there is a great resistance due to the overhang of consumer debt. New motor vehicle registrations continue to flag. So, on the retail front the news is quite grim. South Australia's inflation rate is 30 per cent higher than the national average, indeed due to the Bannon Government's policies.

We have seen the way in which in the budget for the previous financial year net taxation increased by a whopping 18 per cent. This was at a time when the level of demand was decreasing. How many business houses in this State or in this country can afford that sort of pressure? The net debt faced by this country is \$130 billion. There is no hope of its being repaid in the short term. This budget that we have seen from the Federal Parliament—

Mr Ferguson: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, the honourable member is displaying material in the House and I am afraid that is probably against Standing Orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Displays are out of order. I ask the Deputy Leader to continue with his speech.

Mr S.J. BAKER: We have a \$130 billion debt overhang. We cannot repay it in the short term because, according to the Federal budget, we will go another \$14 billion into debt this financial year—and that is because of the Hawke-Ban-

non policies. Of course, this will impact on all the States and on all the people, because some very strong restraint will be needed and, indeed, real interest rates will have to remain high in order to suppress imports. So, there is no great hope of any magic recovery.

I refer to South Australia's previously much envied industrial relations record. This State had a wonderful record. We could always count on South Australia's having on average 30 to 50 per cent *per capita* of national disputations. So, in South Australia, we had a much better industrial record, particularly in the postwar period and during that long period under Premier Playford. So, we did have some very solid foundations. However, according to the latest statistics we find that the situation in South Australia has deteriorated dramatically due to the Bannon Government's policies. We are now running second to New South Wales, whose industrial relations record has been notoriously bad since the Second World War.

In each of the past three financial years, South Australia has set new record levels of bankruptcies, higher than anything that we have seen post Second World War. Each year we have set a new record. How is small business coping in such circumstances? South Australia's share of investment is also at an absolutely abysmal level. Because of the Bannon Labor Government's policies we in this State are lucky to generate about 4 per cent of the nation's total investment.

The rural community is experiencing its worst financial situation in my living memory and in the memory of most people in this House, as a result of the pressure placed upon it by the inordinately high interest rate policies of the Bannon and Hawke Labor Governments. Members should well remember that Premier Bannon, cap in hand, year after year, went to Canberra and said to his friend, 'Bob, what you're doing is all right. Your policies are heading in the right direction. Don't worry about whom you hurt on the way through.' That is what we have seen. We have seen Federal policies which have hurt small business and the rural sector and which have been supported by the Premier of this State. At least he could have stood up for South Australians.

Every major thoroughfare in Adelaide is sprinkled with vacant commercial premises. If we look at the statistics we will find that vacancies in prime commercial real estate comprise about 20 per cent of the total market. In secondary retail areas I suspect the figures are even worse. Think of the hundreds of millions of dollars of investments on which interest has been paid but with no return—a legacy of the Bannon and Hawke Labor Governments. It will take at least four years to clear this investment off the books and present some possibility of resurgence.

These bland figures and performance indicators are perhaps an inadequate reflection of the human tragedy caused by Labor's policies. Many people walk through my office and the office of every member of this Chamber asking for help. They need help because they cannot pay their school fees and they need a form filled out to get special allowances for their children or they need guidance with finance because they are unable to cope. We get hundreds of inquiries a year. I imagine that in some Labor electorates the inquiries would be far greater than those that I and my colleagues experience. I know that in rural areas inquiries pour through the doors in their hundreds.

Mr Atkinson: But not in Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: They certainly do in Mitcham because people's dreams are being shattered and people who have never been on the breadline now find themselves there. The other side of the coin is that, because of the recession, a

whole lot of our entrepreneurs have been destroyed due to the policies that have been pursued by the Hawke and Bannon Labor Governments. These people have lost their dignity because they have not been able to get out and have a go. The cost is absolutely enormous. I do not believe that the Premier of this State, given the records that we have seen—and I intend to briefly reiterate some of the comments I have made previously—can hold his head high.

People ask, 'What is the role played by the Premier in this tragedy?' I regard him as the Judas. He has betrayed the trust of the people. He was given the responsibility of managing the affairs of this State to the best of his ability, but his level of commitment and dedication to the task have been found wanting. His 30 pieces of silver are a guarantee of historic recognition as the longest serving Labor Premier of this State during the twentieth century. It is obvious that he has accepted the advice of his political minders that immortality was only a possibility if he avoided the hard decisions, only associate himself with the successes and ensure that information of a damaging nature was filtered from his ears. That is the Premier that we have had for the past 8½ years. It is great if you can get away with it. The Premier thinks he can live under two principles of the three monkeys, namely, hearing and seeing no evil. But, of course, the world is not like that. This papier-mache leader has effectively avoided his responsibilities for far too long.

I now mention some matters that need emphasis because they highlight the extent to which the Premier has left this State lamenting. We could mention the State Bank, but the jury is still out on that. However, I suspect that at the end of this year or early next year the Premier will have the title of 'The Billion Dollar Man'. We could look at SGIC. The Premier was the man who put his signature on the paper that effectively lost us \$200 million because of the put option on 333 Collins Street. He was responsible because he was the signatory to the deal. The Premier was a party to deliberately breaking five sections of the Act. Ordinary people would be prosecuted.

I know that Mr Skase is overseas and is unlikely to return because he is too busy, but let's face it: the courts have a way of prosecuting people for acts that are seen to be breaking the law. We have a Premier who has broken five sections of the SGIC Act yet he still holds himself not responsible. He was content to mislead the Parliament on at least four occasions over the SGIC deal. I suspect that at the end of the day he really does not care whether \$200 million or \$300 million is flushed down the toilet as a result of his lack of attention to detail.

We have also had the remarkable circumstances surrounding SATCO's timber deals. SATCO never made a profit since its establishment in 1979, yet it was put in charge of entrepreneurial projects. If we add up the cost of the Scrimber deal, the Williamstown deal and the Grey-mouth (New Zealand) deal, we have a massive loss of \$74 million. The Premier still does not care, even though the confidence of this State has been shattered. Let us reflect on what we could do with \$1 billion—or, as my list adds up, some \$1.6 billion. We could pay off some of the debt and save taxpayers over \$100 million a year. We could find some respite from land tax for small business, whose shops are closing daily. The Minister of Transport could have his free public transport. In fact, he could have two free public transport systems in South Australia for the losses involved here.

We could reduce payroll tax by one-third, and help some of the beleaguered industries of South Australia. Ministers have mentioned firms that are closing as though it is some-

how their fault. It is not their fault; it is the Government's fault. It is the fault of Premier Bannon and Prime Minister Hawke. With the interest component on \$1 billion, we could build 1 500 public houses and flats per year. We could fix up our roads and reduce the road toll by at least 10 per cent. We could reduce the waiting time for surgery to zero. We could tackle the catastrophe of crime in a constructive fashion, put far more effort into it and get better results. With the money that has been lost by the Premier, we might even be able to afford to tow an iceberg or two to South Australia to ensure that we have decent water. If he really wanted to be inventive with this money, he could even stretch his imagination—

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, I refer to Standing Order 123, which provides:

Members refer to other members by the name of their electoral district or their parliamentary title, and not otherwise.

The honourable member opposite is referring to the Premier as 'he'.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Indeed, the Chair has asked the Deputy Leader to refer to members in the correct way, and I ask him to continue his contribution in that vein.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Premier might even be able to give our business community an even break. He might even be able to lower the cost of electricity or water to South Australian consumers with the money he would save if he did not have to provide for that extra \$1 billion.

Mr Brindal: Were you born an optimist?

Mr S.J. BAKER: I was born an optimist and I hope that I will die an optimist, but I am having my optimism severely dented by his performance. We can refer to the Justice Information System, another slipshod piece of administration, which has blown out by \$54 million. As we heard in the House today, the privacy considerations of that initiative have not been taken care of, even though a report reflected its inadequacy back in 1983.

Mr Brindal: That is petty cash!

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is petty cash: a spare \$54 million here or there does not really amount to much, according to the Premier of this State. Let us forget the disasters for the moment and just think of the areas of administration that should be improved. We know that, for a number of years now, the Auditor-General has raised the question of the administration of the public sector work force, pointing to the fact that sick leave is not kept under control. Statistics have shown that public servants are about 25 to 30 per cent more prone to taking sick leave than are people in the private sector.

We would expect that, with job security and with all the assistance given to people in the public sector, their amount of sick leave would be far less, but it is not. The Auditor-General believed that with proper management there could be a saving of at least \$10 million a year. Of course, that is just too much trouble for the Premier.

We had promises from the Premier that he would keep the public sector under control. He gave an undertaking that there would be no increase in the number of public servants yet, during the election year, another 2 400 people were put on the payroll, and the cost to the Government and to the people of South Australia is around \$72 million per year.

We have had the Fielding report presented by the Minister of Transport, who is also in charge of the GARG committee. The Fielding report recommended some simple areas of adjustment, which would have yielded some very large savings. They were minimal adjustments that could have saved \$20 million a year in the public transport system, but we have not seen one change in that area. Of course, if we look

at asset management and the leasing and maintaining of empty premises, we see that millions of dollars are tied up. In fact, as the Auditor-General pointed out, the Government still does not have an adequate asset register.

So, there have been marvellous opportunities for efficient management within the public sector; yet the Premier has failed to deliver on so many occasions. If the Premier had managed the budget properly, if he had administered his portfolios properly, he would not now be selling off the family silver to balance the budget; he would not have been increasing Government debt to shore up financial institutions; he would not be the laughing stock of other countries when we are attempting to market the MFP.

I will now spend a few moments referring to some of the underlying costs associated with the lack of management and the disasters that have been the product of the Premier's mismanagement. I refer first to the MFP. At a time when we are asking international investors to put their money and their confidence in this State, we have a Premier who has shown his total inadequacy to the rest of the world. He does not need to put it up in lights; it is already there for all to see. In fact, if one adds up all these disasters, all these failures, one finds that the Premier has lost the State about \$1 600 million. What investor in his or her right mind would invest in a project that is, at best, marginal or risky, and managed or promoted by a person of the Premier's calibre? Who indeed would put money into a project like that? If indeed the MFP does fail at the end of the day, he should not blame the Opposition; he should just look at himself and the Government that he has led.

When we talk about creating confidence; when we talk about people taking a risk, how can we possibly expect them to take a risk when they have the glaring example of a Premier who has been totally incapable of administering his area of responsibility and who has caused such an enormous downturn in this State? Quite frankly, I have told all of those people who are banging on my door rejecting the MFP that it would be a great project if it were managed properly. They will not have to worry any more, will they?

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, I do. I refer also to small business because it is my belief, and the belief of all members on my side of the House, that the way to get out of this current recession, if indeed we do, is to give small business a go. I know that the Minister of Agriculture in his former role as Minister of State Development was a great promoter of small business. At least that is what is said. That is one of the great hopes of our time. If we did not have the terrible financial disasters that have been imposed on us by our Premier, think of the relief we could provide to small business in this State. I would like members to consider the extreme stress caused to the business community by the recent increases in payroll tax, financial institutions duty and land tax. Of course, the down side is that it is the people who have suffered. So, the Premier's hungry demands for more and more money to back an unstable Administration—a badly managed financial administration—have had to be financed by the business community and, ultimately, that has been at the cost of jobs in this State.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The members for Henley Beach and Napier are out of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: If the Premier had been half smart in the way he administered his budget and institutions, we would not have this iniquitous water rating scheme, which is designed to lower the bills for the Housing Trust. We would have some real money to provide relief for the rural community, which has been hit so hard. We know that

times are difficult, due in large part to the policies of the Labor Governments, both Federal and State. The Liberal Opposition will continue to do its job without fear or favour, but when the Premier is prepared to be responsible, to provide leadership, admit to his mistakes, to make decisions without checking the popularity charts, to get rid of the dead wood within his Ministry and to consider the Westminster traditions, we will take him seriously.

The alternatives do not look very glamorous. The Minister of Agriculture—the most of assiduous of Ministers on the front bench—will talk himself out of a job. The Minister of Transport is rather good on his feet, but an administrative dud. Another heir apparent, the Minister of Water Resources, is an improving performer, but has trouble with the truth. The Minister of Employment and Further Education simply cannot be trusted. There is not a lot of hope. The only hope we have is that Premier Bannon lifts his game, and he must earn respect in the process.

Times are difficult. The only catalyst in the market is lower interest rates. The Treasurer must treat his allocations as though they were coming out of his own pocket. We have a real challenge in the budget before us. Times will be very difficult for at least the next 12 months and, indeed, the challenge for the Treasurer is to correct the mistakes he has made, to cut his cloth according to the money available and not seek to increase taxation in this State, as there is no capacity to pay it. He must apply himself to the task ahead in a way that he has not done in the past eight and a half years. There is no sense in borrowing money or selling off assets to keep the budget afloat, as has been the case for the past financial year and I suspect for the next financial year, because it has to be paid for by our children in the future.

There is a task and, whilst we support the Supply Bill before us tonight, let it be clearly understood that there is a limited time to our patience. We have two Independent members in this place—people from constituencies under stress and stretch. They represent areas where people are hard hit, where unemployment is reaching new highs and where there is huge social disadvantage as a result of the policies of the Federal and State Labor Governments. At some stage in the not too distant future they will have to make up their mind whether they want their electors to continue to suffer under the duress of the policies of these two Governments or whether they will give their constituents a chance. I support the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling the member for Eyre, I remind members for the need to direct their remarks to the Bill.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Thank you for your guidance; I am happy to do that, Sir. We are about to approve \$1 200 million, which the Government has asked Parliament to allow it to spend on behalf of the taxpayers. Judging by its track record, this Parliament ought to be hesitant about agreeing to another \$1 200 million of hard-earned taxpayers' money being entrusted to a Government that has presided over more economic disasters than any other Government since Federation.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Since 1975, the honourable member reflects. This Government—and its colleagues interstate have done similar—has been responsible for squandering the hard-earned dollars of the taxpayers of this State. The role of the State Government is to be involved in providing the basic facilities and services that the community requires to sustain a normal lifestyle. That particular lifestyle is now under threat. Those of us who live in rural parts of South Australia

know of the attack which has been made on the rural services and the basic necessities of life on a daily basis. With reference to the field of education, last Saturday morning I was in one of the towns in my electorate when a person connected with a school told me that, because of the economic downturn, SAFA will not now lend money to school councils for the purchase of computers. The school wanted to purchase three computers, because the Government is not in a position to supply them.

Most people recognise that young people about to enter the work force need computer skills. However, the school council went to the Education Department but the Government had no money. It wished to borrow money from SAFA but there was none. It does not have \$20 000. The school council asks the very simple question: why? It is not hard to answer. This Government has squandered \$60 million on a foolish timber exercise. It bought a bankrupt timber plant in New Zealand when that money would have provided many computers for the school system in this State. It was not an unusual request—nothing out of the ordinary—just a request for the basic necessities of the modern commercial world. That is what that school wanted, but it has been denied those facilities. An attack was made on a kindergarten in my area. On a weekly basis, I have groups of parents coming to me complaining—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Yes, members can leave the Chamber because, at the first opportunity, many of them will be leaving on a permanent basis. They will not be here, including the member for Hartley, who these days is attempting some media campaign to try to let his colleagues on the front bench know that he is still about, even though he has been overlooked so many times. Mr Deputy Speaker, you know very well that the community is hurting. People are becoming particularly agitated. Not only are they upset but they are concerned about the future of their families and about job opportunities. I do not believe that the economic recession in this country has reached the bottom of the barrel. Unfortunately, I think we have a lot further to go and more people will be hurt. I believe that the full effects of the difficulties caused by the irresponsible international trading arrangements, which are so affecting people in this State, and the rural industry in general, have not yet been felt.

The full effects of the lack of purchasing power of the average South Australian have not yet been felt. The only people who are not feeling the recession are those in highly paid Government jobs. The top bureaucrats in Canberra do not understand about the recession. It is not having any effect on them. It has not affected their lifestyle. They still have their cheap motor cars, paid for by the taxpayer. The senior bureaucrats in this State have not been affected. Most of us in this Chamber have a reasonable lifestyle. It is the people outside who are really suffering, because they do not have the means to offset the grab for money in which the Government has been involved. I find it difficult to understand and comprehend why the Government is proceeding down the current economic course.

Mr Brindal: They find it difficult to explain, too!

Mr GUNN: My colleague is probably correct. What concerns me is that, in a country such as ours with all our opportunities, raw materials, wide open spaces and only 17 million people, unemployment is at a record high level. So many of our young people cannot obtain permanent or even part-time employment.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Despite their education.

Mr GUNN: Despite the fact that they are the best educated group in the history of this country. What sort of future are we building for this country if we allow those

people to remain on the economic scrap heap? Instead of building for the future, we are creating a situation where there will be social dislocation, which will cause long-term scars across society. That is what concerns me, because I do not believe this generation or the next generation will forget the difficulties that this Government has brought on itself.

The unfortunate thing about these economic policies, which have brought such economic disaster to this State, is that certain of the prominent political journalists of this State have conveniently overlooked the problems. From time to time we read what Randall Ashbourne writes in the *Sunday Mail*. Having supported this Government throughout its entire time in office, he has not yet been able to bring himself to admit that he was wrong. He has been an avid supporter of this Government. He has virtually been an unpaid press secretary, yet he is still peddling that line of trying to reflect upon the Liberal Party.

We have not been in government; we are not responsible for the State Bank, Scrimber, Marineland, the New Zealand venture, SGIC and the litany of other bad economic decisions in which this Government has involved itself. However, that journalist keeps treading the line that the member for Briggs—the Minister of Employment and Further Education—keeps feeding him. He religiously puts his views forward to the *Sunday Mail* and other papers, with no regard for the facts.

There is a peculiar outlook on economics. Randall Ashbourne is trying to make excuses, and he has a problem, because he has supported the Government through thick and thin, but surely, after all the disasters, even he can recognise that the manner in which he has been writing up this Government has been not only inaccurate but also misleading and not in the best interests of fair and accurate reporting. The snide and inaccurate comments he has made in relation to the leadership and alleged problems on this side of the House are nothing more than a smoke screen for the Government. It is obvious that he wants to become a full-time press secretary; currently, he is only a part-time Government press secretary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair doubts that his wages are yet paid through the Supply Bill, and therefore asks the member for Eyre to return to the Bill.

Mr GUNN: I would think that he is getting plenty of free lunches paid by the member for Briggs through this Supply Bill and that therefore my comments are quite relevant to the debate. I want to turn to another journalist, Mr Rex Jory. He is in a different situation. He had the chance; he worked for the Premier, the then Leader of the Opposition, at one stage. During that time he could not come up with these magic economic policies that he expects us to come up with now. He can make similar snide comments. I do not know whether his judgment is somewhat clouded, because there was a time when he wanted to become the member for Bragg. It was well known that he wanted to be a candidate and, of course, he was not successful. I do not know whether that disappointment affected his judgment, but if I were a doubting or cynical person, I would say that it is having an effect on him.

Mr Jory and other journalists should clearly understand that it is not the Liberal Party that is responsible for the economic woes of this State. The mismanagement, financial incompetence and deception that has taken place cannot be blamed on the Liberal Party; it is the fault of the Labor Party. It has been in government for more than 20 of the past 25 years, and during the past eight years it has had the support of its Federal colleagues, and together they are responsible. The only competition in this country in the

past few years has been a competition between Labor Governments as to which one of them could make the worst job of managing its respective economy. Unfortunately, that is the only competition there has been. What is required is genuine competition and incentive for the community, for people in business to work hard to develop their industries and to produce. What we have to do is to create more wealth. It is not a matter of redistribution; the only way we can improve the welfare of the underprivileged or people in difficult circumstances is to create a bigger cake to go around.

That is what is required in this country. We have got hung up on the nonsense of affirmative action. It may be all right in small doses, but what has affirmative action done to solve the difficult problems facing the underprivileged and the unemployed? In my view, absolutely nothing. Crazy people like Ms Tiddy and others go racing round the country making inflammatory statements. They have done nothing for the welfare of the average person; they have not put one dollar in the pockets of any of my constituents who are on the verge of bankruptcy. They have all these feminists racing around the country making all sorts of foolish and irresponsible statements, and they have infiltrated the Public Service.

What value has that sort of affirmative action or positive discrimination been to the average person? I believe that people should be promoted purely on merit. We should not have this sort of nonsense. Political activists have taken over these movements and the wrong sort of people have been promoted. That has been detrimental to the long-term stability of the management of the Government and of the people of this State. It is not only unfortunate; it is nonsense. It is about time that people came to their senses and looked reality in the face.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr GUNN: That may be the line of my right-wing friend over there, but moderate members on this side of the House, who are fair and reasonable, believe that people should be given a fair go. However, when their time expires, we should replace them with competent and responsible people.

The size of the Government has grown out of all proportion. If we keep going at the present rate this \$1.2 billion this time next year will have to be \$1.5 billion and by the time the next election comes it will have to be \$2 billion, and that will be taken out of the pockets of the long suffering taxpayers who have to continue to prop up this Government's woeful economic record. In an exercise of self-justification, the bureaucracy has decided that big is beautiful. Apparently we have to centralise everything. We cannot have democratic management. One of the fundamental hallmarks of democracy is to allow people to participate in decision making.

Throughout the history of South Australia we have had a system of hospitals which have been supported very well by local communities. People have taken a great interest in them. The hospitals have been run by local communities and local boards have been involved in their running. Now the Health Commission, in its wisdom, has put forward a discussion paper headed, 'Area Health Service Administration South Australia'.

This document sets out to amalgamate hospital boards into regions covering vast distances—hundreds of kilometres. What is the aim of this exercise? The local communities have successfully run their own hospitals and caused no trouble. Why put in full-time paid officials? Why allow the bureaucrats to steamroll what has been a very successful program? Not one hospital or group of people in my community has supported this document. Many people have

complained most vigorously to me, and I certainly shall not be supporting it. I am totally opposed to it. It is unnecessary. It is a waste of the hard-earned money that we are talking about allowing this Government to appropriate. It has not got an ounce of commonsense to it. The best thing that the Minister can do is to consign this report to the rubbish bin and allow local people to provide the services that they have been providing for years. The Minister should allow the local communities to look after their own affairs. All the collective wisdom does not reside within the metropolitan area or in massive bureaucracies. Most citizens have a great deal of commonsense which they bring to these boards. They give their time freely and they attract the support of the community.

I venture to say that if this report is accepted there will be an added cost. If local people are excluded from the decision-making process and have no involvement they will not want to participate because they will feel on the outer. People will be isolated. It is bad enough dealing with people a few kilometres away but when hundreds of kilometres are involved it does not make sense. The best thing for the Minister to do would be to scrap this exercise. This was obviously Bill McCoy's last attempt to manipulate the bureaucracy—and it was a very poor attempt at that. I do not know who was responsible for putting this together. All I can say is that they have wasted their time, and they are currently wasting the time of people in rural hospitals.

Mr Venning: And in Parliament.

Mr GUNN: Yes, this sort of nonsense will waste the time of the Parliament. The second matter they are concerned about related to the proposal that was floated last session in relation to conveying patients to hospitals and the compulsory use of ambulance services. That will take up many hundreds of thousands of dollars of this \$1.2 billion that we are about to appropriate. I have been advised that if this exercise is allowed to come into law the hospital budgets will be blown out of the window. The only person that should be in a position to direct the mode of transport to be used by a patient, whether it is to shift someone from their home or from one hospital to another, is the local doctor. If the doctor determines that a person should use an ambulance, well and good, but if there is another means of transport available and, for example, some hospitals have a special vehicle to take patients to hospital, or if the doctor says it is all right for a member of the family to take a person to hospital, why should those people cost the system many thousands of dollars?

I have been told that the cost of using an ambulance from Booleroo Centre to Adelaide, for example, would be in excess of \$1 500. If every person, including people with the most minor of ailments, has to be transported in an ambulance, consider the excessive cost. We would need more than the \$1.2 billion. We would need many more millions of dollars. This is another unnecessary intrusion into the running of these local communities. It is not only unnecessary but it is undesirable and does not have an ounce of commonsense about it. I call on the Minister to scrap those two proposals and to stop causing controversy and uncertainty in the community.

We are going through a most difficult time in the economic history of this State and nation. It seems that this is a deliberate act by the Government bureaucracy to try to take away people's rights. This is the last thing we need. Democracy is all about allowing people to participate. This relates to a problem that we will have to face in this Parliament. If the electoral system is not altered soon, people will feel that they are not part of it. If they cannot participate

and be part of it they will lose confidence in it and they will not want it. They will want a new system.

I said this a week or so ago and I repeat it now. If we are not very careful, the people in the rural areas of this State will lead the push for regional government in this country. Therefore, the State Government, the Parliament and the bureaucracy have to become more attuned to the wishes of the community and more accessible. They must be less remote and display and use some commonsense. I sincerely hope that the appropriation of this \$1.2 billion will be in the long-term interest of all citizens. Unfortunately, based on the Government's track record, I have grave reservations.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): It gives me pleasure to rise in this debate, because any monetary contributions that we vote for in this House need to be properly discussed and talked about and, hopefully, we can get some sense out of Government members in reply to some of our concerns. The amount of \$1.2 billion is a lot of money. However, one thinks in terms of, say, a potential \$1.5 billion possible injection into the State Bank and the WorkCover unfunded liability that is heading towards \$250 million; it is quite small. In 1986 we had a situation of no debt for workers compensation, and today we have a debt of \$250 million.

Whilst looking a few minutes ago at last year's budget, I noted that the payroll tax for this community was to increase by some \$80 million, that an extra \$60 million in respect of WorkCover contributions and levies was to be paid by the business community, \$9 million extra in land tax contributions and \$60 million for FID contributions—in total, over \$200 million extra taken out of the business community in this State in the past 12 months—whether it be small, medium or large business—to prop up the mismanagement of the Bannon Government.

This evening, we have seen a budget report in the Federal arena, in which several important statistics have been set down for the first time, which will dramatically affect the State arena. The Federal Government believes that there will be 10.4 per cent unemployment in this country in the next 12 months. That means that in South Australia close to 12 per cent will be unemployed. The tragedy, of course, is that the participation rate has decreased also by one per cent, which means that a large number of people will not be employed in this State and also will not be interested in looking for employment. The fact is that 38 per cent of young girls and 20 per cent of young boys under the age of 25 are unemployed. What has this Bannon Government done about that situation? It has talked about it, but it has done absolutely nothing.

Every day the Premier now says that interest rates have to come down. Last year, the Premier said that this country and this State needed high interest rates to control inflation, yet only last week he said, 'I think it is about time interest rates came down.' He is a hypocrite, and the sooner the Premier is brought to account the better off this State will be. We have the potential to have 12 per cent unemployment by the end of this financial year, because Labor Governments in the Federal and State arena have put us into this mess. Let us not forget that: the Labor Governments in both the Federal and State arena have caused the problems that we have today.

It was fascinating tonight to hear the Federal Treasurer make no mention at all of the need to reduce interest rates. The issue of interest rates is the single most important issue that has destroyed small business in this country. Interest rates alone have caused most of that unemployment figure. What did we hear from the Federal Treasurer tonight? Not

a damn thing, not one single mention of the need to reduce interest rates to benefit every person in this country.

At Federal level tonight a new payroll tax called compulsory superannuation was introduced. This new payroll tax will require every business that pays salaries of over \$500 million to contribute 5 per cent to superannuation. That is a compulsory payroll tax by a different name, at a time when 38 per cent of our young women and over 20 per cent of our young men under the age of 25 are unemployed.

This Government, run by the Premier and all its front-benchers, could not care less about the unemployed of this State, and neither could their Federal colleagues: they do not care at all about young kids, because if they did they would have done something about this extra payroll tax, this superannuation burden, that they have put on all Australian business tonight.

The ludicrous thing about it is that the Federal Government says that it will be 9 per cent by the year 2000, not 5 per cent as it is to be from next year. One of these days the loonies in the Labor Party will learn that if you increase the cost of business you reduce employment. It is fundamental and simple. The problem with the members of the Labor Party is that they have never employed anybody; they have never had to worry about the cost of money, the investment dollars and the interest that one must pay on this money.

Last week the Premier said in this House that the SGIC's investment in The Terrace was very competitive. Sure it is competitive—\$100 million of investment and no interest to pay. If I ran my business and was not required to pay interest I could be successful and competitive with the Hilton and Hyatt. I could run every other small hotel out of business in this State if I did not have to pay interest. SGIC Health had \$15 million worth of investment with no interest to pay. I could run my health company and be competitive if I did not pay any interest. I bet that every farmer in this State, if they did not have to pay interest on their money, would be very successful farmers.

Yet, the Premier has the gall to stand up in this House and say that The Terrace is competitive. Of course it is competitive. But it has the best advantage of all—it does not have to pay any interest. That is a disgrace. The Premier stands up and says that that is what competition is all about. That is absolute nonsense.

On the national scene we now have a 5 per cent superannuation impost and a 1 per cent compulsory training levy. For what reason? To me there is only one reason—so that these socialist Governments can send business broke in this country and redistribute income. One of these days it will learn that unless you have investment dollars out of profit you cannot continue to survive. Every single day the sales figures are coming closer to the expense figures, and the Labor Governments of this country do not care.

As I said, some \$200 million came out of the business community of this State last year because of extra taxes imposed by the Bannon Government—\$80 million in payroll tax, \$60 million for WorkCover, \$9 million for land tax and \$60 million for FID. An amount of \$200 million extra had to be paid by businesses in this State for them to survive so that this Government could blow it all on investments such as the State Bank, Scrimber, WorkCover, and so on. This Government is an absolute disaster. It has totally mismanaged the State.

Tonight I would like also to talk about a problem that relates to age discrimination and as it concerns the youth of this State. A businessman rang me recently and said that he wanted to employ an 18 year old person, and said that he did not mind whether that person was male or female.

So, he rang the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity to ascertain how he should go about it. The first thing he was told was that he could not advertise for a young person because age discrimination legislation had been introduced in this State. Having also been told that he could not advertise for a person of a particular sex, this businessman placed an advertisement for a person to be paid \$180 a week, and he was knocked over with 37 applicants. The fascinating thing about this matter is that, of those 37 applicants, only three people were 18 years old or younger. So, he had to tell 34 people, 'Sorry, it is a waste of time. I do not need you here. I want somebody who is under 18 years of age.'

The businessman could not advertise that. He had to knock back 34 applicants who had wasted their time and his, because he wanted a person who was under 18, and he had only about \$180 to spend per week. That is the first part of the story, and that is difficult enough, but one of the applicants who came along and who happened to be over 30 objected about this situation to the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. The Equal Opportunity Commission told this person that it might have to review this whole exercise because as an employer he was no longer allowed to decide that he wanted an 18 year old person, and that under no circumstances should he discuss the age of the person until he had employed him or her.

What a load of nonsense! I remember in 1990 asking the Minister concerned what was going to happen in industrial relations with respect to age discrimination. We in this House were told that the sort of example I gave today would not occur, yet within less than 18 months we have this ridiculous situation in which people who want to employ young people, first, cannot advertise the fact and, secondly, are not allowed to ask their age before employing them. The stupidity of this is that the 38 per cent of young women under 25 who are unemployed and the 20 per cent of young men who are unemployed in this State are disadvantaged.

We said that when that Bill was before the House, but were given assurances by the Government that that would not occur. That is one of hundreds of examples of lunatic legislation that is not thought through by this Government. The practical applications that were questioned in this House, for example, have all gone by the board. We warned the Government that young people would be disadvantaged by the age discrimination legislation, but it scoffed and laughed at that.

The example is there now, and the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity is saying that if you talk about the age of an individual when you make an employment and you do not employ a person and that person then complains, the commission will review that situation. If that is not Big Brother gone mad, I should like to know what is.

I turn to a payroll tax incident that occurred in this State. A small company with an employment payroll last year of \$1.8 million decided that it would increase the size of its business and put on another seven or eight people. Its payroll is now \$1.47 million, an increase of 24 per cent in base salary and wages that have gone out to the community. But, last year the company paid payroll tax of \$53 000 whereas this year it has to pay \$77 200—a 24 per cent increase in salary paid out and a 46 per cent increase in payroll tax.

This Government is supposed to be about employment. It prides itself on representing the disadvantaged, the unemployed and the 'working class'. But, how can this Government stand by when a company increases employment by eight people, yet it charges an extra \$25 000 in payroll tax? That is one person's wages down the drain in tax. It is

absolutely absurd. We have the worst recession that this country has seen in 60 years, yet this Government is continuing to place imposts on business and on employment in this State. And it does not care!

As I said, its Federal colleagues in Canberra tonight have put in another superannuation increase that will reduce employment again. As I have said many times in this House, I do not think that the Labor loonies on the other side understand that, if you increase the bottom line and do not increase the top line, people lose employment. It is so simple and fundamental that one has must wonder whether they on the other side understand anything.

I will finish my comments tonight by referring to WorkCover because, if there were one single disaster in this State that is run by the socialists, it is the attempt to get what is a reasonable concept—a fair and reasonable return to those injured at work—into this socialist nonsense, and in this respect I refer to the WorkCover Corporation. Only this evening a group of contractors came to see me. They have been employing subcontractors for the past 25 years. It is not something new; they have been doing it for 25 years in this part of the building industry. One would not believe it, but tonight all those small contractors have bills back-dating workers compensation for five years and they have the WorkCover Corporation telling them that they must pay bills ranging from \$10 000 to \$100 000 in back payment.

There is no question that the people who are employed under this system are subcontractors. They all have their own private insurance relating to accidents, yet WorkCover is now insisting, five years after the event, that these people are employers. It is absolute nonsense that this organisation can get away with the interpretations that it is placing on what really is a very simple and straightforward matter.

This morning I had a young girl ring me for the fourth time in a month to tell me that documents she had sent to WorkCover had been lost again. She has sent documents to WorkCover because it has asked for them and they have been lost four times. The number of times that I hear of that happening is disgraceful. What does this Government do? The Minister knows about it because we have told him on numerous occasions that documents have been lost, and all he does is throw his hands up in the air and nothing happens.

Mr Lewis: How many people work there now?

Mr INGERSON: That is an interesting question from the member for Murray-Mallee. When the private sector ran the equivalent of WorkCover about 250 people were employed. Today WorkCover employs over 600 people doing the same job. It is absolutely incredible.

Finally, this year the employers of this State have paid out an extra \$60 million in levies to WorkCover, yet in this very same time, the unfunded liability of WorkCover has increased from \$160 million to \$250 million. If the business people of this State had not put in that \$60 million, the unfunded liability would be over \$300 million. This is an absolute disgrace, and this Government is doing nothing about it. The Minister is doing absolutely nothing about it. It is a total disaster. And, what happens for business? All it does is pay, pay, pay and employment goes down, down, down because this Government cannot manage anything in this State.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. P.B. Arnold): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I am pleased to support the Supply Bill and simply comment, as I did a few days ago in concluding my remarks on the Address in

Reply, that funding for South Australia's Government departments prior to the State and Federal budgets—which do not seem to have helped our employment situation at all if one listened to the Federal budget this afternoon—is in a very parlous condition. We are in a very serious financial situation in this State, as are other ALP-controlled States in Australia. The situation seems to worsen with every succeeding news bulletin.

I believe all members would agree—even those on the Government benches—that that is obviously attributable to a substantial degree of bad management on the part of the Government, because this Government has dissipated—I think perhaps 'squandered' might be an equally relevant word—thousands of millions of dollars worth of borrowings, investments and State taxes collected over the past decade, since it came to power in 1982.

Whether this is due to an almost total lack of scrutiny of Government departments—it claims to be a hands-off Government—and scrutiny of institutions or whether alternatively (and this could be one of the reasons) it is due to carelessness or simply financial ineptitude, the simple fact remains that taxpayers, workers and their families throughout the State of South Australia will be paying for these misdemeanours for decades to make up for Government failures committed on a massive scale. All Government departments are suffering (time does not permit me to itemise them—we would need a whole budget Estimates Committee debate for that) and public services and facilities are deteriorating.

Hospitals are greatly underfunded. Mount Gambier Hospital in my own electorate has always been exemplary in working to budget and, in fact, has never had a deficit-funded budget—in other words, spend up and trust that someone will bale you out. Mount Gambier Hospital has had a \$400 000 reduction in funding, and the hospital board will be hard put indeed, along with the administrative staff, to meet community health needs. I note that all other South-East hospitals have been advised in the past two weeks of reduced funding. Things do not look good health-wise in the South-East. What do ill people in the South-East do as an alternative? The Adelaide hospitals are equally badly hit with substantial waiting lists, cosmetic surgery is almost right out and even those requiring necessary surgery face increasing delays.

In the South-East we have a Life Education Centre van. It is a caravan, very attractive and bought by public subscription. We are not mendicants down in the South-East and do not put our hands out for everything. We raised over \$150 000 in less than a year through public subscription to serve the aims of the Government, namely, to educate primary school children on the very serious effects of drug abuse on their health. It is almost totally funded by our community, despite being a very important adjunct to the Health Commission and the educational services of South Australia. The Government claims to have policies that are admirably met by the Life Education Centre van. Businessmen and women in the South-East are still, in spite of having contributed towards that huge sum of money, providing a vehicle for the teacher, a prime mover to shift the caravan from school to school, and providing fuel and accommodation for the staff, as they move around the upper and lower South-East teaching primary school children about drug abuse.

In other words, they are continuing to maintain the van whereas in Adelaide the Central Mission is provided with funds specifically to keep other Life Education Centre vans on the road. We have helped ourselves in order to help our youngsters and to educate them better when the Govern-

ment claims it is doing everything that it possibly can. The South-East community sets a fine example and I am proud of it. In addition, hundreds of thousands of dollars are raised in the South-East each year for charities, relief appeals and overseas donations. Now, more than ever, the community in the South-East is in distress with 2 500 recognised unemployed in Mount Gambier and some 20 per cent of several other major companies on short time (and I say 20 per cent because, rather than stand off staff, the staff have agreed to go on to a four-day week).

One of those factories, the South-East Spinning Mills in Mount Gambier, is run by the international and highly reputable South American-based company, Bunge. That firm has just stood down people for one week, asking them to take leave for that period because work is in such short supply. Markets are being constrained by the day, partly due to Government policies on finance and partly due to Government policies on trade and tariff protection, or the removal of such. I am very fearful for the clothing and textile industry in the South-East, wonderful though it is, particularly for women in the work force in my electorate.

As I was saying, in spite of the problems that we have with so high an unemployment rate, I am very proud of the residents in the South-East who are always willing to help others. They are generous and unselfish. I refer, as an example, to the Miss Australia quest. Of course, the Miss South Australia quest, supporting the South Australian Spastic Centre, is the immediate target for our local entrants. There is also the Miss 2000 quest, in which 11 contestants from primary schools raised about \$37 500 in only eight weeks, with five of the leading fund-raisers in South Australia coming from the South-East. I refer also to the \$150 000 raised for the Life Education Centre Van, regular collections for the Anti-Cancer Foundation, the several appeals each year for the Salvation Army, childhood cancer research, the National Heart Foundation, Multiple Sclerosis, and Offenders Aid to assist prisoner rehabilitation.

I also refer to the wonderful charitable work conducted by St Vincent de Paul, the work done by Lions, Apex, Rotary, Soroptimists, Penguins and all the other service clubs too numerous to mention in the short time I have tonight, as well as the collections for Red Cross, St John, and churches who have specific charitable causes. The Anglican church is currently trying to raise \$150 000 for a trust fund simply for the huge fostering which it carries out on behalf of the Department of Social Security, with the Government looking after the needy and neglected in South Australia.

They are all wonderful causes, and voluntarism shines through in the South-East as in no other area that I have ever visited. This voluntarism is the salvation for many of the distressed in our community. Yet, in 1982, this Government came to power promising nirvana to everyone in South Australia, but instead we had the 1982 depression which, as I said the other day, was really the 1983 depression. This Government had been in power for a full year when the number of unemployed in Mount Gambier went from 1 000 towards 3 000 (as is the case now), and that was after the very first year of the Labor Government's rule—but it is easy to manipulate dates and facts.

As I said, I am very proud of my people in the South-East. I say that to the Government because I have always maintained that it is my duty to put forward to the Government the needs of my community and it is up to the Government to establish the priorities. We are not a grossly mendicant group of people in the South-East—we like to help ourselves. We have that strong streak of independence. It is good to see, and it is good from the Government's

point of view that we look after ourselves quite a deal. I am just sad about the news I received only today about the Bunge spinning mills because they say that the Federal Government policies and financial constraints are hurting them. I appreciate Bunge's investment in our community and was hoping to see a much more expansive mood about, but that is not to be in the short term. I just hope that they stay there and weather this storm.

Other projects which I have been vitally interested in for several years, as the Government will be aware on a perusal of the budget estimates questions, include SATCO and Scrimber, following the line taken by the Auditor-General. Scrimber worries me. When we look at the size of the loss, we can see that \$60 million is really five times the amount of money that the Federal Government has committed to that magnificent MFP project. The Federal Government has said that it will give us \$12 million over five years and that is virtually it; we are on our own. Yet, here we have lost \$60 million on one industrial project and the manner of losing it is sad, too.

We alerted the Government to the problems, but the Minister says that he was unaware until very recently that things had gone awry. That is strange, because I recall that the Minister was appointed to replace a former Minister who was already in trouble over SATCO, Scrimber, Woods and Forests and IPL New Zealand. This Minister was appointed to resolve the problems; he knew they were there. He has not really addressed many of them, other than to shut them down or whatever. We have not recouped any of the finances. Not only that but he appointed the Board of Directors and the Managing Director also to do the trouble shooting, in other words, to get Scrimber out of the hole.

So, to say that he did not go down and look because he was unaware is really begging the question as to why he was appointed and why the two senior staff and others were appointed to do the job on Scrimber; that is, to pick it up and not to do the job by running it down. So, I question the Minister's sincerity when he says he was totally unaware. Even if he were aware, I do not think it is really forgivable that, since November 1989, when almost everybody in Government came down to Mount Gambier to launch Scrimber as a going concern and say it would be producing in a few weeks time, the Minister has not been down to see the South-East or to talk to the senior management or staff and he admits this fully. He has not even been to look at it.

I looked at the plant by invitation and I saw a study in still life. If I had been the Minister and gone there I would have wanted to know why there was no movement; why logs were not moving in and out of the factory; why there was no dust in the air; why there was no smell of glue in the process; and why there was no heavy rumble and noise of manufacture. These would have been signs that things were okay. So, it did not need a Philadelphia lawyer to tell me that; a Van Gogh portrait would probably have been as animated as the Scrimber plant the day I visited it.

Very few problems are associated with Scrimber. Let us compare it, for example, with core board, which has been manufactured in the South-East for many years. In the early days of core board and panel board, about 20 per cent of those pressed board manufactures were rejected because the boards were blowing steam inside. Problems occur only with glue or steam inside the moist wood, and steam generally separated about 20 per cent of the boards which were rejected but, after five years or so, the problems were ironed out and now, the rejection rate is extremely small. It is pushed off the presses in excellent condition with very little wastage.

Are the troubles we are having with Scrimber due to glues or steam in the microwave, as the material is put through the press and the cooker? I suspect that it has been both but that more recently it has been the moisture content, which would be pretty high in the young, five inch to seven inch (75mm to 150-175mm) diameter wood. It would be fairly moist because it is so young, green and sappy. It is not mature wood, but even mature pine is very moist; every tree is a chemical factory in itself.

Another myth that has been readily promulgated by the Government is that this project is wonderful because it has been using waste wood. It has been doing no such thing. The taper of the timber from one end to the other has a very fine tolerance, otherwise there would be a scrim that is very dense on one side, light in the middle and perhaps even lighter at the end. The scrim has to be very uniform. So, it is perfectly sound, millable wood, for which Mount Burr is crying out, and which has been milled profitably and economically. It would have been used for pine posts for fences, for the viticultural industry and a whole range of other things. It is not waste wood; that is just a myth. It is good quality but small sections.

We on this side of the House have been critical of Scrimber—our criticism has accelerated more so in recent years—because 10 per cent of a \$60 million project is \$6 million, and that would be a reasonable interest rate. We have to earn \$6 million in interest if we are to make ends meet, and we are not even paying any of the principal. The Minister and his staff said, 'We will produce 45 000 cubic metres in the first few months; in other words, we will go into full production.' This was the 1989 budget Estimates promise. Given that they might raise about \$700 a cubic metre to compete with all other fine quality construction materials competitively, if they are earning 10 per cent of their annual turnover, which would run to about \$31 million, then 10 per cent of that is \$3.1 million and 20 per cent is \$6.2 million. If anyone ran an industry at 20 per cent profitability these days, they would be doing extremely well, but they would be meeting only the interest payments on Scrimber; they would not be meeting any of the principal.

The mathematics are quite simple and unequivocal. After several years I was becoming concerned that Scrimber had reached the point of diminishing returns and there was a diminishing chance of even paying the interest. I suppose that is why the Government went in boots and all a few weeks ago and closed the plant, but it was looking at this more than 12 months ago, and questioning the finances and wondering whether it was going to pay. Rather than close down Scrimber as a gone concern and then try to market it somewhere across the world, it should have been looking for research and development money 12 months ago.

Why did the Government not look at Germany where scrim type products are being made successfully? Why did it not go to Canada where Paralam is being marketed as a scrim by a Canadian manufacturer? Why did it not nip around to the Adelaide University or one of the other academic institutions in South Australia and say to its commercial arm, Luminis, 'Is there anything that you can do with all your young PhDs? Can they come along and have a session for a year or so and get their PhDs by cutting their teeth on a project like this?' All sorts of exciting and interesting possibilities could have used South Australian enterprise and initiative, instead of having the whole project almost swathed in secrecy.

I was asked into that factory only once. I always felt that I was *persona non grata* because I was asking questions about the profitability and the manufacturing commencement dates, 19 of which were made over the past few years.

More openness, more frankness and more inquiry and seeking assistance instead of having this cloak of secrecy would probably have helped that project out of the doldrums and into a successful position, just as the core board products have been brought to a successful manufacturing state over the years. I suggest that it is extremely bad management to go in at the very last minute and, as a desperation ploy, fire the Managing Director and put all the blame on him and have the Minister say, 'I was unaware; I do not have any skills.' The Minister has never been the sort of person who is noted for modesty. He has generally told us frankly and openly in this House that he is a man of considerable skill in many areas.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. P.B. Arnold): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): This Bill seeks the approval of Parliament for the expenditure of an additional \$1.2 billion for the recurrent costs of the Government in the payment of salaries to the Public Service; that is, something a little less than one-fifth of the total State budget. It is worth reflecting, when the Government is seeking this money, that if the money that has been demonstrated to have been lost by the Government over the preceding year or more and that has been highlighted in recent months were to be made available to Parliament, then virtually everything that South Australians are currently seeking could be provided and money would be left over.

I refer to the \$1.5 billion—which may yet expand to \$3 billion—lost through the State Bank, to the \$1.5 billion contingent liability of the State Government Insurance Commission, to the more than \$200 million unfunded liabilities of the WorkCover Corporation and to the \$60 million lost as a result of the mismanagement and misguided hopes of the Scrimber project. Had that money not been lost and had the money that South Australians now have to find to pay not only those bills but the interest on those bills been made available, South Australians could rebuild their hospitals, we could build all the schools that we are perceived to need, we could resurface all the roads that members, principally on this side of the House, regard as imperative for the safety, security and productivity of their electorates and the State at large, we could clean up our degraded national parks, we could streamline our justice system and we could supply the Police Force with all the equipment it needs—and I suggest that, having done all those things, we would still have hundreds of millions of dollars left over.

It is a very serious indictment of this Government's inability to manage that we find ourselves in this position. Last night I was reading and by chance I came across this passage which appeared 60 years ago and in another country. But what a magnificent commentary this passage would be on the Labor Government in South Australia in 1991. I quote:

When the situation was manageable it was neglected and, now that it is thoroughly out of hand, we apply too late the remedies which then might have effected a cure. There is nothing new in the story. It's as old as the Sibylline Books. It falls into the long dismal catalogue of the fruitlessness of experience and the confirmed unteachability of mankind.

Want of foresight, unwillingness to act when action would be simple and effective; lack of clear thinking; confusion of counsel until the emergency comes, until self-preservation strikes its jarring gong. These are the features which constitute the endless repetition of history.

These are the features which constitute the endless repetition of the history of mismanagement of the Bannan Labor

Government of the State of South Australia. Those words were uttered nearly 60 years ago in 1934 by Winston Churchill, speaking of the problems in the Middle East, but they are as relevant to the Labor Party's activities in South Australia today as they were in 1934 to the problems of the Middle East.

In addressing the Supply Bill I refer particularly to the recurrent budget of the Health Commission. As we all know, there is a strong political push to reduce the staffing of the central administration of the Health Commission—as distinct from the delivery of health services.

There is one section of the Health Commission which, few South Australians would realise, is the most important section of the Health Commission in terms of the prevention of disease and the maintenance of hygiene. Therefore, it is the most cost-effective unit and, in terms of public health, the most important unit of the Health Commission. I refer to the Public and Environmental Health Division of the South Australian Health Commission. This division spends \$11 million per annum out of a total health budget of \$1.2 billion. However, that relatively minimal sum expended on public health is, without a doubt, the most cost-effective health dollar that we spend. In health terms, its significance dwarfs entirely the hospital services and, if we were to do without it, we would be in dire straits. It is that division which controls epidemic disease and ensures public health and hygiene, thus ensuring that South Australians can generally live in a healthy environment.

As I said, the commission and the Government are preoccupied with the complex needs of clinical services and the associated acute events and crises that, of course, are invariably more newsworthy on a day-to-day basis than public health itself. However, let the current Minister experience an epidemic of any kind whatsoever and he will realise that the public health services of this State are, without doubt, the most important of all the health services that we provide.

In 1987, the Public and Environmental Health Division had over 200 staff. There are now only about 130, and further cuts are being planned. There has been a 10 per cent per annum reduction in the staff of that division over the past three years, and I am told that the forecast cut in the forthcoming budget will be in the region of 15 per cent.

I would like to take the opportunity in this debate on the Supply Bill to warn the Minister of Health that, if he pursues cuts of that nature, if he allows the Health Commission to slice off a continuing number of staff from the Public and Environmental Health Division, he, the Government and the State will rue the day that that shortsighted action was taken. I will be specific. The Epidemiology Branch, which is referred to on page 35 of the Program Estimates under the heading 'Public and Environmental Health Services' along with environmental health services, occupational health and radiation safety services, sexually transmitted disease services, general community health promotion project and public and environmental health management, is one of the principal tools of health management in this State. For those members who are not aware of it, epidemiology is the study of disease in a given population. The Epidemiology Branch of the South Australian Health Commission has an international reputation and is generally regarded as the best epidemiology branch in the country.

To give members some idea of what that branch undertakes, I mention in particular the cancer registry. The cancer registry provides a vital information service to the medical profession and the public regarding the occurrence of cancers and the outcome of treatments. I vividly remember, Mr Acting Speaker—and you may also recall—that in the

early 1980s studies by the Epidemiology Branch of cancer in the Iron Triangle populations were critical to the determination by both the Health Commission and the Engineering and Water Supply Department of the possible effects of heavy chlorination of water in the Iron Triangle, to the Government's and the Health Commission's efforts to ensure that there were no outbreaks of amoebic meningitis, and also to the monitoring of the effect of trihalomethanes on the water supply in that area.

Without the cancer registry it is impossible for any Government to assure the population that its water treatment plants, its air quality and other aspects of public health are at a satisfactory level. It is the cancer registry that provides the measuring stick and the level of reassurance that South Australians need if they are not to become unreasonably anxious about rising levels of cancer in particular local areas.

Among other functions, the cancer registry provides an annual report that is readily available to all, including to health planners, and it enables cost-effective forward planning in the prevention and treatment of these potentially fatal and costly diseases. If this function is damaged or reduced in any way—and I stress that a low cost function is currently threatened—community and health planners will lose one of their most powerful tools available in the fight against disease.

Clinicians need to know whether the treatments they are using are effective, and the only way they can know that is through the information provided by the cancer registry. If this registry, which is staffed by a minimal number of people, were cut by even one it could result in the database losing currency and becoming progressively more outdated and therefore of little or no use to health planners, clinicians or the Government.

I warn the Minister, as one of his predecessors who has been through this extremely stressful situation of trying to reassure people that levels of cancer in a given area cannot be attributed to water quality or air quality—in the case of Port Pirie the possible lead contamination—that he will find himself in a very vulnerable position if the cancer registry database is run down and if that reassurance is not able to be given on a scientific basis.

Another service of the Epidemiology Branch is the births registry, which has the legislative role of monitoring and providing information on pregnancy outcome and of maintaining a record of peri-natal deaths and birth defects. When it comes to birth defects, it is impossible to assure women of reproductive age who experience an unusual increase in the number of birth defects in a given area that these defects are a natural outcome rather than being caused by contamination of air, water or soil. Without the births registry and the cancer registry the Government has nowhere to go when it comes to reassuring the public, and staff cuts in these areas could result in the loss of important guidelines to researchers and planners.

I mention in passing that the current staffing of the Epidemiology Branch is 29 persons. However, in the Program Estimates the staffing of that branch is identified as being 36 persons. In other words, the branch is seven persons down on the number of actual average or full-time equivalents as listed in the Program Estimates, and I understand that further cuts are planned. It is simply not good enough, and I urge the Minister to address himself to this situation in the interests of the health of South Australians.

The expenditure on epidemiology, according to the Program Estimates, is supposed to be \$3.56 million. It is my understanding that this is clearly not the case, and I also understand that the within branch expenditure at this stage

of the year is about only \$1.5 million. So, South Australians are being short-changed by comparison with what the Government said it intended to do.

Another unit of the Public and Environmental Health Division of the commission is the Infectious Diseases Unit, which is responsible for monitoring, reporting and controlling contagion. Despite our modern society, we face water borne diseases, food borne diseases, TB (which is increasing as a result of immigration and, partly, because the current generation of medical practitioners is not familiar with the disease and may not identify it in its early stages), HIV infection and sexually transmitted diseases.

Some or all of these are considered to be factors in the development of so many common and lethal cancers, for example, cervical cancer, lymphomas and leukaemias. In addition to that, we must consider the potential effects of rapid climate change, which is indicated, for example, by the southward migration of mosquitoes from tropical and semi-tropical regions. This can lead to diseases previously unknown in this State, such as malaria and the increased incidence of Ross River fever or Murray Valley encephalitis, which is currently rare.

All these things need to be carefully monitored. It is not possible to do so if the capacity of the Infectious Diseases Unit is run down. The unit, I might add, has a legislative role of recording notifiable diseases and of advising other bodies of appropriate actions. There is the Injury Prevention and Surveillance Unit, and all members would be aware of the excellent newsletters we receive from time to time from that unit.

Then we have the Environmental Health Branch, which is responsible for clean air, clean water, the disposal of waste, food quality and soil quality. Some of those functions have been transferred to other departments: the Department of Environment and Planning and the Department of Agriculture. But I say to the Minister and to members of the Government that when people need reassurance about the quality of water, of air and of soil they do not accept assurances given by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Environment and Planning; they insist that doctors and health professionals give those assurances.

Without the assurances of the Health Commission, no Government can feel secure in the maintenance of the quality of public health controls in this State. To run down the Public and Environmental Health Division of the Health Commission is more than short-sighted: it is myopic and dangerous, and it cannot be allowed to occur. I ask the Minister of Health to regard what I have said this evening as a warning, in the interests of South Australians. If he chooses not to take it on that level, at least he should take it on the level of a political warning to a Government that will find itself in dire trouble if it fails to maintain the public and environmental health capacity of the South Australian Health Commission.

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

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

Motion carried.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I support the Bill. I believe that all members on this side of the House who have participated in this debate have expressed their grave concerns about the competency of this Government to continue to manage the affairs of this State. I believe we are all expressing deep concern about the Government's inability to grasp the depth

of the financial chaos perpetrated by inept and inappropriate policies and by the lack of management controls. Management controls are inherent in every ministerial portfolio, but we have a Government whose Ministers refuse to accept that responsibility.

One of the most recent examples of what I am talking about involves the Minister of Forests, whose department has overseen the loss of \$60 million in the failed scrimber project. The scrimber project, which is 50 per cent owned by the South Australian Timber Corporation and 50 per cent owned by the State Government Insurance Commission, lost \$60 million of South Australian taxpayers' money. That \$60 million of taxpayers' money was invested in this project—\$30 million by the South Australian Timber Corporation and \$30 million by the SGIC. The scenario that led to the scrapping of the scrimber project defies all economic rationale.

We have to go back to 1986, when the South Australian Timber Corporation decided to invest in three projects. SATCO had not made a profit since its formation in 1979, nor did it have a capital base. Nonetheless, the decision was made to proceed. The first project to be pursued by SATCO was for the production of 5 000 cars. That is not necessarily a shattering initiative until one realises that the cars were to be made of plywood. It was suggested by the Hon. Legh Davis in another place that the only winner in that project would be the white ant exterminator. However, again, taxpayers' money was spent on the project and trips were made overseas to discuss this farcical notion, which was supported by our Premier and Treasurer.

The second project was the New Zealand timber mill at Greymouth. The financial credibility of the Bannon Government, if not already disabused by the plywood cars, was most certainly exposed by the loss of \$50 million incurred when the burnt out logs refused to float across the Tasman.

We now come to the third project in this fatal trilogy—the scrimber project. This project was rejected by all major private timber industries in Australia. The Government was warned about the project by the Auditor-General, but that did not deter the Bannon Government. It was picked up by SATCO which, of course, with no capital base and no profit record in its history, was off and running into a \$60 million loss. I also question the role of the Minister of Forests, who quite blithely reported to this House that since the opening of the scrimber plant in November 1989 he had never visited the plant. What an extraordinary admission!

Taxpayers' money was at risk and the allegedly responsible Minister had no apparent interest. The Minister of Forests further clarified his contempt for his office and for the people of this State by excusing his neglect of duty stating that he did not know anything about timber, so it was a waste of his time to go down there. I find that attitude to ministerial responsibility totally cretinous, to say nothing about unconscionable and totally inept. If the Minister had in fact performed with minimal responsibility, this State may have been saved millions of dollars. The Minister was so disinterested in this portfolio that he remained in cloud cuckoo land as SATCO expended further taxpayers' funds, in this instance to rent a warehouse in Sydney, mainly to store a product manufactured by Scrimber International.

The cost to this State over an 18-month period was \$215 000 and, needless to say, the warehouse remained empty. A warehouse in Sydney was sitting empty costing South Australians \$215 000 and the Minister's only comment was that he knew nothing about timber. Such is the total arrogance of this Government and its Ministers, whose grandiose schemes have bankrupted our once great State. With what interests do these Ministers of Government con-

cern themselves? Are they interested that in 1990-91, 13 700 Australians went bankrupt—an increase of 50.3 per cent on 1989-90? Are they interested in the fact that small businesses are in serious trouble? The only answer that this Government has for small business is to tell them that inept management procedures are the cause of collapse. Inept management: the pot calling the kettle black. That answer is not good enough. We are seeing businesses that have been in the family for 20 or 30 years—they are not Johnnies-come-lately into the business world—being hit hard and failing.

We continually hear the member for Hartley parroting his line to members of the Opposition: 'What are your policies?' Is the honourable member asking for ideas on policy for his Government with no policies, or is he already abrogating his Government's hold on the Government benches? Has the honourable member forgotten that he is a Labor Government member and that it is his and his Government's policies that need to be known? Small business needs to know what further imposts will affect their already meagre budgets in the coming year. What policies will the honourable member assist his Government to initiate to save service provision in our hospitals in this year's budget? I refer to a report in the *Messenger* newspaper this week which carried the headline, 'Hospital faces half a million dollar cuts', subheaded 'Very difficult year ahead for Modbury Hospital'.

Modbury Hospital will look for ways to cut spending by at least \$500 000 in the wake of State Government funding reductions. Hospital Administrator David Young said it was too soon to say how the funding cuts, announced last week by the Health Commission, would affect his hospital. 'Although all aspects of the budget are yet to be analysed, it's fairly clear that additional savings amounting to at least \$500 000 will have to be found,' he said. 'In financial terms this will be a very difficult year for the hospital.'

The hospital's total budget is just under \$40 million. Mr Young said some savings could be achieved by improving efficiency. Staffing levels also would be looked at but emergency services would not be touched.

'The board has already resolved that the cost-saving measure of a reduction in the scope and level of services is a last resort,' Mr Young said. 'But this option most certainly cannot be ruled out.'

What policies will the honourable member assist his Government to initiate to save service provision in our hospitals? Modbury Hospital has already been applying cost-saving measures for consecutive budgets handed down over the past five years. An increasing number of beds are closed for a period of three to four months to effect cost savings.

Perhaps the member for Hartley would like to explain the policies of his Government to the people of the northern regions and explain why his Government is restricting access to this vital facility and relegating hundreds more patients to hospital waiting lists.

Another area that I have touched on in other debates in this place is the recent new water rating system. Amongst the many concerns and complaints brought to me by constituents is the very sensible question, 'What is wrong with charging for water using exactly the same method as that applied to other essential services such as gas and electricity?' An editorial in the *Sunday Mail* of 4 August posed that very question, but was far less kind to the Minister of Water Resources. Headed 'Hogwash Susan—come clean', the editorial states:

The new water rates system is a hidden wealth tax and it's high time the Water Resources Minister, Ms Susan Lenehan, stopped quibbling . . . the Minister tried a typical bully-boy tactic with the public—accept the controversial new water rates system or pay for a new \$200 million pipeline to the Murray.

The article continues, quoting the Minister:

This system was inevitable. It's economic reality. Anything you use of the community's resources ought to be charged for in proportion to the use.

The editorial continues:

Well, if that's true Minister, how come people in houses which cost more than a certain amount have to pay more to use less water than people in cheaper homes? How come people who drive, or walk, or cycle to work have to pay for a bus, tram and train system used by so few? How come people who don't have children have to pay for a public school system? How come people who don't get ill have to pay for the hospital system? You are talking a load of absolute hogwash, Minister. You are the one living in cloud cuckoo land. This system was not inevitable—and it is economic unreality. The system you have introduced does absolutely nothing to encourage real attempts to conserve water. The only system which does that is a full user-pays scheme.

The present scheme imposes an extra burden on those who live in what the Minister would see as the well-heeled areas.

The article ends with the same statement with which I started and which has been brought to me by many other logical and reasonable constituents within my electorate. It states:

If Ms Lenehan truly believes that 'anything you use of the community's resources ought to be charged for in proportion to the use' then what is wrong with charging for water using exactly the same method as that applied to other essential services such as gas and electricity?

Perhaps the member for Hartley, on behalf of his Government, would also like to answer the anguish of the unemployed and, in particular, that of the 26 600 teenagers actively looking for work and answer the despair when the jobs are not there. Through you, Mr Acting Speaker, I ask the member: what are your policies? The Bannon Government has been obsessed with high-risk investments such as reported by the SGIC fiasco, high technology—reflected by the Scrimber disaster—and offshore operations exhibited by the purchase of the New Zealand timber company. The millions of dollars lost to this State by the mismanagement of this Government could well have been supporting our hospitals, education systems and very necessary policing resources.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): This Bill is before us to allow the allocation of \$1 200 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. I acknowledge that such a Bill is customary at this time of the year and, in accordance with normal practice, I rise to support its passage. However, I note that the Bill reflects an increase of \$60 million over expenditure for the same time last year. I realise that some of this increase covers wage and salary increases, but I also note that a proportion not identified in the Premier's very brief second reading explanation for this Bill covers unspecified 'other cost increases'.

I seem to recall that the Premier announced a public sector freeze in November 1990. Now, only nine months later, we find that he needs to increase the appropriation by some \$60 million over last year's amount. I wonder what actually happened to that public sector freeze. It seems that that freeze has probably gone the way as other freezes that the Premier has announced.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Members opposite who are interjecting at the moment may recall that in early June 1987 the Premier also announced a similar freeze. Indeed, on that occasion he announced that Public Service numbers would be reduced, but then, of course, in the election year period of 1989-90, what we really found was that the Premier increased the number of full-time equivalent public servants by 2 100 to a grand total of 88 100 people.

Mr Ferguson: But we won.

Mr MATTHEW: The honourable member for Henley Beach says, 'But we won.' Is he confessing that that is the

only way this Government wins elections? It has to employ people—offer them jobs, and effectively offer them a bribe to buy their votes? We know what it did for people who used to sit in this place and who justifiably lost their seats at the last election: it created jobs for all five of them. It is very good at offering jobs to appease and to bribe people. I wonder what else the member for Henley Beach might have to add to that. He may have some very interesting things indeed. I look forward to his speaking perhaps a little later in this debate if he does take the time to stand and talk. I give the honourable member credit; at least he is here in the Chamber. Most Government members are not even here, and that is indeed unfortunate, because this is quite an important debate. Still, they are making a fair bit of noise. We all know that empty vessels make a lot of noise, so perhaps we need only the small numbers who are here at the moment.

As a result of the effort that the State Government has embarked upon with its promises of cuts, yet with no cuts occurring, the State Government has embarked on a program of jacking up State taxes. We saw the same thing happen in 1990. The Premier even won from the IPA a lemon award for his economic management. The IPA gave him an award for the significant effort that he managed to make during that year. The award was actually for the biggest tax increase in the Commonwealth, and the way he is going at the moment it looks as though he is heading for yet another of those awards.

We all know that our State is facing economic ruin in the face of the disasters that are falling around the Premier and his Government team. There is no doubt that if he is to be a contender for such an award he will have a pretty tough battle against a couple of other Premiers who are doing a fine job of bankrupting their States, too. He has to compete against the Premier of Victoria and against the Premier of Western Australia, but I think that the path of economic ruin that our Premier is taking us down will probably mean that he will pull off another lemon award. Who knows; he might even be able to go for a hat trick. Perhaps he can go for three lemon awards in a row. It might be a new IPA record.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 123, which states that members must refer to other members by the name of their electoral district or parliamentary title, and not otherwise. The member for Bright has been referring to the Premier for the past three or four minutes as 'he'.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. P.B. Arnold): There is no point of order, but I would ask the honourable member to direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. The past run of increases in taxes and charges in this State put our Premier in good stead for this award. The Government embarked on a frenzied raid on the public purse in the dying stages of the 1990-91 economic year. We saw an unprecedented 800 taxes and charges increased. There were so many increases that State Print had to print a special *Government Gazette* to accommodate all those increases, and that printing run was so great it was 12 hours late.

At the same time, the Premier continues to fleece petrol taxes from South Australian motorists, who are presently paying 4.5 cents per litre in tax. This State Government has ripped petrol tax from South Australian motorists at an alarming rate. In the 1983-84 financial year, this Government froze the amount of tax revenue going to roads at \$25.726 million. Since 1983 State petrol tax has generated more than \$405 million with only \$180 million of that

amount being credited to the Highways Fund for roads. Where has the other \$225 million gone? It has gone straight into general revenue; straight into the funds that are needed to prop up this ailing cash strapped Government. This money has been absorbed into the massive losses brought about through this Government's mismanagement and by the financial problems in organisations such as the State Bank, SGIC, WorkCover and Scrimber.

I have repeatedly asked this Parliament for the money from petrol tax to be used on roads. It makes good sense. After all, if we are taking money from South Australian motorists, it is only right that those funds should be used on roads. I have asked for the construction schedule on the third arterial road to be brought forward, and the Premier has had the gall to criticise me publicly for that. He offered only criticism despite the fact that this road would alleviate pressure on traffic on South and Brighton Roads, despite the fact that these roads will service a projected population of 324 000 people by 1996, and despite the fact that this Government has encouraged people to live in the new suburb of Seaford which will have 19 000 residents within the next nine years. This Government should not be developing new suburbs without putting the infrastructure in place. There will be 19 000 more people in Seaford with no roads to service them. The Government has talked about a new road and it has also talked about extending the Willunga railway line, but that is all we hear from this Government: all talk and, with due respect, no action.

The Government's talk takes it in some very interesting directions. I think that probably the biggest load of talk that has come from the other side of late has been in respect of the MFP project. The original MFP proposal was very interesting. It talked about a city that would house 100 000 to 250 000 people, but now it has been watered down to a collection of 25 little villages, each no more than 600 metres square and housing perhaps 50 000 people. It sounds to me like a Clayton's MFP, but then again we have only a Clayton's Government at the moment, so perhaps that is appropriate. This little MFP might be a reflection of the Government today: shrinking, and shrinking all the time, but needing more and more money to prop it up.

We are also told some very interesting things in the MFP Update, issue number 3 of 1991, as follows:

It is estimated that the 20 to 30 year development will need infrastructure funding of \$105 million.

It also says that the board recognises that the project will see 'appropriate infrastructure provided by Governments'. We have now seen what the Commonwealth Government is to provide. It is to provide \$12 million over five years. Who will foot the rest of the bill? Obviously the South Australian taxpayer, because the MFP Update tells us that the State Government will provide money for infrastructure. Where will the Government get the money from? It is too busy propping up all its ailing financial ventures to start investing in an MFP.

There is a lot of talk in this brochure, and I am sure that all members have read it. I note that on the front of the brochure there is an artist's impression of a balcony on the back of a dwelling in the MFP with two people lounging in deck chairs. And what do we see on the horizon? We see a monorail—a symbol of modern public transport.

This Government cannot even extend the Noarlunga railway line to Seaford and yet it is looking at putting monorails in the MFP. It should get its act together and provide infrastructure for existing growth areas before starting to look at pie in the sky infrastructure. There is a lot of nice talk about public service infrastructure, particularly public

transport infrastructure in this MFP Update. It says on page 3:

While cars will be discouraged inside villages, planners recommend smaller alternative vehicles be investigated for internal commuting and that communal garaging be provided on the edge of villages for residents' cars. Cars and public transport are, of course, still essential as many village residents are likely to be working in other locations around Adelaide.

So, they certainly need public transport to survive in the MFP: well, so too do people living in the existing urban fringes of Adelaide need public transport, and this Government has done nothing to meet those needs. Now it is talking about futuristic car packages for the MFP. While all this money—South Australian taxpayers' money is poured into the MFP, what will be happening to southern residents? We do not need an MFP to allow this Government to develop new forms of public transport. If it wants to develop new forms of public transport, the southern suburbs offer that opportunity now, and indeed that area has offered that opportunity for the past two decades. It is about time that this Government got up off its backside and did something.

In those past two decades the Tonkin Government was in office for a mere three years but it developed the O-Bahn system, one of the greatest public transport success stories in this country. The present Premier was Leader of the Opposition at that stage. He knocked the O-Bahn development from start to finish—but who was the first one who wanted to be down there to open the extension? It is a different story when the television cameras are around.

Mr Brindal: The 'mirage' in the north-eastern suburbs.

Mr MATTHEW: Yes, indeed that is perhaps how he did regard it. How wrong he has been proven to be. How wrong indeed. This Government has been too short-sighted to notice the opportunities presented by the southern suburbs. I am contacted regularly by residents from Brighton, Kingston Park, Marino and Seaview Downs, who are fed up with their road systems being clogged up due to the massive increase in southern traffic, because the Government has failed to develop the infrastructure that is needed to support the growth of the southern suburbs.

What is more, the Government has forced those southern suburbs residents to travel to other locations because there are not enough facilities in the area. Recently we have seen southern suburbs residents band together to try to lobby for sporting facilities in the south. Indeed, we recently had the football match between Norwood and South Adelaide at the Bice Oval, which attracted 9 714 spectators. That was indeed a good, strong indication that people in the south want their own football facility. Instead of the Government wasting taxpayers' money on pie in the sky MFP projects, it is about time it put the money where it is needed.

We do not need the MFP in order to attract high technology to South Australia. There is plenty of vacant land north of Technology Park, and there is also plenty of land down south at Lonsdale. There are plenty of empty office buildings all around this city at the moment. Some of them, such as the ASER site, are being propped up by this Government, and they could quite easily be filled with high technology industries. High technology industry is not necessarily dirty or smelly. It can be carried out in normal office blocks. We do not have to produce new office block towers in the MFP. If the Government develops something at Gillman (and there is no doubt that it is an area that could do with some development), at the end of the day all that it will really be is another West Lakes, a residential development, 12 kilometres from the city.

Before they do that, they should put the infrastructure where it is needed and do their job properly, because South Australians are fed up with this Government not concen-

trating on the basics of government. They want to see a Government that will get back to the important aspects of government such as health, education, transport and law and order. They want responsible government, a Government that will indulge in responsible economic management.

I would like to read into the record a letter that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 15 June 1991. I feel that this particular letter is symbolic of the way many South Australians feel today. It is entitled, 'Work, pay taxes and keep quiet', and reads as follows:

What the heck is the world coming to? I used to read newspapers from cover to cover. Not any more.

I used to devour current affairs programs on radio and television. Not any more.

Why? It's just so darned depressing and makes one feel so powerless to actually change things.

It seems that the role of the average bloke and his wife is just to work (if they have a job), pay taxes and keep quiet. The experts have it all in hand.

You've got to be joking. Got what in hand. The economy? Crime? The public transport? Education?

What the polliès and the experts comprehensively fail to recognise are the basic requirements of the average family: a home; a job; schools for the kids; hospital if we get sick; security in our homes and on the streets.

The rest can be left in our more than capable hands. We do not need nannies or big brothers with the interference and cost they bring with them.

Let us get on with living our lives, not fulfilling politicians' ambitions.

That letter is signed by a gentleman named Doug Eadon of Banksia Park. It says it all in a nutshell. People in this State want to see a Government that gets on with the job of governing properly. They want to see a Government that concentrates on the basics, the important aspects of government. They want a Government that is financially responsible; they do not want a Government that loses massive sums of money through the State Bank, SGIC, WorkCover and Scrimber. They do not want to read in the newspapers about a Minister who admits that he has not even been to an installation that has lost \$60 million because he does not have any technical expertise. If that is an example of what this Government has to offer, it is about time it did the honourable thing, stepped aside and went to the polls, because there is no doubt that people in this State will send members opposite a resounding message. They want this Government out—now. They are looking for responsible government and the Opposition is ready, able and determined to provide that alternative whenever the Government names the date.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I commend the member for Bright for another excellent contribution. I suggest that if more members on the other side of the House understood how people in the community felt, as has been portrayed by the so-called marginal members on this side of the House, we in this State would all be a lot better off. The majority of members opposite would not have any idea of how people in South Australia are hurting at this time. If they only listened instead of foolishly interjecting on members such as the member for Bright, we would all be better off, and we would have a better Government—not that we cannot expect that from the Bannon Government. It has had its go and it has failed.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The member for Henley Beach says that they have won. How many times do we have to tell members on the other side of the House that they are only there by default. They have not won; they are sitting there with a minority. At the next election, whenever that might be—and as far as I and the people of this State are concerned, the sooner the better—we will have a Govern-

ment with a majority that will enable it to do the things that have to be done, to make the hard decisions that need to be made in this State to get it back on the rails again.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Tell us some of your hard decisions.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will tell you lots about my hard decisions. How much time have you got?

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. P.B. Arnold): Order! There are too many interjections. I ask the honourable member to direct his comments through the Chair.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Reluctantly I support this Bill which appropriates \$1 200 million from Consolidated Account. As other members have pointed out, I remind the House that this is \$60 million more than this time last year.

Mr Groom: Five per cent.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That is far too much as far as the average taxpayer in this State is concerned. As I said earlier, if members opposite spent more time going out talking to people—no, not even talking to them but listening; it is more important that they listen rather than talk all the time—they would soon find out how people feel about the appropriation of an amount like this from the Consolidated Account. It is with some reluctance that I support this Bill.

Much has been said about the economic calamities in this State over recent times. I suggest that in the last couple of years we have seen the biggest economic disasters in this State's history. If any member opposite can dispute that let him get up and take part in this debate and say so. But, members opposite cannot dispute that. All they are able to do is sit there and nod like noddies and interject.

So far I have not heard one member opposite stand up and support this measure; perhaps the opportunity might be provided. I have not seen it yet, and I do not think members opposite have the guts to do so. But, we will wait and see. There is no doubt that in the last couple of years we have experienced the biggest financial disasters in this State's history. I do not need to talk again about the SGIC, the State Bank, Scrimber—we could go on.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Tell us about entertainment centres.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I want to talk about water rates; that is more important. It is not my intention to go into a lot of detail on this matter because I will have plenty of opportunity, as will members opposite, to do something about water rates. If they are not receiving the message loud and clear from their constituents, it is another example of where they are not in tune with what the people of South Australia are concerned about and what they want to see changed.

On Thursday, when I introduce a private member's Bill, I will provide the opportunity for members opposite to change the system that has brought so much anger and concern to so many people in South Australia, and not just people in the metropolitan area but throughout the State. At this stage I have received over 180 letters. That is not to mention the hundreds of phone calls, I would suggest, that my office or my colleagues' offices have received from people expressing absolute disgust about this new water rating system.

I received a copy of a letter from a tractor trader in Kimba. That could hardly be referred to as the metropolitan area. I believe that it is in the member for Flinders' electorate, and I am sure that he would have received a similar letter to the one that I now bring to the notice of this House. It is a copy of a letter written to the Manager of the E&WS Department and it states:

Dear Sir, Several weeks ago we paid our water rates and enclosed with our payment a letter querying the \$328 excess water rates (and other matters) which we did not incur. We asked that you reply to our correspondence, explaining what had happened. At this stage no-one has had the courtesy to do so. Today [7 August] we received a final notice for \$328 for the excess, notice dated 21 July, but still no explanation. I have since writing to you followed some of this through the papers, and understand that this excess may be based on valuations of dwellings; therefore, if this is correct can you advise what you value our house property at.

Our bank has been putting pressure on us to sell our various businesses and house property due to the collapse of businesses due to the recession, which is much more evident in the agricultural areas than in the cities. The land agents who have listed our properties doubt that we will get \$120 000 for the property in question; however, the E&WS Department valuation is much higher. We may be able to use this as a lever to get the bank to let us remain here.

This is a pretty sorry state of affairs. The letter continues:

If of course the higher valuation cannot be justified by your department then increased water rate would not be applicable . . . We would not like you to even consider cutting the water off without at least giving us just cause for this charge as was previously asked.

That particular company did appeal and, as far as I know, from the last conversation that I had with those people, they have still not received any answers from the department.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: No, they have not had their water cut off and, by jingo, if the water is cut off from that property, all hell will break loose—as will be the case with many other properties. I bring that to the notice of this House, but it is only one of many letters that I have received from businesses outside the metropolitan area.

For so long we have heard about the impact that this new water rating system is having on people in the metropolitan area—the anger, concern and frustration it has brought with it. But I want to remind the House that this relates not just to the metropolitan area but to the country areas. The thing I am finding more interesting than anything else relating to these water rates is the absolute disgust regarding the so-called \$60 000 that the Minister is spending—\$60 000 worth of taxpayers' money—on an advertising campaign in a blatant attempt to get people to understand what this system is all about.

I suggest to members opposite and to the Minister that people well and truly understand what this system is all about. They understand, because they understand the impact on their hip pocket.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The member for Henley Beach is muttering away again over there. I would be very happy to provide copies of the correspondence I have received from people in various parts of the metropolitan area and from the country for the member for Henley Beach to look at. If he does not believe the Opposition, let him read some of the correspondence. Some of it has come, would you believe, from the District of Henley Beach.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would not suggest that the member for Henley Beach is not able to read. I would not want to do that, Mr Speaker, but I suggest that it would be a very good exercise for the Minister to look at some of that correspondence. I have not checked, but I presume that the majority of letters I have received are from people in Labor electorates.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The member for Albert Park is having a giggle over there. Let him also look at the correspondence. It would do all members opposite good just to recognise how serious the problem is out there. But we

saw the Minister standing up in this place, only two days ago, telling us that she spent \$60 000. If she has not spent more than \$60 000—more like \$100 000—I will eat my hat. There is no way that the Minister or the E&WS Department can be carrying out this advertising campaign—and we have all seen it on television and in the three quarter page—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I doubt it is working.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Well, I would be surprised if it is working for members on the other side. I do not think they understand anything about this new system.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Well, I would not be surprised about that. As a matter of fact, the advertisements in the *Advertiser* remind me a bit of tombstones. I can remember what happened to a campaign that involved tombstones—it was not too successful, and I do not think this advertising will be any more successful. That was a bit of a pity as far as we were concerned. There is no doubt that the Minister has spent a lot more than \$60 000. If \$60 000 is being made available through the E&WS Department, perhaps the Minister is getting a bit of money from somewhere else to put into that. I do not know: that is her business.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, it is the Minister's business where she gets her money.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On reflection, it is probably the taxpayers' problem. However, I would not mind betting that that campaign is costing more like \$100 000 than \$60 000. It does not matter if it is \$40 000; people out there in the community are disgusted about their taxes going to pay for a campaign such as that. It is a campaign that has been brought about because of the Government's mismanagement in the first place. The Opposition made the Government and the Minister of Water Resources aware of the problems that this legislation would bring with it. We foreshadowed many of the concerns that are now being felt in the community. We suggested to the Minister, in the strongest possible terms, that the Government should not proceed with this legislation. We opposed the legislation in this House and we opposed it in another place. Regrettably the Independents did not see that it was necessary to oppose the legislation. I suggest, with respect, that the people of South Australia are regretting that. However, when we look at the other place, we see that, of course, the Democrats—

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Standing Orders do not allow reference to debate in another place.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not quite sure what the honourable member was going to say about the other place. The point of order is valid if the debate is referred to.

Mr FERGUSON: I thought that the honourable member was referring to what the Democrats said in another place.

The SPEAKER: The Chair did not pick that up. The comment, as far as the Chair heard, related to the Democrats in another place—which is where they are—and that is not out of order unless the honourable member refers to the debate.

Mr FERGUSON: I see, Sir. Thank you very much.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the member for Henley Beach understands. The member for Heysen.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Democrats—and you are quite correct, Mr Speaker, in saying that they are in another place—have said repeatedly, outside the other place as well

as inside, that this new policy is a conservation measure. As I have said time and again, I will be the first one to recognise the need for appropriate conservation measures to be introduced and for incentives to be given so that people will use less water. It makes sense: if it does not make sense in this State, it being the driest State, etc. etc., where would it make sense? This is not a debate about conservation: it is a debate about a fair system, a just system and a system that enables people, wherever they are, to pay the same price for a basic commodity. There is plenty of opportunity for the Minister to introduce practical and sensible conservation measures.

I was delighted to hear the Minister today during Question Time refer to her desire to see a greater emphasis and higher priority placed on storm water as a valuable resource. I have been suggesting for a long time, as have other mem-

bers on this side, that that should be happening. If I remember correctly, when I was Minister some time ago I instigated a report on how best to use storm water as a resource. I presume the Minister is talking about the same report, so that shows how much priority it has. It is not a conservation matter. The current water rating policy is causing considerable concern and anger, understandably so, to people in the metropolitan and country areas of South Australia.

Mr BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 21 August at 2 p.m.