

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 11 September 1991

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

PETITION: WATER RATING SYSTEM

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to revert to the previous water rating system was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore.

Petition received.

PETITION: THEBARTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 240 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the Thebarton Primary School on its present site was presented by Mr Heron.

Petition received.

PETITION: FISHERIES ACT

A petition signed by 44 residents of South Australia requesting that the House reject the proposed amendment to section 37 of the Fisheries Act was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

PETITION: NET FISHING

A petition signed by 1 838 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to close the waters adjacent to Stansbury to net fishing was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

COUNCIL AMALGAMATION

In reply to Mr De LAINE (Price) 11 September.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: The proposal to form a single municipality was initially submitted to the Minister for Local Government Relations as a joint proposal by the three councils in December 1990, pursuant to section 26 of the Local Government Act 1934. The Minister then referred the proposal to the Local Government Advisory Commission for examination and recommendation. In May 1991 periodic elections were suspended for up to 12 months following a proclamation by the Governor in accordance with section 94 of the Local Government Act 1934, at the request of the three councils, and with the support of the Local Government Advisory Commission. The purpose of this was to enable a smooth transitional phase should the proposal to amalgamate the councils proceed.

The commission advertised the proposal between 23 January and 9 February 1991. Public comments were accepted until 1 March 1991. In total 112 submissions were received. The most common concerns of this respondents involved a perceived lack of community consultation on behalf of the three councils and a lack of information on the benefits or otherwise of the amalgamation. Councils involved now realise that the community requires a greater level of consultation and information on the proposal, and the commission understands that the councils are presently preparing this information prior to implementing a further community consultation program. The commission will convene a public hearing on the amalgamation after more detailed consultation has taken place at community level.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING FACILITIES

In reply to **Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh)** 22 August.

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: The State Transport Authority (STA) is aware of community concerns regarding safety in subways and, where practicable, is arranging for their closure. However, the pedestrian underpass on the tramline adjacent to Mavis Avenue, South Plympton, is structurally sound with an effective life of 30 years. As alternative at-grade pedestrian crossings exist 240 metres west and 230 metres east of the facility, the STA is unable to justify the cost of its removal and replacement with an alternative crossing at this time. Nevertheless, in response to the honourable member's request, the STA will include the underpass in its works program for replacement by a standard at-grade railway pedestrian crossing in due course when funds become available.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: COURT SUPERVISION ORDERS

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Family and Community Services)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: On 15 August 1991 the member for Morphett asked me a question on court supervision orders. As there has been further comment on this matter in the House, I am taking the opportunity of responding in this way rather than through the normal written answer process. I indicated that my understanding of the matters raised was different from that of the honourable member, and I undertook to get a considered reply for him.

It is difficult to provide a full answer to the question, as the honourable member appears to misunderstand the nature of (1) bonds with supervision, (2) guardianship and (3) the foster care program. In his question and explanation, the honourable member asked, 'Why is it that, when the Children's Court awards a bond with supervision which effectively places a child under his guardianship, the supervision of those children by the Minister through his department is virtually non-existent?' Initially, I would draw members' attention to the assertion that a bond with supervision is in effect guardianship. The honourable member went on to assert that, where children in foster care are placed on bonds with supervision, no supervision exists, except for that provided by the foster parents themselves.

I advise the House that, when the court places a child under a bond with supervision by the department, this does not entail placing the child under guardianship. It is not, in effect, guardianship. A child on a bond with supervision

can in fact live at home with his or her family and be subject to the authority of a parent or parents as well as subject to the direction of an officer of the Department for Family and Community Services with respect to the bond conditions. The honourable member's assertion that a bond with supervision effectively places a child under guardianship is quite simply wrong, and it demonstrates his confusion about the family and community services area.

Guardianship involves the assumption of all legal rights. Guardianship orders are normally used where a child is deemed to be in need of care, whereas bonds with supervision are related to offending. That separation between 'offending' and 'in need of care' has been in effect for the past decade. Foster parents are not used to provide supervision for offenders. The foster care (substitute care) program is used for children who cannot live with their natural family, generally because the level of care is not adequate. Children in foster care and under guardianship may have had no connection whatsoever with the juvenile justice system.

If, however, a child in foster care is also on a bond with supervision, that bond is supervised by an officer of family and community services and not by the foster parents. I also advise the House that a child in foster care need not be under my guardianship. When a child is placed on a bond with supervision, the relevant district office allocates the case to a social worker, to provide the supervision. Due to heavy workloads, there have been some instances where a young person has not been seen as regularly as planned. However, my department's restructuring has been designed to increase the number of direct service staff particularly to deal with this shortfall, and the new adolescent and family teams in district centres will take on this responsibility.

Rather than wait for the restructuring to be in place, the department's executive meeting of 13 August instructed district centres to anticipate the completion of restructuring by using existing staff working with youth to provide the necessary supervision ordered by court. Through the Court Social Work Unit, a monitoring system has also been established to identify and rectify any shortcomings in meeting court orders. In summary, this means that all bonds with supervision will in fact be supervised. Broadly the same issues have existed for children in foster care, except that the frequency of social work contact is much more geared to the particular foster care situation: a stable long-term placement, for example, can rely much more on the foster parent contacting the worker as required, and fewer scheduled social worker visits.

QUESTION TIME

HOMESURE

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Following figures provided in the Auditor-General's Report, how does he now justify his Homesure promise during the 1989 election campaign? At the 1989 election the Premier promised that Homesure would help 35 000 South Australian families with assistance of up to \$86 a month to help pay crippling home loan interest rates. In the election aftermath, many observers said it was this promise which allowed the Premier to cling to office.

The Premier put a cost of \$35 million a year on Homesure, but figures in the Auditor-General's Report show that, in the 18 months Homesure operated before being quietly wound up in June, it provided assistance of \$847 000 but

cost \$1.105 million to administer. I am advised that these figures mean that more was spent on administering rejection of applications for assistance than on helping home owners who genuinely believed they were eligible following the Premier's second sleazy election deal affecting home buyers.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We knew that it would not take long for the abuse to flow again. In the absence of anything positive to say, the Leader of the Opposition resorts to abuse of that kind—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —and the jackass sitting next to him tries to play it up as well. The issues surrounding Homesure have been fully canvassed and debated in this place, in another place and in public. It was a scheme devised to protect household mortgage holders from undue increases in interest rates and from the effect that such would have on the proportion of income in that household going towards servicing a mortgage. Those guidelines were laid down and the scheme made available. The fact is that the assessment of how many people would be eligible was obviously overstated. We used figures that were similar to the ones used by the Opposition in its calculations, and the Leader of the Opposition announced a grandiose proposal along similar lines that he had costed in a similar way. One sees in retrospect that the problem was not of the dimension that had been described. It is true, therefore, that the budgeted allocation for that scheme was not spent, and the reasons for that have been fully canvassed.

With regard to drawing attention to the administration costs of the scheme, I might say that a large proportion of that cost was devoted to getting information out to encourage people who were, in the broad statistics, seen to be eligible for that scheme yet were not applying for access to it. It was clear that out there in the electorate people did not have a full understanding of the scheme and its benefits. They were reluctant to apply, and far fewer people were devoting that percentage of their income to servicing mortgages than the general statistics had indicated. That is why quite a lot of money was spent. It was spent in part because the Opposition insisted that we were trying to hide the scheme, that we were hoping to get away with not paying it out by not telling anyone about it. That was not true. We spent a good deal of money informing people about their access to the scheme, and the fact that they did not respond is nothing to do with the Government or with our willingness to publicise it.

Finally, the scheme has been wound up. It was triggered at a certain level of interest rate. The current interest rate is well below that trigger point, and that is another reason why the money was not spent: soon after, into 1990, interest rates began to come down. Once they came down, access to the scheme, which was to protect those above a certain level, was simply cancelled out. There is no need for the Homesure scheme in those circumstances, because the current interest rate is below that level—the level which, incidentally, the Opposition also espoused. There was a lot of recycling and rethinking in terms of the Leader's question, and I totally reject the innuendo contained in it.

HOUSING TRUST HOMES

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction inform the House whether there have been any developments regarding heating of South Australian Housing Trust homes and, if so, what are those developments?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for her question and interest in this issue. It is one that all

tenants will be interested in, because in some areas, especially in the District of Stuart, there is a particular need for heating. We are aware from the review that a positive response is required in relation to particular areas throughout the State. I am sure that members will know to which regions I refer.

The Housing Trust has implemented the relevant recommendations of the review. In particular, we are looking at heating from gas. Since the review was brought down, the trust has continued discussions with the South Australian Gas Company in order to promote an equitable scheme for the leasing or sale of heating appliances to trust tenants. I am pleased to announce that agreement has now been reached on what appears to be a very favourable proposal to provide trust tenants with an opportunity to purchase a gas heater.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: You have your own heating problems. Basically, the Gas Company will provide an excellent financial arrangement for tenants, who, for about \$3 per week, can purchase their own appliance over three years on no deposit, interest-free terms. I am sure that members will welcome that and I am sure that the member for Stuart in particular will welcome that announcement. The cost will be recovered direct by the Gas Company through consumers' accounts. Again, that is another convenience that will be offered to tenants of Housing Trust dwellings.

I am sorry that the member for Mount Gambier is not present, because I am sure that he would be more than delighted with this announcement; his is one area in which we have been interested in finding a solution to a problem. Some of our surveys carried out in that area highlighted the need for a regular and cheap form of heating for Mount Gambier residents.

The scheme will be available to tenants across the State where there is reticulated natural gas. I understand that it is currently being instituted in Mount Gambier. I am sure that members who have that advantage will encourage their constituents to take up this opportunity. I say this because it is not confined to Mount Gambier: it is part of the whole State network that will be provided. The Gas Company will shortly be writing personally to tenants, providing details of the scheme for their consideration. I stress that it will be voluntary and apply to those areas that have reticulated natural gas supplies. I think it will be a marvellous facility for tenants in Housing Trust houses, particularly those people in areas that have a colder winter than perhaps we have in the city. I am pleased to announce that, and I am sure that members will be delighted to communicate that information to their constituents.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer, and I will take it very slowly so that he can understand and we can get an answer. What is the total value of SAFA's credit and market value risks and indemnities, and what is the nature of the risk which attaches to taxation indemnities given to third parties? I refer the Treasurer to pages 342 and 347 of the Auditor-General's Report.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer the honourable member to those appropriate pages and to the SAFA annual report.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Labour advise the House what action has been taken to combat the problem of alcohol and drug abuse in the workplace? Recently I was approached by a Government employee who sought the Government's policy in relation to drug and alcohol abuse, particularly pertaining to the policy on occupational health and welfare.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Albert Park for his question; he has had a long history of involvement in the effects of alcohol on workers and what it can do in the workplace.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Minister of Labour will give the answer, not the member for Chaffey.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Heysen should have his ears cleaned out and he may hear and learn something. The abuse of alcohol and other drugs naturally can cause major problems in the workplace. Of course, not only do we have the direct health effects of drugs on their users but also we have an increased risk of a workplace accident. This is especially true where machinery is involved in the workplace. The total economic cost of drug abuse in Australia is estimated at about \$14 billion per annum, 47 per cent of which is put down to smoking, 42 per cent to alcohol abuse and just 11 per cent to illegal drugs.

The problem is well recognised and is being tackled at a national level by employer, worker and occupational health and safety bodies. The South Australian Occupational Health and Safety Commission is monitoring these developments closely. A national conference supported by the Confederation of Australian Industry, the Australian Council of Trade Unions, WorkSafe and the Alcohol and Drug Foundation was held in Melbourne this year to look at ways of attacking the problem. One of the real issues is that, while drug and alcohol abuse is a danger in the workplace, most of the causes of that abuse are outside the workplace. However, managers need to ensure that any factors at work likely to add to or promote drug and alcohol abuse are reduced.

Employees suffering from drug problems should not be victimised, as that will not solve the problem. They should be assisted, counselled and supported through things such as employee assistance programs. Last week, at the launch of Alcohol Awareness Week it was my pleasure to present General Motors-Holden's Automotive Ltd with an award for its efforts in tackling alcohol problems in its workplace. This program enables workers to seek help for all manner of personal problems before they become a problem at work. The program was developed in consultation with unions, and Holden's has clearly shown the way for other employers on how to tackle this very serious problem.

FREE PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister of Transport confirm that the Government has scrapped its free public transport election promise and restricted tertiary student travel concessions to recipients of Austudy because the cost of the free scheme has significantly exceeded estimates? The Premier made the free transport for students promise in his 1989 election policy speech without consulting the STA. He put the cost at \$7.5 million a year at that time. However, figures in the Auditor-General's Report show that the cost of student concessions in 1990-91—the first full year in

which the free scheme operated—was \$21.6 million. The cost in 1988-89, the last full year before free travel was introduced, was \$9.1 million. Even allowing for inflation, this suggests that free student travel cost much more than the election estimate. Now 39 000 tertiary students are being forced to help make good the \$12 million blowout in cost.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As the question was framed, I should probably answer 'No', but I know that the House would be disappointed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The figure given in the Auditor-General's Report was \$21.588 million, which consists of the concession given to tertiary students and the total of the concessions given to primary and secondary students, including the former child category. Concessions in those categories in 1989-90 totalled \$14.907 million. The total in the same categories in 1990-91 was \$21.586 million, as pointed out by the Auditor-General, giving a difference of \$6.581 million, of which \$6.35 million involved the free public transport policy. Our estimate at the time the election promise was made was about \$7 million.

This year it is \$6.35 million. That estimate was pretty well in the ball park. I think there is some confusion among members opposite about what makes up the \$21.588 million, and I can only leave them to sort out that confusion. I hope that all members opposite, particularly those in rural areas, will note that free transport for school children in rural areas has not been affected. As I said, the cost for metropolitan students was \$6.35 million, while the cost for country students was close to \$20 million. I have always wondered why the Liberal Party has attacked a program—and attacked it viciously—costing about \$7 million, when they have never mentioned that it was close to \$20 million for country students. The member for Custance looks a little embarrassed. Perhaps that is a breakthrough; he ought to have been embarrassed over the past couple of years, but he has chosen not to be.

It is regretted that this particular concession has been modified somewhat, but, like no other Government policy I have seen implemented over the past 16 years, it has been under constant and sustained attack by the Liberal Party, in particular. Very few groups—if I can remember any—have supported it. As Minister of Transport I had one letter supporting the policy, but I had hundreds of letters opposing it. The member for Morphett, who was one of the leaders in attacking the policy in this place, hated the policy, as did the Hon. Diana Laidlaw in another place.

I have often thought that I was the only person in this State in favour of the policy and my powers of persuasion have kept it alive for 12 months. However, even with my powers of persuasion, I did not have one scrap of assistance on this—not from the National Union of Students, not from the South Australian Institute of Teachers, not from the United Trades and Labor Council. When this policy was under sustained and repeated attack, where were they? They were not supporting the policy, which has been modified severely, and I think that is a great pity.

As regards tertiary students, again, there has been a significant modification, and we do not run away from that. What we have done in this State is maintain the concession for those who, according to the means test, are in need. I would have thought that members of the Liberal Party, of all people, would have supported that; that the Liberal Party has a general policy against what has come to be known as 'middle-class welfare'.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is your policy, and that was confirmed today. I read in today's *News* a statement by the Opposition spokesperson in this area:

Miss Laidlaw says some students and their families, depending on income level, still should be encouraged to contribute to transport costs in a realistic manner.

All I can say to that is 'Hear Hear!' That is precisely what we are doing: 35 per cent of students in this State who have been means tested to be in the greatest need will still have the concession. I would have thought that we had a bipartisan policy on this matter, particularly after reading this press release from the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. So, let us have no hypocrisy in here; there is far too much of it. There is a need to better target Government concessions and assistance, and this particular policy is doing precisely that.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr HERON (Peake): Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of a proposal by the Opposition that recreation areas within the national parks system be transferred to the Department of Recreation and Sport?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am aware that the Opposition is proposing that we transfer recreation areas within the national parks system to the Department of Recreation and Sport. I want to put clearly on the public record the Government's position on this matter. I certainly would not criticise the Department of Recreation and Sport. In fact, officers from that department and my friend and colleague who sits next to me in this House and I work closely on a number of areas which relate to the whole concept of recreation and sporting areas, particularly within recreation areas in national parks. In fact, we have representatives on joint committees who look at some of the management proposals; and, indeed, our officers work cooperatively and positively. However, I would be reluctant to see recreation areas transferred out of the national parks system because quite obviously the officers within that system are trained to take care of the national parks and, indeed, the recreation parks.

Aside from the fact that recreational, open space areas help to provide park visitors with an integrated and holistic experience, the areas themselves provide a useful cash flow to the various national park districts and, in many cases, the major source of revenue for the General Reserves Trust. The reason for this is important. During the past financial year the General Reserves Trust has employed some 70 additional part-time parks staff to assist in providing visitor amenities and services in our more popular parks and reserves.

The assistance of these casual employees, aided by the thousands of volunteers from the various local friends of the parks groups, have allowed full-time staff to concentrate more on the tasks of wildlife management and of park conservation programs. In concluding, I believe that this proposal makes about as much sense as the allegation by the Liberal Party that national parks are a threat to the health of wildlife.

FOREIGN DEBT

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Why did the Treasurer say that none of the State's debt was owed to foreigners when SAFA's annual report reveals that overseas borrowings have just increased from \$1.96 billion to \$3.38 billion? On the 5AN Keith Conlon show on the Friday following the budget, a worried listener called and asked the Treasurer whether the

State's debt was owed to foreigners. Mr Bannon replied that none of the debt was owed to foreigners. It was stated that the \$3.38 billion borrowed by SAFA equates to every man, woman and child in South Australia being in hock to foreigners to the tune of \$2 337.66.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The context of that call was quite clear. It was based around the sort of xenophobia being expressed by the member opposite in respect of the assertion that, in some dangerous or sinister way, we might be in the hands of overseas creditors who own our assets. Of course, the fact is that SAFA has international money operations—it always has had. This State, from time immemorial, has had raisings on the international markets, and it will continue to do so. To say that the State is in hock to foreigners in that alarmist way is wrong; it is not the truth, and that is what I said to the caller.

RURAL ADJUSTMENT SCHEME

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Is the Minister of Agriculture considering making any changes to the rural adjustment scheme, which is run by the Rural Adjustment and Development Fund division within the Department of Agriculture? The Western Australian Government recently introduced a pilot program changing the criteria for financial assistance under part A of the scheme. Is the South Australian Government considering any changes to part A?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. He notes of course that the Federal member Mr Ian McLachlan has raised this matter, has written to me about it and has been given some press coverage. I have responded, and the point I want to make is that we are considering the scheme which has been put in place in Western Australia. The reason it has not been implemented in this State before now is, for a start, that part A is a capped scheme, and the Federal Government has not even provided sufficient funds to meet the lending program that we have put in place. We have had to top up that fund with State-held funds to enable the borrowing program to be put in place to help farmers get the money they need for structural readjustment in the rural industry.

The second point I want to make is that, if it does turn out that the funds are available under part A, we are prepared to consider it, but we are awaiting a further assessment of the Western Australian program. I want to make the point that the Western Australian program, which is organised by that State's Rural Adjustment Finance Corporation (RAFCOR) is still on trial. They themselves are not certain that this is the way to go. They advise us that to date 18 clients have participated in the program and that they have been given an average of \$3 500 each.

The other point I want to make is that, while the guidelines for part A allow funds to be used for this purpose, Mr McLachlan has identified only the grant element, whereas the guidelines refer to grants or loans. So, it could have been for loans. Another mistake is the suggestion that in South Australia we provide such funds only under the rural adjustment scheme part C. That is incorrect. The money we provide comes under the assistance for diagnosis of farmers' adjustment needs, and the rural adjustment coordinators are not funded under part C.

Another point that was a misreporting, attributing to Ian McLachlan statements that he did not make, concerns the fact that all the funds out of RAS, all the rural assistance surpluses, were going back into consolidated revenue. Ian McLachlan has written to me acknowledging that that was a misreporting in the journal that covered that story. How-

ever, I find one thing unusual, that is, it has taken a Federal member, who I would have guessed would be asking questions in the Federal Parliament about the Federal policies on rural assistance, to raise this question in the State arena. This made me wonder where the shadow Minister of Agriculture has been in terms of examining what should be happening with rural assistance. It was interesting to note that he was remarkably quiet and said few words on that matter yesterday.

A couple of things have helped to clarify my thinking on this matter as to why this would be the case. First, the very competence of the person involved would have something to do with it. I was interested to note that in the *Stock Journal* of 25 July this year the retiring President of the United Farmers and Stockowners was asked for his comment on the shadow Minister of Agriculture.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Custance knows it, enjoyed it and is looking forward to being the next shadow Minister of Agriculture.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule the Minister out of order on the basis of relevance and because he is debating the question.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I ask the Minister to come back precisely to the question, as per Standing Orders.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Really, I am wanting to know exactly what the shadow Minister thinks about Ian McLachlan's proposals, and whether he is suggesting we should be doing this. I acknowledge that Don Pfitzner did say that the shadow Minister did have an understanding of the rural crisis—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The Minister is clearly now debating the question. His comments have nothing to do with the question asked. The matter is being debated by the Minister and I ask the Minister to come back to answering the question that was asked.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Certainly, Mr Speaker, I appreciate that I must keep to the point. The shadow Minister does not keep to the point at all and it is so difficult to find anything he says that is relevant to agriculture in this State. Indeed, he himself indicated—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Goyder. Leave is withdrawn.

RURAL ASSISTANCE ADJUSTMENT

Mr MEIER (Goyder): If I abuse the privilege of the Parliament, I love to have a reply, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture, and we will see whether he can answer it. How many farms have been sold in South Australia in the past three months because of their lack of viability, and how many farmers have successfully sought carry-on finance under the revised Part B of the rural assistance adjustment scheme?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We have the Estimates Committees coming up shortly.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Last year the shadow Minister, who does not ask many questions, despite telling the UF&S that he is constantly asking questions, in the Estimates Committee asked detailed questions on this very matter, and we were able to supply him with pages of information. I would think that you, Sir, would advise that I should not be using this forum to supply pages of information but to use the Estimates Committees. I intend to obtain that information. Clearly, the honourable member requests information which is current and which involves applications that are in right now, and I could not be expected to know about them. Some people might have lodged an application only yesterday, for example. I would not want to be guilty of citing figures in this place which are not current and which are out of date. I will obtain the exact information available on the matter. I am reassured that the honourable member is taking an interest in this matter because, when asked earlier whether he wanted to be the shadow Minister of Agriculture, he said that he had reservations.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister is again debating the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister again debated the question. Leave is withdrawn. The member for Gilles.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PARKS VOLUNTEERS

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I direct a question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. The Opposition's recently announced policy on the environment promised a wider use of volunteers to contribute significantly to the protection of our wildlife. Will the Minister inform the House of any programs in which volunteers are involved in wildlife protection?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I know that other members in this place will be very interested to hear my answer. It is actually something which I believe is—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I would be delighted. I am sure that most people who are interested in conservation are aware of South Australia's outstanding Friends of Parks program. Indeed, the shadow Minister and I attended a most successful—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Who set them up?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am a bit worried about the insecurity across the Chamber; the honourable member is demanding instant gratification. It is quite amazing. Many of the 63 friends groups are involved in wildlife protection, mainly in the rehabilitation of habitats damaged by weed control and in replanting. However, an exciting new program has been developed by the Sporting Shooters Association of South Australia which has proposed to become a park friends group and to undertake a program of feral pest control concentrating on goats, donkeys, foxes, cats and pigs. The association will coordinate other shooter bodies to ensure a well organised and controlled approach to this program. It is also registering interest in assisting with native animal reintroduction and native flora regeneration.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am disappointed that the member for Murray Mallee is not supportive of the program. Indeed, I have in front of me an advertisement which

was authorised by the Sporting Shooters Association and in which it promotes the parks preservation project.

It also talks about preserving and protecting national parks. I believe that the association is to be congratulated on its interest and contribution. I think that it will be very much appreciated by conservation minded people in the community. It is a worthwhile project and adds another dimension to the conservation of flora and fauna. It will be an add-on to the 63 Friends of Parks groups which are operating so successfully in South Australia. It was the Opposition spokesperson who introduced Friends of Parks, but it was Penny Robertson who actually suggested the idea. I am delighted that we have such bipartisan support for these groups. They will continue to be successful in helping to preserve and protect the environments within our very extensive parks system.

OPERATION HYGIENE

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Has the Minister of Emergency Services or any member of his staff been informed that senior police officers are involved in organised corruption and that more than the 10 officers now being investigated under Operation Hygiene may be involved in organised theft? If not, how does he explain statements attributed to his staff that 'this could be bigger than Moyse'?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have not been informed by anybody that senior officers in the Police Department are involved in organised crime. I have been made party to a comment by the Commissioner that it may well be more than 10 officers who are being investigated. He made that comment publicly a day or so ago. If the honourable member has any information whatsoever about corruption in the Police Force, he should make it immediately available to the Commissioner instead of using it here for the purposes of political propaganda.

AGRICULTURE PORTFOLIO

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Agriculture report to the House whether his efforts to maintain adequate communications with South Australians employed in the agriculture sector of the economy have been successful, and has he any reservations about his portfolio similar to those cited by the shadow Minister in the *Stock Journal* of 13 June?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I do not have any of those reservations, but the comments that were made do need to be shared. On that occasion the shadow Minister said that he had reservations in that his appointment had concerned and disturbed him at the time. He was disturbed and concerned when the Leader of the Opposition appointed him as shadow Minister. I certainly was not: I was excited when I had the opportunity to be the Minister of Agriculture. I was also quite excited when he was appointed shadow Minister, but that is by the way.

I believe that our attempt to maintain communications with farmers throughout South Australia has been positive and active. The Premier himself has been involved. Indeed, next week the Premier and I will be going on another one of the series of joint visits that we undertake to talk with and listen to farmers as they tell us about the problems that they are facing and the issues that they see as being important. We intend to keep that up. I have maintained a regular program of visiting rural areas, as well as being as available

as a busy diary will allow to have meetings with farmers groups.

Naturally, one would expect the UF&S and the Government to spar on a number of occasions, and they have done and will continue to do so. Nevertheless, they do feel that positive lines of communication have been established. At least we talk and listen to each other, and I think we deserve better credit for what we do than has been attributed to the shadow Minister. When Don Pfitzner was asked what he thought of the shadow Minister, he said he was clearly annoyed with his performance. He asked, 'How can we answer this one without offending anyone?' When asked about the shadow Minister's role in agriculture, he said, 'I believe he has an understanding of the current crisis,' adding that he thought there was little else to be said.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TIMBER CORPORATION

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Premier in his capacity as Treasurer. Is it SAFA's intention to provide any further capital to the South Australian Timber Corporation this financial year in addition to the \$65.4 million already contributed, including \$16.1 million in 1990-91?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question of the provision of capital will obviously be looked at during the course of the year. The accounts of SATCO have been put before the House. Ironically, if one wanted to treat the accounts of SATCO in the way in which certain companies in the private sector have treated their results, namely, by excluding abnormal write-offs, members would see that, in fact, a profit was made in that area. However, the fact is that there have been some major write-offs, such as IPL(NZ) and, of course, the Scrimber project—

Mr D.S. Baker: From day one.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —which have received a great deal of publicity. Yes, 'from day one', says the Leader of the Opposition. From day one he worked to undermine and bring down that project. Now he feels some sort of triumph and takes a kind of pride in the fact that an attempt to find a downstream—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Coles interjects. She is meant to be part of this broader green movement. I would have thought that she would be enthusiastic for the fact that the thinnings of the forest, which at the moment have no commercial value or use, could be used in the scrimber process, which would mean considerable environmental and other savings in a worldwide process.

That has not been able to be brought off. The Leader of the Opposition has a great deal of satisfaction in that fact, as he is now able to claim, 'I'm vindicated. I've always said it was hopeless; I've told everyone it was; and so far it hasn't worked.' I think that is pretty rough on two counts at least. First, it is the Leader's own area that is involved. The forest industry and related employment is a vital part—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: He wants schools and hospitals.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, he does indeed, and if Scrimber had come off in the way in which it was meant to, there would have been, as there has been in past years, a major contribution to our budget that would help schools and hospitals. More importantly, the employment that would have been generated in the South-East, raising the general

prosperity of that community, would be something which his constituents—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader screams in outrage. His constituents ought to know a little more about the way he represents, or fails to represent, them. The second aspect—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A large number of these galahs who are interjecting—I had better not name individuals because I might misrepresent them—were crying out for the Government to put some money into a special high tech sheep shearing process. There was talk about it not being able to be brought to fulfilment through lack of funds. Instead of saying that the private sector should look after that project—this sturdy independence of the Leader of the Opposition—members opposite were demanding in this place and elsewhere that the Government put money into it. It would be fine for that project apparently, but when we embarked on the Scrimber project that was unacceptable. They cannot have it both ways. The Scrimber project has failed to date, so the Opposition can delight in that.

Let me get back to the other point of criticism of the approach to the Scrimber project. There is still value in the process. An enormous amount of money has been spent on the pilot stage, which was successful, and on the proving up of it on a large-scale basis. There is overseas interest in licensing, and commercial operations may be interested in picking up something there. No more State money will be put into it but, to the extent that we can market licences or other parts of the process or if we can get someone interested in investing, we will get some recoupment. Are we getting any assistance from the Opposition in this respect? Not a bit of it. The man who says that we should privatise things, the man who runs around saying, 'We'll give them to the private sector', is desperately talking down the project to ensure that the private sector is not interested. The last thing he wants is private sector investment. It is a disgraceful attitude, and to use the hapless honourable member from somewhere down south to fire his bullets is pretty disgraceful also.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I object to the word 'hapless'.

The SPEAKER: I am not aware that the word 'hapless' is unparliamentary. I do not believe that its use was unparliamentary. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am sorry if I offended the honourable member. To get back to the core of the situation, it was, in fact, a project that had enormous potential and a great deal of benefit. It was constantly undermined by some members opposite, while it was praised and supported by other members of the Opposition. At the end of the day, it has had to be written off. That is bad news and a bad thing, and it affects SATCO's results.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Again, the Leader of the Opposition interjects about New Zealand. Does he not recall the almost total destruction of the South-East forests in the 1983 Ash Wednesday bushfire? Is he not aware that the Woods and Forests Department had certain employment—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: He wanted to heap on the South-East community not just the impact of the destruction of the forest resource but also the loss of all the jobs in the sawmills because there was no product for them to

process. This Government was not prepared to do that and I do not think that the member for Mount Gambier was, either. This Government was prepared to look for any alternative source of timber to use to try to ensure that those mills kept operating and that there was employment.

For that attempt, all that the honourable member can do is fold his arms, sit back and interject in this absolutely non-constructive manner. It is quite disgraceful. We will look at SATCO realistically. The present Minister of Forests has worked decisively and effectively to deal with every single one of those problems.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If it were not for the fooling around, the undermining of the local community and the destruction of the commercial viability that the Opposition would like to wreak on it, we would be in a much better position today.

PORT THEVENARD

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Marine advise whether the State Government has refused to upgrade the port of Thevenard on the West Coast, or has it been decided to leave this job to the private sector by selling the port?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for Stuart for her question, and I appreciate all the advice I am getting by way of interjection from the member for Goyder. The Government has constantly indicated to the people of Murat Bay and the district council that it is our intention to operate that port into the future. We have also indicated to those people that we intend to operate that port in cooperation with the people who export grain, gypsum and salt from the port. We have proposed a levy to those users to cover costs of any major upgrades to that port, because some of the major upgrading suggested exceeds \$50 million. We have also said that we are willing to consider some form of joint venture with those port users for improving Thevenard. So far, those users have indicated that they are not willing to support any of those plans. We are committed to maintaining Thevenard as a viable port.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: We have no plans to sell this port or parts of it to anyone. We believe it is important to indicate this now, because I understand that the people of Ceduna are worried about the future as a result of an upset caused by the shadow Cabinet on a recent tour of the West Coast. Apparently, members of the shadow Cabinet refused point blank to put any money into upgrading the port; they said that they would just sell it off. The Penong branch of the Liberal Party stated in the local paper that it was not satisfied with the shadow Cabinet's statements, and the Leader of the Opposition said a future Liberal Government would not put any money into the port. He is quoted in the local press as saying:

I made it plain . . . there was no way we could become involved. Local opinion was summed up nicely by the Mayor of Murat Bay District Council, who said:
I thought it [the shadow Cabinet] was very poor . . . a shadow of a shadow.

The Government believes that Thevenard is a viable port and will remain that way, especially if the new era of self-unloading vessels takes off. We will not be selling it to the private sector, which will pick up only the profitable parts

of it and leave all the rest for the State to pay for. We have had offers for the grain belt and operations, but not offers to buy or even invest in expensive facilities such as the jetty. The people on the West Coast can remain assured that we will not sell off important community assets while we are in Government and while the shadow Cabinet remains a shadow.

STATE BANK

Mr SUCH (Fisher): In light of recent figures released by the Reserve Bank, will the Treasurer apologise for repeatedly misleading the House by his claims that the problems of the State Bank were similar to those of all other Australian banks? The annual report of the Reserve Bank states that in June 1991 the non-performing loans of Australian banks, including their overseas operations, amounted to \$29 billion or 5.5 per cent of total assets. The annual report of the State Bank reveals that the bank had a non-productive loans to assets ratio around four times the average of all Australian banks, which cannot fairly be described as 'similar'.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I stand totally by that statement. Every day that further information is provided—and we see this as the reports of banks are produced (and we are still awaiting a number of them; for instance, the reporting time for the State Bank of New South Wales was extended by some months, and I would be interested to see the result of that)—what I say is confirmed. I said quite clearly that one must not minimise or underestimate the problems of the State Bank, but one must put it in context. It is appropriate to put it in context.

I refer the honourable member today to the bank which has been hailed as one of the best run, one that, in fact, avoided the problems that afflicted the banks by and large in this last period, one that has just employed due diligence, issued a prospectus and shares to the public—the Commonwealth Bank. To illustrate my point, in this result declared today, it referred to a 122 per cent increase in its non-performing loans category. If one looks at the way in which it has treated those, one sees that it is looking at a 30 per cent provision as opposed to the 40 per cent plus provision in the State Bank of South Australia. I still say that one must look at the State Bank in context and not isolate it from what has been happening around the country. Every day those results are reported, what I say is shown as even more true.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. In recent days in this Parliament the word 'misleading' has been used with gay abandon by most members. Mr Speaker, I ask you to draw the attention of the House to Standing Order 127 regarding personal reflections on other members and that the phrase 'misleading the House' should be used only by way of substantive motion.

The SPEAKER: The word 'misleading' can be used in the context of a member's making a misleading statement or, alternatively, in the context of a member misleading the House. At a time when there is obviously much feeling in the Parliament, all members should be careful about the words they use. The words 'misleading' and 'defrauding', which was used yesterday and which I brought to the attention of the House, should be used carefully by members. The dignity of the House is the responsibility of the Chair and all members. I believe the use of words is important, and I ask all members to choose carefully the words they use in this House.

ROYAL SHOW DISPLAY

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning, the Minister of Water Resources and the Minister of Lands inform the House of the success of the Royal Show exhibit which was presented as a joint effort by her three departments and which highlighted the close relationship of the work of the departments, the Government and community organisations? One of my children visited the Royal Show with his class from school and, as part of his activities, followed the environmental trail. I was told that the exhibit was very popular with the children and with the adults who accompanied them.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed, it is important that we acknowledge it when we do things well. It seems to me that the credit must go to the staff of my three departments who organised the joint environmental exhibit and organised the environmental trail. The theme for this year's natural resources portfolio exhibit was 'Care for what we share'. I spent some time at the exhibit and was amazed by the overwhelming support from the community.

I can inform the House that we gave out some 20 000 environmental passports. Each passport was used not just by one individual: in some cases they were used by families of five people. If we consider that 20 000 were issued, and even if there was a factor of two or three, we are talking about a huge number of our community who visited not only the three stands of lands, environment and planning and water, but the 18 other organisations who joined with the departments to offer displays in an integrated educational experience.

I point out that this is only the second year that we have had the environmental trail at the show and already we have more than doubled the number of people who visited the trail. The other thing that is significant when we talk about the importance of the environment and the three departments in providing a public face to the community in respect of what the Government is doing in this area is that all the stands along the trail were inundated with inquiries. Many people commented on the benefit of having exhibits of interest for all members of the family, and I note that the honourable member picked that up in his question.

I have to say that the E&WS received a great response from the 7 000 people who drank the free sample of filtered water from the Happy Valley reservoir. Because of the hot weather, at times people were queuing to drink our water, and I am delighted to inform the House of that. The lands information, mapping and photography displays were excellent, as indeed was the whole habitat display showing where Bazza the Bunyip's habitat would be if it was in the wild. This year we chose not to use any of our native animals because we felt it would put them under undue stress. Instead—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I would have thought—

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We have seen today an exhibition by the Minister who has occupied the time of the House when this information would have been more appropriately put in a ministerial statement.

The SPEAKER: I take the point made by the member for Mitcham. I commented yesterday about ministerial statements. Again, I draw the attention of Ministers to access to ministerial statements, if it is possible, instead of taking up Question Time. I ask Ministers to consider that in future in respect of questions or ministerial statements.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The member for Mitchell asked me a question. I am sorry if I was a little lengthy, but I was carried away with the success of the exhibit. I apologise to you, Sir, and to the honourable member opposite. I have finished now and I thank the honourable member for his interest.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: FREE STUDENT TRAVEL

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr OSWALD: During Question Time this afternoon the member for Bragg asked the Minister of Transport whether he had scrapped the free public transport election promise and restricted tertiary student travel concessions to recipients of Austudy. In his reply the Minister stated in part:

It is regretted that the policy has, like no other Government policy I have seen over the past 16 years, been under sustained attack by the Liberal Party in particular. The member for Morphett was one of the leaders in attacking the policy in this place. He has a hatred of it. The honourable Diana Laidlaw in another place also has an absolute hatred of it.

That is a blatant misrepresentation of the truth. Indeed, the Minister made the statement while he was playing to university students in the public gallery. The resolution that I moved in this House early this year stated quite clearly that the policy direction should be to restrict the hours of free travel for students to legitimate school activity. The resolution clearly stated that students could still avail themselves of free travel for anything associated with school activities, including Saturday morning activities. For the Minister to stand up in this place and construe something to the contrary is a blatant misrepresentation of the truth.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Summer), the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese) and the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage (Hon. Anne Levy), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

MOTOR VEHICLES (REGISTRATION—ADMINISTRATION FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959; and to make a consequential amendment to the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and to make a consequential amendment to the

Stamp Duties Act 1923 to provide for an administration fee to be charged for motor vehicles registrations that are issued and renewed without fee pursuant to the Motor Vehicles Act and regulations. The administration fee is required to cover the costs to motor registration of recording vehicles to be registered without fee on the register, preparing and issuing registration labels and certificates and forwarding notices of renewal when the registrations are due. There is no recovery of these costs at present. The cost is estimated to be \$16 per transaction which is in line with current charges associated with processing transactions of a similar complexity.

The administration fee will recover approximately \$134 000 annually from 3 400 of the 13 500 vehicles registered without fee. It is proposed that the remaining vehicles, essentially Government-plated vehicles and vehicles owned by accredited diplomats, be exempted from the administration fee. Registration fees for Government-plated vehicles are paid by account and there are no individual renewals of registration or individual registration labels issued. Under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations consular offices are exempt from all States taxes and dues. Accordingly it is considered that an administration fee is not appropriate for these categories of registration. I commend the Bill to members.

Clause 1 is formal.

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

Clause 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 make minor amendments to, respectively, sections 16, 20, 21, 22 and 24 of the principal Act to include references to any administration fee that may be payable on an application to register a motor vehicle in lieu of a registration fee.

Clause 8 amends section 27 of the principle Act to extend the Governor's regulation-making powers in relation to registration fees to the making of regulations that prescribe administration fees to be paid in respect of applications to register motor vehicles entitled to registration without payment of registration fees.

Clause 9 mends section 31 of the principal Act to make it clear that the requirement that the Registrar register those classes of motor vehicles referred to in the section without fee is a requirement to register without payment of registration fees.

Clauses 10 and 11 make minor amendments to, respectively, sections 41 and 42 of the principal Act to make it clear that references in those sections to fees are references to registration fees.

Clause 12 makes a minor consequential amendment to the second schedule of the Stamp Duties Act 1923 to make it clear that a reference in an exemption provision to fees is a reference to registration fees.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 September. Page 711.)

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I speak today not for the people of Hayward, whom I represent with pride, but for all South Australians. I speak today not to a Government which, ostrich-like, has buried its eyes and ears in the sand for so long that it has become blind and deaf, nor to those commentators and power brokers within our community

who daily are willing to tell Joan and John Average what they think, gratuitously, even though their advice might vary so much from one week to the next as to be unrecognisable. I speak to and for those average South Australians who, like me, are appalled by what has happened to this State of which we were once so proud. I speak also to those members of this House who, like me, seek only to serve the interests of this State through diligent application, effort and intellectual endeavour on behalf of their constituents. In so doing I hope that I speak to at least one or two members opposite.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The budget that the Premier presented to this House on Thursday last affects the daily life of every citizen in this State. It is the most important effort of the Government in every year and it deserves the concerted deliberations of this House. Members opposite interject as they have done on previous occasions during this debate. Not long ago I heard the member for Walsh making some carping criticism. Unlike members opposite, my colleagues and I consider this an important and serious matter. In a sense of constructive criticism, I point out to those who bray and chortle around carrion that such creatures are normally known as jackals. I would not want that to be the epitaph of any member opposite.

Not long ago the member for Walsh, passing some carping criticism, as he has done repeatedly during this debate on the Appropriation Bill, deliberately dubbed my colleagues as silvertails, friends of big business and lackeys of the wealthy. I grew up in the electorate of Ross Smith, I attended Enfield Primary School and Adelaide Technical High School and I served in an electorate of honest hardworking South Australians who, by and large, would never be described as wealthy. Neither I nor most of my colleagues are silvertails. Those who seek to dismiss the serious commentary that we wish to make on those grounds demean not only themselves but the public expenditure that is involved every day in keeping this Parliament House open.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: Who wrote your speech—Peter Sellers?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you for your intervention, Mr Speaker. You remind me that the member opposite in this rich tapestry of life is just one dropped stitch.

I was born a stone's throw away from this building in the shadow of Mount Lofty. I have no greater ambition than to die on the plain on which I was born. My family has on all sides for four or five generations been members of the South Australian community. They have been teachers, manufacturers, engineers, doctors, physiotherapists, nurses, butchers, tradesmen, grocers and artists. In short, they have been the ordinary people of South Australia who have made this State what it is today. They have been the stock that Sir Thomas Playford galvanised to produce a modern industrial entity which was the pride of the people and the people's pride.

It is those people whom this Premier has betrayed. He comes into this House and presents a budget which attempts disgracefully to dupe those honest South Australians who make up this State's population. For his efforts he is neither pilloried nor derided in the popular press but hailed as some kind of conjurer or magician. Like most children I was fascinated by conjurers and magicians. Magic was always a bit of fun. However, when I grew up I put away childish things. It would have been better for this State had this Premier done the same thing. Unfortunately for this Premier and for those media commentators who think he is so clever, many South Australians find little joy in the conjur-

ing illusion which projects the failings and shortcomings of our generation onto our children and onto our children's children. While Pilate opposite washes his hands and the commentators applaud, his Party cries 'On our heads and on our children's children's heads.' But the public is in truth neither stupid nor easily fooled.

This budget is from a Premier to whom my colleague the member for Coles referred yesterday when she quoted his own words from his 1989 budget speech in which he claimed that he 'rejected the easy solutions which impose debt burdens on our children and the generation beyond'. How hollow now that rhetoric sounds; how far has the wheel turned.

At the centrepiece of this budget lies the \$2.2 billion bailout of the State Bank and the recurrent debt burden of \$220 million annually. As I have said previously in this House, \$2 000 million is a sum beyond the imagining of a normal person. For the benefit of members opposite and so that I might illustrate the profound problem that we have created for ourselves, I wish to draw a number of allusions.

Trucks take 7 440 26-ounce bottles or 720 dozen bottles of beer. These trucks are 6 metres long. If they were parked bumper to bumper, to carry two billion bottles of beer, the column would need to stretch from Adelaide to Sydney and beyond. Assuming that Football Park was covered with loaves of bread (I am disappointed that the member for Albert Park is not present, because he has an understanding of Football Park, if nothing else) and they were piled one upon another until two billion loaves were accumulated, the height of that pile would be twice the height of the State Bank building. Further, if \$1 was paid to a member of this House for every minute since 13 July 100BC, on which date Julius Caesar was born, that pile of money would not have amounted to half the debt of the State Bank.

Finally, in case members still fail to comprehend the enormity of the problem, if every railway sleeper in the entire rail system of this country were counted, there would not be two billion. That lies at the basis of this budget—the debt which has been haplessly created by inefficient management.

Members opposite have sought to confuse the issue by clouding the failings of this Government with previous levels of public debt. In doing so, they blithely ignore the times and the interest rates that were payable on that debt. More importantly, they ignore one central and important fact, which I challenge any of them to deny today: debt which was incurred in the past was to provide roads, schools, hospitals, bridges and other infrastructure of Governments.

Members opposite allude to the Playford era and feign mock horror at the debt levels of that time. All South Australians remember that era with pride. They remember well that that debt established ETSA, built Elizabeth, built the infrastructure for Whyalla and its shipyards and steel yards, opened the Leigh Creek coalfields and changed South Australia from an agrarian backwater to an industrial State. This debt about which they spoke in the Playford era was accumulated in an era in which in one year alone we saw over 1 000 new factories and businesses opening their doors for trading in South Australia. We have not seen its like since under any Labor Administration. I would point out that the big proportion of this debt was lent to this State Government by the Commonwealth Government of the day led by none other than the Right Hon. Ben Chifley, who is so beloved by members opposite. The debt was repayable at an interest rate of about 4 per cent. Let members opposite tell people in South Australia today what monument there is to the debt of \$2 000 million which they now know. The

State Bank tower may prove to be their mausoleum, and it is worth just a fraction of that.

The money about which this budget is concerned was callously squandered through what could most charitably be described as poor management practice. It helped not one pensioner, not one student, not one elderly or disabled person: it went into subsidising the fairytale dreaming of corporate cowboys and others who thought they could become richer by the artificial creation of wealth built from the borrowings of others. It has lined the pockets or fed the dreams of those very silvertails who are supposedly so beloved by members on this side of the House.

So we come to the social truth of this budget. Opposite sits a Government whose politics at Federal and State level have for a decade seen the decline of the vast middle classes in Australia while the rich become super rich and the poor sink to levels of poverty which would be the pride of any third world country. This Government may, and does, trumpet social justice, but the judgment of history on this Government will be very different. We do not beat about our support for the poor and oppressed: members on this side of the House can and will try to do something about it. As my Leader so ably pointed out yesterday, in government we would have a positive approach that would give greater social justice to all South Australians. We would not be afraid to govern without fear or favour for all South Australians. Unlike members opposite, we would not pander, either wittingly or unwittingly, to the dictates of power obsessed bureaucrats or to the false illusions of would-be multi-millionaires.

This budget does nothing for the people of South Australia except cheat on them and sell them short. I and every member of these Opposition benches are proud to be South Australian. We will not desist from our criticism in this matter until this Government becomes accountable to all South Australians. This nation faces a new millenium and it demands of its leaders that they show the prophetic vision which, at the turn of the last century, galvanised six separate States into one indivisible nation.

After the last election, the Premier claimed that he had heard the people's voice. He promised flair and light, but what accomplishments have we seen? We have seen despair and darkness; people without hope and people without real ambition. How long did the Premier's home loan scheme last? Where now is free student travel? What was the cacophony of sound on the steps of this House as we came in to Question Time? Was it people praising the Premier for his noble accomplishments? I think not.

Who now in South Australia pays the piper? It is not Premier Bannon but those who need assistance in public housing and who will now be obliged to pay for excess water; those who sicken and die in appalling conditions while the much vaunted Health Commission fails them; or future generations whose educational standards have been eroded daily by this Government.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

MR BRINDAL: I note that the member for Henley Beach has risen from his newspaper. I point out that a species of fish once existed off the coast of the honourable member's electorate that bears a very close resemblance to him: as it grows older, it looks more and more ferocious, it gets a hump on its back and enormous teeth but, like the snapper that he so closely resembles, the honourable member is largely harmless, so I will ignore him.

MR FERGUSON: I must raise a point of order, Mr Speaker. The honourable member is dragging red herrings into the debate.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: I thought for a minute that the honourable member was going to snap at me. The Premier has dishonoured those Liberal and Labor statesmen who have so nobly held the office of Premier before him. In this budget he brings dishonour and discredit not only upon himself but, more appallingly, upon this House and upon every person in South Australia. I am surprised that under these circumstances we can be treated to the daily spectacle of the Premier's coming into this Chamber and abdicating his public responsibility before those to whose service he is pledged. The media may applaud and exalt the tricks of a new Mandrake; however, I see him for what he is—he is a nurse who is content only to smooth the pillow of the dying patient. I, with every member of this House, am appalled because the patient can and should live.

In the presentation of this budget, the Government has amply demonstrated that it has neither the desire nor the inclination to see the reality of the financial situation for what it is or to hear the people. I will not bother to join the rightful chorus of those who have demanded this Premier's resignation, because I do not believe in acting in anger and, today, I am angry.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Some people are more to be pitied than censured. If the Premier's resignation should be called for—and I believe that it should and that members have the right to do so—it should be done in the cold light of reasoned argument, something which I have done on more than one occasion before today as the record of this House shows. However, I will not do so today because, as I said, I am angry. Today, I shall rest content to consign the Premier to history, as history is the best judge of all things and has the habit of colouring even colourless men and their more colourless Governments. History shall colour this Premier and this Government black.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): After reading the press of the past few days, one could be forgiven for wondering what the object of some of our illustrious press representatives might be in this State, especially when we read articles such as the one written by Rex Jory which suggested that, given his budget the other day, the Premier was a financial wizard. The story went on to say that there was only one tax increase, which related to petrol. How short a memory has this journalist? It was only a matter of about two months ago that, during a period of some two or three months, the Government increased about 800 taxes and charges.

I would have thought that the financial situation confronting South Australia and the rest of Australia at this time was extremely serious, yet supposedly leading political journalists are writing stories saying that there is virtually no problem, that things are fine and that the Premier is a financial wizard. If ever there was a need to return to some basic, solid administration and financial management in this State, it is certainly right now. As the Leader indicated, one could do a lot worse than to return to the style of leadership and management of the Treasury as seen in the days of Sir Henry Bolte and Sir Thomas Playford, rather than the entrepreneurial style of premiership that we have seen in the past six to eight years.

We have seen the rise and fall of many entrepreneurs in the 1980s. The Premier believed that it was all too easy, that he could join in that flurry and that all the benefits would go to South Australia. What are we confronted with

today? The taxpayers in South Australia are confronted with a massive increase in the State's debt, an increase in the past 12 months of roughly \$2 500 million of additional debt—just on the State Bank alone. The taxpayers will have to find \$220 million annually just to service this debt with no repayment of capital whatsoever; it is an ongoing debt that will be handed on to the next generation. Yet, this journalist says that the Premier is a financial wizard. I am afraid that my local bank manager would not adopt the same attitude towards me in relation to my little farming pursuits if I operated on the same basis. In fact, he would regard me as a no hoper and would say that the sooner I was off the property, the better.

As the Leader of the Opposition said in reference to some of the leading entrepreneurs who have failed during the past three or four years, at least they have acknowledged their failure and resigned. That is the fundamental difference between entrepreneurs in the private sector and the Premier of this State. He will neither accept that he has failed nor resign, no matter what are the consequences for South Australia. One can look in many different directions to see the disasters that have occurred. We have the State Bank debacle. The Leader has clearly indicated what the Opposition would do in that situation. We would offer it to the employees of the bank and then to the people of South Australia. We would enact legislation that would ensure that the State Bank remained based here in South Australia and it would do a great deal to relieve the current tax burden on the people of this State.

Let me consider what we could do with \$220 million annually. For example, I refer to the Riverland. As I have said on numerous occasions, the rural sector of South Australia still produces 50 per cent of the State's income—its wealth—even though less than 30 per cent of the population lives in country areas. However, there is a crying need and a recognition of the fact that we have to become more efficient in the country. Particularly in the irrigated areas, we need modern irrigation distribution systems and modern on-farm irrigation practices. However, the Government has repeatedly said that there is no money to upgrade the irrigation infrastructure in this State, even though the rural area is a considerable income earner for the State.

Yet suddenly, out of the blue, the Government can find \$220 million, which it is squeezing out of the taxpayers, to meet its failures. A few million dollars would have rehabilitated the irrigation areas, would have dramatically increased the productivity of the irrigation industries in this State and would have returned a considerable increase in profits to the State and to the Treasury. But, no, that could not be done. Consequently, we still have an antiquated Government irrigation system in about 40 per cent of the Government irrigation areas of this State.

Once again, out of the blue, as a result of the Government's massive failures in financial management, it can just draw another \$220 million out of the taxpayers, and the State and the people will not receive a single dollar in return. It is merely \$220 million worth of ongoing failure on the part of this Government. That in itself is a tragedy. If for no other reason, no Government in the past would have ever considered remaining in office, and the Premier and Treasurer of the day would have resigned as a matter of principle—a principle that is well established and has been in existence for many hundreds of years under the Westminster system, but that principle seems to have been completely thrown out of the window.

We have the Minister sitting on the other side of the House who has been in charge of the Scrimber project in the South-East, involving another \$50 or \$60 million loss

to the State and the taxpayers. Had that occurred under any previous Government, the Minister would have been honour bound to resign. But, no, the Minister still sits there and tells the House, 'I have no knowledge of the Scrimber project. Why should I resign? I knew nothing about it.' The Minister is responsible and he cannot blame the Chairman, the directors or anyone else, because that is the way the Westminster system works. However, that has all been completely thrown out the window, and the South Australian Government is possibly the only Government operating under the Westminster system that has totally disregarded that tradition. That system has stood the test of time, but it is rapidly being destroyed by the Bannon Government.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: He didn't recognise where the buck stops.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Everyone else does, but it appears that the Minister and the Premier believe that for some reason it does not apply to them. I turn now to the problems of WorkCover. Of course, that has been another piece of wizardry—to use Mr Jory's terminology—introduced in this Parliament by the present Government. It has taken only a comparatively few years for that operation to amass a massive unfunded liability. I suggest to the Government that the WorkCover legislation should be amended. WorkCover should remain, inasmuch as it should be a nucleus of highly competent people acting as insurance brokers and farming out insurance cover to the 10 or 12 insurance companies at the best competitive figure available. Rather than WorkCover's trying to act as an insurance company, it should be acting as an insurance broker and seeking the best deal obtainable in the private sector in this State.

That in itself would provide the competitive edge necessary to make anything work efficiently. Unfortunately, no matter which Government operations are involved, they are, in the main, monopolies; they are not operating in competition with any other organisation in the field. Consequently, their performance is never up to scratch. The Government is there basically to provide essential services. Any area that can effectively be covered by the private sector in competition with other organisations should be left to the private sector. I suggest to the Minister and the Government that they look seriously at restructuring WorkCover so that it operates more as an insurance broker with a highly skilled, competent nucleus of people who have the professional ability to act in that field. It would not do the Government any harm to consider this: it has been tried in other places and has worked extremely well.

I now refer to the area of Government services, infrastructure, or whatever one likes to call it, in the form of making greater use of capital works or of the capital available for this purpose. I have recently come across a situation in the Riverland involving the Blue Light discos, which are run by the Police Force—another Government instrumentality—and which are doing a magnificent job in the interests of the young people of this State. Their results have been quite outstanding and I have no doubt that in providing supervised entertainment, they are operating in the best interests of the young people of this State. We recently had a situation in the Riverland where, because of other events taking place, insufficient buses were available to bring the young people of the Riverland to the central point at Berri. An approach was made to the Education Department for the use of some of the department's buses, which were lying idle in school yards and certainly not being used on that particular evening.

However, when the approach was made to the Education Department, the reply was an adamant 'No'. The buses

provided by the Education Department are used in the morning and in the evening to take children to and from school. However, let us not lose sight of the fact that those buses are provided and financed by the taxpayers of this State. The taxpayer also finances all the other Government instrumentalities in this State.

Until we get to the point of making greater use of the facilities and resources available to us through the Government, rather than the Education Department's standing on ceremony and saying that those buses belong to it and that they will not be used by the Police Force in the interests of the young people of this State, we will have an absolutely absurd situation. I hope that the Minister of Education will send out a directive that in similar situations in the future those buses, when requested, will be made available, because most of the buses are driven by qualified schoolteachers who, I have no doubt, would volunteer their time in the interests of the operations of Blue Light discos.

These discos have been a magnificent success, and the contribution made by police officers through that program to the well-being of the young people must be commended. One can only shake one's head and wonder what it is all about when one Government department denies another Government department access to its resources simply because they happen to belong to a particular department and are said to be not for use by another. The Minister at least ought to discuss this issue with the rest of his Cabinet colleagues so that we can make greater use of the resources available to us which belong to the people of this State, having been provided by them as taxpayers.

In overseas countries far greater use is made of the resources provided by the people of the country concerned. Schools are used not only for two day shifts, that is, in the early morning and the afternoon so that double the number of students can be put through but also at night for the benefit largely of the adult population. That is making greater use of the available resources that have been provided by the taxpayer. Until we in this State get to that point, where we get value for money from the facilities provided by the taxpayers, we will continue to see the farcical situation that we have seen in the past 12 to 18 months of assets being totally under-utilised and the resources of this State building up with less and less use.

We have touched briefly on the Scrimber project in the South-East and on the State Bank. Other areas, involving SGIC and the Timber Corporation, could be highlighted at great length. The comments made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition have the total support of members on this side; we will put our policies into effect in government, and the benefits to the taxpayers will be enormous. Further, we on this side totally support the concept of the consumption tax as being proposed by the Federal Opposition. That in itself will be an enormous incentive to that section of the community prepared to work 10 or 12 hours per day because, on that principle alone, there will be an incentive, a reward at the end of the day: it will not all be swallowed up in income tax.

At the moment, in this country there is the silly situation where numerous members of the community are prepared to work hard but they will not do so under the present taxing situation because they finish up paying half their efforts away in tax to support, in many instances, others in the community who are just not prepared to put the same effort into this country. The Prime Minister and the former Treasurer know only too well that that is the way to go, and they were determined to go down that path until the unions told them it was not on; they backed off at 1 000 miles an hour. I have no doubt that after the next Federal

election, if by some strange course of events the present Hawke Government were to be returned, it would introduce a consumption tax within six months of being returned to office.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I am as concerned as most South Australians about this State's economy. I do not think anyone accepts the argument—except perhaps the Premier himself (although deep in his heart he would not accept it) and a few of his colleagues—that it is not the Premier and his colleagues who are to blame for our State's position. Anyone who is managing the State has the task of making sure it does not drift into a major economic crisis. That is what it is: it is the greatest crisis per head of population that has ever faced any State in Australia.

Even those living in the 1930s would not have dreamt that a Government would have allowed such organisations as the State Bank, SGIC or Scrimber to amass such huge debts. There is no doubt that in a traditional Parliament any Minister responsible for an organisation like Scrimber who had not been near the place since it was opened (having gone there to get the glory of opening it) would have resigned automatically in the circumstances because it is indeed a failure on the Minister's part.

The figure of \$60 million is involved—money that could have been used on projects important to people, for example, housing, water and sewer main replacement and extensions, and the upgrading of public buildings. Or we could try to create other jobs by reducing State taxation, which is penalising so many businesses and putting them, their employees or their potential employees out of work and, very often, the businesses out of business. Today's *News* contains an article on street youth as we know them in our community, as follows:

Mr Keneally dismisses suggestions street kids have nowhere to go, claiming that many medium to long-term shelters are under-utilised. But he stresses this is no fault of the shelters' management.

And he says many of the youths over 16 squatting in the inner-city can be financially quite well off, receiving the JobSearch allowance and unemployment benefits yet not having to pay rent.

'The majority of kids on Adelaide's streets may have been victims of horrific circumstances but to say they have nowhere to go is an absolute fallacy,' he says.

'It is a difficult concept to grasp but in one sense many remain there by choice and getting them off the street is virtually impossible unless they want to go.'

When that was said by people like me about two years ago some people got upset and said I was being cruel. I have no doubt that the vast majority of those young people could go home to their parents if they wanted to. They have reasonable homes and could live there if they were willing to abide by some rules or perhaps, as I said before, they could ask their parents whether a window could be made into a door so that they could come and go with more freedom than they think their parents allow them to have or as much as they want. Certainly, we would then not have as many problems as we seem to have at the moment.

In essence, we spend money on community welfare advisers and others in that field. They provide counselling that in a way encourages young people to leave home. It certainly does not encourage them to stay at home. I can give an example in my area of a constituent who wrote to me a while ago (not within recent times). The constituent was to have a meeting with her daughter who had left home to live with a young man. They were to discuss the situation in the presence of a departmental officer. The parents were not told where the daughter was, but on the day of the supposed meeting they received a call from the officer saying that the meeting was off.

When my constituent asked why the meeting was off, the officer said, 'We have spoken to your daughter and her boyfriend and we believe that you are unsuitable parents.' However, the officer had not even interviewed the parents. It is in such areas that we are spending money, supporting people who really have no concern about the family unit. I find that difficult to accept when we talk about the debt that the country carries, and especially the debt the State carries through inefficient and bad management by a Government that is supposed to be managing it.

That philosophy has had control of this State through a Government in office with a minority vote, as is the case now, for a majority of the past 25 years. Certainly, we have had 20 years of it. The Government has failed, although I admit that modern people often are easily conned through television, smart advertisements, fancy words, a nice glamorous look, a neat hairstyle and fancy suits. In other words, it is an image thing. Politics has reached a point where management means nothing, as long as you have a glib saying or you can con people just before an election with a fancy promise or the buying off of an area of the department—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Buy their vote.

Mr S.G. EVANS: There is a promise to buy their vote, but the Government does not deliver the goods afterwards. People will complain for 12 months after an election but then four years later they are bought by the same smart alec gimmicks once again. I hope that many young people now realise that honesty, straightforwardness and frankness about what we face in the future is what they want. We face a difficult time and many young people realise that.

I want to refer to another area of mismanagement, although I promised that I would not take my full time so that the Premier can finish his reply before 6 o'clock. I ask the Premier whether it is a fact that last September Crown Law gave an opinion that the South Australian Institute of Sport coaching contracts were illegal and that payments should not be made. However, payments were made on those illegal contracts, even though Crown Law said that they were not valid. I am advised, and the Premier can tell me whether this is right, that subsequently Treasury ruled that the payments were not to be made. I cannot confirm the date, but perhaps the Premier can do that.

Certainly, I would like to know who gave the instruction that those payments were to be made. More recently, a second Crown Law opinion has been given that the contracts are invalid, yet people are still working under those contracts. Is that not deceitful and ignoring the law? If one did that in private enterprise, one would be sued.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: And deservedly so.

Mr S.G. EVANS: And, as my colleague says, 'Deservedly so.' In this case, the money comes from Treasury, and the Treasurer should know the details. Certainly, he fails one way or the other: either he knew and did nothing about fixing up the contracts, or else he did not know because he does not have the ability to manage.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Perhaps he doesn't want to know.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am confident that my colleague is right: the Treasurer knows, but he would not want to know. I challenge the Premier to say what is wrong in that area. Further, I ask the Premier whether the person appointed as the CEO was put there to try to straighten out the situation. I have respect for that person and I will not name him. Is that officer's task to try to straighten out the situation without the public finding out that money has been spent illegally, because the contracts are illegal?

At the same time, I believe an inquiry is going on in respect of misappropriation of funds and possible nepotism

at the Institute of Sport. As a Parliament we must be concerned if a Government will not immediately act if something like this occurs. I am advised that that is the case—although I have not seen the Crown Law opinion—that two opinions say that the contracts are not valid. I ask the Premier, when he replies to the debate, to say what is happening at the Institute of Sport. It is no good the Treasurer saying that it is the responsibility of another Minister, because the cash comes through his department.

I want to refer to one or two other matters briefly. In an electorate such as mine encompassing part Hills and part plain there is a massive problem with the police having insufficient resources. The police tell us that they are doing a good job. They have to. The police cannot criticise the Government, especially a Government that is willing to take out the whip and penalise people by different methods if they speak out, as explained by the member for Fisher yesterday in the case of a school in his area about which the truth was spoken and the school then had the heavy hand put on it by departmental officers.

I accept that the police have to say what they are saying and that they are doing the best they can with the resources provided, yet the Premier sits idly by and allows \$2 200 million to go down the drain in one hit and \$60 million in another hit, as well as anything up to \$300 million with WorkCover plus SGIC. He then tells us that we do not have enough money in the State to pay the Police Force or to equip it properly.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: It is the best and the largest—

Mr S.G. EVANS: The Minister claims it is the best equipped and the largest Police Force of the States. How can the Minister say that when a group of louts can go to a recreation centre and disturb and abuse people on the badminton courts and then go outside and jump on car bonnets and kick in doors and do thousands of dollars of damage and it takes the police 50 minutes to get to the scene? How can the Minister say that that is good enough?

The Minister should ask people in the community whether it is good enough. What about the woman who rang the police and said that there was a person in her backyard after midnight? So far as I know, to this day (according to the police sergeant who phoned me recently) that woman has not been visited by the police. We pay for that. It is disgusting that this woman had to sit up and watch for two hours while a person was in her backyard saying that she should not worry and he was not going to harm her, while he was still trying to get inside.

The Minister tells me that I should not worry, that it is the best and the best equipped Police Force in Australia and has no problems. If it does not have enough resources to do the job effectively, we need to equip it, and the same applies right throughout the system. With a \$2 200 million loss in the paperchase, the Minister of Emergency Services and the Premier stand condemned. I have no qualms with the big paperchasers in the corporate sector. I wrote to Mr Murdoch about four or five years ago. In a three page letter I said that I had no time for the way that the corporate sector was operating and that, in fact, it was causing some of the problems that we were experiencing. I spent money in my electorate, allocated in the budget, to send that letter. He did not answer it. I am not a supporter of Mr Bannon as a paperchaser, thinking that he will make a fortune through the State Bank—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davernport must refer to members by the title of their office and not by their name. I also draw his attention to the topic of the Bill.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I apologise, Sir. The Premier is paid from the budget, and the money he uses for his car and electorate and ministerial offices comes out of the budget, which is part of what we are talking about. The Premier has a responsibility, yet he set out on a paperchase, as did others, and failed. He knew what was going on and authorised many of the transactions, but in the process he let down the State. The best thing that the Labor Party, State and Federal, can do for those whom they say that they traditionally support, namely, the workers, is resign.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to again contribute to what should be the most important debate to which the Parliament addresses itself, namely, the budget. We are about to agree to the Government having the authority to spend some \$5 700 million of hard-earned taxpayers' money. I suppose the real debate that will take place in Committee will be whether the Government is spending this money in a manner conducive to development, employment and stabilising the long-term situation for the citizens of this State. My constituents, who produce a large portion of the State's and nation's wealth, will receive very little from this budget—very little indeed. However, they will pay a lot in return for the Government's mismanagement. My concern is that, out of the \$5 700 million, my constituents will not have their port facilities upgraded and will not get better roads. We have to fight to keep the schools open and to maintain the kindergartens, with people going bankrupt on a daily basis. However, they will not get very much.

Today we witnessed the spectacle in this place of the member for Stuart, who obviously does not have enough questions to ask about her own district, taking it upon herself to ask a Dorothy Dix question of the hapless Minister of Marine. We know that he is not particularly bright and has to surround himself with a number of officers wherever he goes. I well recall his visit to Ceduna and the Port of Thevenard where it was put to him quite clearly that he needed to do something about the situation there. He gave a grumpy reply and has done absolutely nothing. It is the same as what Paddy shot at—absolutely nothing! Yet, he had the audacity to stand in this House today and mumble in his beard about the alleged activities of the Liberal Party when in Government.

The member for Stuart and the Minister ought to realise that the Liberal Party supports the upgrading of port facilities in this State because it recognises clearly that, if this country is to survive, it must do something to assist exports. There is not much point spending \$15 million on the Museum—what will that do to create employment? Absolutely nothing! We need not have spent \$5 million for a group of odd bods in the old Fowler building on North Terrace. There is nothing in that for the long suffering taxpayers. There will be no benefit whatsoever to the long-term employment prospects of the people of this State—absolutely nothing.

The South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling Company—one of the most successful organisations in this State with a record second to none throughout the world in handling grain, which brings in so much revenue and creates so many jobs in this State—offered to buy from the Government the unloading facilities because it knows that this Government will not spend one cent on an upgrading program. The company would have upgraded the facilities to double the loading capacity, but in a most grumpy and offhanded response to the manager of the company, the Minister rejected the offer. He did nothing. We make no

apology for saying that that excellent private enterprise company could run those facilities much better.

The Minister also refused to do a detailed costing on upgrading the facilities. He had a survey done but not a detailed costing. The Liberal Party has said that it will do it and will provide through SAFA the money to upgrade the port so that users can make the necessary repayments. We want to see the port upgraded. We recognise and understand that the size of ships is increasing. One has to meet the demands of the purchasers who supply the ships to carry the barley and the wheat to the various ports. We know that the size of these ships is increasing and that trials have been carried out involving ships calling in there to offload and transfer the grain. It must be clearly understood that producers in this area are working on a very fine margin. If they are forced to continue to pay for two port loading or for their grain to be transported to Port Lincoln, the viability of many of those people will come into doubt.

I challenge the Minister, the member for Stuart and the Government to say how much they will spend on the port this year, next year and the year after. I guarantee that they will not have the courage to stand up and tell the truth, because we know that they will not spend anything. However, an incoming Liberal Government will take steps to improve the facilities. I call on the Minister to outline what steps he will take to upgrade the facilities. I suspect that he has nothing to say, and that the Government, with little regard for the people in that part of the State, will hide behind its usual smoke screen.

I wish to refer to a number of other matters. I am concerned because every South Australian family will be paying \$4 600 to cover the mistakes of the State Bank. When the Leader of the Opposition replied yesterday in the debate we were expecting that some of the so-called enlightened members of the Government would respond and indulge in a decent economic debate. Instead, the hapless member for Napier got to his feet. The honourable member has never been noted for being an economic genius or even for being able to read a balance sheet, let alone understanding a complicated set of documents such as the budget. However, the member for Napier has suddenly become the financial genius of the Government, the spokesperson on economic affairs. Here he was—elevated to this new position. He certainly did not address himself to the budget, as he obviously did not understand it. He failed to appreciate, as has the Government, that a fine long-standing institution in the State Bank has been ruined—destroyed for all time.

The State Bank will be a burden around the neck of taxpayers. Future generations will be bogged down with paying for that facility and adequate and ongoing development in South Australia will be the loser. As between 1979 and 1982, the Liberal Party will have to get rid of some of the albatrosses that the State is carrying. I have always believed that there is a place in the economic structure for the Government to have a window to the banking sector. Unfortunately, one has to be a realist and recognise that we cannot continue to spend \$220 million every year just to pay for mismanagement. That money should be directed towards improving our export oriented industries, building schools and hospitals and other such important exercises, including providing houses for people.

There are not enough police. While we have the albatross of the State Bank, there will never be enough money. Taxes will continue to rise. We could talk about the SGIC. On a daily basis we are going to see Labor members, like the foolish member for Napier, spruiking and asking us for our stance. We have been absolutely straight with the South Australian people as regards what we intend to do. We have

not been using the sleight of hand trick that the Labor Party has been using. We all know that, no matter which Party is in government, the State Bank will be sold. It is a reality, and we all know it. It is like a goods and services tax. It does not matter which Party is in government in this country, a goods and services tax will be imposed, because it is the only way that we can get some commonsense taxing arrangements put in place. At the end of the day, people must face realities. Taxes are too high. Do we want to get unemployment down, and do we want to get people to invest and to work hard and to create the opportunities that we should have in this country? Those hard decisions have to be made.

We cannot accept the word of the Prime Minister. His own Treasurer could not trust him, because he is the same member of Parliament who promised the people that there would not be a capital gains tax. We know what he did in that regard. We know what ongoing effects that will have on small businesses and the farming community. It will devastate them in future. Let us not have any more of this double standards nonsense that we have had to take from Governments, both Federal and State. If the Government were honest and straightforward, it would know that it has to get out of a number of those exercises into which it got itself involved in the early 1970s, such as SGIC and the South Australian Timber Corporation.

If the Government wants to raise revenue, it should make it economically possible for all landowners to freehold their land. In one sweep it could save a large amount of money and speed up administration. However, it does not seem to be capable of understanding that there is no value in the Government's being involved in the leasehold system. We ought to have a new system in place. People should be encouraged to freehold their land. Those are just a few areas where the Government could make some major improvements.

In these documents, what really concerned me was the level of debt in this State and how it has continued to rise. The Premier has had quite a bit to say about how he has been bringing things under control. From my reading of these documents, we are paying the equivalent of 23 per cent of our State gross product towards the debt. No Government can continue to fund that sort of arrangement, because it is just putting good money after bad. I am surprised that the Government should expect future generations to meet responsibilities that should be the Government's. When the next disaster occurs, will the Government borrow more money and continue to put off the evil day or will it stand up and say that the time has now come to face these responsibilities?

The Government has got itself involved in far too many non-productive areas. The Government's role is to assist people to get established with a home and to assist industry. It has no right to compete with private enterprise in many of these areas. Many Government departments are over-stuffed and under utilised. I am of the view that there is an urgent need to carry out a close assessment of all these things. The Liberal Party's proposition, that all statutory authorities should come under review, is one that the Government has failed to address ever since it has been in office. I suggest that that course of action will cost the Government dearly in future, because a large amount of money is being soaked up in areas where that should not occur.

I should now like to draw the attention of the House to the value of rural production and the need to understand that people in isolated parts of South Australia have made a great contribution to the State. At present there seems to

be a lack of appreciation and understanding of those people on the part of the Government. We have before us a proposition to do away with country hospital boards and amalgamate them into some large organisation which would not only be insensitive but would have no local knowledge. That would suit the three large industrial towns in the north of the State where all the hospital facilities would be controlled. Not only is it unfair and unreasonable but it is unworkable. Unfortunately, the Government does not appear to recognise that.

There is a similar situation with respect to the Barley Board. The Government has been attempting to go along with suggestions that people should no longer be elected to but should be selected for that organisation. Democracy insists that local communities have the ability and the opportunity to select their own members to make decisions that will affect them.

Much the same could be said about the current redrawing of electoral boundaries. If electoral boundaries are drawn in such a way as to deny people in isolated rural areas the ability to be represented or to be part of the electoral scene so that they have some say or influence, they will be the first group to lead a campaign to get rid of State Parliaments. The Parliament took a most unwise course of action earlier this year when it refused to support some members who wanted to ensure electoral justice and fairness. Electoral justice and fairness means that all sections of the community should have some input. Because people live within 25 kilometres of the GPO does not mean that they are the only ones who should be allowed to have reasonable access to their members of Parliament.

Clearly, if the electoral boundaries are drawn in a fashion that put into effect the waggon wheel principle or deny people in isolated communities the ability to have reasonable representation, there will be massive political agitation in this State. The so-called fairness principle has been based on the ludicrous proposition of one vote, one value, which we all know is not fair and can be as undemocratic as any system in the world. However, if that comes into being, appeals will be made against it. The Parliament will get another opportunity to consider the electoral system in this State in the next few months. We will then see whether the Parliament is mature and has the courage or has any consideration for people in isolated communities. I know that many people support my proposition. I also know that there are those who have no regard for people in isolated communities and who are interested only in power and the manipulation of power. Therefore, I shall be looking forward to this challenge in the next few months.

People in isolated communities receive very little from the Government. They ask for very little and they get less, but they are entitled to have access to their members of Parliament and to feel as though they are part of an electorate. They do not want to be dominated by large industrial centres. They want to be able to take part in the democratic process. If the electoral system continues as it is currently drawn and constituted, those people will miss out badly. What most people in rural South Australia and South Australia as a whole do not realise is that three months after the next State election we shall have to go through the whole exercise of re-drawing the boundaries again.

When that is explained to people, they wonder what has gone wrong with the Parliament, and they are quite interested. However, I say to members that, each time that happens, the isolated rural communities will have less and less say. It is up to this Parliament to ensure that that process is altered because, from my experience as a member of this place for a long period of time, there is a mood of

concern in rural South Australia that the people's views are not being heard.

The Government and its bureaucracies are attempting to impose their will on those people whether or not they like it. People in Government departments are going out to rural areas saying, 'This is what you are going to get, because you have Ministers who don't know; the decisions do not affect the Ministers, so you will have to wear it.' When people such as those who work in the Lands Department in Port Lincoln impose their will on people, we are headed down the road to trouble. People will not tolerate it. When the system lets them down, or if it does not accommodate their views or give them a fair go, they will want to change it. It is up to us, those who believe that the best system of parliamentary democracy is a three tier system. However, if that system does not give all sections of the community a fair go, it will fail—make no mistake about that.

People like me will be in the forefront leading the campaign against this sort of institution unless all sections of the community are given the ability to be represented. Members should not misunderstand or fail to appreciate that those people will join in it, because all sections of the community are entitled to be able to make decisions that affect them. If we isolate them from the decision-making process of Parliament, they will react, and the only way open to them is to call for a change in the system. I have raised this matter today because I believe that it is very appropriate. Members should not misunderstand the feeling of concern regarding the way in which Government is operating in this State and this nation or fail to appreciate and understand the great damage and hurt that they are inflicting on the community.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I wish to address some comments to the SGIC report by the Government Management Board Business Operations Review's Sub-Board Review of SGIC which was dated August 1991 and which was released earlier this year. Within this 120 page report there are a great number of areas in which the SGIC's management and administration are criticised. First, I express some concern at one or two things that have happened over the past 12 months by way of comments in the press, on the electronic media and in letters from senior executives of not only the SGIC but the State Bank received by members of Parliament.

I recall that the Leader of the Opposition felt impelled to write to the Premier expressing grave concern that members of the Opposition believed they were being intimidated by, in the first place, letters received from senior executives of the State Bank who implied that we should not be asking questions about that body and its *modus operandi*. Subsequently, comments were made in the press by a senior executive of SGIC, who said that the Opposition was going a long way towards ruining the manner in which SGIC was able to conduct its affairs.

I suggest that the joint effects of board and executive administration of both the State Bank and SGIC pre-dated any ill-effects that questioning by the Opposition might have had on the operations of those two organisations. They were already well down the track long before the Opposition was alerted to the fact that there were problems. I find it remarkable that senior executives should try to stall members of Parliament from legitimate questioning in this House and that, repeatedly, the Premier and Government Ministers have found it more expedient to deny any knowledge of what was happening within their departments and within

statutory authorities than to do what the Opposition has repeatedly asked over the past 12 months to two years, that is, to have a look at the problems and do something about them.

In law, ignorance is no excuse, but with this Government, as the member for Chaffey said, ignorance seems to be taken as a reasonably legitimate excuse for not resigning from ministerial office. I find that fact extremely disturbing in its own right. As I said, there are so many matters into which one could inquire, but I have chosen today to look specifically at the operations of the SGIC with respect to its method of keeping accounts.

The SGIC report is a critical commentary which contains very few compliments in its 120 pages. I am alarmed that the Australian Accounting Standards, copies of which are readily available to the public and to accountants, seem to have been bypassed. While in some instances the SGIC as a Government body does not necessarily have to comply with the very letter of the law, I suggest that practically everyone in South Australia and in Australia would expect Government departments to be exemplary in the manner in which they conduct their accounts. Any company dealing in finance must have a board, management, administration with accounting knowledge and expertise, and must be in a position to present its bookkeeping effectively and accurately if it is to demonstrate its integrity.

That standard applies no less to State Government departments and statutory authorities in South Australia. The SGIC report draws attention to failings in this respect. I also find it a little disturbing that the commissioner of the SGIC said (page 80 of the report) that the public accounts were a true and fair view, while the Auditor-General in his report said that the accounts were presented fairly, and the report by the Government Management Board came down with the opinion that the accounts were not in accordance with Australian Accounting Standards. So, we have some conflict in the opinions of those three reputable authorities.

The SGIC report goes on to establish precisely why it believes that SGIC's accounts are not in accordance with AA Standards. I said earlier that the SGIC does not have to comply with accounting standards to the full letter of the law—there is no legislative requirement—but it certainly should. With respect to Australian Accounting Standard No. 10 (financial reporting of general insurance activities), the SGIC itself has admitted that, if it is to have any credibility in this field, it will comply. I simply ask: why has it not already complied with Australian Accounting Standard No. 10?

Also, with regard to accounting for revaluation of non-current assets, the Woods and Forests Department has been the target of criticism from me over the past several years because it, too, has failed to act in accordance with AAS 10 in the way it values its growing timber. It actually reflects it in its current profit and loss account, whereas AAS 10 requires that the profitability from growing forests, which may not be realised for 10, 20, 30 or 40 years down the track, should be placed in a trust fund.

On the surface, there may be nothing wrong with it, but an unwitting investor may be led into a false belief that there is a high rate of profitability when, in fact, the timber may not be milled for 20 or 30 years. Similarly, Australian Accounting Standard 10 is being breached by SGIC. AAS16, covering financial reporting by segments, relates to the nature of business and the geographical location of that business. The SGIC is not clear in its presentation of such matters and a new model is being set up so that in future I anticipate that it may comply with AAS16.

In relation to AAS22—related party transactions—there is a need for disclosure, a need to show where there are conflicts of interest in relation to SGIC transactions, and these could relate to a whole range of bodies: subsidiaries, associated companies, parent companies, directors, relations—that is, the family relations of directors—business interests of senior employees, and so on. Obviously, the committee of inquiry had to express some concern with regard to the manner in which full and proper disclosure may or may not have been made. There is no hint in what I am saying that there is any impropriety, but I believe that full and proper disclosure would have gone a long way toward allaying opposition and possibly public suspicion that there may have been something wrong. Why hide things if there is nothing wrong with them?

Similarly, AAS22 relates to the disclosure of directors' salaries. SGIC is not legally required to comply with that, but why hide the directors' salaries when every company in South Australia is required to divulge that information? Why should not State Bank and SGIC directors have their salaries disclosed when other public companies across Australia have to do that?

AAS8 refers to events occurring after the balance date and requires that, where a sale or purchase of shares or property or a substantial property market decline or collapse affects the books of a company after the balance date, these events should also be disclosed if they are known before the balance sheet is presented for public scrutiny.

AAS6 relates to accounting policies disclosure and requires a summary of the accounting policies used in the preparation of financial reports. Those summaries were not available in the SGIC report. I think it is sad that a report like this, first of all, should have to be made and, secondly, that it should have to bring down adverse criticism. I am also surprised that a couple of days after the report came out one member of the reporting team—I believe he was associated with one of South Australia's leading academic institutions—questioned why the Opposition was expressing great concern. I simply point out to that erudite gentleman that, had I had a report presented about my business and accounting methodology similar to the report handed down with regard to the SGIC, I would have been very worried. I am astonished that he should express surprise that we should make great play of the fact that this report was handed down with so much criticism.

I would like to spend a little more time on one specific aspect of this report, which deals with interfund loans and transactions. At page 84 the report states that interfund loans and transactions have occurred between SGIC's compulsory third party fund, the life and general funds and the corporate accounts. It says that loans have been made by one fund to another fund and that equities have been transferred from one fund to another. That particularly concerns me because when life insurance funds are involved there is an expectation with regard to a Government institution that it would comply absolutely with the letter of the law in relation to financial accounting requirements.

However, in this case, life insurance funds may have been borrowed by compulsory third party funds and then used, not for gilt-edged security, as one would expect with life insurance funds that are absolutely critical to people who are looking forward to a happy retirement, but for high return, high risk ventures. Really that is the implication behind this criticism—that the compulsory third party fund, in borrowing those high security funds from the life sector of SGIC, has then gone out and put them out to high risk ventures.

The report states that during the review the committee also became aware of the relatively poor performance of investments made on behalf of the compulsory third party insurance fund. The sums involved are not inconsiderable. The interfund loans at 31 January 1991 involved lenders in the life fund amounting to \$247.7 million and in the general fund, \$14.5 million, a total of \$262.2 million. The borrowers of that money were the compulsory third party fund, which received \$170 million, and the corporate fund, which received \$71.6 million. In his financial condition report, dated 30 June 1990, the SGIC's actuary commented on the interfund loan at that stage of \$145.5 million, provided by the life fund to the compulsory third party fund:

Although SGIC is not bound by the Life Insurance Act 1945, it does comply with the intent of this Act. Section 39 covers the investments of the Statutory Funds and the ISC issues Circular 268 to clarify some aspects of this section. According to this circular:

A company cannot invest, except with the prior approval of the Commissioner, any assets of a statutory fund in a related company unless it is a subsidiary company of that life company. For this purpose, a related company has the same meaning as in the Companies Act 1981.

As a matter of practice, approval is not generally granted for assets of a statutory fund to be invested in related companies.

There we have a blatant criticism of the manner in which SGIC has had one fund borrowing from another fund and investing in relatively high risk areas. What are those high risk investments? Interfund lending primarily arose because of significant involvement undertaken by the compulsory third party fund since 1988. These investments include \$100 million in Bouvet, the purchase of Centrepoint for \$43 million—and I remind members that that was another put option similar to the Collins Street put option for \$530 million that had to be exercised—the investment in Scrimber of \$25 million (which, of course, has had to be written off and which also has forgone interest on that investment because Scrimber, like other things, is a poor performance investment), and also the acquisition of Austrust for approximately \$30 million. Because the compulsory third party fund did not have the money to pay for these assets, it borrowed from the life fund.

Surely, the question has to stand out glaringly in the minds of members of this House: if the compulsory third party fund did not have money to invest in those projects, why on earth did it borrow money to invest in high risk, high return ventures of that type? Surely, it would have been better keeping completely out of high risk investment if it were borrowing from the life fund in order to put money at risk; it is almost a gambling mentality prevailing through the executive of the SGIC.

I am told the compulsory third party fund philosophy was to invest in assets for long-term capital growth. Yet, the compulsory third party fund, using life funds, acquired a number of investments, many of which were not, still are not and, in the case of Scrimber, never will be producing any income: in other words, a very poor return investment on funds which could have been invested in Government gilt-edged securities for a much more favourable return than that obtained by the compulsory third party fund.

The committee, which brought down the report, also commissioned the Crown Solicitor to advise whether the SGIC had the power to invest or lend moneys from one fund to another and whether the life fund and general insurance fund may have assets which are moneys lent or invested in another fund within the SGIC. While I will not have time to bring down the Crown Solicitor's full opinion, I can say that it was not favourable. In fact, a recommendation is contained in the report at the end of that section

saying that the practice of interfund lending and borrowing and transfers of investments between funds should cease.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I propose to cover several matters which, on the face of it, could appear to be disjointed but they are not. Now, as never before, the Parliament has an opportunity—and indeed it is high time it took unto itself the responsibility—to finance its own activities and to determine the extent to which it needs finance for that purpose. It is ridiculous that the institution of Parliament should be subject to the whimsical inclinations of up to five Ministers, and most definitely be subject to the opinion of the Executive Government's own servants.

Parliament is not Executive Government: Parliament facilitates the establishment of Executive Government. Without Parliament, nothing is possible in a democracy. If the sophisticated concept of Executive Government, with the accountability of Ministers through the tradition of Westminster, as we ostensibly claim to have it in this country and in this State—indeed, it was in this State before this country was a nation—is to survive, the Parliament must now take command of its own destiny. Accordingly, all members at this time should consider whether or not they wish Executive Government to use Parliament simply as a rubber stamp or whether it does indeed mean to them and to their constituents that Parliament is something greater and more important than Executive Government.

It is not enough for Executive Government of any political colour to be able to take its place in this House with other elected representatives and, during the course of, for instance, Question Time, Minister by Minister abuse the inclinations and inquiries made by other members who may not be of the same political persuasion as the Minister concerned. That demeans us all. It demeans the institution and its purpose and function in society. It brings into disrepute the institution to which we belong and which has made laws for us and provided the means by which we have orderly government. It does that in this current time because of our reliance on sophisticated technologies enabling the communication of messages to the broader population rather than on the written word.

Non-verbal communication is known to be far more important in its impact than verbal communication. Accordingly, where the sort of message that can be published abroad from this institution by the electronic media of communication can be misleading and can lead people of lesser intelligence—and I do not say that disparagingly—to believe that they could do without such an institution as Parliament and, indeed, the democracy which requires it. They would be incapable of conceiving how their life would change if they were to be without such an institution. However, I have dwelt enough on that point, and I will leave members to consider seriously the proposal in the immediate future and to ensure that, in the process, the Parliament is master of its own destiny and is not squeezed a single-line budget (as might otherwise occur, if we were careless) by the Executive Government of the day.

In relation to this Executive Government, many people outside this House at present are still shellshocked and do not understand the seriousness of what has happened to this State and its finances. They are bewildered. Horrendous increases in taxes and charges have occurred in this hideous and insidious budget. It is an immoral budget and a farce. Those words have been used by a member on this side of the House, the member for Light, although it occurred to me that they were indeed two words appropriate to describe the budget.

Some people just do not understand how they can possibly continue with life as they have known it with the increases they have to face in taxes and charges. I represent a greater number of those people than does anyone else, because they are not just on the smallest of incomes: they are the new poor. Since the Second World War, there has never been a class of people as poor as most of my constituents. They are in a situation where probably more than nine out of 10 of them will have negative incomes following the very hot, drying winds of just over two weeks ago which devastated what little crop they had. I said a few weeks prior to that time that it would be more than 60 per cent; there is at least half as many again now.

I turn now to my responsibilities as shadow Minister to my colleagues and to the State of South Australia. I refer to a news release attributed to Mr Paul Harvey, the National Utilities Service International (NUSI) Senior Analyst, of 22 June, who said from his post in this independent firm involved in considering cost analyses:

Adelaide continues to reduce electricity prices . . . The price for Adelaide's industrial and commercial electricity dropped by 8.5 per cent to 7.82c per kilowatt hour in 1991.

I found these comments startling, because on the previous day in the *Advertiser* I read that electricity charges were to rise by 5.7 per cent as from 1 July 1991. They rose more steeply in that category of consumer than in any other.

That news release by Mr Paul Harvey states that for some years South Australia's electricity cost structure had been a factor in the State's difficulty in attracting new investment. It is a factor of some significance, in my judgment. In ETSA's 1989-90 annual report, which we have had in this House, we see that contributions to the State Government rose from \$52.981 million in 1989 to \$104.091 million in 1990. This was the start of the Government's priority exercise of milking ETSA as a cash cow. It has been to the detriment of our State's industry and commerce and, more importantly, to the detriment of this State's population, particularly those people who are without work.

If we increase the cost of basic energy to our industry, it becomes uncompetitive—and not just for a few jobs. If an industry that was succeeding just marginally prior to a cost increase in a basic commodity like its energy then finds with that cost increase that it is no longer viable, it is not just two, three, five or seven per cent of the employees who will lose their jobs: we are looking at the disappearance of the entire industry, with the loss of all the jobs.

In this budget the Government intends to increase the levy on the sale of electricity still further. That increase is expected to raise \$42.8 million in this financial year, which is an increase of 7.3 per cent. In addition, ETSA will pay \$45 million to the South Australian Government Financing Authority and hence direct to the Treasury because of the Government's plan for SAFA to contribute to the budget all of its estimated surplus in this coming year. So there is a milking exercise—it is backdoor taxation.

Members of the public do not realise when they pay their electricity account that a substantial portion of the bill goes into revenue for the Government itself. It is estimated that gross sales for ETSA last year were \$810 million, and the current rip-off by the Government represents about 12 per cent of that sum. This all represents a further rip-off. It is money that should be going toward lowering electricity charges to industry and to lowering input costs and charges to get our State's economy moving again, and to lowering the cost of living.

By this means, in particular, it would create much needed jobs in this State where at present youth unemployment runs at about 30 per cent and unemployment generally in my electorate runs at much higher than the State's average

because of the destruction of the viability of its enterprises, and not only farming enterprises about which I will have something to say in a minute.

The trust could afford to lower its tariffs if it was not being skimmed unmercifully by the Government in this way. As if to add insult to injury, the Pipelines Authority of South Australia has had to pay the Government of South Australia, through the budget, an extra \$3 million. These costs will flow on to SAGASCO and ETSA and further force up the costs in those enterprises about which I am speaking, and that will further exacerbate unemployment.

Under the guise of receipts from State undertakings, this budget has introduced increased backdoor and back-handed taxation and, more importantly, it is regressive taxation that is to the detriment of the State as a whole—not just to families but, more importantly, to the unemployed, the people who would otherwise have a prospect of getting a job. Of course, they would be employed in more viable enterprises, and not only more profitable enterprises but in a greater number of them. In human terms these increases are the equivalent of more than 2 500 jobs.

Let me turn to another topic. My office has been inundated during the past five months with letters and phone calls from irate shackowners, many of whom are retired pensioners, who are outraged over the hikes in their shack site rentals. These amounts are used to reduce the payments to the department from the Consolidated Account.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes. It makes Robin Hood look like a saint. In human terms the stress and concerns being felt by these people in order to pay for this Government's corporate disasters is horrendous. South Australia Inc. got off the rails, and now people seeking to preserve what minimal amounts of money they have left in their old age will have it taken from them in these fashions.

Let me turn to another topic relevant to my electorate and that of the member for Victoria. In the Upper South-East we are faced with an excess of \$10 million annual gross margin losses caused by salinity and inundation. This lost productivity is worth over \$10 million annually and it will occur within the next couple of years. It is already occurring and it is occurring, as I have said, because of inundation and soil salination. Already 100 000 hectares of agricultural land from Kingston to Naracoorte and north to the Dukes Highway is involved. This 100 000 hectares is a huge area, and it is being degraded by the rising watertable and the salt that it brings with it as it rises.

On 31 July the Minister of Water Resources told the public that the State Government is looking at the economic and environmental impact of drainage schemes as a solution to flooding and dry-land salinity problems in the Upper South-East. I have looked through the budget papers and cannot find any allocation for that purpose, even though I heard the Minister speak about it. Where in the budget has the Government committed any extra funds to address the drainage operations that are now urgently needed, especially in that area? Indeed, finances to the South-Eastern Drainage Board have actually been reduced by 22 per cent. Obviously, the Government does not consider that the loss of revenue to a State of \$10 million—most of which would be export income—is significant enough to warrant even a meagre maintenance of that pitiful sum provided to the board, and that is in spite of the fact that the Government proposes to expand the area for which the board is responsible.

Let me now turn to the budget problem overall. We have a \$220 million interest bill to pay as a result of the financial incompetence of the Premier and Treasurer and the \$1 million Chief Executive Officer of the State Bank. That

single pay-out, which the Premier should have been responsible to examine and otherwise prevent in prudent management of his responsibility under the terms of the Act alone, would have been adequate to save the important agricultural area to which I have just been referring and prevent the heartbreak and collapse of the social and economic infrastructure of that locality. That is tragic.

Let me point out for the benefit of members that, if they look at the current population of South Australia and the number of people on the electoral roll—somewhere around 900 000—and remembering that the Premier's financial incompetence is to cost us \$220 million per annum in interest (\$600 000 a day), it means that, if we all pay \$1 a day, we are left with \$300 000 to pay off that debt. If we took a hire purchase debt or even a more favourable loan by which we could address the debt and then looked at the prospects for interest rate changes, which are not great given the current economic management of this Government, we would find that if all of us on the electoral roll today paid \$1 a day for the rest of our natural lives—and, of course, some of us would start dying tonight and tomorrow and in 10 years, 20 years and 30 years, while others might live for 60 years—we might just meet the interest bill we have got and just pay off that debt.

One dollar a day for the rest of our lives, regardless of our age at the present time and whether our time comes tomorrow or in 60 years, is the amount required. I find that an incredible way for us to contemplate our future, because there are plenty of us who do not have a dollar, leave alone a dollar a day or \$365 per annum to give to the Government in addition to what the Government already gets from us, so others will have to make it up. In conclusion, the Government is either farcical and immoral in its approach to this huge debt or, alternatively, we are being governed not by knaves but by fools. I do not believe that we deserve that kind of Government. South Australians deserve better.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The State budget presented on this occasion was one of those documents about which I can only say that the people of South Australia had one put over them. It was a cleverly marketed document. The report in the *Advertiser* the following day spelt out the various Government departments and the main instrumentalities. It handled the report extremely well, and I am surprised at the competence of the journalists at the *Advertiser* in being able to analyse the budget so quickly.

An honourable member: They were organised.

Mr BECKER: I believe that they were organised. The budget was well marketed and given to them in packages that they copied down chapter and verse. However, nowhere have they analysed the incremental receipts for the State, and nor have I seen a breakdown in respect of the State Bank. Much has been said about the \$2 200 million borrowed to keep the State Bank afloat, but nothing has been said about the \$220 million interest bill per annum, which breaks down to \$4.23 million a week, \$604 395 a day, \$25 183 an hour, \$419 a minute or, to get really technical, \$7 a second. That is burning up money so fast that most people in the community cannot comprehend that amount of money.

When we talk of \$2.2 billion, or \$220 million interest, people do not understand those figures. However, if we come down to \$419 a minute, which is equivalent to three pensioners' weekly incomes, we are starting to talk turkey. However, we are still not getting the message through to the people because they have not been impacted upon in any real way. Their money is safe in the bank and they can still deposit and withdraw it. Had there been a freeze on

funds and had they been told that they could draw out only 50 cents in the dollar, that would have had a real impact. Thank goodness that will not happen.

The debate relates to the future of the bank and where it will head. What annoys me is that in this situation—probably the most disgusting and disgraceful economic management impact on any bank in Australia and the most disgusting performance by a group of executives of any company or bank associated with a Government—not one executive has had to pay any penalty whatsoever. Presently the bank is sacking middle and junior management. The bank has said that it will retrench and do all sorts of things, and that it will curb the growth and development of staff. However the big question that State Bank branch managers aged 55, 56 and 57 years are asking is, 'Why am I the bunny: why do I have to go?' They are not being retrenched—they are being sacked. The term 'redundancy package' is another expression for sacking people.

The frustrating part of it is that they are being replaced with inexperienced junior economists and people with no front line hands-on branch management experience. In respect of operating the State Bank, the people at the shop front are being made to pay for the mistakes of executive officers. In simple terms, one does not need a great deal of intelligence to run a bank. A bank manager can lend only what is available and cannot exceed the lending ratio set down by the Reserve Bank. Somehow in the State Bank of South Australia all the principles of good lending went out the window. Any fool can lend money, but it takes a clever banker to get the money that he has lent repaid without causing the person who borrows it any inconvenience or hardship.

We have seen with the current mopping up of the State Bank the bringing in of two people from interstate to help in the operation. Whatever one might think of Nobby Clark—and he is a shrewd character—it is costing the State a lot of unnecessary money, with the State having to bring him from interstate for board meetings and at other times. He is one of the most expensive chairmen that one could find in any bank in Australia. I am not impressed by the performance of Nobby Clark—he disappoints me. Being a private enterprise banker I would have expected better from him in the way he has handled the situation. I would not have brought in someone from interstate. We need to use local people and those not connected in any way with the bank.

That is one of the mistakes we have made in South Australia. We have tended to appoint people we consider to be reasonably successful to boards of statutory authorities, but the trouble is that they have too many connections. We must try to find people with no involvement. If they are prepared to accept a position on a board, they must resign from all other areas of involvement. If we cannot find people who are prepared to do that, we have to go back to the old principle of appointing to boards people from within the Public Service. There are plenty of retired Treasury officials who can handle these positions without having to bring in other people who have vested interests.

I do not care what the royal commission does, no-one will ever convince me that some of the well-known high flyers around Adelaide could not believe their luck when given these positions. Certainly they knew what was going on and they have had an interesting and profitable period in these management positions. I am not one who favoured Nobby Clark's appointment; nor do I favour the appointment of the current Chief Managing Director of the bank, Mr Johnson. I believe that the ANZ Bank was pleased to

get rid of him. He came here with not the type of credentials that I would have accepted for appointment to that position.

It is hard to take over a bank in the sort of financial situation that the State Bank finds itself. I do not think that Johnson is the right person. From what I can gather from my contacts, he was the corporate loans person within the ANZ Bank and was removed from there. It all happened too conveniently. The information I have is that Will Bailey was delighted to get rid of this person because the ANZ has its problems like all other Australian banks. The approach seems to have been: why not get rid of somebody in the lower echelons and save your own skin at the top? Mr Bailey has a question or two to answer in that respect.

Of course, the State Banks are subject to immense pressure, intensive questioning and criticism by those who represent the shareholders—the politicians who represent the taxpayers in this case. It is a pity that the shareholders of the private banks are unable to get to the annual general meetings of shareholders and pursue the same type of questioning and line of investigation as we have had in this Parliament. It is also a pity that more public companies cannot be subject to the same type of pressure and questioning, because it all impacts on the taxpayer. One way or another, the taxpayer pays the price. Because these organisations are not earning the income or the taxes, the average worker has to pick it up, and that is not on.

Whilst the State Bank is retrenching staff, which is a shame, the private banks are doing the same. Today, the ANZ Bank will say that it has retrenched 21 branch managers. There is no doubt that they have been sacked. Anyone at the ANZ at about 55 years of age was sacked. They were given three months, redundancy payments, and so on. The bank is getting rid of them to save a few dollars. It is not saving much money by getting rid of these people, but those who perpetuated the crime remain. The disappointing feature and the impact for South Australia of the retrenchment of 21 branch managers in the ANZ Bank this week is that nearly half of them were former Bank of Adelaide people. The ANZ Bank took over the Bank of Adelaide after the private enterprise banks conspired with the Treasury, under a Liberal Government, to get rid of the Bank of Adelaide. No-one will ever convince me otherwise. They may come up with all sorts of reasons concerning the prospectus of the finance company, but it was a conspiracy to remove the Bank of Adelaide from the scene. Now we find the ANZ Bank kicking out some of the best branch managers it ever had under the guise of saving money to meet its commitments.

The National Australia Bank and the ANZ Bank have also decided to close their Bankcard section in Adelaide. Another 100 staff are about to be retrenched as the operation of Bankcard for the ANZ Bank and the National Australia Bank is transferred to Melbourne. South Australia loses out on 100 jobs. I want to challenge the Premier, because I cannot see in the budget where provision has been made to assist the creation of employment for middle-aged and/or mature people. Here we have another 100 people thrown on the scrap heap.

The banks have joined those whom they helped—the corporate cowboys, the con men of the 1960s and the 1970s, who became the entrepreneurs of the 1980s. There is no such thing as an entrepreneur of the 1980s. They were con men all the way through. Each and every one of them should be gaoled and so should the directors of the banks which lent them the money. If State Governments do not follow through the corporate law and hold these directors responsible for the huge losses that have to be paid through bank charges, interest rates and loss of taxes, they are just as

guilty of the corporate cowardice that is going on in Australia.

I feel sorry that there will shortly be the end of an era, because the State Bank cannot survive in its current form. Even the State Bank of New South Wales is in no better position. As former Federal Treasurer Keating said, there will be no State Banks. The Commonwealth Bank will have to take over the State Bank of South Australia. I would not buy shares in it. I did not think that it was a good enough investment. In today's paper we see that the result for the year ending 30 June 1991 was not what it was cracked up to be. That information should have been contained in the prospectus. The warning should have been there for those who took up those shares. The warning should also have been there that, under the Reserve Bank Act, the Commonwealth Bank could be requested to take over any other State Bank that remains in Australia should it get itself into bother, because the Commonwealth Bank would be acting as an agent for the Reserve Bank.

The Federal Government is just as guilty of these entrepreneurial smart alec tricks that we saw in the 1980s. Here is the first real attempt at privatisation, and the shareholders in this organisation do not appear to have been given a fair go. I think that every taxpayer in Australia should have had the opportunity to participate in the privatisation of the Commonwealth Bank. I still think that it was a tragedy that that had to be the first organisation to be privatised. Be that as it may, the Labor Party fought any suggestion of privatisation, let alone the Commonwealth Bank, in this period.

There we have the Australian banking system. The State Bank will lead the way in the demise. Twelve months ago in my budget speech I predicted that the economic situation would mirror what happened over 100 years ago. Randall Ashbourne, in his little column in the *Sunday Mail*, thought that he would have a lend of me, in journalistic terms. He knows as well as I do that, under the Reserve Bank Act, no bank will fail entirely, nor will the depositors of that bank lose their money. What Randall did not pick up and what he has not foreseen is the immense impact and cost to the people of South Australia, the people who kept that bank going years and years ago. It was the Savings Bank of South Australia. Religiously every Monday or Tuesday a quarter of a million schoolchildren in South Australia in those days would go to their school and bank their fivepence, sixpence, shilling or whatever small change dad had. That kept the Savings Bank of South Australia going and made it possible for it to make tens of thousands of housing loans which gave the majority of South Australians the opportunity to purchase a house on a quarter-acre block, as it was then known, and for us to have the highest affordable home ownership in this country.

I was intrigued to see eight letters to the Editor in the *Advertiser* of Monday 9 September about the advertising campaign being conducted by the State Bank. Seven of the authors of those letters woke up to the facade that was being created by this advertising campaign. Again, the State Bank has wasted thousands of dollars by trying to sell its depositors and the people of South Australia a pup. That is another issue that I can deal with later. I feel so sorry that poor management and poor Government control of the State Bank have led to the situation where the State budget this financial year, if it is ever met—and I do not think it can be; I do not think the State budget has a snowball's chance in hell of balancing—will cost the people of this State money that they can ill afford to lose.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I should like to make a few comments in support of the budget. I believe that the Gov-

ernment, and particularly the Premier, deserves to be congratulated on the budget. The times that we face are extremely difficult, as everybody knows. We are in the middle of a very severe recession, yet, in spite of that, the Premier was able to bring down a budget which did not produce any tax increases. It is a most appropriate budget in the current climate. With those few words, I add my congratulations to the Government on the budget. I shall have more to say in the grievance debate later.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I am delighted to have the opportunity to close this debate. I do not have the time to canvass all the issues raised during the debate, so I will confine myself to a few major points and some comments on the general process of this debate which, of course, provides an opportunity for the Opposition to respond to the budget and to what has been proposed for the 1991-92 financial year, and not only to put forward its views of the Government's plans and performance but to say something definitive about what it could or should do in the economic and financial situation in which we find ourselves.

If we needed confirmation that the Opposition Leader was in trouble with his Party, was finding his job of selling Liberal policies to the electorate a little too hard and was being subjected to major criticism on that front, we certainly had that confirmation yesterday. There was a magnificent build-up to this performance. There was a lot of talk about the fact that finally the Leader would produce the definitive blueprint. Of course, he was being called on to perform not just by the media but very much by members on his own side—his tactical response group, that group of heavyweights which, obviously, is quite discriminating in its membership, I must admit. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not a member of this group so, obviously, they know that they have to choose people who may have a few ideas.

They are certainly approaching the affairs and concepts of the State very productively, because we are told that their prime job so far was not to criticise the performance of the Leader—heaven forbid—but actually to canvass the rest of Australia, taking opinion polls and looking at leadership performances in order to target in on the Premier himself. That is a great compliment to me. However, it has been very interesting to see how that tactical response group's approach to the management of the State's affairs, the personal attacks, has been reflected right from the beginning of the tirade of the Leader of the Opposition and through numerous contributions from members opposite. All sorts of accusations and abuse were thrown up.

I will not deal with or respond to those accusations, but I will certainly talk about what I find to be the most amazing aspect of the Leader's address yesterday, and that was simply that he obviously made a decision that, rather than address the budget and the problems and finances of this State, he would have to put on some kind of performance to impress his back bench, his Party colleagues, and that he would do this on the basis of a 10 second grab. Of course, that 10 seconds was extrapolated into a 90 minute tirade of abuse with a considerable lack of policies. My colleague the member for Napier put it well when he made his response and called him 'The 19 minute Leader', because, effectively, that is all the time he could devote to address the issues of this budget.

Of that 19 minutes, only about three or four minutes could in any way have been related to what the Opposition could or would do. The remainder consisted of this nonsensical tirade of abuse and personal vilification. He got his grabs, but where was the considered Liberal plan of action,

or even what one might call the trappings of substance, in what he had to say? Where was the alternative budget, the reply to the policies that we laid down? There were none of those. It was a near hysterical performance directed at the television cameras, not to this House, not to producing issues for debate and not to the momentous issues of the day.

When the Leader got towards the end of this very small amount of time that he had been allocated—the real speech of substance was left to the Deputy Leader, which indicates how totally bankrupt the Opposition must be—he made some sort of a policy announcement, but it flew totally in the face of his previous utterances, and I will explore that matter in a minute. I suggest that anyone who plans to be Premier, who says that he can lead South Australia, should at least stop and think before cobbling together a series of ill-considered proposals, which is exactly what the Leader did.

Why was there such a rush? We had a week's adjournment in the period between the delivery of the budget and the time of the Leader's reply. That was plenty of time to work up a considered response. We know that the Leader has plenty of useful resources. At times, I have been quite impressed by the staff work of the Leader of the Opposition's team, so we expected to get something of substance. Of course, what happened was that he was required to perform in a particular way to stop the rumours of the Party room revolt. He had to completely change his tactics and strategy because of criticism that has been levelled at him on his abysmal performance in his immediate response to the budget.

As the people of this State understand, one spray of ill-considered contradictory proposals is no substitute for properly considered policies. If anyone had doubts about the Leader's agenda, their worries would certainly be confirmed. Let us look at the proposal which, I suggest, was cobbled together very rapidly—I say that because of statements which I will indicate to members in a few moments—and sprung on his Party yesterday. What about the statement that the State Bank should be carved up and sold off—the big centrepiece of how we solve the State's debt and the economic position we are in? This is the Leader who made that the chief policy plank announcement of his 19 minute in-depth assessment of the budget; yet, nine days ago on ABC radio he specifically denied that he had any plans to sell the bank. In that context, he was simply repeating things that he had already said on a number of previous occasions. Let me quote from the interview with Keith Conlon.

Conlon: Well, let's just work on this difference though between, say, Greiner economics, which says sell the State Bank of New South Wales. That's on their list, isn't it?

Baker: Yes.

Conlon: Why does Dale Baker say 'Keep a State Bank for South Australia'?

And that is what he has been saying. The Leader replied:

Well, quite simply if we could sell the State Bank in this State and get back all the money that we have put into it, it would be a great deal for us, but I don't think we ever can.

A little later he went on to say, 'Let's concentrate on core business', echoing the very policy and strategy which the State Bank has announced and which should be welcomed by all members and people of South Australia. Compare those statements with yesterday's:

The Liberal Party will transfer ownership of the State Bank from the public sector to the private sector. Employees will be offered preferential shares at a discount and shares will then be offered to all South Australians—

presumably, those who have the funds or means to purchase them—

I hope and know that South Australians value that instrumentality enough to take up those shares.

Indeed, I hope they do value the instrumentality, and I hope that the instrumentality returns value, but I do not think that this quick fix solution of the Leader will in any way deal with that particular problem.

He talked of being a patriotic and (I think he used the word) 'chauvinistic' South Australian. Presumably, his reference to selling shares to employees—and I presume that includes all those executives and others whom he has been denouncing for the past few years; that is an interesting reward for them, I guess—and then offering them to South Australians will make us think that this is some sort of patriotic or chauvinistic approach to preserving our State Bank.

Unless some restrictions are placed on the disposal of those shares—and by so doing they are immediately devalued quite considerably—what is to stop all those South Australians with preferential benefits from simply selling them off, an institution mopping them up or a foreign bank coming in and acquiring them? What guarantee does that give that there will be any headquarters here in South Australia, or any other of those issues? None of those matters were considered. The hasty, ill-considered leap that the Leader made from a position where he said, 'Yes, it is on my agenda, but I don't believe that it is possible in these circumstances' and 'No, we won't do it' and a number of other contradictory statements turned into this definite assertion yesterday that 'We will do this', because his colleagues demanded that he perform.

The other major plank cobbled together was the cut to the public sector. We have not done enough here. We are being 'gutless' (I think was the word he used) in our approach to the public sector. What a disgrace when one looks at the things the Leader has said on this matter. He does not even know what he is talking about in relation to the structure of the public sector and public sector numbers. In the past week alone he has a total freeze, a cut, and now, in response to some detailed questioning by the media, a 'non-essential freeze', whatever that may be. So, just where he stands is very hard to follow. At best, his remarks are confusing and at worst they show just how jumbled and incoherent the Opposition is in trying to explain what we presume is a major plank in its election policy and one of its magic solutions for State finances.

Let us look at what the Leader of the Opposition said on the subject of public sector numbers. Bear in mind that I refer to his own words, which is only appropriate. In the *Advertiser* of 13 November 1990 the Leader labelled plans contained in last year's budget to restructure the Public Service as 'draconian' and 'knee-jerk'. He stated:

They are tackling one specific area without looking at the whole picture across the board.

Obviously he is not into the slash and burn mentality—that we are advocating draconian and knee-jerk cuts. That was last year, of course. The story has changed—or at least as of this morning it has changed. In yet another interview on the radio—and I am delighted that he persists in going on these shows; it is a very good opportunity, first, to hear him questioned in a context in which he is forced to reply and, secondly, to listen to these replies, which are quite extraordinary—he was asked by Keith Conlon this morning what the Opposition would do to achieve its cuts in the public sector. How will it not allow the level of public service to drop because of a slash in staff members? In fact, Mr Conlon asked:

So, the 6 000 (jobs in the State Bank and SGIC) go because of the sales and about 30 000 nurses, teachers and police are quarantined. It means that, in order to gain your 9 000 jobs (cut) over

a year, you are going to have to cut pretty savagely into the rest aren't you?

That is a pretty fair and reasonable comment. Mr Baker replied:

No, no, no. You're talking . . . if you take . . . if . . . if you pursue the non-essential freeze—

there it is, the non-essential freeze, this new concept—

and that is what I've been explaining to people all along. There is an attrition rate . . . but Frank's trying to apply it to individual areas—

the reference is, of course, to our learned and esteemed Minister of Finance—

It's an overall attrition rate—6 000 would go as you transfer from the public to the private and the rest would go through normal attrition. Of course, it has to be a non-essential freeze.

Well, Mr Conlon was a little puzzled by this, as I suspect any listener was. He tried to clarify it and said:

So, really, what you've done is come up with the same number that the Bannon budget has. If you take the 6 000 out of your 9 000 you end up with about the same as the Bannon budget, a cut of just over 3 000 people.

Mr Baker responded:

Well, yeah.

Mr Conlon then said:

But just on the Public Service freeze, you're actually coming up with the same figures as the Bannon Government?

Mr Conlon cannot believe it. Mr Baker replied:

Well that's right. Okay. Fine.

I am sure members opposite will be delighted to know that their Leader has found himself in agreement with at least that element of our budget, which is a pretty major one indeed. Perhaps they should keep tuned to Keith Conlon for further updates on those policies. In last week's *Sunday Mail* the Leader of the Opposition stated that when confronted with a particular problem he had this great experience in business. He said:

I realised during those (private business) years that if part of my business was going sour I had two alternatives—tackle the problem immediately or cut my losses and get out.

His response has been made quite clear in his address to this budget. He is all about cutting and getting out, not in fact tackling the problem or taking the option or the alternative that is the only necessary and responsible option in this current climate for any State Government to take—or indeed any business in the same situation—that is, to tackle the problem immediately, to work it through, to stabilise, to choose the best times in which to ensure that we get some return on our assets or to decide what other treatment should be applied to them.

I believe that that sums up the whole difference in approach. This hasty, ill conceived, mish-mash of policies was cobbled together to try to make a dramatic splash, because it was quite clear that there was absolutely nothing there unless the drama of the sell-off of the State Bank, in contradiction of everything else that had been said, could be added to the Leader's address—his minor contribution—on the budget.

They have not really gone very much further. The privatisation issue has been on the agenda for some considerable time. It was there back in 1985; it was discreetly dropped through the intervening period and was not really heard of much in 1989—it was not very fashionable then. It is back on the agenda again; it was mentioned last year along with the forests, the State Bank and the Moomba pipeline. All of those issues have been raised at different times. That is seen as the solution: privatisation. It is the cornerstone of Liberal economic policy and it is a desperate attempt to try to make some sort of mark. If that is to be done it needs to be much better thought out, very much

better developed and very much better analysed and presented than the Leader of the Opposition has done.

I will now deal with some of the specific areas. In relation to the sale of the bank itself, I believe that the way in which the Leader has presented this issue is ill considered and an irresponsible reaction to the problems the financial institutions face. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition has already done some damage by the way in which he has announced this particular policy, and I have already dealt with the implications of pretending that what one's policy will do is secure the bank's presence or future here in South Australia when, in fact, it would have quite the opposite effect. Indeed, there would be no way in which one could prevent the eventual foreign takeover in the long term by the methods that the Leader is suggesting.

Of course, it is quite clear that he will not be buying shares. He has stated a number of times that the Government should take its capital out of the bank because it does not make a sufficient return on funds. That makes his suggestions even more ludicrous. He will come back and say, 'Well, you will divide it into the "good bank, bad bank".' In fact, in our announcements about future treatment of the bank accounts we said that the concept of separating assets was something which needed exploration and which could well be developed. However, the concept that one simply get rid of the good profit making side of the business and retain in the public sector and debt burden all the non performing loans and worse loans is really an outrageous suggestion in terms of how one would treat it and hardly does something about the debt.

Incidentally, the Leader, having now finally made up his mind that the bank should be sold, announces that it really should have happened last year; that he had mentioned privatisation being examined. He now says in the light of what has happened that it should have been sold immediately. That is an extraordinary proposition, too. The fact is that if the bank were to be sold in those circumstances appropriate due diligence would have to occur on the 1990-91 results. If, in fact, that \$2.2 billion loss were uncovered in the course of that time frame, the State Government would have been obliged to re-capitalise the bank in that instance. If, in fact, it were declared later, and people had bought on the basis of a prospectus that had not revealed the true nature of that loss, guess where they would come? Right back to the Government to protect the disadvantage suffered by investors. That is a totally unacceptable situation. The liabilities that the bank is grappling with now were all incurred some considerable time ago and this hindsight that a privatisation option was open is absolute nonsense.

Woods and forests are also under the hammer. They will be sold off by the Leader. This is a great attitude from someone whose electorate has been supported by this activity, where employment is created and economic activity is fundamental to the State's investment in the forest—it is our community's investment in those forests. They have been a vital part of the South-East and its development and there is no reason to believe that they cannot continue in the long run. But, no, the Leader wants to get out of there; he does not worry about the commitments that might have been made in this area. One interpretation of what he is saying—that the forest area should be cleared, the timber sold, and that the Government might have some basic hold on the land itself—is not very much different from what happens at the moment. But, of course, he is proposing something well beyond that and, again, there is the slash and burn approach which means that a properly managed

and planned strategy would be impossible in those circumstances.

I have dealt, too, with public sector employment, and that was adequately covered, I believe, in responses to some questions yesterday, where the figures were in fact provided very clearly. One would, in fact, have a very basic and fundamental reduction in the essential services if one got anywhere near those attrition, reduction, non-replacement figures about which the Leader of the Opposition is talking.

Then the Leader of the Opposition gets onto the question of debt. He loves using these figures; he jumps between families and man, woman and child. One has to follow him very closely, because he plays around with the figures to get the worst possible interpretation. But at least yesterday it was every man, woman and child who had a debt hanging over his or her head of \$4 524. No attempt was made to balance that or to put it into perspective. Our debt is still the third lowest of all the States. It is still significantly lower than Victoria and Tasmania. It is still lower than it was when we came into office in 1982, lower than the Tonkin overhang that we inherited. It is still very much lower than historic levels of debt in this State. The Leader's way is not an appropriate way to measure it. Nor should he frighten every man, woman and child in South Australia, as he would like to do, into thinking that they will suddenly get a bill for \$4 524.

I point out that, on the other side of the ledger, we have net assets in this State in excess of \$8 000 per head for every man, woman and child. The Leader focuses on this \$11 billion liability which he beefs up as some kind of insuperable problem that the State cannot handle and which has been foisted onto our children. He refuses to acknowledge the figures which show, even on the rough estimates that can be made at present, \$23 billion in assets; in other words, net assets of some \$12 billion in this State, completely ignored, deliberately misunderstood or misused. I do not think there is much more one can say about this 19 minute address; I have dignified it probably too much. I think it is important, because of the presentation that the Leader seeks to make that he is the expert in these matters and that he knows where he is going, that an analysis of the terrible events of the past couple of weeks as far as the Opposition is concerned needs to be made.

Of course, the champion then moved into action: the real expert on the budget and its finances, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. What an extraordinary performance. One can see why he is not on the tactical resource group. This is the man who said that the leadership issue was a carnival on the political sideline. I suspect that he is really defining the Opposition and its role at the moment—totally irrelevant to the core affairs in this State. He claims that the Government has failed to provide unemployment forecasts as we have done in previous years. We do not provide the specific forecasts in the way in which the Deputy Leader is suggesting he wants them: we certainly do provide considerable detailed financial information on the state of the economy: seven pages on unemployment and employment in the labour force, which he is either too lazy or too thick to analyse properly. It has all the general expectations there, if only he would settle down and do a bit of work on it.

The Deputy Leader says that the document assumes an inflation rate of 2.5 per cent. Some members, who were unfortunate enough to have to listen to what he was saying, will remember his carrying on about this inflation rate, saying how outrageous it was, that we were going to predict for South Australia a much lower rate than the Commonwealth was predicting for the rest of the country, and how inflation would clearly be much higher than that. Again, he

has not been able to read his budget papers, which make quite clear that the estimated CPI for next year is not 2.5 but 3.3 per cent. It is actually slightly above what the Commonwealth is predicting, not well below it as the Deputy Leader was asserting. The figure of 2.5 per cent is what we are providing to the agencies; in other words, it is a way of ensuring that we do get some savings in the operational budgets of those agencies of something around \$10 million. It has been done over years and has been highlighted as an important contribution departments can make to the savings. But the Deputy Leader thinks that this is the inflation rate we are predicting.

In relation to ETSA tariffs and the backdoor tax, it is extraordinary the way this matter is treated. The \$45 million dividend effectively represents a reasonable and moderate return on the capital invested, the guarantees provided, the ownership of this State and its community in ETSA. It is consistent with developments interstate and, indeed, with the Opposition's own policy stance. Members of the Opposition are the ones who are talking about our getting some sort of return on these assets. Only last year, the member for Murray-Mallee, who has asked a question about this issue, said that ETSA should be required to earn at least 4 per cent real rate of return. The shadow Treasurer said that ETSA's minimum rate of return should be not 4 but 7 per cent. In fact, its financial contribution was only a little over 3 per cent on total assets.

If the Opposition had had its way, ETSA's contribution would have been between \$60 million and, as the Deputy Leader would have it, about \$116 million. What would that do to tariffs? It would cause an increase in tariffs ranging from 10.2 to 19.5 per cent, while we have managed to maintain ETSA's efficiencies in delivery below CPI for the past five years. That is what members of the Opposition are advocating on the one hand, but on the other hand they come in here and criticise. They are totally inconsistent.

In relation to the hoary matter involving the number of taxes and charges, the Deputy Leader said 800 were hurriedly increased prior to the end of the financial year. For some years now we have announced an annual review of charges to ensure that they keep pace with inflation or cost recovery. Surely, that is prudent financial management, and the end of the financial year is a very appropriate time to signal what those charges will be for the duration of the forthcoming financial year.

Of course, members opposite like to make a great deal about the vast number of these charges. For instance, they did not mention in their list last year that 200 of some 500 charges were all in the central veterinary laboratory, including such charges as an increased fee for wart vaccination for animals and one for an egg check on animal faeces, and so on. These are all labelled up in some kind of horrendous package of imposts on the community—on the families (and I am not sure how many families need wart vaccination for animals). If one looks at the range of charges mentioned, one sees that it is absolute nonsense to suggest that the Government has acted other than responsibly.

Once again, this year the Opposition's 800 alleged increases refer to many which have little or no impact on average households. We are told that households are under the burden of these appalling charges, things such as the factory licence they have to get to manufacture explosives. The cost of penile implants has increased in excess of inflation this year. I do not know what that says about this procedure or the Minister of Health's administration of his area, but I suggest that they do have a minimal impact on the community, yet that is not what the Opposition says.

The Government takes a responsible view on user-pays services. If members opposite want to oppose this, I would like them to state whether they support a reduction in the level and quality of Government services, and whether they want an increase in taxes on the rest of the community, rather than on the few who use the particular service. The Deputy Leader can contribute to the manufacture of explosives and to penile implants from the general taxation revenue if he chooses: this Government does not so choose, and the charges are adjusted accordingly. We are committed to keeping the increases in major domestic charges, such as electricity, motor registration and STA fares, at or below the CPI level, and that will continue.

That will be continuing. What about another assertion made by the Leader, his Deputy and others, that the Police Force has been cut back this year as a direct result of the State Bank situation? He said that the Police Force is undermanned. What absolute nonsense. The fact is that law and order is one of the areas where the Government has increased funding despite the budgetary constraints. Policing has been given a higher priority, whereby an additional 61 officers are to be appointed. Relative to the other States we are neither under-resourced nor undermanned. The most recent Grants Commission report shows that in 1989-90 South Australia spent (as it had in each of the previous four years) more per capita than was necessary to maintain services comparable with the other States and the Northern Territory—above the national average.

With respect to the number of officers employed, we are second to none. Police strength per 100 000 population in South Australia at 255 is well above the State average of 218, and way above all other States. In fact, it is significantly above Queensland with 193; and New South Wales, with a massive law and order problem and crime rate, has a level of 217—ours is 255. The police budget has been allocated an extra \$11.2 million, bringing the total to a record \$273 million. Yet, the Opposition says that the Police Force is suffering because of State Bank problems—what absolute nonsense.

Then we get the normal criticisms of SAFA, that it is cooking the books and that it has not declared its surplus. The Deputy Leader suggested that the capital gains realised by SAFA on the sale of assets in 1990-91 should have been applied in that year. To do so would have disguised the \$99 million deterioration in the budget. I guess that we would have been delighted to do that, as we could have said, 'Despite the loss in revenue, despite the application of the State Bank, we are able to come in with a budget that has actually gone into surplus, or certainly improved its net borrowing requirement.'

That would have not been a correct presentation of the situation. We felt that in this year it was important to show exactly what the result was and how it was arrived at. SAFA adheres strictly to accounting standards. There has been full disclosure of everything, including the impact of those assets, and to question its accountability is quite outrageous.

There are of course numerous other complaints. I thought one of the best examples of the Deputy Leader's inability to read the budget papers—a most simple and fundamental inability—was his excitable attack on SAFA, when he said:

To settle the increase that is developing, the Premier must table SAFA's 1991-92 budget projections.

They are actually in the budget and the financial statement at page 4. They show that the surplus will be \$400 million, and the Auditor-General showed that SAFA had a surplus of \$192 million for distribution.

So, it is a sorry tale and, while the Leader may have felt that he got some temporary advantage in getting his little

grabs on television and sounding a little more aggressive for his troops, it was really a great cover-up—a cover-up of the fact that his Party's policy had been cobbled together, in contradiction to previous statements, in a very few days. In fact most of the budget reply—most of his 19-minute tirade—was an attempt to shore up his position amongst his colleagues and was not in any way directed at addressing the State's problems or even attacking the Government.

To hand over major responsibility to his colleague the Deputy, who he will not trust in other areas, just shows with what contempt the Leader is treating the process and indeed how concerned he is about his own position. I thought it was interesting, too, in terms of contradictions, that the Leader finished with a thunderous demand that the Government resign, that I resign, and presumably we have an election where he would be triumphantly voted into office.

That was very interesting in the context of the budget because yes, it did echo, I guess, the sentiments he had uttered in an inept no-confidence motion on the opening day of Parliament when he thought he would try to upstage the Governor with his own exercise on the floor of this Parliament. But, what was his reaction on this issue in the days following the budget?

There was nothing at all about resignation. Indeed, on the Keith Conlon show he was asked about why he was taking so long to get going and what his plans were and he said, 'Look, there is a while to the next election, a couple of years to go.' 'Yes,' said Conlon, 'it is a long way away.' 'Yes,' said Baker. Conlon said, 'You are saying it is a long way to go, so do not worry about it?' That is what the Leader was saying, and he went on to say, 'We are in the second quarter and we will really demonstrate our plans.' That is what he was saying a week ago, yet he came into this House yesterday expecting the public and us to believe that what he is really on about is the Government immediately resigning. The Leader had better make up his mind.

I believe that the appropriate and responsible course for this Government is to get on with our job, to serve out our term and ensure that we deal with the problems as we are dealing with them. The Leader of the Opposition knows full well that, if by some mischance, he was suddenly put into office, he would have no answers—no solutions—and he would be absolutely terrified at the implications of that. I suggest it might be in his interests, too, but, then again in the light of what we have heard, if ever the people of South Australia entrust their future to him, heaven help us all.

Bill read a second time.

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

That this Bill be referred to Estimates Committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That the House note grievances.

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

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): What a response from the Premier! It was 35 minutes of a rambling and scrambled mind trying to tell us why the Liberal Party could not govern this State. A man who has just lost \$2.2 billion of taxpayers' funds was not game to mention one monetary figure other than trying to say that the \$4 524 owed by every man, woman and child in this State was a reasonable comparison with what is going on in other States. As I said yesterday, until the Treasurer came to power in this State, we were the best and lowest cost State and South Australians were proud of that. In the past 12 months our

debt has blown out dramatically for every man, woman and child because of one man and his financial mismanagement (and I am not pointing to the honourable member opposite but to the Treasurer).

Would not the Treasurer have loved to bring down the budget response that we brought down yesterday? Would he not have loved to do something positive to get South Australia going again? Would he not have loved to get up in the Parliament and say, 'We will make some tough decisions. We will be forced to sell off some of the jewels of the State to reduce the State debt so that we can provide incentives for business to come back to South Australia or to get going and prosper in South Australia.'? However, he could not do it because the Labor Party would not let him do it.

We have been telling the Labor Party for four or five years that the time could come when it might have to sell something, but he could not get it through Cabinet as Cabinet would not agree to it. Trades Hall would have jumped up and down. It has even forced off anyone looking into WorkCover, as presently it will not allow the Premier to bring in changes. The unions come to our office when one of our members introduces a measure the same as what the Government wants and say, 'How dare you bring this in'. The Premier was rolled again. The hapless Treasurer sits there desperately wanting to do something positive, but every time he is rolled by the mob sitting behind him.

The Premier made an interesting comment today when we asked a question on the South Australian Timber Corporation and there were interjections on Scrimber. It gave him a chance to say something to the House, and he got stuck into the member for Mount Gambier and other members on this side. He said that I had knocked the Scrimber operation, and that I had said how terrible it was for the people of the South-East. The Treasurer finished up by saying, 'If only it had worked'. Well, if only the bank had worked, we may have been competitive with other States and there may not have been a debt of \$4 524 for every man, woman and child in South Australia. If only it had worked at SGIC. If only the South Australian Timber Corporation had worked; and if only the little investment in New Zealand, about which the Premier was very irate today, had worked. How dare the member for Victoria question buying an operation in New Zealand when the South-East was devastated by fire, jobs were at risk and so on!

In respect of the New Zealand investment, some how the Treasurer gave the Ministry the okay to buy an operation on unaudited accounts. Quite frankly, I do not think that the Treasurer knew what unaudited accounts were, although he had to present audited accounts on the State Bank to the Parliament this year, which proved embarrassing. In the previous two years, day after day, he had been telling us that there was nothing wrong with the State Bank, that everything we had been asking was not relevant. All of a sudden, when he had to bring in audited accounts—which means you cannot tell the little fibs that you can tell in this place when you do not have to have audited accounts—it was different. The Premier would have loved to do something positive.

The Liberal Party yesterday put a firm policy on the line to reduce the State debt by \$1.5 billion and reduce recurrent expenditure by \$150 million. That happens to be the amount that the Premier will have to borrow this year to prop up his budget's recurrent expenditure. It is quite simple. One does not have to be a genius to work out the facts and figures, which is why we kept it simple yesterday. Three simple items can raise \$1.5 billion and bring incentive back into South Australia. I was interested in the first few pages

of the Auditor-General's Report, as he is starting to focus on honest and accountable government in this State. The first few pages are all about accountability, honesty in government and Ministers who are prepared to face up to what their portfolios are all about and to the ramifications of running their portfolio.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: That is right. We have been calling for this for quite a while. We have two amazing examples, the first being the Minister of Forests who, upon losing \$60 million of taxpayers' funds, stood up in this place and said, 'It is unfortunate, but it is management's fault.' That is what the Auditor-General is saying.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: That is exactly right.

An honourable member: But only if it had worked.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, he said that earlier today. Accountability in the Westminster tradition means that that Minister should have resigned. He got up in this place and said that it was management's fault and not his. Following the disaster of the State Bank the Treasurer got up and said, 'If only it had worked.' He also said, 'It is someone else's fault. I didn't know about it. No-one told me.'

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And if they did, it wasn't my fault!

Mr D.S. BAKER: Exactly. However, a couple of little things are happening. What about the sleazy little election deal with Homesure about which we are hearing now? The Auditor-General brought out that matter. The Homesure scheme allowed the Government to buy the last election. It was to help 35 000 South Australians at a cost of \$36 million in a full year. What happened? The Government changed the rules just when the ink was dry after the election. The scheme lent \$847 000 and it cost \$1.1 million to administer. Quite honestly, that is a scandal. It was a sleazy vote buying exercise to try to win the last election.

I read in the paper another example highlighted by Senator Olsen the other day regarding a sleazy deal between the Treasurer, SAFA and the State Bank to keep down interest rates. It involved a sum of \$2 million behind the scenes so that the Government could buy more votes at the last election and, even though it received only 48 per cent of the vote, it claimed Government. With such things happening in the State, no wonder the Auditor-General is starting to question the Government's accountability. If there is one thing South Australians should understand and learn it is that this Government will do anything to buy its way into power. The Westminster tradition says that the Premier should have resigned already. He got it wrong when he said that I asked the Government to resign—I asked him to resign because he is the one responsible.

Mr Brindal: He thinks he is the Government.

Mr D.S. BAKER: And I think that he probably is at this stage, but that will not last long. It really amazes me the lengths to which these people will go to cling to power. Not once in his reply—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Ros Kelly said that he would sell his grandmother.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I was not going to comment on that, but he might have to do so rather than sell the State Bank. When the Premier was asked to comment on that, he refused. One of the problems we have is that not only has the Premier not been able or even had the guts to stand up and take tough decisions but in fact he has passed them on to the next generation. That is the cynicism with which these people treat the people of South Australia in not facing up to what really should happen.

I guess we can say over and over again, 'If only it had worked.' Of the last 10 years of this Government we could all say, 'If only it had worked', because our debt in 12 months has blown out \$2.3 billion and every man, woman and child owes \$4 524. I do not know how they will ever pay that back if the Premier of this State does not have the guts to make some of the tough decisions that are necessary to get this State going again.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): What a response to a response! If the Leader thinks that he would have got any response from the Premier other than the one he got during the summing up on the second reading stage, he is more stupid than even I gave him credit for. As a result of the current tactics of the Leader of the Opposition—that is, I am allowed one minute speaking time per percentage that I have out there in the popularity stakes—he will go down in history as the man who copped out of his responsibilities as the Leader of an alternative Government and used the most important debate in this House, the budget debate, to shore up his position in the leadership struggle that is going on.

An honourable member interjecting.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I did not quite catch the interjection by the member for Coles, but I should have thought that the member for Coles would privately have been agreeing with me. The members for Coles and for Bragg always—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: There are certain people over there who always sound the same to me. I should have thought that the members for Coles and for Bragg, apart from privately agreeing with me, would have understood what I am saying. This afternoon—perhaps you, Sir, did not see it as you only see things in one particular direction in this House—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that the honourable member is reflecting on you, and I would ask him to retract his remarks.

The SPEAKER: I am grateful for the protection given to me by the Deputy Leader. However, let me inform the House that I do not need protection. I interpreted the honourable member's statement as being in one direction looking down the Chamber.

Mr Oswald: One-eyed.

The SPEAKER: Order! That can be taken as a reflection, I point out to the member for Morphett, and I would caution him about his use of the words 'one-eyed'. However, I took the comment by the member for Napier as referring to the aspect down the Chamber. If in his contribution he expands upon it and reflects on the Chair, be assured, each and every one, that I shall take action.

Mr OSWALD: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I do not want to incur your displeasure. I was only interpreting the remarks of the member for Napier as saying that you were one-eyed. I would never reflect in that way myself.

The SPEAKER: I do not take that as a point of order. I think the word was not 'one-eyed'; 'one angle' was the term used. As I have just informed the House, I shall be listening very carefully to the member for Napier and how he expands the point. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It just goes to show how perceptive you are, Sir. You knew exactly what I was saying. When the Premier was summing up the second reading debate, every member of the Leader's staff was in this Chamber. Mr Ian Smith was sitting up there in the Strangers' Gallery.

Mr D.S. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been here for a long time. I am not sure how many years, but it is many years. He is well aware that Standing Orders do not allow reference to people other than members in the Chamber or in the environs. I would ask him to be very careful in his contribution.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am sorry, Sir; I apologise. One member of the Leader's staff was sitting in the Strangers' Gallery skulking in that area which is currently occupied by the policeman. I thought that was a rather ominous prophecy of what would happen if the Leader eventually became the Premier of this State. I suggest there would be so many police cuts that there would not be any policemen up in the Strangers' Gallery.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I seek your guidance. I understood that you were saying that according to Standing Orders it was inappropriate to refer to people in the gallery. I believe that the honourable member just did so. I would ask you to rule on that matter.

The SPEAKER: To clarify the situation, reference to people when they are in the gallery and when there is a debate on the floor is definitely out of order. It would seem to the Chair that to refer to people who might have been in the environs in the sense of being there at some time during the day is not necessarily out of order, but it depends on the context in which it is made. If the member for Napier will pay attention to the Chair, he will hear what I am saying. Again, I would ask the member for Napier not to refer to people, visitors, strangers in the gallery, because such reference is open to the interpretation of being unparliamentary. I do not see it as a necessary part of his contribution to do so or not to do so.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: After that comment was made, Sir, the member for Napier commanded people on this side to shut their faces. As that comment is unparliamentary, I would ask that he retract it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am having a little trouble, because I did not hear him say 'Shut your faces.' I would ask him not to use those—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member could have a very quiet evening if he is not careful. I would ask the member for Napier to be very careful. I did not hear it, but it is not within the dignity of the House. I ask him not to use such terminology. Before he rises, the points of order have been taken and I think they are all cleared up.

An honourable member: Exhausted.

The SPEAKER: Exhausted will cover it. I will now allow the member for Napier to continue his contribution to this debate.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I do understand what you are saying, Sir. You said that you were having a bit of a problem following this: I am having a bit of a problem delivering it. The fact is that, when the Premier was delivering his reply to the second reading stage, it was fairly obvious that many people who guide the present Leader wanted to hear what was being said about their man. I think the message that has to get through to the Liberal Party, whether it be the parliamentary wing, the organisational wing or the wing that gives the current advice, is that what has been happening up to now has been a complete waste of Liberal Party money.

I should like to think that those people who were listening and taking note of what the Premier said will be listening to what I am saying. Despite the points of order—and I

should like to think that I am going to have more than two minutes—the message is getting through to them that what they have to offer the people of South Australia is a sham. What they have to offer the people of South Australia as an alternative Premier is a farce. The quicker that those people on the other side who are reluctant to do so come to their senses and throw their support behind the members for Bragg or for Coles, because of some deal that was made a few months back,—and I do not care which one it is—

Mr Ferguson: The member for Coles would be far better.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague the member for Henley Beach says that the member for Coles may be better. At least the member for Coles has courage (she was prepared to say certain things) but I think that as far as the electorate is concerned the member for Bragg would perhaps be a more amenable prospect. At the moment—and I repeat what I said in the second reading stage—with everything going for it, the Liberal Party cannot get more than 20 per cent support for its Leader; 46 per cent of Liberals still prefer John Bannon as Premier. If that message is not getting through to the minders of the Liberal Party, we on this side of the House might as well say, 'We've got it made forever.'

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

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I will use part of the time allocated to me tonight to address the tax on petrol and funding for transport. However, before doing so I wish to turn my attention to what I term sleazy little deals. In his excellent address to this Parliament, the Liberal Leader mentioned something about the sleazy Government deals that have been revealed in the Auditor-General's Report relating to Homesure. However, I wish to turn my attention in particular to a media statement entitled 'Secret deals which buy votes must be halted by political disclosure legislation' by Senator John Olsen of 2 September 1991. In part, the Senator's press release states:

The Bannon Government's secret donation of \$2 million of taxpayers' money to the State Bank of South Australia to keep interest rates down during the 1989 State election campaign was an unscrupulous use of funds to buy votes; exactly the type of political corruption the Political Advertising and Political Disclosures Bill should be legislating to halt.

The press release further states:

Senator John Olsen (Chairman of the Federal Coalition's Disclosure Committee, Chairman of the Coalition's Public Inquiry into the Political Disclosure Legislation and now Deputy Chairman of the Senate Joint Party Select Committee on the Bill) said that deliberately keeping the 'donation' hidden off the bank's books showed just how devious a Government desperately clinging to power was prepared to be.

The Senator finishes his media statement by saying:

The 1989 campaign was about high interest rates, and it was won on a knife edge.

From all the evidence, the Government literally bought votes secretly through the State Bank—and the taxpayers of South Australia paid for it. It was not an excuse in clean Government and one the Senate select committee must ensure cannot happen again, anywhere in Australia.

If the Premier has not been involved in political corruption, there is no doubt that he is morally corrupt. If the Premier has had any part in this sort of sleazy back room deal to effectively buy votes by paying a bank \$2 million to hold its interest rates down until after an election by using taxpayers' money, he is morally corrupt. That is the sort of Government we are left with.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Backbenchers on the other side may well start interjecting, because their future depends on this sort of corruption being exposed.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The Minister of Finance may well scoff also. I am sure that this Parliament will be interested to hear what he has to say about this matter in the future. As I said in opening, I wish to address that matter only briefly, but I wish to look in more detail at part of the budget as it pertains to petrol tax. As members of this place would be aware, on a number of occasions I have brought up the issue of petrol tax in this Parliament. This State Government continues to reap petrol tax from South Australian motorists at an ever growing and alarming rate. Since it froze the amount of tax revenue going to roads at \$25.726 million in the 1983-4 financial year, we have seen a massive generation of moneys that have finished up in general revenue. I note that since 1983 the petrol tax has generated more than \$394 million but that only \$180 million of that amount has been credited to the Highways Fund. The balance of \$214 million has gone straight into general revenue. That amount going into general revenue has received a massive boost this financial year, because I note from the budget papers that in this financial year the State Government plans to collect \$86 million through petrol tax, an increase of almost \$20 million, with every cent of that going into general revenue. There is no doubt that that money will ultimately be used to prop up, yet again, the State Bank.

While this has been happening—and this has also been fostered through the 1 cent per litre increase in the budget—we are finding that money is not being allocated realistically to roads and transport. I am delighted that the Minister of Transport is sitting here tonight to hear a little bit about this; he may care to reply to my comments a little later if he wishes to participate in this debate. By way of example, I turn now to some past Government statements that were made in 1986 via a report entitled 'Transport policy in strategic planning', which was prepared by the then Director-General of Transport (Dr Derek Scrafton). Dr Scrafton looked at transport needs in South Australia as a whole and he made some very interesting comments. I note that for the years 1991 to 1996 he recommended that an overpass be built at the Oaklands Park railway crossing. That is something that my colleague the member for Hayward and I would be very pleased to see, and we look forward to the Minister's honouring that recommendation.

The report makes some further very interesting recommendations. It talks about such things as building a new rail line from Hallett Cove to Hackham along the disused Willunga rail easement and about extending the Noarlunga Centre rail line south to serve Moana, Seaford, Aldinga and Willunga. It talks also about developing the Glenelg tramline either by extending it north from Victoria Square along King William Street to terminate near the Adelaide Children's Hospital or by converting the tramline to a busway. The report recommends upgrading or converting all or part of the suburban rail network to light rail transit, which at that stage was costed up to \$355 million; improving diesel heavy rail, which would cost up to \$243 million; or, alternatively, improving heavy electric rail, which would cost up to \$282 million or converting to a busway at a cost of up to \$150 million. It also recommends reintroducing trolley buses to inner suburban routes.

That report makes a number of interesting recommendations for our rail network, and it makes me wonder whether that is why the Minister of Transport seems to be hell bent on closing down our rail line so that he can then do whatever he likes with it. First, he would get the commuters off the trains and close down the rail network so that he could have a bit more flexibility. However, the problem is that too many decisions need to be made; there are a few options that require closer analysis, a bit of

scrutiny and, heaven forbid, decisions, something that we have not seen much of from this Government.

There is a growing momentum amongst a number of interested groups in this State for something to be done about funding in transport. Members opposite should be aware that the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, as one reputable body, some time ago launched a campaign for a north-south motorway for Adelaide by the year 2000. At the rate at which the present Government is going, we will be lucky to have anything left but the State Bank debt by the year 2000. Nevertheless, we must try to get something done, to get some sort of planning in place.

The paper published by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry entitled 'A north-south motorway for Adelaide by the year 2000' states, in part:

Our top priority, as representatives of business, is a north-south motorway to relieve the congestion on many of the existing roads. We have to assume, notwithstanding present State financial problems, that if we can get the people to understand both the roads problem generally, and the benefits which can come from a north-south motorway, that the politicians will hear and the money will be found. We have to work hard at this in order to drive our message home.

That is almost a message of frustration from the chamber; it will have to work hard to try to drive the message home, because it keeps falling on deaf ears as far as the Government is concerned—a Government that has become stagnant, lacklustre and lacking in ideas. South Australia needs a Government with vision, a Government of action and a Government for advancement. It also needs honest government, and the present Government provides absolutely none of those things.

It has failed South Australia; it has let down the people of this State. Ultimately, there is only one way of giving the people of South Australia what they want and that is to change the Government. It is time for a change; it is time for a change for the future of our State and for the future of our children.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The Minister of Finance and Transport may well say, 'Calm down, calm down', but at the end of the day that is what people of this State are saying. They have had enough of the Government; they have had enough of the Government's policies; and they are saying loudly and clearly that they want the Government to go and that they would love very much to have the opportunity to have a poll. As I keep saying in this place, we would love that opportunity now.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I will continue on from my budget speech, wherein I was critical of certain management aspects of the State Bank. What concerns me is that I am not yet convinced that we have been told the full story in relation to the bad and doubtful debts of the State Bank. The whole issue has been confused in relation to the difference between bad and doubtful debts and non-performing loans. Some months ago the Bank of New Zealand took action against the Remm Corporation concerning a debt of \$300 million. I understand that was settled out of court and that the State Bank, as the primary organiser/lender of the \$530 million project in Rundle Mall, was protecting its interests.

Somewhere along the line \$830 million is locked up in loans to this organisation. I believe that the time has come when the Government must inform this House and the people of South Australia of the true extent of the bad and doubtful debts in the State Bank/Beneficial Finance organisations. We must be advised—and I have endeavoured to

put a question on notice about this—of how much was written off in the first year against the bad and doubtful debts and how much has been written off this year.

In the first year of a bad or doubtful debt it is the normal practice to write off 40 per cent; in the second year, if that debt has not been recovered, 30 per cent is written off; and in the third year, if the debt has not been recovered, the remaining 30 per cent is written off. In other words, the full amount of the loan is written off over a three-year period at a rate of 40 per cent, 30 per cent and 30 per cent.

When we are told that the provision for bad debts in the State Bank is about \$2.2 billion, we want to know how that amount is made up. I do not think that is a difficult question for the Government to answer in relation to client confidentiality of the State Bank, because most of those companies are well-known public companies and their results have been published and/or printed in financial journals and magazines throughout Australia. All we want to know is exactly what is the bottom line.

I well remember in December 1988, and on previous occasions but particularly on this occasion, when I attended a luncheon with the then General Manager of the State Bank and the then Leader of the Opposition (John Olsen), questioning Marcus Clark on some of the performances of a particular company, and I was remonstrated with for doing so. I was told that there were no problems, no worries. I understand that that company never paid off its debt to the State Bank—it transferred non-performing loans from that organisation to cover the security that was being used—and that those non-performing loans from that company turned out to be almost worthless.

It will take the royal commission a long time, a lot of questioning and hard work if it wants to get to the bottom of the real problems within the State Bank organisation. However, in the meantime, I suspect that, because those \$830 million in loans are tied up with the Remm Corporation and are due in March 1992, we will not be told until some time after that what is the fate of that financial arrangement. If that is to be put aside, the taxpayers of South Australia are not looking at \$2.2 billion: they will be looking at \$3 billion. It will be an absolute tragedy if that is the situation.

Not enough questions have been asked, and Nobby Clark has not provided enough information to the people of South Australia in relation to the way in which the amount has been made up in the provision for those bad and doubtful debts, nor has anyone had the chance to question him. No-one has had the opportunity to face him. He is the most difficult person to talk to, because he does not talk to anyone. No-one can talk to him. As a politician I do not give a damn who is the chairman of the board or who is the general manager of a company, if I cannot get through to them, I think it is time they should be replaced. Nobby Clark is not beyond approach by anyone and, if he has this State at heart—he is a Victorian and I cannot see how he could—he had better start demonstrating a bit of fairness.

As I said, like everyone else, I was taken aback by his recent unfounded criticism of the Leader of the Opposition. However, if he wants to play that sort of game, he should remember that on this side of the border we play hard as well. I just hope that Mr Clark will get the opportunity through his new managing director—whatever his name is—to provide a lot of the answers that are still required. I do not care who they are; they are being paid good money to be directors of these companies, they are accountable to the people and it is high time they were made to perform. There are plenty of competent people in South Australia to take their place; have no fears about that.

I received a telephone call this afternoon from a very worried constituent who had had enough of the behaviour of certain juveniles in the community. I suppose his concern was triggered by the *Advertiser* this morning which contained a photograph of a car that had rammed into a police car. My constituent asked how much longer should we have to put up with this tolerance towards the larrikinism of certain people. We have had to go to extraordinary lengths through the State Transport Authority to control the behaviour of some passengers and the amount of damage they have done. They have held the transport system to ransom. For God's sake, we have to put jazz bands on the train to control their behaviour.

I was young once and we enjoyed ourselves, but we never got up to the antics of these young people. If we did step out of line we got a good kick in the tail or a clip behind the ear from the local police sergeant. I do not think that it hurt me or anyone else. What really gets up my nose is when I see at page 98 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1991 the reference to offender services, within the Department of Family and Community Services—the slap on the wrist service—and the statement that the department provides residential secure care for young offenders who have been sentenced or remanded in custody for assessment by the Children's Court. Details of net costs, staffing capacity and average occupancy for each centre as supplied by the department state that for 1991 the South Australian Youth Training Centre had 104 staff, the capacity of the centre was 50 and the average occupancy 38, and that is an increase on an average of four from the previous year. Because the average occupancy increased by four, two extra staff were required.

In 1990, the cost of looking after a juvenile offender in the South Australian Youth Training Centre was \$131 000 a year, or \$358 a day. They could be put in the Hilton Hotel at half that cost. In 1991, because we had four extra offenders in that institution, the cost reduced to \$119 289 per annum, which is more than the average Minister of the Crown receives for the work he puts in. The daily cost was \$326. In 1991, the average cost per juvenile offender at the South Australian Youth and Remand Assessment Centre was \$151 411 per annum or \$414 per day. In 1990 the cost was even greater. At that time 14 was the average occupancy at that institution, which has a capacity of 36 people and a staff of 60, and the cost was \$173 071 or \$474 per day. We could send these offenders on a one-way trip to Singapore for that amount. Look at the money we would save. It would be an education for them—a great learning process. They would not come back unless they learned how to behave themselves.

As my constituent said, he is tired of the damage being caused by offenders running rampant throughout the community harassing and tormenting the aged, the disadvantaged and the disabled. It is time that we got tougher. It was his suggestion that we should bring in the birch. I do not necessarily go along with that suggestion, but he said that when the birch was in operation only one person ever came back a second time.

I believe we have to adopt a soft approach: we have to take those people on camps, we have to take them into a greater caring environment and teach them normal lifestyle habits. We must educate them in life's disciplines. They will learn that if they are taken away with a couple of caring workers. It is still expensive, but they could be taken to the outback, although not too far.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. P.B. Arnold): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During the 1950s, Roger Bannister broke the four minute mile; the world applauded and called it the 'miracle mile'. Then we saw another miracle: we saw a four minute policy speech. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition broke the four minutes: in three minutes and 59 seconds he told us how he would right all the ills of the South Australian economy. I must say that it was delightfully simple, and I suppose I ought to say that it probably had to be delightfully simple so that all members of the Liberal Party could understand it. His policies were: to sell the State Bank, to sell the SGIC, to sell the State forests and to cut the Public Service. He believes, from what he has told us so far, that by taking that course of action he will solve the financial problems of South Australia.

I want to know more detail—as I believe do the people within his own electorate—of the proposals he has put forward to the Parliament. The Opposition Leader's statement that a Liberal Government would sell the State's forests is more noteworthy for what it does not say. It has a nice ring to it: sell the forests, they are worth a lot of money. Nothing could be more simple! No mention was made of the Woods and Forests Department's sawmilling operations to which a significant proportion of the forests are dedicated.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting.

Mr FERGUSON: I am pleased to hear the member for Mount Gambier interjecting because he ought to be demanding that his Leader ease the problems of the people in his own electorate in terms of what will happen with the Woods and Forests Department. There must be a lot of worried people in Mount Gambier, particularly after they heard what the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday about what he will do to the people in his own electorate and to those in the electorate of the member for Mount Gambier. There are three mills at Mount Gambier, Nangwarry and Mount Burr which currently employ in milling and marketing about 800 of the department's 1 220 employees. What will happen to these people if the forests are sold? What does the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mount Gambier intend to do with—

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I know this is a sore point, and I know this is upsetting the Opposition, but details of this sort are absolutely necessary. Before any announcement is made in this Parliament, before anything is put before the people of South Australia, they are entitled to know the details. Certainly, those people in the South-East would want to know what will happen to their employment should the woods and forests operations be sold. Are they part of the Leader's 9 000 public sector employees destined for the employment scrap heap? Will that group of people in the South-East be included in the Public Service cuts? Let him come out and tell us. Let someone stand up and say what members of the Opposition will do with those people employed in the Woods and Forests Department in the South-East if they sell the forests.

The loss of 800 jobs in the South-East would be devastating for the region's economy. Will the mills be sold off to the private sector? Will they be sold to foreign investors? Will they be sold to Japanese interests? What will happen to them? Over 100 years ago a conservative Government in this State invited private enterprise to enter into the forestry market in the South-East but it was not game enough to touch it. It would not touch it with a barge pole. So, it was the Government that went in and established the forests; it was Government money.

The Hon. Thomas Playford had much to do with forests in the South-East. Government money was invested. Government enterprise has produced those forests and now, when there is something that could be valuable and could be exploited, the Leader of the Opposition wants to hand it to private enterprise. Not even a price was mentioned: would it go to the highest bidder?

In this time of recession, what sort of a price do they think we would get for the woods and forests? We would be selling the woods and forests at fire sale prices, after Governments, both Conservative and Labor, have invested time and money in something that has become so valuable. It would go to private enterprise at a bargain basement price: not only that, it would mean unemployment and misery in the South-East.

If the timber rights do not go with the mills, they would fetch a fraction of their true value. This would be a serious, unnecessary loss to the State's taxpayer. Indeed, what would happen to the timber rights for the mills? Will a future Liberal Government sell the rights and have no reference to the millions of dollars that have been invested in the mills in the South-East? If a Liberal Government does that, is it prepared to write off the huge losses that would be involved? I know that you, Mr Acting Speaker, have been involved in finances from time to time and that you would understand that the amount of money that could be gained from selling our woods and forests, on the one hand, would be lost through having to sell the mills at bargain basement prices.

What will happen to SATCO's core businesses at Nangwarry and Mount Gambier and the people they employ? Those people depend on existing contracts for timber with the Woods and Forests Department. Will those contracts be among those contracts which the Leader says he will honour? What will happen to those mills in Mount Gambier? Given the Opposition's attitude to SATCO, one would not want to hold one's breath.

Debt has been mentioned and reference has been made to the marvellous record of Sir Thomas Playford, who had the worst debt record in the history of this State. Time does not permit me to read out once again the levels of debt that have occurred during the history of government in South Australia, but Sir Thomas Playford holds the record for the worst debt in this State. I have heard members waxing lyrical this afternoon about the reign of Sir Thomas Playford. What short memories they have. It must have been wonderful for members of the Opposition when the establishment families held sway in South Australia and could do what they liked while producing huge profits for the companies that they controlled. But, I can remember what working conditions were like in those days.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I notice that the junior sports policy is back in the public arena, and I say at the outset that it is a philosophy that I happen to support, wherein children are taught the skills of sport before they graduate up through the stages of competition. However, the way that the policy was sold and its implementation over the past 18 months has left much to be desired. The Government keeps telling us that it does not have a problem, that Institute of Sport officers have the authority to go around and make alterations and amendments to the policy. Indeed, that is what they have been doing. Hopefully, they have been putting out bushfires as they go.

I have been bringing to the attention of the public through the media over the past six months what is happening in high schools in the State. Over the past 12 months, since the Education Department brought in the 85 per cent time

in front of students rule, we have seen the demise of zone sport and knock out competition and, indeed, the interchange of teams between schools. In some areas we have seen zone sport cut out completely, and in others we have seen reductions of up to 75 per cent. Those figures have been well publicised in the media.

Until a week or two ago I was almost a lone voice in the wilderness, but I should bring to the attention of the House the concern expressed publicly at a meeting at the South Australian Sports Institute on Tuesday 3 September this year. That meeting represented about 13 major sports in this town. This group has come out publicly in support of what the Opposition has been saying for the past 12 months, that is, that the implementation of the junior sports policy, particularly as it applies in high schools, is a matter of grave concern. It is of concern because it cuts right across the Government's social justice policy. It means that, if one wants one's child to be involved in sport at secondary level, one has to send the child to a private school in order to guarantee that participation because the State system no longer provides it, despite the claim that sport is part of the curriculum in the State school system. In reality that is not the case.

In some zones there has been a cut back in team participation of up to 75 per cent, so one cannot claim for a minute that sport is now featuring as part of the curriculum. I would like briefly to put on the public record the resolution passed at the institute on 3 September, as follows:

This meeting expresses its concern that:

1. The Education Department is not fulfilling its obligation and responsibilities with regard to the implementation of the junior sports policy.

2. The time devoted to teaching of physical education and sport during school time is decreasing when the junior sports policy advocates that 'sport is a legitimate and significant activity within the school curriculum.'

3. The loss of up to 60 per cent of staff responsible for the organisation and conduct of Education Department school sport, that is, SAPSASA and SASSSA. This will result in a reduction of the programs offered by these organisations, which again contradicts the major objectives of the junior sports policy which is 'to provide the best possible sporting experiences for all children with a view to encouraging long life, successful, active participation in sport'.

The meeting expresses its support for the principles and concepts upon which the junior sports policy has been developed.

I agree totally with that last sentence: it is vital that we do ease children through the principles and concepts of sport before we take them up to competition. The only reason sport is surviving now at high school level is because of the dedication and volunteerism of a few dedicated teachers and parents. Indeed, the number of teachers now staying involved in sport because they are dedicated to it is decreasing, and it is of great concern to all parents that they run the risk of their children not being involved in and exposed to sport.

The Government is hoping that the associations will step in and fill the breach, but that is not happening because the associations are not being funded to provide the coaching wherewithal to go in and fill the gap. It is a great concern and one which I hope the Government in this budget session will take on board and start to redress. The sports that put their signature to that motion included Athletics S.A., hockey, baseball, softball, squash, rugby, South Australian National Football League, table tennis, badminton, SA Tennis, netball, the Womens Football League and lacrosse. Members can see from that list that those sports comprise a significant part of the South Australian sporting community.

I would also like to raise the same matter I raised yesterday in Question Time. I was pleased to see that the *Advertiser* mentioned it this morning and, since then, it has gathered momentum. I refer to the closure of Crisis Care

during daylight hours. At some time all members will have advised someone to ring Crisis Care or they will have told people what services are available at Crisis Care. It is an extremely valuable part of the welfare sector, and it is a service that people can call on. Sometimes they might think about it for days or weeks and let it build up before they need its services. Others need access to Crisis Care quickly, perhaps as a result of a particular incident.

The evening service is to continue, although there are problems with that service and the number of staff available to go out on emergency calls. We will be addressing that matter during the Estimates Committees. To cut out the service during daylight hours and to rely on staff at the various regional offices is something that is doomed to failure. Today I have been called by officers involved in Crisis Care as a result of this morning's *Advertiser* article. They confirmed what I have already been told by other social workers in the field around Adelaide, and they added that the regional and branch offices of the department will not be able to cope or provide service.

If someone rings Crisis Care, they will want to spend some time on the telephone, and the counsellor also will want to spend time on the telephone. If someone is contemplating taking some sort of serious action or needs advice, that is not the sort of thing that can be fobbed off in a quick telephone call by saying, 'Come down to the office. We will make an appointment for you on Friday.' It is a matter of sitting down and talking through a problem there and then on the telephone. A number of staff are involved in Crisis Care at any one time. The Government cannot believe that shifting the service out to the regional offices is the answer. It will be impossible to train new staff on the job.

The Government has to bear in mind the number of retail outlets that the department has at the moment. If they were all to become contact points for Crisis Care during daylight hours, the service would not work. It is a travesty that this is happening, and it is of grave concern to all of us involved with the welfare sector. I know for a fact that the professionals in the non-Government welfare sector involved in referrals are deeply concerned about it.

The final point I make tonight in the one minute I have left is to voice the concern of the Glenelg community and council about the way the Government is taking so long to announce the preferred option for the redevelopment of the Patawalonga. Members would know from the media that three plans remain in contention. The Glenelg council was asked to put its preferred option, which it has done. It is waiting on the Government, which is dragging its feet. The Glenelg council has every right to be extremely concerned that the Government is putting off the evil day of making its decision. Local residents want to know what plan would be the preferred option so that others can have some input. I implore the Government to get on with it.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I wish to speak tonight about the Bannon Government's strong commitment to crime prevention and community security. Before so doing, I add my congratulations to others in the community who have recognised the work done by our Attorney-General, Chris Sumner. I do not believe that any other Minister, in the 12 years that I have been in this Parliament, has committed themselves to the issue of law and order as he has. The fact that he was elected unanimously as the President of the World Society of Victimology attests to his ability to address this very important issue out there in the community. As most of us would be aware, his term of office is for three years, until 1994. Mr Sumner has been an execu-

tive member of WSV since 1988, and he is the current President of the Australasian Society of Victimology and the first Australian to be elected World President.

It is unfortunate that the media has not run with this story, because to be the first Australian elected to this prestigious position is quite an achievement, particularly with the amount of concern in the community (and every member of this Parliament recognises it) in respect of law and order. We should all extend our congratulations to the Attorney-General. It is a great honour to be elected President of such a body. In recognition of the Attorney-General's position, Adelaide will host the next international symposium on victimology to be held in August 1994. This symposium, addressing the problems of victims of crime, will bring together academics, researchers, lawyers and victim support organisations interested in issues concerning victims of crime. The fact that we will have, in 1994, more than 400 delegates participating in this symposium attests to the amount of work to which our Attorney-General has committed himself over many years.

I extend my personal congratulations to the Attorney-General because, as I have indicated, this is one of those very important issues that concerns each and every one of us in the community. As a consequence of the work done by the Attorney-General, this Government has indicated to the community at large that it has come to grips with problems in respect of law and order. Despite the attempts by members opposite to play down the amount of work that this Government has put into law and order and the resources committed to it, that work is paying off. I am not saying that there are not problems out in the community in respect of law and order, because there are many issues. For members opposite to say that South Australia has the worst record in this area mishandles the truth. We can look at New South Wales and the sort of problems it has under a conservative Government. I do not necessarily say that it is the fault of that Government as I believe that that is the attitude of people who wish to make it a political issue.

I vividly recall, back in 1979, when I first stood for a position in this Parliament, the disgusting advertisements run by the conservative Party implying that the problems of rape and other law and order issues in the community were the fault of the Corcoran Government. That incensed me and, as all members in this place know, since coming into this Parliament I have addressed this issue constantly. Let us look at the amount of money provided for the police budget. I seek leave to incorporate a graph in *Hansard*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it of a purely statistical nature?

Mr HAMILTON: It is, Sir.

Leave granted.

COMPARATIVE FUNDING LEVELS

	\$ million
1987-88	191.9
1988-89	217.1
1989-90	236.7
1990-91	261.8
1991-92 (EST)	273.2

Mr HAMILTON: The Police Department budget has been increased overall by \$11.4 million, that is, 4.3 per cent from \$261.8 million to \$273.2 million. This reflects an increase in recurrent funding of 6.6 per cent, and the maintenance of high levels of capital funding for equipment, vehicles and building of recent years. In terms of staff levels, the budget provides for recruitment of additional personnel in the 1991-92 financial year. This includes the final 15 of 45 additional police officers for the Aboriginal deaths in custody initiatives. Those staff are in addition to the 200 extra police positions approved in the last two budgets.

Again, I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* statistical data detailing that information.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir, I saw the document that the honourable member sought leave to incorporate in *Hansard* on the last occasion. His assurance to you was false: it is a graph. He used that term in the course of his remarks both before and after seeking leave.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair sought an assurance from the honourable member that it was not a graph but rather a statistical table. The honourable member gave an assurance. Until such time as the Chair has an opportunity to inspect the document, I am not in a position to rule on it. I take the honourable member's word to this House as he gave it and I assume that Standing Orders are complied with. Is the honourable member still seeking leave to incorporate the statistical table?

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

COMPARATIVE STAFFING LEVELS

	FTE's
1988	4000-4050
1989	4050
1990	4150-4200
1991	4300-4350
1992	4350-4400

Mr HAMILTON: I feel sure that, if it is not to your satisfaction, Sir, it will not be incorporated.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Correct: if it is not a statistical table, it will not be incorporated in the record. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: Funding has also been provided for the retention of 14 police officers previously seconded to the National Crime Authority. These staff will now be employed on Anti Corruption Branch operations and on secondment to the permanent NCA office in Adelaide for use in areas such as joint surveillance operations within the department on a cost shared basis. An additional 32.5 public servant positions have also been provided for clerical duties. A significant level of funding has again been provided for equipment and vehicle acquisitions in 1991-92.

This includes \$10.7 million for 624 replacement vehicles, including 230 patrol sedans, 151 unmarked sedans, 105 light sedans, 43 station sedans, 34 motorcycles and various other quantities of two and four-wheel drive prison vans, utilities and so on. Some \$4.6 million has been allocated for new and replacement computer equipment, including a firearms control system, crime case management system, prosecution brief inquiry system and a human resources management system. The sum of \$3.3 million has been provided for other equipment and \$1.6 million for communications equipment in country divisions.

There is no doubt that anyone examining this document and, indeed, the allocation to the budget for crime prevention in South Australia will quite clearly see that the Government has honoured its commitment to address law and order issues in the community, and I believe that not only in this budget but in future budgets there will be increased funding to address this important problem of crime prevention in South Australia.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The member for Henley Beach had the absolute gall to attempt to rebuke the Opposition for its future intentions with regard to the sale of timber in the South-East. I say 'gall' because we should look at the Government's record: SATCO, that organisation that should never have been founded in 1969, lost \$10 million; Scrimber, closed, lost \$60 million; and a further \$3.1 million was allocated simply for the final closure of Scrimber, and those figures include a loss of \$5

million by SGIC for non-performance of its \$25 million investment. The township of Mount Burr is to close under this Government's hands. It already has that in mind for next year. Eight hundred pine fallers have lost their jobs in the South-East through automation, and we now have only 20 or 30 pine fallers. Shepherdson and Mewett mill was closed at a loss of \$750 000. The Williamstown mill has been closed under this Government at a cost of about \$500 000. IPL New Zealand lost \$16.1 million.

The member for Henley Beach had the gall to ask how we can improve on the Government's performance. It would not be very difficult given that track record. We have a Minister who has admitted in this House that he does not know what is going on with regard to Scrimber, and any Minister who does not know, I suggest, does not care. I assure members that the South-East mills will thrive. They cannot move the mills or the forests of growing trees. The cost of transportation of heavy logs over any distance to a mill is exorbitant, and value added at the mill is the best way to process material.

The South-East mills will thrive, and I assure residents in the South-East that my first concern is to protect employment. The Government has not done that, because in the South-East unemployment is at an almost all-time high. It would be at an all-time high if the figures were not rigged currently by Federal and State Governments. There are 2 550 people registered as unemployed in the South-East, and several major industries are on only four-fifths time, which would put another 20 per cent of their staff on unemployment, because that is the amount of money that is lost to the economy. We have an assortment of Government schemes which transfer people from the unemployment lists onto Government supported lists—educational, retraining, and so on. Officially, they are not unemployed, but they are still in receipt of Government benefits. I believe that the unemployment level in the South-East would be about the 3 000 mark.

Let us look at the Government's track record. Unemployment in South Australia is well over 10 per cent when the Australian average is 9.9 per cent. The Premier predicts that things will improve, yet the Federal Treasurer, John Kerin, says that the Australian unemployment rate will go to 10.75 per cent within the next 12 months. He is not predicting any rapid improvement in the economy and in employment. South Australia has about 26 per cent of its youth officially unemployed, and I suggest that there are pockets of unemployment around this city and in the country where that would be closer to 35 or 36 per cent. The Government's track record on employment is disastrous.

Another point that I have to make relates to this repeated reference by members on the Government benches, from the Premier downwards, to the fact that the Playford and Tonkin days were bad ones financially. In 1966, the year in which Tom Playford left office, the net indebtedness of South Australia was \$1 136 million for a population of 1.094 million—about \$1 000 per head of population. By the time the Tonkin Government came to office in 1979, the net indebtedness of South Australia was \$2 440 million for a population of 1.299 million. The Tonkin Government borrowed about \$100 million a year for three years, increasing the indebtedness from \$2 440 million in 1979 to \$2 767 million in 1982. But the Bannon Government, during the next three years, increased borrowings in South Australia not by \$300 million but by \$1.03 billion. I suggest that is a pretty good improvement in the borrowing in a short period.

During the Bannon term of office the borrowing has gone from \$2 767 million in 1982 to \$6 642 million in 1991—a massive increase of about \$4 billion in nine years. The

interest rates per capita have increased from \$109.15 per head in 1982 to \$520 per head in 1991. That is just for the interest to service debts. So much for an improvement in the economic state of affairs in South Australia! I have a table which is absolutely statistical and I seek leave to have it inserted into *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

STATISTICS FROM AUDITOR-GENERALS REPORTS: S.A.
S.A. Indebtedness and Interest (Nett after Recovery)

Year Ended 30 June	Net Indebtedness in \$ Million	Net Interest Costs p.a. \$ (Million)	Population in Millions	Per Capita Debt \$ (Int.) (p.a.)
1966	1 136	N/A	1.094	N/A
1967	1 215	N/A	1.116	N/A
1968	1 303	N/A	1.132	N/A
1969	1 406	N/A	1.149	N/A
1970	1 492	49.30	1.170	42.14
1971	1 567	53.56	1.200	44.63
1972	1 646	59.56	1.209	49.26
1973	1 746	63.32	1.227	51.60
1974	1 844	66.52	1.254	53.05
1975	2 006	71.38	1.257	56.79
1976	1 918	65.54	1.274	51.44
1977	2 097	75.43	1.280	58.93
1978	2 281	90.08	1.292	69.72
1979	2 440	97.90	1.299	75.37
1980	2 663	110.48	1.304	84.72
1981	2 759	125.64	1.318	95.33
1982	2 767	144.52	1.324	109.15
1983	2 898	165.36	1.335	123.87
1984	3 489	200.59	1.348	148.81
1985	3 797	267.20	1.366	195.61
1986	3 664	369.00	1.377	267.97
1987	4 003	413.00	1.388	297.55
1988	3 960	439.00	1.401	310.35
1989	4 042	440.00	1.417	310.52
1990	4 174	559.00	1.432	390.36
1991	6 642	780.00 (Est.)	1.500 (Est.)	520.00

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I hope that I have put that little—

An honourable member: Furphy to rest.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is a furphy, although Furphy is the name for the Australian water cart which was invented for the soldiers in the First World War, so I am not really sure. They used to say that the Furphy was coming around, but the Furphy was something good. We will just say that it is a specious argument that the Government has been promulgating that has now been laid to rest.

I now refer to the State Bank. The Managing Director of the State Bank has not in official documents stated that he will repay the \$2 billion grant that the Government and the taxpayers of South Australia have made to the bank. But there have been conversations on radio interviews and information given to his bank officers. Question 17 of a series of 20 questions (page 4) asks:

Will the bank repay the State Government for its indemnity?

The answer is:

The State Bank will repay the Government from profits over time. The time this will take will depend on the speed at which the bank can return to strong profitability.

I should say that is another specious argument, if ever there was one. Last year the bank returned \$43 million to the State's coffers, and this year it has returned \$21 million. It would appear that it will take forever before the State Bank arrives at a state of profitability where it can meet even the \$220 million a year interest repayments, let alone begin to start repaying the principal.

So, for the General Manager, the Chairman and every member of the staff of the State Bank to tell people that the bank will return to profitability and start repaying the loan is an absolutely false argument. The State Bank will

never be in a position to repay that loan. It is a permanent millstone debt around the necks of all South Australians.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: From here to eternity.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: From here to eternity, as the member for Coles says, and quite right too, because there is no way that that debt will ever be repaid through bank profitability, especially as the bank is winding back away from national and international banking affairs into becoming a more localised, regionalised bank with, therefore, diminished profitability.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words in this debate, because this afternoon we were treated to an interesting exercise from the member for Stuart, who decided with all her wisdom and knowledge of rural areas of South Australia that she would draw to the attention of this House the gross inadequacies of this Government by asking questions about my district. One would have thought that the member for Stuart had sufficient problems in her own district. However, it has been rather interesting, because—

The Hon. H. Allison: She doesn't know the difference between a sheep and a Holden: the Holden is the one with the woolly seat covers.

Mr GUNN: I thank my colleague for his assistance; he has always been a most helpful member. It is rather opportune that only yesterday I received a letter from a lady at Port Pirie. It is not normally my fashion to interfere in other people's districts; I intended to give this letter to the Hon. Ron Roberts but, as the member for Stuart is so interested in my electorate, I thought I would bring to the attention of the House some of the difficulties that she is overlooking in her own district. The letter is dated 6 September, it is addressed to me and it states:

Dear Sir, I am writing to you hoping that you can help me. Regarding the environmental health mob, six months before we bought this home they did work on the outside, painting and a new roof (about 2½ years). I made complaints to them regarding the quality of the work done here and even approached a Mr Calder who came here and Ms Kathy Phipps very quickly stopped our interview (this was also with the chap two doors away) regarding the same thing, yet the house behind us that has no young kids has just about been rebuilt. Yet they will not do anything else here. They painted over rotten tin, and yet a house that could have just done with a coat of paint they reclad. Even the house next door has had new walls but they have done nothing else.

Even the dividing fence is 1 foot the wrong way. Mrs Dite came out over three months ago and of course we will look into all the complaints. This is their byword. If I could get the iron from the wall I would send it down to you. It is a case of who you know in the department or who you are in the town or if you were in the smelters at some time or other. Hope you can help as the Labor Party office referred me to the environmental mob, but the inspector I saw told me it should have been done properly as the walls were leaded.

The 'Labor Party mob' are the people in the member for Stuart's electorate office in Port Pirie. She has done nothing about it, yet she has plenty of time to get up in this House and raise matters about the port of Thevenard.

The interesting thing about that course of action is that in this budget the Government has decided to spend only \$8 million on the Department of Marine and Harbors. This is an industry which is producing nearly \$2 000 million, yet the Government has only \$8 million to spend on improving the ports. We all know that, if we are to improve the welfare of the citizens of this State, we have to export our products. When one examines the capital works program to see what some of these moneys are to be spent on, we note that at the Port Adelaide berth the Government will put in new dolphins.

Mr Brindal: New what?

Mr GUNN: New dolphins. It is also going to establish navigation aids that will cost \$800 000 and to spend \$1.5 million on the Outer Harbor crane centre, but nothing on the port of Thevenard. The Minister stands in his place attacking the Opposition in his usual grubby manner, because we have said that we will transfer loading facilities to private enterprise so that they will be upgraded—a bit of common-sense. However, the member for Stuart has the audacity to ask a barrage of questions. Obviously, someone in the Minister's office typed them for her because she did not understand what she was asking; she just read them in parrot-like fashion, attempting to pile scorn onto members on this side of the House.

I suggest to the honourable member that, if she wants to go down that track, that is fine, because there are a lot of questions that we can ask on a regular basis about the district of Port Augusta. I am not one to interfere, but this is the second occasion on which the honourable member has decided to ask a Dorothy Dix question. Obviously, she is the asker of Dorothy Dix questions. We know that she is under pressure in her electorate and that the mayor of Port Augusta is right after her, so the Government in its wisdom hands out each day to the member for Stuart two or three Dorothy Dix questions to try to get her photograph on the front page of the *Transcontinental*. We know all that, but it will not help the honourable member unless she can be a little bit original and ask some constructive questions that may do something to assist her unfortunate constituents who are losing their jobs.

I refer to employees of the Electricity Trust and Australian National who are losing their jobs. Because of the situation with ETSA, 100 of my people at Leigh Creek will lose their jobs and 80 houses will be sold. Traditionally, those people would have gone to Port Augusta, but there are no jobs there for them because AN is cutting back its operations. The Dunstan Government sold those people out, so there will be no jobs and there is nowhere for them to go.

It was this Government's friend in Canberra who cancelled the Darwin to Alice Springs railway line, which would have done so much good for the people of Port Augusta, but the honourable member has nothing to say about that. Her Federal colleague Mr O'Neil has been quoted in the newspaper complaining most bitterly about the high rate of unemployment in the Iron Triangle, one of the highest rates of unemployment in Australia, but where has the member for Stuart been? We have not heard her stick up for her unfortunate constituents who have all lost their jobs or for my constituents who are losing their jobs, who have been driven off their farms because of the economic policies of the Hawke Government. She just gets up and, like a parrot, asks Dorothy Dix questions about Thevenard, but the Government has no intention of doing anything.

In an interview that I arranged at Thevenard, the Minister (Mr Gregory) was rude and insulting to one of the Directors of Boral who had come all the way from Sydney to try to convince him that he should spend some money on the port. The fellow was disgusted with the way the Minister carried on. He has done nothing to honour the earlier undertakings of the Government. I look forward to the Minister explaining clearly to those people why he will not upgrade their port.

Instead of having the hapless member ask these silly sorts of questions, the Minister should do something constructive and agree with the suggestion of the South Australian Bulk Handling Company, which has sufficient funds to upgrade the unloading facilities if he is prepared to transfer them to that company. This budget, like most of the Bannon Government's actions, has done little for people in rural South

Australia, the people whom I, the member for Murray-Mallee and the member for Custance represent. Our electorates produce the export income. They provide the income to keep this State going, but the Government will spend less than 27 per cent of the revenue raised on rural South Australia. Because of the State Bank fiasco, every South Australian will pay \$600 000 every day towards meeting that debt.

The Government has increased the level of debt to 23 per cent of gross State product, and that is why my constituents will not have their port upgraded. That is why the Government will continue to close the kindergartens in my district and that is why taxation is going up. I look forward to the challenges that we will face in the next six months, because the program outlined by the Leader is courageous, it is commonsense, it is in the interests of all South Australians and it will help get rid of this incompetent socialist Government.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): For the first time since I have been in this House I have actually heard, during the Leader's reply to the budget, what the Liberal Party has, in the very general but nevertheless critical sense, in store for the people of South Australia: a proposal to sell the State Bank, the SGIC and the whole range of other activities owned by the taxpayers of this State at fire sale prices to a few of its business mates. Members opposite might be interested in this. In fact, I am sure they will be interested. For example, the Leader said:

We will sell off the forests in South Australia by tender, retaining the land; the Woods and Forests Department would replant their forests when they are clear felled.

There are two statements there that warrant very close scrutiny: first, the use of the word 'tender', which I will come back to by way of example. The second point is that after the Liberal Party has given away all the timber in this State to its mates to sell off at huge profits, it then expects the taxpayer, through the Woods and Forests Department, to pay for the cost of replanting its own land. Do not tell me that that is not a cosy little deal. I have been hearing sleaze coming from the other side of the House for the past week, and do not tell me that that is not sleazy.

I also referred to the use of the word 'tender'. Let me give an actual example of a Liberal Government's use of the word 'tender', and also of its helping out its mates. Members opposite should listen to this. In 1989, in New South Wales, under the Greiner Liberal Government, it was decided to upgrade and renew the State rail container fleet. The job was let out to tender, which attracted responses from four companies. They were TNT, with a known involvement in transport and the container industry; Sea Containers of London, which was also directly involved in the container and transport industry; Wreckair, which again has an established involvement in the transport industry; and, finally, a company called Mackfield.

The principal of Mackfield is Mr Bruce McDonald—none other than the former Liberal Opposition Leader in New South Wales, also a scalp hanging from the belt of Neville Wran, and also former State President of the Liberal Party and current backroom heavy of the South Australian Liberal Party. Guess who was awarded the \$5 million tender? None other than Mackfield. Is that not very strange? The essence of the deal was to reduce the State container fleet from 850 used containers to 550. The 550 containers would consist of 250 old containers to be refurbished by Mackfield and 300 new containers supplied through Mackfield, but built in Korea.

The remaining 600 old containers were to be given to Mackfield to be disposed of in any manner it saw fit.

Because the refurbishment of the 250 old containers was to be undertaken in South Australia and the 600 that were to be given gratis to Mackfield had to be delivered to South Australia, they were all transferred to this State at a cost not to Mackfield but to the taxpayers of New South Wales through the New South Wales railways. The cost to the New South Wales taxpayers was \$400 000. The cost to the New South Wales taxpayers gets even worse. I am reliably informed that out of all of those containers—

Members interjecting:

Mr McKEE: This is a great successful deal done by the New South Wales Liberal Government under the free enterprise basis that you have been espousing here this afternoon and over the past couple of days. I am reliably informed—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order, the member for Gilles will resume his seat. The honourable member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, I thought it was the custom in this House that members address their remarks through the Chair. The honourable member is directly addressing the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I did note the member using the term 'you'. The honourable member should direct his remarks to the Chair, as Standing Orders provide, and any reference at all to a member in this House is to either the electorate that he or she represents or their position in this Parliament. The honourable member for Gilles.

Mr McKEE: I am reliably informed that out of all of those containers only 30 per cent are being used; 70 per cent are sitting around empty in rail yards across New South Wales at a cost to the taxpayer of \$50 000 per month every month. However, the profit to Mackfield—their old mate—was \$560 000 for the 300 containers from Korea and 600 containers to do with as they please.

That is a direct example of what I have been hearing from the Opposition for the past couple of days, when it suggests that we should sell off the State's assets; in fact, strip the State assets, float the assets that are currently owned by the taxpayer and put them out on the free market for tender, and so on, so that they can supposedly be efficiently run under the strict free enterprise system. In that context 'free' is the operative word because, as my colleague the member for Henley Beach said earlier, if under the current circumstances State assets were to be stripped, they would be sold at rock bottom prices and picked up by friends of the Liberal Opposition. I have just given an actual example of that process under a Liberal Government in New South Wales, which not only generally helped out its mates—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gilles will resume his seat. The honourable member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I have listened with great patience to the honourable member while he denigrated the New South Wales Government, but now he is attributing improper motives to all members on this side of the House by saying that we would sell off to our mates, when in fact the Leader stated quite clearly that the issue would go to tender.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I do not think the honourable member impugned the Opposition.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order. I do not uphold the point of order. I did not read the honourable member's statement in the same way as the member for Mount Gambier. The honourable member for Gilles.

Mr McKEE: In fact, when I raised this issue, my comments were centred around the word 'tender', and I was referring to the tender offered by the New South Wales Liberal Greiner Government which seemed to have been won by a former Liberal Opposition Leader in New South Wales. There appears to me to be a very direct connection between the Greiner Government's operating under the public tender system and, all of a sudden, rewarding its former Leader of the Opposition, its former State Liberal Party President in this State—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Mr Speaker, I accept your ruling on the previous point of order, but I feel personally offended that this man is implying—

The SPEAKER: Order! 'This man' is not an acceptable term in the House.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member for—the visiting scholar.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, the member for Gilles. I must apologise, Mr Speaker, but it is the first time I have heard the honourable member speak in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take the point made by the member for Mount Gambier. My interpretation is that the member for Gilles is making a statement about Party members. I do not uphold the point of order, but I assure the member for Mount Gambier that I will listen very carefully now—now that the member for Goyder has finished with me—and I will listen to every word. If there is any point of order I will certainly entertain it.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, while you were on your feet, the member for Gilles referred to us as having wax in our ears. I take exception to reference being made to my hygiene.

The SPEAKER: If the member for Gilles used that term, I did not hear it. It may have offended the member for Hayward, although I do not find it unparliamentary. However, I think that the member for Gilles was out of order in speaking while the Speaker was on his feet, and I will certainly chastise him for that. The term itself is not unparliamentary. The honourable member's time has now expired and I think that the Opposition has successfully prevented his continuing in this debate. I now call the member for Culance.

Mr VENNING (Culance): I will follow my Leader's good example and be positive and talk about the way that South Australia can get out of the problems it is in now. We have spent the past three days being very direct and talking about the problems of this State. I will be positive now and talk about a way that we can get out of our problems, and that is by way of value adding. There is an increasing recognition that, to make the most of our resources, Australian primary producers must value add to their product in order to extract the greatest return. Value adding is the buzz word at the moment. As we all know, Australian producers are the most efficient in the world, but they are still susceptible to international market behaviour, and we know what is happening there.

We are suffering financially and economically. As a small nation, Australia is a price taker in exports of unprocessed commodities; that is, the market share is too small to influence price on the world markets. Great wealth is to be gained and retained by value adding here in Australia. Value adding means the upgrading and processing of primary products so that they can be sold for higher prices. For example, wheat worth \$120 a tonne to the grower as a raw

product can be transformed into a breakfast cereal worth \$2 400 a tonne, and it is not a highly technical matter to do that.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Do we export breakfast cereals?

Mr VENNING: We do not export breakfast cereals in any great quantity. I know the Sanitarium company has tried that, but it has not been pushed to its full potential.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: A high bulk product!

Mr VENNING: It is a high bulk product, but it is a very high value added product. In 1990-91, \$12.7 billion in agriculture commodities were exported, and they were mostly raw. I remind members opposite that we are exporting jobs and capital as well. It is estimated that \$80 billion is added to our exports overseas by other people. If it were done here, it is estimated that we would increase our total exports by at least 20 per cent and that we would double our food exports. We have a huge potential to improve our balance of payments. We need to resist the control of Australian produce by multinational food corporations and the lower requirements for the imports, and we have seen a big movement on that.

We have Australian companies, and we need to promote them. We know who they are. Farmers need to integrate vertically into the food and fibre chains, from primary production, through to processing and retailing. We need to smarten up right across the board. We need to build larger, farmer-controlled manufacturing and marketing organisations. We are seeing moves there, and that is encouraging. Government needs to give them help, not hinder them. Presently, Australia has far too many individual statutory marketing authorities across the States, all competing on the international market. I think members would agree that it is ludicrous to see so many individual companies going overseas of their own volition and, in effect, in many cases, fighting against each other.

We should form producer-controlled food companies managed by business people to exploit the advantages of size and brand names and not encourage multinational companies to the degree that we do at present. I know we do not grow rice in South Australia, but the rice growers in New South Wales could teach us all a lesson. Rice is now a multi-use product instead of a single use product. It is processed in farmer-owned mills. It is promoted as a health product with such benefits as cholesterol reduction, relaxation and the control of diabetes. The rice hulls are used for bedding in animal enclosures in place of straw, compost for improving soil structures, mulch in the home garden and so on. New South Wales farmers have really got their act together, and we could learn much from them.

United Dairy Farmers of Victoria is looking at forming a cooperative of all farmer-owned companies in Victoria. With that, they will have a great economy of scale. They will have greater marketing power and more resources for research and development. Research and development are, of course, also buzz words. Australians do not spend enough on R & D. We have been importing from overseas. When we do come up with a good idea, we do not seem to have the money to develop it, so it goes overseas, anyway. One such machine was the marino harvesting machine, to which the Premier referred earlier. He did not wish to name names, but I will stand up as the member for Culance and say that it was a pity to see that technology exported. The Premier was referring to me, but I will take it face on. It is a very sad day when we see that sort of technology, and we have lost the Australian money that was spent on that product. The Victorian venture will be aimed primarily at the domestic market and exports will follow.

The meat industry is one of the shining lights at the moment, an industry that is holding up. We should be increasingly tailoring our production to consumer demand instead of what the farmer wants to grow. It is thought to be the largest rural exporter in 1991 and 1991-92 and is keeping our meagre stocks afloat. Japanese involvement does worry me in the feedlot and processing sectors; it means that the major part of value adding is added here before exporting direct to the Japanese markets. Why do we have to have them to show us how? Tatiara Meats at Bordertown is developing a new lamb industry. It is air-freighting value-added chilled lamb to the United States, and that is a good way to go.

A New South Wales family is developing 100 Sous Vide food products from our sheep meats. They are prepared meals in plastic pouches which are boiled for 10 minutes and then eaten. That is a very promising way to go, and it is private enterprise working at its best. In Melbourne, Tibaldi Smallgoods, which is Japanese owned, is exporting specific products, for example metwurst and prosciutto, to specific Japanese markets. That is what the Japanese want to eat. Why do we not get alongside these people, help, copy and learn in relation to our own product? Our Government has not been encouraging this practice.

Other opportunities lie in value-adding, not necessarily in processing but in specialist, high value products sold raw and fresh. A couple of examples of this are designer fruit and vegetables, which can be sent overseas so quickly and cheaply today, and there is an abundance of fresh vegetables, fruit and cut flowers, which my Leader would know about, grown in Australia and in demand in Asia. The CSIRO has developed a new plastic film wrap—again, an Australian firm—which prolongs the life of produce and which means a vast increase in the export potential of marketing in the garden industries. Also, the technology of irradiation has to be further researched. If it were proved to be safe and user-acceptable, we would have tremendous advantages.

ABARE estimates that average farm net income this financial year will be \$2 100, and an extremely slow recovery in future. In one word, that is bad. It is time that farmers concerned themselves with more than just producing. We should not leave the processing and marketing to someone else, particularly to someone else overseas. It is a major objective of NFF and other grower bodies. As I said, value-adding is the buzz word of the moment.

Our commodity markets must be globalised: we must compete at this level or we will be shut out altogether. Our Governments must assist by microeconomic reform. We must free up the labour market, lower our transport costs and lower input costs, including Government charges and taxes—and I alluded to that last night in my speech. It is up to the Federal Government to encourage and facilitate value-adding to our produce in order to give our rural sector and the country as a whole a fair go. I make this speech as my initial input. We must add value: it is essential to get us out of the problem we are in.

I am concerned that the budget just passed down contains cuts to the Department of Agriculture spending. I hope that is not in the extension area, because so much of that area involves marketing. Marketing is an important arm of the Department of Agriculture. I hope that that area has not been cut. I will be interested to see where the cut is. I urge a fully bipartisan approach and the support of all members of this House. Workers, growers and bosses can unite, and value-adding will assist us all.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): In my speech on the budget last night, I referred to the growing

public indebtedness that this Government has inflicted on South Australia. I refer particularly to the extremely high risks inherent in the unlimited Government guarantees which apply to so many statutory bodies. I made particular reference to SAFA. To refresh the memory of members I will repeat some basic facts. The net indebtedness of South Australia in the current year is \$5.175 billion. The net interest on that sum is \$663 million. SAFA's total liability in the current year is \$17.2 billion, and that is increased from the previous year when it was \$13.8 billion.

We must bear in mind that every one of those dollars is Government guaranteed. Whatever happens to SAFA affects the taxpayers of South Australia. It is important to know that those funds are Government guaranteed before looking at what the Auditor-General has to say about SAFA. On page 339 of his report the Auditor-General says:

In view of the nature and amount of the transactions—

that is, SAFA transactions—

there was a need for detailed, timely documentation, recording all duties, responsibilities and entitlements of the respective parties.

That is a serious indictment of the way the authority is conducting its affairs. If it has liabilities of \$17.2 billion and the Auditor-General has to draw attention to the nature and amount of the transactions and the way in which they are documented, it is time for this Parliament to start asking serious questions about the manner in which SAFA is borrowing, lending and investing.

It is equally important to look at page 338 of the Auditor-General's Report and note the reason for this intensive market-driven policy that the Government is imposing on its financial authorities. At page 338 under the heading 'Significant Features' we learn that:

\$270 million...of the amount available for distribution—

that is, from SAFA's profits—

was applied towards a payment to the Consolidated Account...

In other words, the State Government's budget strategy depends on a market-driven, profit-geared financial policy governing SAFA. I maintain that it is entirely inappropriate for a Government-guaranteed financial authority to embark on market-driven policies designed to help finance the State budget. It is not the role and function of Government to take risks with other people's money, and we have had bitter, bitter experience of that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It is no use members opposite trying to defend it—it is an indefensible policy. I am not the only one who thinks it is an indefensible policy. Two years ago Moody's Investor Service of New York assessed SAFA, and said:

Using taxpayer funds the CBAs—

that is, the central borrowing agencies—

are becoming entrepreneurs or commercial risk-takers in enterprises of inherently and uncertain and sometimes dubious value. The distinction between Government and business becomes blurred.

Again, that is a serious criticism, by an internationally recognised accounting and financial assessment body of the way in which SAFA was conducting its affairs under an Act amended in 1986 by this Government to give it the power not only to borrow on behalf of the State's authorities but also to lend.

Looking at SAFA's annual report one sees that the total of loans and capital provided to semi-government authorities in the past financial year was \$2.6 billion. There is also the sum of \$2.095 billion which was borrowed and lent on foreign currency markets. The amounts are dealt with only in pounds sterling, United States dollars and Australian

dollars in terms of long and short borrowings. I would like to see a far more detailed analysis of those foreign currency items than is provided in the annual report, and indeed the Auditor-General himself in his report of June 1989 said exactly the same thing. He was speaking generally and not specifically about SAFA and stated:

I regret once again that I must draw attention to the quality of information provided to support proposals for the investment of funds in public sector programs or projects; or to support proposals for financial guarantees which have the potential to place taxpayers' funds at risk.

There is a Government guarantee to all of SAFA's funds—

Mr Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The honourable member can see all that information for himself in the financial statements of SAFA. I am drawing attention—and attention needs to be drawn—to the Government guaranteed nature of all these dealings. Again, I refer members to the Auditor-General's Report. It is two years old but, my goodness, it is more relevant today than it was two years ago. It is the report of Mr Tom Sheridan before he retired as Auditor-General, and he said:

Recent events in Australia have increased public interest in and concern for the processes by which Governments are accountable to the people for their actions. That interest is being driven by a public which is becoming more concerned about Government activity and is demanding to be assured that—moneys they provide to Government by way of taxes and charges are being spent in accordance with the law—

I stress that—

and on the purposes for which they have been provided.

Many questions need to be asked about the adjustment of interest and the funds that were provided for that and whether that was in accordance with the law. Many of us on this side of the House have serious doubts about what the Bannon Government did immediately prior to the last State election in order to adjust home loan interest rates and make them more appealing to an electorate that was being punished by the Federal Government's high interest rate policy. The other thing that the Auditor-General said at that time was:

The public is demanding to be assured that the relationship between taxes and charges paid and the community services provided reflects value for money.

He went on to say:

There is a growing tendency for some public sector activities to become removed from parliamentary scrutiny (and the accountability process), despite the fact that public funds are involved or that a contingent liability rests with the Government, either directly or indirectly, through guarantees it has given.

The Auditor-General referred to the establishment of subsidiary bodies under the Companies Code by some public sector agencies. Last night I referred to the Enterprise Investment Fund that was created by SAFA to enable just that kind of dealing. I was accused 2½ years ago of scare-mongering and of writing down the State when I questioned the State Bank. I hope no-one would accuse me of that in respect of SAFA.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): This evening I will refer in the main to the pathetic performance of the Minister of Agriculture in Question Time today and in Question Time over a period of weeks now in relation to this sitting of Parliament. It is quite clear that the Minister is starting to clutch at straws. He realises that he has been able to do nothing for the rural sector and as a result, because he is embarrassed by his lack of action, he is trying to direct attention back onto the Opposition. It certainly is not working. I know that one question asked today was a dorothy dixer, as I

happened to overhear the member for Playford, before the sitting started, inquire whether or not the question should be asked.

The question was about rural assistance as it applies in Western Australia and related to whether the Minister was thinking of applying it in this State. First, it was a set-up question. Whilst I acknowledge that so many Government questions are set-up questions and dorothy dixers, the attack encompassed in the answer was totally out of character for the Minister. If he wants to continue to use what I regard as personal attacks or gutter tactics in this place, certainly that is his right and he has the privilege of Parliament to do it, but I wish that he would get his facts correct in the first instance.

Certainly the Minister referred to a variety of issues, and it is clear that he is trying to cover-up his own errors and mistakes in endeavouring to throw heat back on to the Opposition. When I asked a question about how many farms had been sold in South Australia in the past three months because of their lack of viability and how many farmers had successfully sought carry on finance under revised part B of the rural adjustment scheme, the Minister was unable to answer. The Minister tries to defend the impossible, but when it comes to real questions he is unable to cope. His misrepresentations, whilst not fussing me personally, make me wonder where he is trying to go and what he is trying to achieve for the rural sector. It is quite clear that he has not been able to achieve very much at all. In fact, he referred to comments by the former President of the UF&S, Don Pfitzner.

Unfortunately the Minister got it wrong and, if he had checked his facts, he would have found that the *Stock Journal*, from which he was quoting, also got it wrong. When those comments came out, I checked with Mr Pfitzner to see how accurate the comments were, and he assured me that without a doubt they were not the words that he used. The words to which the Minister referred and which were reported to have been stated at the annual meeting of the UF&S related to a conversation some six weeks earlier and had nothing whatever to do with the annual general meeting of the UF&S. I hope that the Minister will start to get back to reality and realise that, unless he does something for the rural sector, it will continue to collapse around him, unfortunately, unless there is a miraculous turnaround. I referred to that matter in my speech last night and will not deal with it further.

In his answer today the Minister said that he felt that it was unusual that it had taken a Federal member of Parliament to bring up the question of what rural adjustment schemes are in place interstate, in particular in Western Australia. He went on to say that he wondered where the shadow Minister of Agriculture had been in terms of examining what should be happening with rural assistance. I do not know whether the Minister expects me to be a little pixie running from State to State and finding out what they are doing! I am concerned for the farmers and rural people in this State. I do not have time to go interstate on a regular basis, nor to contact interstate people to find out exactly what they are doing. However, I would have thought it appropriate for a Federal member such as Mr McLachlan, who travels interstate and throughout Australia, to pick up these various facts. That is exactly how it occurred when he was in Western Australia.

I compliment Mr McLachlan and other Federal members of Parliament for highlighting the inequalities that occur between South Australia and other States. In fact it is very important to look at what Mr McLachlan highlighted. He indicated that Western Australia, New South Wales and

Victoria have already implemented increased assistance under part A of the rural adjustment scheme and that farmers in these three States are now benefiting from the more specialised advice available.

Mr McLachlan referred in particular to Western Australia where grants of up to \$5 000 over three years are available for financial and farming management advice under part A assistance. He referred to the fact that in New South Wales under the same arrangements advisory training grants are available up to \$1 000 for three years, and in Victoria similar funding for training and advice is available through the Rural Finance Corporation to assist farmers to improve the performance and profitability of their farming enterprise. Certainly each of the States mentioned are way ahead of South Australia in terms of providing assistance to farmers still on the land.

The Minister came out blasting the Federal member for Barker, Mr Ian McLachlan, last week when he felt that Mr McLachlan had got it all wrong. In fact, in a media release of 3 September under the headline 'Rural aid claims an outrageous fabrication' the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold) stated:

It is a preposterous assertion with no basis in fact whatsoever and I challenge the Federal member for Barker, Mr McLachlan, to produce any evidence to the contrary.

What did we hear in this Chamber today? We heard no such onslaught because the Minister realised that he was wrong and that he had made a big mistake in that he did not even know to what part of rural assistance Mr McLachlan was referring. The Minister referred to part C rural assistance where farmers are forced to get off the land and given assistance to make such a move. He said that his department is helping in that area. He had no idea that Mr McLachlan was saying that we should help farmers still on the land to take advantage of part A of the rural assistance scheme. The Minister needs to get things factually correct and not run off on completely false tangents.

As the Opposition spokesman on agriculture I am proud of what we have endeavoured to do for the rural sector. Almost a year ago when we identified that the crisis was upon us we sought action from the Government—but to no avail. We put forward a five point plan to no avail—the Government said that it was simply political point scoring. In fact, the Government was not interested in the facts. We also highlighted the fact that rural assistance—the area of rural finance and development that is supposed to provide actual assistance—was not forthcoming. The banks were doing a far better job, but the Minister did not want to know about it.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The member for Playford continues to interject and he had the hide to ask the question today, 'What about catfish processing?' Again, that is a classic case; the Minister continues to misrepresent what I have put forward, whether it is catfish processing, lamb processing, mutton processing, emu processing, crayfish or crawfish processing, wool processing or food processing, or machinery manufacture. As a State we have to look to adding value to our goods and products. I compliment the member for Custance on his excellent speech earlier in which he identified that very fact. The Minister is embarrassed by this Government's lack of action in this area. He has not performed. He knows that the rural sector sees through him. The rural sector has no confidence in the Minister, because it has been crying out for help for a long time without any response from him. So his only defence is to try to throw the blame back onto the Opposition. Mr Speaker, you and I know that the Government has been doing nothing.

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

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I should like to canvass three or four issues in the short time available tonight. The first one relates—

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Let me say to the member for Napier, before he raises his point of order, that frivolous points of order will be dealt with fairly severely. We have had many points of order tonight, so I hope that it is a substantial point of order. What is the point of order?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: To be honest, Sir, I have forgotten.

Mr SUCH: It happens to us all in time; we lose our faculties. Recently the Education Department released its submission to GARG. It is a very interesting document, and I think its intentions are to be commended. Whether they are actually achieved is another matter. The GARG submission recommends giving more decision making to schools at school council level, allowing schools to manage ongoing staffing, initiating school development plans, determining the mix of contract teachers, transferring funds between salary and non-salary items and *vice versa*, deciding the numbers and mix of teachers within maximum and minimum limits of the total budget, allocating resources to locally managed educational programs, including training and development, and managing their budgets for utilities, communication costs and most aspects of facilities management. I would not have any dispute with those intentions. I think that they represent a step in the right direction.

My concern is in respect of the detail of how this will be implemented. It is one thing to state the intention: it is another to provide the details of how a program is to be implemented. At the moment, that is a great deficiency in that submission regarding a program that is due to start next year. I hope during the Estimates Committees to get an opportunity to pursue that matter and to find out how this program is to be implemented. It would be unfortunate if schools were burdened with extra tasks without being assisted in carrying out those tasks. We know that in recent years schools have had to carry an extra heavy administrative burden as a result of some of the changes that have been occurring within the Education Department.

One of the welcome aspects of this proposal, as I indicated earlier, is to give more power, and allow more meaningful input and contribution by school councils. At the moment, school councils are essentially paper tigers. They lack real teeth; they lack the opportunity for making a real contribution to education. If this submission is achieved and does nothing more than that, that in itself will be most welcome.

One of the difficulties associated with this proposal is that schools will have no control over the numbers of students that they have to take. That matter will have to be addressed urgently. It is a major problem in my electorate where many high schools are at capacity, likewise many primary schools. It is one thing to manage staffing resources; it is another when schools do not have control over the numbers of students that they have to take.

I now refer to a couple of items in the budget. I note (page 104 of Estimates of Payments, Financial Paper No. 3) that the two Australian Democrats in another place are to be allocated \$142 000 for salaries, wages and related payments, and goods and services—administration expenses, equipment and sundries in respect of support services. This is a very generous allocation, and one must question why

the State Government is being so generous to the Democrats in the Upper House.

Let us consider the statistics relating to the other members of the other place. For example, there is a total of three staff for the 10 Liberal members. The six Labor members, that is other than Ministers and the President, have two staff, whereas the two Democrats, as a result of the generosity of this Government, have three staff. That is not a bad ratio of resource allocation. We can see that this Government is a social justice Government which treats the Democrats with absolute generosity.

On page 94 of 'The Budget and its Impact on Women' we find an allocation to the lesbian community. I did not know that such a community existed. I knew that there are lesbians, and I have no quarrel with the personal sexual preference of people, whatever that may be; it is basically their business, but it seems strange that in a budget we find under the heading of 'Equal Opportunity', an allocation of twice as much money to that group than to junior sport. I find that rather interesting. The aim is 'To help lesbian women understand the rights given them by the Equal Opportunity Act'. There is nothing wrong with that intention, but it seems rather surprising that, when we are looking at greater access and participation by girls in school and club sport, the same page shows an allocation for junior sport exactly half of the amount allocated to the lesbian community. As I implied earlier, I am not attacking lesbians or homosexuals or anyone else on the basis of their sexuality—that is basically their business—but it is our business when it involves the allocation of taxpayers' money.

I turn to the question of literacy programs in the community, the development of which I applaud. Some concern has been expressed to me by groups within my community that operate neighbourhood houses about the difficulty they face because of delays in funding. I wish to quote briefly from a letter from the Coordinator of the Literacy Program at Aberfoyle Park Neighbourhood House in which she says:

As coordinator, I and my volunteer tutors work the school terms so that we can offer the best possible service to our students. However, even with the best of intentions we cannot continue the program without funds. In 1990, funding arrived 10 weeks late; in 1991 (term 1) funding took seven weeks to arrive; and now, several weeks into term 3 1991, I am again working unpaid. Promised funds transferred from Commonwealth to State are now contingent on State Government allocation.

I highlight this problem, which is a perennial one in terms of these worthwhile literacy programs in the community, and call upon the Government to do all it can to ensure that these people are paid on time. They can then feel some certainty in terms of the programs they offer in such a valuable service.

For some time I have been aware that at the Bolivar sewage treatment works, which seems to be a topic close to the hearts of many members here, we waste the potential that exists for using digested sludge to generate methane gas and hence electricity. Whilst the plant provides its own electricity, it wastes a considerable amount of methane gas which is discharged into the atmosphere and, as a result, our community loses the potential electricity that could be obtained from that source. I am concerned to read in the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works in respect of the cessation of sewage sludge disposal into the sea from Glenelg and Port Adelaide sewage treatment works that we will transport sludge by pipe from Port Adelaide and Glenelg to Bolivar and then bury it. That seems to be a wicked waste of a potential resource that could be used to generate energy. I understand that at the moment the Electricity Trust is reluctant to accept the electricity that could be provided from Bolivar, but I hope that matter can be looked into.

Finally, I note that in the report the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works (page 16) expresses concern about the disposal of waste and the fact that the sites for the proposed land fill have not been fully evaluated and there has not been full consultation with residents in the areas where the material is to be dumped or transported.

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

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

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

Motion carried.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Conscious of their duty to the people of South Australia, members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition in this place spend much time trying to get the messages of the people of South Australia across to this Government. It dismays this Opposition to see that day after day in this Chamber we are largely unsuccessful. The calls that we make on behalf of the people of South Australia seem repeatedly to fall on deaf ears. Nevertheless, it is our duty to continue to try, and I am sure that every member on this side of the Chamber will continue to do so—

Mr Quirke: Who wrote this speech for you?

Mr BRINDAL:—until such time as we are granted by the people of South Australia the privilege of Government. I have been casting around to try once again to get through to this Government the serious plight that this State is in, to try to get it to stop ignoring what needs amending and to stop believing that the problems of this State will go away or that they can be foisted upon future generations. I dealt with that matter earlier when speaking in the second reading debate.

However, it occurred to me that perhaps if members opposite do not understand logic and English they might understand the State's problems expressed in mathematical terms. There is a very simple mathematical equation which expresses quite clearly the problems of South Australia, and it is $(2B)^2 = \$2\,571$ million. In case some members opposite do not understand mathematical equations, I will carefully explain this. Two squared is obviously four; and B squared is B times B, as anyone who has done year 8 mathematics would understand. B times B obviously stands for Bannon's blunders, and the number of Bannon's blunders is four—the SGIC at \$81 million; WorkCover's unfunded liability which is currently \$250 million (and we will be conservative with our figures because we do not believe in giving the Government criticism which it does not deserve); the State Bank at \$2 200 million; and the Timber Corporation at \$40 million, giving a total of \$2 571 million.

That is the extent of this State's problem. This State's problem has been caused by the four principal blunders of the Bannon Government. It is interesting that the member for Playford previously interjected, 'Who wrote this speech for you?' Nobody wrote this speech for me, but I must give credit where credit is due. The idea for this speech came from a taxi billboard. I was driving around Adelaide and in front of me there was a taxi which had, on the small billboard on its boot, 'Bannon's four blunders—SGIC, WorkCover, State Bank and Timber Corporation.'

If taxis are driving around Adelaide with that sort of thing on their billboards, one wonders, first, who paid for it—because I certainly did not—and, secondly, how strongly the people who would put such notice on the hoardings on the back of taxis must feel on this subject. I can hardly wait to see the advertising that might suddenly appear, both gratuitously and otherwise, on STA vehicles informing us

of the performance of this Government. I believe that this Government is in trouble. As I have just said, I believe that that equation honestly and accurately expresses the problems caused by this Government.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It is always delightful to listen to a symphony of sound, even when it is so badly out of tune.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward has the floor.

Mr BRINDAL: I am constantly upset and distracted from my thoughts by the carping criticism of Government members who keep calling, 'What are your policies?' I am new to this place and do not as yet perfectly understand the Westminster system, but it was always my opinion that the Government of the day had the policies and it was the Opposition's duty, before going to the people, to explain not to the Government at its behest but to the people, in good time, which policies we would use if we were in Government.

It really demeans and detracts from this place rather badly when the principal function of Government members seems to be to question the Opposition. If they were doing their job adequately, we would be able to question them and they would be able to supply some answers. Instead, we have the amazing sight of Ministers and prominent, senior members of the back-bench appearing daily on national radio and television, trumpeting the highest causes, with nothing better to do than to come into this place and demand of us—

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Hartley has asked 'Who is doing this?' There is no face better known on national television, no face more adored by the ABC at present, than that of the member for Hartley. His Privacy Bill will live in the annals of South Australian legislative history if he gets his way. And he asks 'Who?' The matter would be funny if it were not so serious.

I recall some 18 months ago that the Government pulled what it thought was a very smart trick: it added up every request of members on this side of the House and spent a week or two telling us how greedy, selfish and demanding we all were. Government members totally ignored the fact that all requests from this side of the House were being made by members who were representing the interests of their electorate, just as I would expect members opposite would represent the interests of their own electorates.

However, having told us that we were greedy, the Government proceeded literally to throw down the toilet something like \$2 billion for which there is no demonstrable return. I remind Government members, as I believe every member of the Opposition can remind members opposite quite legitimately, that I have spoken about unmade and unrepaired roads in my electorate; I have spoken about the need for an overpass between Diagonal Road and the Noarlunga railway line; and I have referred to the need for a new technical studies and home economics facility at Brighton High School, because it is in a sad state of disrepair. Indeed, the regional office of the Education Department is in an even sadder state of disrepair trying to work out what to do about it.

What scandalises me in my own electorate, on behalf of all the people of South Australia, is a proposition to sell off what is described as surplus land at the Oaklands Road Safety Centre. At a time when we should be concentrating on the safety of people on our roads, this Government will sell another asset, yet its members came in here tonight and accused us of conducting fire sales! Let this Government

look at its closed schools, its unallocated land and all the other things that it is attempting to sell off, and then come back here and talk to us about fire sales.

I finish where I started. I spoke about a mathematical equation which that was expressed in the form of 2B squared. That is the answer of this budget: this budget is 2B squared, and it will only be squared by future generations of South Australians.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): As a result of the health budget blow-out, the Government is endeavouring now to try to make some alterations to the structure of the Health Commission, and in so doing it is suggesting that it will regionalise health in the country areas. The Government is making regions of a size that will in no way advance the cause of efficient operations of health services in South Australia. Take, for example, the proposal that has been put forward by the Minister of Health for a Murraylands health service. It includes areas as far south as Murray Bridge and Mannum and up to Renmark. The area will be far too large to be administered effectively from a headquarters in Murray Bridge.

I support the concept of regionalisation and decentralisation of the health services in this State. Certainly, the Health Commission, with its massive structure in the metropolitan area, is of little benefit to the people living in the far-flung areas of this State. I suggest to the Minister and to the Government that the proposal that the Government has put forward for a Murraylands health service should be split and that there should be a Riverland region and a Lower Murray region. The hospitals at Waikerie, Barmera, Loxton, Berri and Renmark in the Riverland area have individual hospital boards. The Minister says that those boards should be disbanded and that a central board should be established at Murray Bridge made up mainly of public servants, but that will not serve the interests of the people in the hospitals and towns that I have mentioned.

A central hospital has been built at Berri, and the operation and board at that hospital has representatives on it from the other surrounding towns and, if the Minister was to encourage the Riverland hospitals to work as a group, I have no doubt that they would provide an even more efficient health service to the people in the Riverland than is being provided at the moment. The resources are there, the individual boards of the hospitals in the Riverland are acutely aware of the needs of the individual communities, and the fact that there is no public transport system in the country areas makes it extremely difficult to operate country regions on a basis similar to the metropolitan area.

There is strong opposition to what has been proposed by the Government in the country areas. It has been expressed in the following terms in the *Murray Pioneer*: 'Furore over proposed hospital board axing'. I believe that is an understatement of the concern that exists in the Riverland over this issue. The Liberal Party has clearly indicated that it supports small regional centres such as the Riverland, and it will do all it can to facilitate that happening. The article in the *Murray Pioneer* clearly indicates the concern of the various hospital boards, their chairmen and the representatives from each and every hospital.

It is up to the Minister of Health to encourage the hospitals within the various regions to work closely together to provide the services that each hospital is best able to provide. A large region with 150 kilometres between the headquarters at Murray Bridge and the nearest hospital, say, at Loxton, is just not appropriate. Members on the board based in Murray Bridge will not have sufficient knowledge of the local requirements in each Riverland town.

The Government has put forward a proposal that has been hastily assembled in answer to the policy announced by the shadow Minister of Health, the member for Adelaide, a policy which will very much meet the needs of country people. Unfortunately, the Government's proposal will not meet those needs. Consequently, a furor has erupted in relation to the future of the various hospitals, particularly in the Riverland.

I suggest to the Minister that he rethink the position he has put down in the policy announcements and that he approach the individual boards and hospitals and find a new proposal that will in fact meet the needs of country people. As I said, country people are distinctly disadvantaged in many respects. The lack of transport is a significant factor, making it difficult for people in regional areas to get from one place to another. If the Government was prepared to adopt the proposal of the member for Adelaide, who has a wealth of experience in the medical arena, I believe that the Government would be acting in the interests of the country people of South Australia.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): First, I will finish my presentation from last evening and then talk about a major issue in which Big Brother—unfortunately our State Bank again—is causing problems for small business in our State. The Bannon budget has been erroneously presented as one apparently designed to save public money at the least expense to the taxpayers and the business community of South Australia. Payroll tax may seem to have been reduced by .15 per cent but the budget estimates indicate that an additional \$40 million will be collected from this tax in the current financial year. Obviously, the increase in tax collected is partially due to the decrease in the rate not taking effect until December of this year, but the estimates would seem to be highly inflated, considering the projected increase in unemployment and the growing number of small business closures. In addition, the reduction in payroll tax will be of small consequence to the State's employers experiencing the massive hike in this tax imposed in the 1990-91 Bannon budget.

The apparent cuts to the Public Service are in reality only an attempt to counter the equivalent increase in the size of the Public Service which has taken place in the past few financial years. There will be no real saving to the State here at all. Estimated increases in revenue from higher tax rates imposed in the last budget, FID, gambling, stamp duties, cigarettes and fuel taxes are expected to net \$309 million. In all, the Bannon Government is gambling on collecting a massive increase of 11 per cent in total tax receipts. Again, this is totally unrealistic, given the worsening economic position of every South Australian.

The budget strategy relies heavily on the performance of SAFA in 1991-92. Its performance has been good over the years, and we are the first to acknowledge that. Nevertheless, SAFA is operating in markets where investment returns are not as good as previously. If some of SAFA's investments need to be rolled over in 1991-92, providing lower returns and lower income, and cannot be offset by refinanced borrowings at a lower rate, then, in essence, SAFA's profitability and its ability to contribute to the Consolidated Account will be affected. I am saying that in the current environment there is no way that SAFA can suddenly pick up that extra \$140 million in the budget. SAFA is being asked to contribute \$400 million to the Consolidated Account this year, an increase of \$130 million. Using 1990 as a basis, that would represent all its profit for 1991-92 and require SAFA to use some of its reserve. If SAFA was forced to use its reserves to the extent that it affected the strength of

the balance sheet, the question of SAFA's credit rating could come under review.

The problem with this whole budget is that we have recurrent spending at the highest budgeted deficit level that we have seen for a long time. We have borrowings at the highest level we have seen and we have borrowings being used to service day-to-day expenses. That is a prescription for disaster, a disaster that I believe should require the Premier and this Government to resign.

I would now like to take up an issue of concern to me involving a small business, a land broker in the district of Burnside and a land agent in Burnside who this week had pressure put on them by the State Bank to not accept the commission that rightfully had been agreed to on behalf of the vendor. An agent of the State Bank, an employee, rang the land agent 10 minutes prior to the sale being sealed and said, 'If you do not reduce your commission to a low level, we will withdraw the finance on the project and we will not allow it to proceed.'

Mr Ferguson: That's private enterprise.

Mr INGERSON: It is fascinating that the member for Henley Beach should say that it is private enterprise, because he would know that, if an arrangement is entered into between the person who owns a property and the person who sells the property, it has nothing to do with the company providing the finance. In this instance it is the State Bank of South Australia. This matter was brought to my attention by three people. First, the property owner, who agreed with the bank that, as part of the mortgagee sale, what was left over after the standard commission for the REI agent was taken out, would be the balance the bank got. Secondly, the vendor is complaining. Thirdly, the land agent, who is directly involved and who was stood over by a person employed by the State Bank, is complaining. The land broker, who had to carry out the whole transaction, has complained to the bank, to the Premier and me.

If the State Bank—and for that matter any bank, but it just so happens that in this instance it is the State Bank—wants to get to the stage where it holds off finance until the last second of a sale and then threaten that it will not allow the sale to proceed unless it manages it and takes all the commission, something is really wrong with the system. I will supply the Premier with all the documentation to help him investigate the matter, because this is one of the worst examples of Big Brother standing over two people—the vendor and the land agent—that I have ever seen.

To back up my comments it is important that I read into *Hansard* a couple of paragraphs of the letters that have been sent, first, to the Land Brokers Board and, secondly, to Mr Nobby Clark. The first letter, from the vendor, puts in context what I am saying, as follows:

As the property was mortgaged to the State Bank as a security to a business loan I sought the bank's approval to accept the contract and as such arranged a meeting with Mr . . . on 25 July 1991. At the meeting Mr . . . sighted the contract and asked what I thought the net proceeds would be and I replied that I was not sure of exact figures but that there would be normal associated costs including the REI standard fees for the agent. Mr . . . instructed (my representative) to organise a letter stating the bank's agreement to my acceptance of the contract and further agreeing 'that upon receipt of full net proceeds from the sale of said property I would be released from all liability under my guarantee to the bank.'

In essence, that is saying that there was an agreement between the bank and the vendor; and there was an arrangement that provided that the land broker and the land agent would get their standard fees and that the bank would pay and accept the balance of the proceeds. In his letter the land broker states:

It transpired that the bank, in its wisdom, decided that the agent's commission . . . which I understand conforms to the REI

scale, was too high. [A representative from the bank] telephoned the agent and threatened that the bank would 'frustrate the sale' (his words) and sell the property as mortgagee to the same purchaser, thereby depriving the agent of any commission, unless the agent agreed to a reduction by about half. In the end, possibly influenced by pressure on the bank . . . the agent . . . reduced [by a sum]. I know that the agent spent a great deal of money and time, over a period of about nine months, advertising the property and I have since made inquiries of the vendor, who acknowledged this, saying that she was happy to pay the full commission . . .

He was sure that the commercial loans section of the bank used 'scare tactics', first to sell the mortgage and, secondly, to apply pressure. Further in the letter, the broker goes on to state:

I was so incensed at what was, to me, an unwarranted and unprofessional assault by the bank on the relationship between principal and agent, that I telephoned the Victoria Square branch of the bank, where I have conducted all my banking business . . . for about 25 years . . . [and decided to withdraw my business]. All this absorbed at least three hours of my time, the cost of which is not recoverable. I contend that the commission charged by an agent is none of the bank's business . . .

This whole thing is all about the bank, and in particular, one person within the bank, using its position to stand over a small business person who just happened to be selling as part of a mortgagee sale. The bank was not the mortgagee in possession. The only involvement of the bank was that the person had taken out a business loan. The bank had agreed to accept a sum, less a reasonable fee to the agent, and the agent was being stood over by the bank. I think it is despicable and I ask the Premier to look into the matter.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Unlike members opposite who have been carping and criticising this budget, I would like to point out some of the positive aspects of it as far as my electorate is concerned. This downgrading and denegrating of the State we live in really surprises me, because I am very proud of South Australia and this Government has a proud record in the running of this State.

Members interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: I will not take notice of the interjections from the other side. I would like to talk about some of the areas that will be of benefit to my electorate, as I have pointed out previously; first, I refer to the funding that has been allocated for the Kickstart scheme. My district will be a pilot in that regard, particularly the Port Augusta area. Kickstart will be very beneficial, because it will be dealing with training for the unemployed and, obviously, in my electorate as in every other electorate, that is becoming an increasing problem. I look forward to being involved and to meeting with the people who are starting this scheme in my electorate.

I believe it is a very innovative scheme and that it offers opportunities for those who are unemployed to improve their position. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the contributions from the other side; members have mentioned that there is no innovation and no initiative in this budget. I disagree with what they are saying; I believe that there is. I am delighted to know that Port Augusta will be a beneficiary of that with regard to this pilot project, and I commend the Government on that initiative. I think that perhaps other electorates, such as yours, Mr Speaker, will be able to benefit from that as well. One of the areas that really is of increasing worry to me is restructuring, and that has a marked effect in the electorate of Stuart, particularly in Port Augusta where Australian National and ETSA, two of the major employers there, as members would be aware, have been heading. A large number of jobs have been lost there.

Again, the State Government has helped it with the development at the Port Augusta gaol. Not only have there been

jobs in the construction of the Port Augusta gaol but also there will be ongoing permanent employment. The new jobs will be of much benefit to the people of Port Augusta and the region as they will be looking to the region itself to get people to fill the jobs. It is terribly important that they get employees from the local area. There is an undertaking to do that and I commend the Government on it, as a large number of jobs will be available at the correctional services institution. I hope to some degree that it will take up some of the unemployed people who come from Australian National. Obviously that cannot be the case with ETSA because of packages being negotiated and they will not be able to take up that employment.

Contrary to the vindictive allegations by the member for Eyre, I have been involved in negotiations with regard to my electorate and unemployment problems. I am surprised at the rather nasty way in which the member for Eyre addressed some of these matters in his contribution to this debate. I have been working to continue to ensure that the Spencer Gulf regional group training scheme continues to flourish in the area. Ironically I am working in that area to continue to help the member for Eyre get jobs for his young people, because not only does this scheme address the employment problems in my area but also the problems in the areas of Flinders, Eyre and Whyalla.

I was pleased to be part of a delegation that met with the Minister of Youth Affairs, the honourable Mike Rann, and we were able to negotiate a grant to the scheme to enable operations to continue. It is one of the few areas for trade training in the northern region of this State and it is an extremely important one that we need to keep functioning in order to maintain that very important training function. Youth training in my electorate is an important area and one in which I take a vital interest, contrary to some of the allegations made a little earlier in this place.

Mr S.J. Baker: Are they true?

Mrs HUTCHISON: I will not deign to answer the interjections from the Opposition, as they are not worth answering. I suggest that the member for Eyre make sure of his facts and not try to score cheap political points. I say nothing further on that. Another budgetary area of benefit to my district and regional areas such as mine in this State is the doubling of the money allocated to regional development committees. I am not sure exactly what amount of money will go to the two regional development committees in my area, but they are extremely important with the Port Pirie development committee and the Port Augusta and regions development committee working in my area.

I mention the very good work done by the Port Pirie development committee, which is extremely hard working and has taken the initiative on a number of issues. Even if two or three of those initiatives bear fruit, it has earned every cent of development money it has received for that region. I am pleased to say that the Port Augusta and regions development committee is now moving ahead and has appointed an officer to look specifically at development issues in the Port Augusta region, and I hope again to see from that committee a number of projects come to fruition because it too is putting in much effort towards attracting development to the northern part of the State.

With development comes jobs. Unemployment is high on my list of priorities. I do not know about members opposite, but it is high on my list of priorities and on the Government's list of priorities, again contrary to what members opposite may say. I am delighted that the Government has been biting the bullet on those issues. Much has been said by members opposite about small business. I think that this Government has done more for small business in this

State than members opposite who are high on rhetoric but short on action. It is easy to talk, but it is much harder to act. If members opposite ever get into government, I think there will be a very shoddy record for small business.

This Government, in an extremely difficult economic climate, has actually been able to assist small business. The problem with members opposite is that they know that this Government has been able to assist small business, but they do not have the gumption to acknowledge it. They hate to think that it has been an initiative of this Government and not of members opposite who basically are cuckoos—or bower birds may be a better analogy—because they continue to take the policies of this Government and put them into policies for themselves. It amazes me that they have no initiative and no innovation. All they do is carp and criticise the Government which is genuinely trying to do something for this State.

I am pleased about the money which has been allocated to crime prevention. I see the member for Newland smirking, but I should point out that this Government is paying

and will continue to pay a great deal of attention to crime prevention. It is putting its money where its mouth is in this regard. I have two well functioning crime prevention committees in my electorate of Stuart, and I hope that such committees are operating in other electorates as well. That is because this Government has allocated more money to crime prevention.

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

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST (WANILLA)

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 12 September at 11 a.m.