

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 9 October 1991

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

PETITIONS: GAMING MACHINES

Petitions signed by 149 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide for the administration of coin operated gaming machines in licensed clubs and hotels by the Liquor Licensing Commission and the Independent Gaming Corporation were presented by Messrs P.B. Arnold and D.S. Baker.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 514 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to decriminalise prostitution were presented by Messrs P.B. Arnold, Chapman and Groom, Mrs Hutchison and Mr Lewis.

Petitions received.

PETITION: JAMESTOWN ALCOHOL BAN

A petition signed by 286 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow for the prohibition of the consumption of alcohol within certain areas of Jamestown was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

PETITION: EXCESS WATER RATES

A petition signed by 154 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to impose the cost of excess water rates upon Housing Trust tenants was presented by Mrs Hutchison.

Petition received.

PETITION: FREE STUDENT TRANSPORT

A petition signed by 291 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reconsider the decision to reintroduce public transport fares for students not in receipt of the school card was presented by Mr Quirke.

Petition received.

Table 1: Selected Offences Reported or Becoming Known to Police: 1989 and 1990

	1989	1990	% Change
Offences against the person	10 648	12 069	+ 13.3
Robbery and extortion	803	1 113	+ 38.6
Sexual offences	1 918	2 281	+ 18.9
Property offences	140 188	158 963	+ 13.4
Driving offences	8 742	8 112	- 7.2
Drug offences	2 820	2 985	+ 5.9
Total	165 119	185 523	+ 12.4

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 7, 22, 55, 102, 113, 116, 119 and 121; and I direct that the following written answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

YOUTH CRIME RATE

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park)** 14 August.

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: During 1990 there was an overall increase of 12.4 per cent in selected offences that were reported or became known to police from the previous 12 months. Table 1 shows the increase or decrease in each of the offence categories. Over this period, there was also an increase in the number of apprehensions (Table 2). The trends in both the number and proportion of juveniles apprehended by South Australian police over the past 10 years are shown in Table 3 and Table 4. These figures show that in all offence categories (excluding fraud) the proportion of juvenile to adult offenders increased in 1990 from that in 1989. However, when looking at the figures over time, the proportion of offenders who were juvenile has declined over the decade. For example, between 65 per cent and 70 per cent of alleged offenders involved in break and enter offences were juvenile in 1981 and 1982, but this figure had dropped to around 50 per cent in 1989 and 1990. A similar situation exists for apprehensions for offences against the person. Around 19 per cent and 22 per cent of offenders were juveniles in 1981 and 1982, whereas in 1989 and 1990, this figure had decreased to 15 per cent and 16 per cent.

There has been a steady rise in crime reported to police over the past 10 years, but there has been a slight decline in the proportion of offenders who are juvenile. In 1981, 36.4 per cent of offenders were juvenile compared to 31.5 per cent in 1990 (both years exclude drug offences from the calculations). The proportion of adult to juvenile offenders involved in drug offences should be treated with caution as in April 1987 a system of cannabis expiation notices was introduced in South Australia. However, this applied only to adult offenders, thus removing a substantial proportion of adult offenders from the figures. A recent report from the Drug and Alcohol Services Council (Trends in alcohol and other drug use amongst South Australian schoolchildren: 1986-89, May 1991) on trends in drug use among schoolchildren aged 11 to 16 showed there was 'no significant changes in the number of students who had ever used (tranquillisers, inhalants, marijuana or sedatives) over the three year survey period'.

Table 2: Number of Alleged Offenders Involved in Cleared Offences: 1989 and 1990

	1989	1990	% Change
Offences against the person	4 627	5 454	+17.9
Robbery and extortion	267	356	+33.3
Sexual offences	555	644	+16.0
Property offences	18 341	21 429	+16.8
Driving offences	8 118	7 736	-4.7
Drug offences	2 404	2 528	+5.2
Total	34 312	38 147	+11.2

Table 3: Number of Juveniles Apprehended: 1981 to 1990

Offence	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Offences against the person	579	609	679	615	659	631	736	728	718	900
Robbery	51	77	67	75	71	82	75	61	78	139
Sexual	74	105	103	114	84	122	89	107	69	86
Fraud	229	268	279	260	304	269	252	204	205	206
Break and enter	1 780	1 879	1 910	1 712	1 818	1 520	1 652	1 586	1 542	1 797
Larceny	4 298	4 742	5 124	4 561	4 830	5 463	4 700	4 267	4 092	5 659
Unlawful possession	340	363	399	418	356	420	379	437	351	479
Property damage	769	869	969	960	1 059	1 065	1 068	1 074	1 208	1 668
Drink driving	314	286	271	259	348	331	320	322	295	287
Drugs	—	567	720	1 045	1 125	1 153	1 042	1 147	1 293	1 450

Table 4: Proportion of Alleged Offenders who were under 18 years: 1981 to 1990

Offence	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Offences against the person	21.5	18.9	18.7	17.0	17.5	15.7	17.2	15.5	15.5	16.5
Robbery	39.2	43.5	41.6	34.1	32.3	35.6	28.1	24.8	29.2	39.0
Sexual	18.5	26.3	20.4	22.7	18.0	21.4	16.2	18.5	12.4	13.4
Fraud	25.2	25.3	25.0	21.8	22.1	19.4	18.7	16.6	17.2	16.7
Break and enter	69.6	65.5	63.9	57.3	61.8	53.9	53.8	49.7	49.9	51.2
Larceny	52.1	49.6	47.1	46.3	47.6	47.7	44.9	43.3	42.9	50.0
Unlawful possession	41.3	39.5	35.7	34.9	30.9	33.9	28.8	29.9	29.0	32.9
Property damage	42.5	42.9	40.0	38.7	39.5	39.0	36.6	34.0	36.4	42.6
Drink driving	5.6	4.8	4.5	4.1	5.0	4.7	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.7
Drugs	—	13.1	13.5	14.0	15.1	18.2	24.9*	50.6*	53.8*	57.4*

* Cannabis expiation notices introduced for adults in April 1987.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FREE STUDENT TRAVEL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On 11 April this year the House passed the following motion:

That This House is of the opinion that the Minister of Transport should keep the operation of the free travel for children scheme under constant review and that a report on the equity, social justice implications, cost and effectiveness of the scheme should be presented to the House prior to the consideration of the 1991-92 estimates.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, it is usual when a Minister makes a statement that a copy is made available to the Opposition.

Mr D.S. Baker: It would have been courteous to do that, Frank.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was waving it; there was not a lot more I could do with it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is making a statement.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On 29 August this year in his budget, the Premier announced that free student travel for all children would be modified to be available only to holders of the Education Department School Card. This calendar year the Education Department issued 66 000

School Cards with 56 000 of these going to students in Government schools and 10 000 going to students in private schools. School Card eligibility is based on a means test. All other students will pay a concession fare. These modifications are aimed at:

1. Ensuring that the financial benefits of free travel are aimed at low income families. At the moment they go disproportionately to higher income families with 12 per cent of school students travelling to and from school by public transport with 75 per cent of these going to private schools.

2. Helping to close the gap in retention rates between children from low income families and those from high income families.

3. Overcoming the perceived links with increased vandalism and graffiti.

Mr Speaker, last year, that is 1990-91, free travel cost \$6.35 million. Under the new scheme additional revenue is expected to be \$2.8 million in 1991-92 and \$5.7 million in a full year.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NOORA BASIN

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, in response to a question yesterday from the member for Chaffey I undertook to provide additional information on the operation of the Noora Basin and the concern that a sufficient water level be maintained for the birdlife at Noora. The low water

level in the basin is a result of water not being pumped from Disher Creek Basin and the Berri disposal basin for considerable periods during the exceptionally high average river flows over the past few years. During these periods of high river flow the water is diverted directly to the river and hence out of the area and to sea, with a saving of pumping costs.

Noora has become a 'wetland' and a considerable bird population including swans, ducks and waterfowl has established itself. I also understand good work has been undertaken in the area by the Field and Game Association, which has established bird roosting and breeding boxes and by other groups that have planted trees. Normally pumping would recommence towards the end of November when river flows had receded to less than 15 000 megalitres per day. However, Mr Speaker, I am pleased to be able to advise the member for Chaffey that arrangements were made for pumping to recommence last night to maintain a depth of at least 200 millimetres over most of the first basin area to protect the habitat. The cost of this additional pumping is estimated to be \$2 880.

QUESTION TIME

KICKSTART

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): What action has the Minister of Employment and Further Education taken since his 22 September launch of what he said was a massive buy local, Kickstart PR campaign to ensure that as much as possible of the 52.5 per cent of Government purchases made by the State Supply Board in 1990-91 from overseas with a value of \$46 million will in future be procured locally?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Leader of the Opposition will be aware that his shadow Minister of Employment and Further Education attended the launch of the Kickstart buy local campaign and staggered everyone present by coming out and strongly endorsing this attempt to involve the media in South Australia through SA Great and the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry to encourage consumers to buy local. What we are saying, and what the Chamber of Commerce is saying, is not that people should buy local goods if they are inferior or of a higher price but that, where price and quality is comparable, we are encouraging consumers to buy local.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

INGLE FARM INCIDENT

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister of Health say what steps are taken when a patient is taken to Hillcrest Hospital by police after an immediate detention order has been signed by a medical officer? Further, will the Minister report back to the House about procedures taken in general when a patient is referred for psychiatric treatment after that patient has threatened the lives of police and residents in the surrounding area, and has threatened his own life?

Constituents of mine in Pandanya Avenue, Ingle Farm, have contacted my office and me about the events on Saturday 21 September. These constituents were awakened early in the morning by a man holding a broken glass to his throat threatening to kill himself. The man was already bleeding profusely from wounds inflicted in fights with others in the house in which he was staying, and with

residents farther down the same street. Police were called and he was eventually overpowered and taken to Modbury Hospital in conjunction with ambulance officers from St John. Medical authorities signed an immediate detention order as the patient had to be handcuffed and refused treatment.

The patient threatened his own life throughout this entire period as well as the lives of police. He threatened to use a machete on some residents in Pandanya Avenue when released. On arrival at Hillcrest, he was released, allegedly after a short time, was given the taxi fare home, and police were immediately again called to quell violence initiated by this man in Pandanya Avenue.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will obtain a report from the Health Commission and report to the House as quickly as possible.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Has the National Parks and Wildlife Service called tenders for two four-wheel drive industrial loaders, and is consideration being given to the purchase of two such loaders, fully imported, at a cost of approximately \$430 000, when equipment that can be used for the same purpose with at least a 50 per cent Australian content can be supplied by a South Australian firm at approximately half the cost? If so, what action does the Minister intend to take regarding this matter?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I would be very pleased to investigate the issue that he has raised and to provide him with a report on the matter.

TRANSPORTATION OF LIMESTONE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Minister of Transport confirm that limestone now carried by Australian National trains from the Penrice Soda Products quarry at Angaston to the soda ash plant at Osborne will, from next year, be carried by trucks along Main North Road, Grand Junction Road and through Port Adelaide? Is it true that the switch from rail to road is partly caused by an annual State Transport Authority charge of more than \$300 000 on Australian National for use of its rails between Gawler Central and Dry Creek and between Rosewater and Glanville? Does the Minister agree that, with continuing suburban development in the Barossa Valley, the line from Gawler Central to Lyndoch may, if not ripped up, become part of the STA's suburban network?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Spence for his question, and I also thank him for his continuing interest in the STA in particular and our rail service; he is one of the very few members of Parliament who patronises the service constantly. Regarding the issue—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, the member for Custance seems to find my congratulations to the member for Spence amusing. I was congratulating the member for Spence on his patronage of our rail service. He is unlike, I might add, the member for Custance, who constantly complains about the discontinuance of lines in and around his electorate when, as a primary producer, he will not use the railways: he uses the roads to transport his grain crops,

because it is cheaper. The member for Spence puts his money and his custom where his mouth is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —unlike the member for Custance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Custance.

Mr VENNING: Mr Speaker, I take a point of order. The Minister is completely misrepresenting the facts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The issue is complex, and it involves commercial decisions made by private industry. It involves the STA's rights to levy, under the rail transfer agreement, Australian National for the use of its lines. These things often end in dispute, and there is no doubt that there have been ongoing discussions between the various parties about this matter. I will have another look at the issue, because I think it would be desirable for the limestone to continue to be carried by rail. However, if it is at enormous cost to the taxpayer, one would have to take that fact into consideration.

As I said, I will have the whole issue re-examined for the member for Spence to see whether we can do anything to bring about a desirable outcome for all the various players concerned in this issue.

ADELAIDE ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Is the Minister of Housing and Construction aware that the recently completed Entertainment Centre has about 650 particle board doors installed which do not comply with the Australian Standards Association construction standards and which were imported from New Zealand, at a cost of \$60 000 or so, when suitable doors of approved standard and made in this State were available? We have heard in recent times of the slogan 'Give a mate a job'. Mr Speaker, as pugilists, you and I both know that that term has alternative meanings, and maybe that is what the Government intends when it uses it.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will certainly investigate the accusation that the honourable member makes and I will report back to the House on my investigations.

CHILD SAFETY

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Is the Government considering action to help prevent accidents to children from workplace machinery? I would point out to the House that my question is prompted by the tragic accident at Kilburn yesterday in which a young girl was killed.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Like all members of this House, I was saddened yesterday when reading the news of a nine-year-old girl being killed in an industrial accident. I am sure that all of us feel for the parents of that child and for all the people involved in that unfortunate incident. This tragic accident does underline the dangers of children being around a workplace where machinery and plant, like forklifts, is operating. Our Government is moving to introduce new laws to help protect children from injury from workplace plant and machinery. This includes considering banning children 10 years or under from being on or near

machinery in a workplace that could pose a risk to their health.

A regulation proposing such a ban is being prepared for the South Australian Occupational Health and Safety Commission for community consultation. The commission is also working on a code of practice for child safety on farms, where accidents involving young children are a major concern. From 1982 to 1984, 34 children under the age of 15 were killed in accidents on farms throughout Australia. Since 1988, two children, one as young as three, have died in South Australia in tractor accidents. As a parent, and lately as a grandparent, I can understand the anguish that parents and grandparents of those children have been through. In another case, a five-year-old girl was very lucky to escape when the frontend loader in which she was travelling overturned. That accident claimed the life of her father.

It is clear that young children and machinery are too often a tragic combination. Drafts of both the regulation and the code will be out for public comment in the next few months. Discussions have already begun with rural community representatives and with peak groups like the Advisory Board of Agriculture indicating general support for the draft code. Rural groups have had a significant input into the development of the draft code.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Mr Speaker, my question is directed to you. Will you, Sir, examine the words expressed by the member for Walsh at the eighty-seventh annual convention of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party in which he stated that, following the last election, and I quote:

... a tenuous working majority could only be obtained by accommodating [and I underline that] the two Independent members ...

Also, Sir, will you rule whether a *prima facie* case exists that the honourable member was in breach of parliamentary privilege, as you did with the member for Hayward yesterday? In his report to the convention, the member for Walsh also said that, initially, both Independent members, the member for Semaphore and the member for Elizabeth, were seeking ministries. They were instead, he reported, offered the positions of Speaker and Deputy Speaker, at the expense of John Trainer and Don Ferguson.

I also point out that, whilst yesterday you felt that the member for Walsh's words could not constitute a breach of privilege because you were unanimously elected as Speaker, this would not be a defence for the honourable member, because, by your own definition, what is at issue is that members are not allowed to cast reflections upon or impugn the Speaker's character by referring to a deal, except by substantive motion. The member for Walsh's assertion that your support and that of the Deputy Speaker was secured in a deal with the Government by accommodating—and I again underline that word—you with your positions was not made by substantive motion and, accordingly, I ask you to make the same *prima facie* finding as you did with the member for Hayward.

Mr Brindal: A deal by any other name still smells.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hayward made an error yesterday. I recommend to him that he not make one again today. When the Speaker rises, all members cease speaking. First, it is a matter of privilege, and I will have to check, but I do not think it is really appropriate to ask the question in Question Time, although I will answer it. Yesterday there was substantial criticism by the Leader and the Deputy

Leader about the matter of privilege not being taken up at the appropriate time. As a matter of fact, it was only a matter of a week or two from the Committee to the first day of sitting when the issue was raised by the Speaker. Therefore, it would seem to me that the same argument about delay exists.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Parliament supported it yesterday. It would seem to me that the course is still open to the Deputy Leader or any member of this Parliament to raise that complaint in a substantive motion which would allow this Parliament to debate every aspect of it fully, and it would seem to the Chair that that would be the way to proceed; a substantive motion would allow full and free debate in this House by honourable members.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Sir, I raise a point of order on behalf of my little mate from Hayward.

The SPEAKER: I think 'little mate from Hayward' is out of order.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: A moment ago, with respect, you gestured by pointing at him with whatever it is you have in your hand at the moment, and said 'You made a mistake yesterday.'

The SPEAKER: I take the point of order. I apologise to the House if I have breached Standing Orders. I repeat: if the member for Hayward ignores Standing Orders, I will take the same action against him as I will against any other member of the House while I am Speaker of the House and acting on the Standing Orders agreed to by the House.

MARDEN SPORTING COMPLEX

Mr GROOM (Hartley): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning confirm that a supplementary development plan is being processed to enable land at Marden to be developed as a sporting complex, and will she outline the procedure to be followed to bring this project to a successful conclusion?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, we certainly are preparing a supplementary development plan. Before I answer the question fully, it is appropriate to acknowledge that the member for Hartley and his neighbouring colleague the member for Norwood have worked tirelessly over the past five years to ensure that this particular complex does go ahead because of its vital importance to the neighbouring communities. It is important that I acknowledge their support and dedication, as I am sure other members would agree.

Certainly a draft supplementary development plan has been presented to enable the use of the land which is part of the Marden High School and part of the Engineering and Water Supply Department depot to proceed for major sporting, recreational and education purposes. These particular facilities include a sports stadium, clubrooms, an indoor recreation centre, a complex of tennis courts and playing fields, and the associated car parking areas. I am delighted to inform the honourable member that the supplementary development plan will be on public exhibition until 5 November this year, and that a public hearing will be held at the Payneham council chamber on 5 December 1991.

SCRIMBER

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Can the Minister of Forests advise who were the members of the Scrimber International Board during 1990 and early 1991 and say

what engineering expertise, if any, the members of the board had? Can he also advise whether Scrimber management in Mount Gambier reported directly to that board and whether reports were sent in full to the separate SATCO board?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In 1990 and 1991 the SATCO board consisted of three members: Mr Higginson was the Chairman of the board and he has considerable private sector experience; Mr Alan Crompton, who also has considerable private sector experience, was another member; and the third member was the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Woods and Forests, Mr Dennis Mutton. So, these three people constituted the board, although other people were often present as observers. These three people constituted the board of SATCO. Regarding the other question the honourable member asked as to the relationship between the partnership and the board, the fact that it was a partnership meant that the senior Scrimber executive, Mr Coxon, reported monthly to a partnership group, which represented both SATCO and SGIC. The SATCO representative on that partnership board or partnership group was Graham Higginson, the Chairman of SATCO.

SHEEP EXPORTS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Agriculture advise the House whether he supports the voluntary constraints on exports of sheep meat to the European community that have been in place since 1980?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The short answer is 'No'. They may have been appropriate in 1980, but it is quite clear from the trading practice of the European community in the international arena that it is not appropriate any more. I might say that the genesis of this issue in recent times is that we received in South Australia a request for the supply of 100 000 tonnes of light weight lambs to go to Spain. When the approach we received was conveyed to some companies in South Australia, they indicated that for two reasons they were not able to supply that. One reason was that their tradition has not been to slaughter lambs of that age—in the eight kilogram to 12 kilogram range—and, secondly, that they do not have other technical capacities that might be needed at this time.

However, putting aside what might have been ongoing discussions about the price and delivery arrangements which, in any event, might not have been successfully concluded, the substance of their incapacity to meet that very substantial order was that in 1980 a voluntary constraint agreement was entered into by Australia and New Zealand with the European Community that bound both those countries to limit their exports of sheep meat to the European community. Indeed, that agreement, which is due to expire in 1992, limited the total access to 240 000 tonnes for New Zealand and 17 500 tonnes for Australia.

That may well have been fine in 1980, at a time when the European Community was playing a fair game in the international commodity arena, when they were not misusing their taxpayer resources to subsidise their own producers and rip away the markets of Australian commodity producers. However, in 1991 the situation is radically different and I see no reason why we should feel bound by voluntary constraints in the sheep meat market if they have ripped up all the rules in the wheat markets and other markets that they are distorting by the sale of subsidised produce in the international arena.

I propose to take up this matter with the Federal Minister, Simon Crean, to obtain his concurrence that we should be

seeking the removal of this agreement at the earliest possible opportunity. This agreement, which is administered by the AMLC, is due to expire at the end of 1992 but, if we are receiving orders now which, subject to proper discussions on price and quality, could result in successful supply by South Australian growers and processors, we should be getting those markets now. I intend to pursue that matter and hope that we will be able to achieve some decent return for at least one other sector of the South Australian producing community.

SCRIMBER

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Did the Minister of Woods and Forests read any of the reports which the sacked Scrimber Managing Director wrote at the end of each month from the time he was appointed in July 1988, until he was summarily dismissed on 31 July this year, and, if not, how does he justify placing all responsibility for the failure of the Scrimber project on the shoulders of Scrimber management, and will he make those reports available to the Parliament so that we, on behalf of taxpayers who have lost \$60 million through this failure, can judge who is responsible?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The question really contains several questions and it is a bit difficult to sort out where to start.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The reports will certainly be made available to any committee that is set up to look at this and, in fact, I understand that the setting up of such a committee is underway in another place.

An honourable member: Did you read the report?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have answered that question previously and I see no reason why I should answer it again; and I also gave my reasons previously, and I see no need to give them again.

DESERT PARKS PASS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning confirm whether new regulations, strategies and marketing methods are being adopted to resolve problems with the desert parks pass for visitors to restricted areas of the State's north? I am aware that there has been some consultation on this matter with tourism groups in my area.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for her question and, yes, she has certainly been involved in wishing to iron out a couple of the problems that I believe are quite genuine concerns raised by users of the desert parks pass system in its introduction. I am certainly very pleased to inform the honourable member that, following consultations between the National Parks and Wildlife Service, Tourism SA and the Flinders Ranges and Outback Regional Tourist Association in Port Augusta, a number of initiatives have now been introduced. Very briefly, those initiatives are:

1. As from December, the pass will be valid for 12 months from the date of purchase rather than lasting for just the calendar year in which the pass has been purchased.

2. Overnight camping permits at \$15 a vehicle will now be available for Innamincka, Lake Eyre and the Dalhousie Springs area.

3. The booklet that is provided when the pass is purchased has been updated with more appropriate information

and now includes a series of special maps of all areas of the north.

4. After a desert parks pass is purchased at the initial cost of \$50 it can then be renewed annually for \$30 until 1996, when the pass booklet will be upgraded completely.

Mr Lewis: When is the expiry date?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member did not listen to my answer, but I am happy to repeat it. It is a little bit of information that I am happy to share with the honourable member. As I said at the beginning of my answer, as from December this year the pass will be valid for 12 months from the date of purchase rather than being valid just for the remainder of the calendar year in which it was purchased. It was agreed that much effort was needed to market the pass to visitors to the area and to give those in the industry a better understanding of the system. This latter move will ensure that everyone, from hotel proprietors through to the people who serve petrol at service stations, is made aware of the advantages of the desert parks pass system and what the money is used for so that they can provide that information to visitors to outback areas. This resulted from my own visit to the northern parks in July, when I had the opportunity to meet with some of the front-line tourist operators. They shared their concerns and said that they wanted more information. I am pleased to inform the House that their requests will be met and that information will be provided to them.

INSTITUTIONALISED CORRUPTION

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I ask for the attention of the Minister of Emergency Services, to whom I direct my question. When does corruption become institutionalised corruption?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has some trouble with this question. I am not sure that the Minister has a responsibility to the House to define the term 'institutionalised corruption'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Minister wishes to answer, of course, it is his choice, but it is not really part of his ministerial responsibility to the House.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, using the Minister's words, we are calling upon the Minister to explain himself, and that he must do before this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule the question out of order, but I will have a word with the honourable member about it. The member for Henley Beach.

SOUTH AFRICAN SPORTING CONTACT

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport please explain South Australia's position in relation to the future of sporting contact with South Africa? I understand that two young black cricketers arrived in Adelaide today to take up training with the Australian Institute of Sport Cricket Academy. Does this herald the start of increased sporting ties with our South African neighbours and, if not, how does this sit with the anti-apartheid movement?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted to answer the member for Henley Beach, and I thank him for the question because it is significant in terms of the visit of the South African Foreign Minister and also the events occurring at an international level with sport in regard to South Africa.

I believe this is the first step in Australia's renewing its relations with South Africa at a sporting level. It is a significant step and one that has been couched carefully to the appropriate authorities involved, particularly the South African United Cricket Board, which is now very much an integrated body.

The position is that we are welcoming—I thought I was going to be able to welcome them myself, but unfortunately I will not be able to do so—Mr Walter Masemola from Alexandria township, near Johannesburg, and Mr Leslie Duiker, who are both prominent young cricketers. Walter is a right-arm fast bowler and Leslie is a left-arm medium-pace bowler and batsman. They will be located under the direction of the National Director of the Academy, Mr Rod Marsh. They will be in Adelaide working with the academy.

Mr Ferguson: Would that be in Kidman Park in my electorate?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It will be close to it. They will be in Kidman Park on occasions.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Why are you not meeting them?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I cannot meet them, unfortunately. It is an important statement between our Governments—the Federal Government and the State Government—to the United Cricket Board of South Africa because, given the events that are occurring, it opens the door for young black cricketers to have the opportunity to develop their cricket talents.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The Premier says you should tell us why you are not meeting them.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I had planned to meet the young cricketers at 3.30 p.m. at Adelaide Oval but, unfortunately, I am unable to do that because I cannot get a pair at this time. I firmly believe that a visit such as this—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will ignore that stupid comment from the honourable member. It is a clear and careful production in the way that we have gone about it. It has received the support of Foreign Affairs, and it was an idea we generated here in South Australia. It has been endorsed by the Federal Minister and supported financially by the Federal Government so that these young cricketers could come to Australia to learn at our academy and improve the quality of their cricketing. It is a significant step for cricket in South Africa. Cricket has led the way in respect of integration. There is a long way to go yet and, as the former Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, said yesterday, in his opinion there are not yet grounds to lift the sanctions fully. We are seeing a gradual lift occur in some areas of sport, but there is still a long way to go because the trappings of apartheid still exist.

This is an important step. I welcome these young cricketers to South Australia and I hope that they enjoy their stay. I am sure they will and I hope they learn a great deal about the game that they love. I hope that they can go back to South Africa and encourage other young black cricketers to take up the game and enjoy the sport. We hope to see them back here representing their country in years to come as part of the South African cricket team. I am delighted that we are able to make this announcement jointly with the Federal Government.

OAKLANDS PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Premier. Did the Premier's Department sell the Oaklands Park Primary School site to SGIC in January 1989 without going to tender and, most importantly, without offering

Westfield Shoppingtowns any chance of purchase and, if so, who approved the sale, and why?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not sure how the Premier's Department would have actual ownership or tenure of that land.

Mr Brindal: You did. You look it up.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will certainly take the question on notice and provide the honourable member with a reply.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction provide details of the South Australian Housing Trust procedure for purchasing houses? In particular, I have been asked to determine how houses are referred to the Housing Trust; the Housing Trust's obligations to advise adjoining owners; and whether the Housing Trust receives priority over other interested purchasers? I have received a number of requests from constituents in the suburb of Albert Park to seek information, as it has been suggested that these constituents have been ignored when the Housing Trust has sought to purchase properties in that location.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his ongoing interest in the housing portfolio because, of course, it affects his electorate directly. Generally, an inquiry is made at some stage (or a number, in the case of the member for Albert Park) into events surrounding any one of these policies that the Government adopts with regard to either sale or purchase. It is something that the honourable member has taken up actively, and I think that it is a reasonable question to ask about the Housing Trust program.

This year, as part of our capital works program, the Housing Trust intends to purchase approximately 300 houses for public and community-related programs. In fact, we follow a program of purchasing, not only for the Housing Trust's own public housing program but also for community housing associations, whether they be sponsored by churches or local clubs or whether they be Aboriginal housing programs. Therefore, a whole range of purchases are undertaken for a number of organisations on behalf of the Housing Trust. Of course, that is done because we have the personnel available to manage the process and to provide it at a very reasonable cost to those communities.

Before we go through the process, a purchase inspection is carried out by our purchasing teams. We have a number of experts involved in that process, including a technical officer, who looks at the structural soundness of the house, and a property consultant who, together with the technical officer, inspects the property to determine the upgrading requirements, the structural needs, and what is required to bring it up to an acceptable standard for occupation. Of course, they then obtain an estimated market value of the property, and that is advised through their normal report to the Housing Trust. Once agreement has been reached for the purchase of a property after the property has met the requirements set by the Housing Trust, the costings are put into the established financial guidelines, and the estimated valuations are then placed as part of the process of ordinary vendor purchase. In fact, we follow the ordinary processes that any person in the community would follow in terms of a house purchase.

The honourable member asked about the sale of houses, how houses are referred to the Trust, and what obligations there are to advise adjoining owners. I will go through these issues in that order. Properties are offered to the Housing Trust by either real estate agents or vendors directly. Approximately 15 per cent of our properties are brought to our attention by the vendor directly. Obviously, there is no obligation for the Housing Trust to advise adjoining owners of purchase or potential purchase of a property, but if we discover through the agent or any other agent in the area that a young couple is interested in purchasing as their first home a house that may be offered to the trust, the trust will automatically withdraw from the market. Therefore, we do not in any way interfere with any young couple who may be establishing their first home through the purchase of that same property. I think that is an important factor to convey to constituents, because I know that there has been concern regarding the fact that the trust is competing with young first home buyers in the marketplace.

The properties that are owned by a vendor for less than 12 months are not considered for purchase. There is an obvious reason for that. It is because in many cases some people endeavour to speculate and bring the trust into that particular sale. The trust also purchases properties on behalf of specific client groups, such as Aboriginal housing, community housing groups and other cooperative housing groups. Also, of course, the trust actively seeks to purchase existing properties that have potential for redevelopment, say, a house that can be divided into two or used for units, so that we can meet the Government's commitment towards urban consolidation or urban infill.

Finally, the Valuer-General regularly scrutinises purchases to ensure that the prices paid are not in excess of current market values. I think that has covered comprehensively the honourable member's concerns. I know that he has raised this matter because of this being raised with him by constituents, and I am sure that he will convey back to them the full response from me.

CORRUPTION

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I ask again for the attention of the Minister of Emergency Services. Will he explain when corruption becomes institutionalised corruption, as referred to by the Police Commissioner in relation to Operation Hygiene last Friday?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I suggest to the honourable member that this is not the right State in which to ask about institutionalised corruption. She should try Queensland, where there are any number of people in her Party and other allied Parties who are guests of Her Majesty's prison at the moment and who no doubt have a much clearer appreciation of the situation. If the honourable member wishes to find out the meaning of words, I suggest she consult a dictionary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ABORIGINAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs advise the House whether he is aware—
Dr Armitage interjecting:

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

Mrs HUTCHISON: —of any changes to Federal budget allocations for Aboriginal employment programs in South Australia?

Dr Armitage interjecting:

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

Mrs HUTCHISON: A number of constituents have expressed their concern that there may be substantial reductions to Federal Aboriginal employment programs in this State. I have been told that this would have a very serious impact on employment for Aboriginal people.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for her interest in this area. Unfortunately, there certainly are clear indications that there will be cuts to the allocations to South Australia of money under the Commonwealth's Aboriginal employment programs.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It seems that the member for Adelaide is not interested in Aboriginal employment issues—if I could have his attention as well. I am concerned that any cuts in Federal money for Aboriginal employment programs in South Australia could seriously jeopardise the Commonwealth's reconciliation process. Last year, DEET the Federal department in South Australia, spent around \$5.9 million in Aboriginal employment development funds, plus \$1 million for Aboriginal organisational training.

I am told that this year South Australia could be facing substantial cuts—perhaps in the region of \$2 million less than last year's allocation. That would be a massive blow to our Aboriginal employment and training program in South Australia, which has been doing some pioneering work. This State would find it intolerable if South Australia suffered because of overspending by some other States to the east. The Commonwealth's moves do not take into account the fact that Aborigines in this State often live in remote areas, which cost more to service, compared with those in the eastern States.

The South Australian Government has a demonstrated commitment to Aboriginal employment through the 1 per cent Challenge scheme. A cut in funds of this magnitude will severely handicap our ability to achieve jobs for South Australian Aboriginal people. At a time when we have major unemployment problems, I find this action by the Federal Government intolerable. I think it is quite clear that this is putting the first Australians further in jeopardy, in terms of this recession.

The Hawke Government has been pushing the line of reconciliation for Aboriginal people for the past year. A cut in funds to Aboriginal employment initiatives will encourage the view that reconciliation is more concerned with rhetoric than with action, and that would be a pity. The concept of reconciliation, I think all members would agree, must be backed by practical resolve. A cut in the Training for Aboriginal Programs (TAP) at this stage would send the message to South Australians that employment and economic independence are not part of the reconciliation process.

HINDMARSH ISLAND MARINA DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): My question is directed to the Premier. What are the terms of the Government's financial arrangement with the marina development company for the new bridge to Hindmarsh Island? Prior to this arrangement, did the Premier or anyone on his behalf intervene to ensure that taxpayer guaranteed loan funds for this developer were made available?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The developers of Hindmarsh Island originally contemplated funding the bridge themselves as part of the long-term development proposal. The project has been stalled due to the difficulty of obtaining finance and I guess the sheer scope of the project and the economic climate in which we are operating. At the same time, the Government looked very closely at the economics connected with the Hindmarsh bridge proposal. It is worth remembering that at present we incur a recurrent cost expenditure in operating the ferry service to Hindmarsh Island. The service is clearly unsatisfactory. Considerable tension has been caused because of the need to issue local passes which allow residents of the island to jump the queues. They do not like being in that position, and obviously it is a major inhibition to tourism and other opportunities to enjoy the recreational facilities there.

In consequence, the Government decided to embark independently on the construction of the bridge, and we would expect to recoup the cost of that investment in part by the defraying of the costs because of the need to no longer operate the ferry. The local council of Port Elliot and Goolwa has undertaken to take over the management and operation of the bridge once it is constructed. In other words, the future recurrent maintenance will be covered by local government. We are talking about the capital cost of construction of the bridge and therefore the set-off of our recurrent expenditure.

Secondly, developments that take place on Hindmarsh Island of the sort launched last week will contribute to defraying the cost of the bridge. An arrangement has been entered into, and this depends on the pace of sales and the financing of those projects. I think the overall package is one of enormous benefit. The point I am making is that the construction of the bridge is not dependent upon the Binalong marina development project, although obviously it makes a major contribution to its success. That very success in turn will contribute to the cost of the bridge.

Further down the track, as one could well anticipate when looking at the marvellous amenity of that area, if there are other developments, there will be a requirement for their contribution as well. I do not know whether or not the honourable member has had a chance to look at what has been done on Hindmarsh Island. I had a look at it for the first time at the weekend, and it is really extremely impressive. There are obviously great tourist and other opportunities for that part of our coast and, as I said on Sunday, I congratulate the promoters of the project on carrying on in these very difficult circumstances.

With regard to the infrastructure support, if you like, that will be provided through the commitment to build the bridge—which is estimated to cost in the order of \$6 million, although the actual final detailed studies and so on are still to be completed—the Department of Road Transport is picking up some of the work that is already being done and is obviously refining and reassessing that. In the end that contribution will not only save the State money but contribute to a very great amenity in that overall area.

SPENCER GULF NAVIGATIONAL AIDS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Spence): Can the Minister of Marine advise the House about the proposed decommissioning of several navigational aids in Spencer Gulf? I understand that the Australian Maritime Safety Authority, a Commonwealth Government body, is responsible for the Middle Bank navigation beacon, the Eastern Shoal, North and South Beacons and the Point Lowly lighthouse. I have been told that the

authority now considers that those aids are no longer necessary.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Government is most concerned about the Commonwealth's decision that these aids are now redundant. This decision was apparently made last October by the Australian Maritime Safety Authority without consultation with the Department of Marine and Harbors. I have written to Federal Shipping Minister Bob Collins on two occasions expressing our view that the Commonwealth should meet its obligations and maintain these aids. The Federal Government collects a navigation levy—formerly known as lighthouse dues—from shipping to fund these facilities, yet it has been reported that both eastern shoal beacons are in a state of disrepair. My personal observation is that they are, indeed, in a poor state of repair.

I have called on the Federal Government to fully consult with the department and more importantly with the shipmasters who operate to northern Spencer Gulf ports about the need for these beacons and aids. Anybody who has seen the charts for that area would know that large vessels have to be very careful in manoeuvring through it, because the waters are very shallow. We are also lobbying the Maritime Safety Authority to reconsider its decision. The matter has also been raised at the Australian Transport Advisory Council. The State Government is doing what is required of it for maritime safety by maintaining beacons it recognises to be its responsibility. In fact, we are undertaking a five-year multi-million dollar program to replace our acetylene powered navigation lights around South Australia with more efficient solar powered systems.

BERRI BRIDGE

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): My question is directed to the Premier. In view of his response to the member for Kavel, what has become of the promise the Premier made to the people of the Riverland, when withdrawing funding for the Berri bridge project in favour of the Gawler by-pass, that the next bridge over the Murray in South Australia would be in the Berri area?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The bridge I am describing is not a bridge over the Murray.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is a channel of the Murray River; that is certainly true, but it is in fact connecting the mainland.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would be delighted if the same sort of economic case could be developed by the honourable member for such a link. It has been under discussion over many years and the fact is that there is no alternative to the ferry across to Hindmarsh Island; that is the only way the vehicular traffic can go.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are a number of ways in which one can cross the Murray River, as the honourable member well knows.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order. The member for Walsh.

RACING RESULTS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport instigate an inquiry with a view to ensuring that justice prevails on this occasion, if possible, and certainly on all future occasions, in the declaring of racing results that may not be correct, especially in view of the following comments made by a racing journalist in this morning's *Advertiser*:

Saturday is not the first time judges have made an error somewhere on a race track and there is no guarantee it won't be the last.

Media reports have indicated that two or more punters from Morphettville last Saturday have been deprived of their winning share of an \$87 933.50 fourtrelle pool which will instead jackpot for the next week, because the South Australian Jockey Club Committee stubbornly refuses to reverse a declaration which is universally agreed to be incorrect. The article referred to also states:

Race judge, Vic Cox, and his assistant John Buhagiar, admitted to stewards, after correct weight had been declared, they had made an error in declaring My Latin Boy as the winner ahead of Sunrise Beach. The committee yesterday considered a report from chief steward, Bruce Fullarton, before issuing a short media statement.

Club Chairman Bob Linke said: The steward's declaration of correct weight is the order from which all betting transactions are paid. The judge's placings followed by the declaration of correct weight are established by the rules of racing, and all rules relating to betting with bookmakers, the on-course totalisator and the TAB as the final and binding result in all circumstances, except for the disqualification of a placegetter from running with a prohibited substance.

The committee sincerely regrets the incorrect placings in race 6, but neither the stewards of the club nor the committee is empowered to alter the judge's decision or the placings once correct weight has been declared.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member has referred to a press statement from the Chairman, Mr Linke, which was released yesterday. I have asked my department for a full report on the issue. The situation was brought to my attention by a couple of constituents who had placed bets on the horse that they believe should have won, and from the photo finish it appears that it should have. They are very concerned. The next day those concerns were expressed in the media by a number of people, including, as the honourable member has said, a number of journalists. It is a situation that no-one—and particularly the SAJC—would wish upon the punting community.

The issue of whether or not the judge's decision stands as a final decision once placings and correct weight have been declared is, of course, a matter involving the rules of the SAJC as the body administering racing in this State. I intend to take up this issue with the SAJC as it is something which has to be addressed for the long-term good of the industry and which has been raised previously. A lot of pressure and responsibility rests not only on the judges but also on the stewards in this regard and, in order to assist the industry in its adjudication process, we have established the Racing Appeals Tribunal. We may have to look at some other way of dealing with this situation, because I do not believe that the credibility of the industry can survive if this occurs again, certainly in the near future. Even if it occurs in the longer term, confidence in the industry will be shaken.

Obviously there is a good deal of anger in the community. I was approached on Sunday by a constituent who was quite obviously disturbed by what had occurred. That constituent made some fairly serious allegations about the events surrounding race 6. This situation does lend itself to such allegations but, as to whether or not there is any truth in them, I will not comment. For the sake of the community

as a whole, I think we have to address this matter very carefully and thoroughly in order to prevent a recurrence.

PARLIAMENTARY APPOINTMENTS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I direct my question to the Premier. What discussions did he have with the members for Semaphore and Elizabeth in 1989 in relation to their requests for ministries, and on what basis was the decision made for them to be supported for the positions of Speaker and Deputy Speaker respectively?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Like members of the Opposition, the Government was very happy to support both the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker for their positions. In view of the state of the House, it was a very logical decision to be made and that support was freely given. The fact is that in the interests of government of the State quite properly consultation took place then and continues to take place with both those members, and there is every good reason why that should be so.

ROAD TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Transport report to the House on the effectiveness of the new measures for controlling road traffic problems such as speed cameras and traffic light intersection cameras, etc.? It has been reported recently in the press that the introduction of such measures has been simply for revenue raising, yet South Australia is heading for its lowest road death toll in many years.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is true, as he said, that we appear to be heading for the lowest road death toll since records have been kept. If that comes about by the end of the year, I think it is something of which all South Australians, including most members of this Chamber, can justifiably be proud.

The statistics at present show that we have about 40 deaths less this year than last year. While the worst three months of the year are yet to come, it seems that unless motorists engage in wholesale slaughter, we will achieve our target of a lower number of deaths this year than last year. Despite the propaganda of certain members opposite—not all of them—that our road laws are used as revenue-raising measures by the Government, it is clear that that is totally incorrect, and the proof of that is in the present road deaths statistics. The figures reflect a combination of measures: there is no one single answer to the trauma on our roads.

One of the measures that I think has been particularly effective has been the introduction of speed cameras. Wherever they have been used they have had a dramatic effect in slowing down the traffic. None of us would argue other than speed kills. An effective measure such as the use of speed cameras in slowing down the traffic is clearly working and working well. It is argued that it is merely a revenue-raising measure, but I can advise the House that, if we wanted to raise revenue, we could reduce traffic fines to the extent that they were trivial. That would mean that they would be overwhelmingly ignored and would result in greater revenue to the Government. This is a clear demonstration that, if the fines were much smaller, the law would not have any impact and the Government would gain more revenue.

That may well be the case, and it was argued by at least one member opposite in respect of reducing random breath tests to the .05 level. How high we make the penalties to stamp out a particular problem in the end is a matter of

judgment. For example, if we wanted to stamp out illegal parking, we could have confiscation of the vehicles involved and there would be no illegal parking, I can assure the House, but that would be an over-reaction to the problem. I thank the member for Gilles for his question, as it allows me to explain to the House some of the successes we are having in this area. I thank those members opposite who have cooperated with the Government in bringing in these road safety measures, and I am sure that they take as great a pleasure as I do at the promising statistics obtained so far this year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: RAIL TRANSPORT

Mr VENNING (Custance): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr VENNING: In a question asked by the member for Spence the Minister of Transport reflected incorrectly on me and said words to the effect that, first, I did not travel on the rail system. I did travel on it when it was there and I will travel on it again if the service is re-established. I have travelled on many other rail services, including the Ghan, the Indian Pacific and the Overland, when operational.

Secondly, the Minister claimed that I did not transport my grain by rail. That is quite incorrect, especially of late, when Australian National has been competitive with its rail freights. In the 1990-91 season I transported more grain by rail than I did by road, particularly in the Bute to Wallaroo sector. If Australian National continues to be competitive and efficient, that will always be the case. I will continue to fight for the retention and use of the rail system. I am not a hypocrite. I look forward to speaking to the Minister in the next couple of weeks about the future of our railway stations.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PARLIAMENTARY PAIRS

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I wish to briefly explain my position as Whip in relation to pairs, and it relates directly to what the Minister of Recreation and Sport referred to earlier about pairs being refused for him to attend a function from now until 4 p.m. and also for this evening. The request for a pair from some Ministers is strictly in respect of important ministerial business, and in other cases it is very borderline. The Minister of Recreation and Sport has made a large number of requests, and I admit that some have been in for several weeks. I do not always respond to them early because certain things happen in this place and, if you have to withdraw it, you are later accused of something, so you are better to wait until nearer the date.

Yesterday the Minister was granted a pair to go to Melbourne to launch the Vic Health Herald-Sun Tour, which is claimed to be the largest cycling event in the southern hemisphere. The tour was launched jointly with the Hon. Joan Kirner, the Premier of Victoria, because it will cross the South Australian border. The pair was granted although, under the circumstances, one could have argued that there

was more important business in Parliament. I raise the issue of the two pairs that were requested today.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the member for Davenport that he cannot debate the issue.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I will give the details. The way in which the Minister raised the matter in relation to the two South African cricketers reflects on me. The application for a pair stated that the cricketers were arriving in Adelaide at noon today, and I think that all members would have loved to meet both of them. In fact, I think that opportunity may arise over the next two months. Of course, the opportunity was there to invite them to Parliament, where they could have sat as special guests. The Minister asked for a pair to allow him to leave the House between 3.30 and 4 p.m., and that request was not granted. Further, the Minister requested a pair for the evening so that he could attend a function in respect of Dr John Daly's pilot study into volunteer involvement in sport. That request was considered, and I made the decision, without consulting others, that that is not really a matter of strict ministerial importance. If the House later wants me to, I will read out all the requests, but I do not wish to do that in my explanation.

The Minister of Recreation and Sport has had something like 15 requests for pairs. I believe that at times Parliament must ensure that the request for a pair relates to a very important ministerial matter. I do not have that problem in other areas. I point out to the House that I find it difficult when the wording of the request for a pair is along these lines:

I will be unable to attend the sitting of the House of Assembly from 7 p.m. on Wednesday the 9th . . .

That says to me that the pair is not really warranted, because the person is saying that they will not be here. I received a request from the Premier in these terms: 'I would like to be absent from Parliament on the 21st in order to attend a function. I would appreciate it if a pair could be arranged.' I think that, if we look at the attitude of members in respect of their approaches to this area, things will be a lot different.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Of course, pairs are not part of the formal structure of this House. There is no Standing Order or any requirement of the House to agree to them. I just raise that matter at this stage.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I find the response in regard to my application for leave to attend the welcome for the South African cricketers—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will ignore the honourable member; he has not had his drugs today.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The reason I did not attend the 12 o'clock arrival of the cricketers at the airport was on advice from the Director of the academy. I actually suggested through my press secretary that it might be appropriate for us to meet them at the airport. In fact, the Director's advice was that he wanted to give them a couple of hours to recover after their plane flight direct from Harare in Africa. That was the reason why we chose to meet them at 3.30 p.m. It was decided, following consultation between the Director of the academy, Mr Rod Marsh, and my press secretary, that 3.30 p.m. would be an appropriate time so that I could be in the House for Question

Time and then attend a welcome for the young cricketers. It is highly appropriate—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I ignore you: I always have. In due course I intend to bring the cricketers into the Chamber to meet the appropriate parliamentary officers. We received advice only late last week confirming their arrival, and it has all been pretty much of a rush for the academy, particularly for Rod Marsh and his staff, to organise a structured week for them, bearing in mind that they must settle in to Adelaide. That is the reason why I sought leave for 3.30 this afternoon.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Because of some of the comments that have been made by the member for Davenport in his role as Opposition Whip, I would like to put on record my role in what has transpired. First, in relation to pair requests from Ministers' officers that I forward to the Opposition Whip, it is true that some of them do have what the member for Davenport obviously believes is presumptuous wording. One of the difficulties is that there is a continuous turnover in ministerial staff, and I find it difficult to always make sure that the appropriate wording is used. In the case alluded to by the Minister, earlier in Question Time I became aware from my opposite number that—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Mr Speaker, I would appreciate your protection from the member for Napier.

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

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I became aware earlier in Question Time that the pair would not be granted as requested by the Minister. At that time, I had no idea of the content of the question directed to him a few moments later regarding international cricketers. As I listened I suddenly became aware that the Minister was inadvertently misleading the House with his intention of meeting with the international visitors and I interrupted him momentarily in order to advise him that he would not be able to do so.

DRIED FRUITS (EXTENSION OF TERM OF OFFICE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dried Fruits Act 1934. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this short Bill is to extend by one year the terms of office of the representative (elected) members of the Dried Fruits Board which would otherwise expire on 31 December 1991.

As honourable members will be aware, the Government carried out a review of dried fruits marketing regulations in South Australia and, in the process, sought public comments on the matter. Such comments, which continued to arrive after the notional closing date of last 30 June, are currently being analysed. It is the Government's hope that, after due consideration of all the facts, appropriate legislation will be passed in the first parliamentary sittings in 1992.

In the meantime, there remains the question of the expiry of the terms of the three representative board members at the end of this year.

In the circumstances, it is the Government's view that it is eminently sensible for those representative members of the Dried Fruits Board to continue in office during the transitional period without the need to conduct a costly and time consuming election under the present Act.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 inserts a new section 39 after section 38 of the principal Act which provides that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the terms of office of those members of the board holding office as representative members immediately prior to the commencement of this section are extended by one year from the day on which they would otherwise expire.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PETROLEUM (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Petroleum Act 1940. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: 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

In the last few years, policy developments, emerging gas supply options, operational requirements in the Cooper Basin, and, administrative difficulties have highlighted the need for a number of revisions to the Petroleum Act.

Recent developments in proposed pipelines which may be required to bring gas into South Australia, and the possible sale by the Commonwealth of the Moomba to Sydney gas pipeline, have necessitated amendments to the pipeline licensing provisions of the Act. The requirement for a gas pipeline from South West Queensland to Moomba is now very likely, and there is also a possibility of a requirement for a pipeline from the Amadeus Basin in the Northern Territory to connect with the existing Moomba to Adelaide pipeline.

The amendments included in this Bill clarify the category of pipeline that requires licensing to include, for example, a pipeline conveying petroleum from or to a place outside South Australia, provided that some part of the pipeline is located within South Australia. The amendments also provide that the Minister may in respect of a natural gas pipeline enter into an agreement with a licensee, or prospective licensee, that ownership of that pipeline will vest in the Crown at some future time. The purpose of providing for such an agreement is that it may be necessary to protect the long-term strategic interests of South Australia.

The amendments also provide that a pipeline licence cannot be transferred without the approval of the Minister.

A growing problem of disposal of waste materials resulting from petroleum exploration and, more particularly, production operations, has arisen over the last year or two. Essentially, all methods of disposal are forbidden by the Act. Necessary periodic inspection of facilities at Moomba for corrosion cannot occur until contained wastes are

removed. The Bill contains an amendment to allow the Minister to give approval for waste disposal.

The fees, penalties and other monetary charges set out in the Act have not been reviewed since 1984, and an increase in line with inflation since that time is appropriate. In addition, a review has indicated that some South Australian charges are substantially lower than those levied interstate and these charges have been adjusted accordingly. The amendments to the Act move the monetary values of fees to the regulations to facilitate periodic adjustment.

There is currently no provision in the Act to allow delegation of ministerial powers. The Bill amends the Act to include this provision with the view to speeding the administrative process for matters of a relatively minor nature. This amendment mirrors powers which already exist in the Acts governing offshore petroleum exploration and development.

Section 42 of the Act provides that agreements in which an interest in a licence is transferred are void if purporting to have effect on a date prior to that of the Minister's approval. This has caused problems in the registration of documents and is not entirely consistent with the equivalent legislation in this State governing offshore petroleum. This Bill amends the Act such that agreements to transfer an interest in a licence have no effect unless approved by the Minister.

Amendments to sections 42 and 43 of the Act have also been necessary to remove anomalies as to certain types of documents which require approval and those that are only required to be lodged and also clarifies the nature of documents which either require approval or lodgment.

Clause 1 is formal.

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

Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act to insert a new definition of 'pipeline'. This general definition will not apply for the purposes of the provisions requiring certain pipelines to be licensed. A more limited definition is proposed for the purposes of these provisions. (See proposed new section 80ca).

Clause 4 inserts new section 4ab into the principal Act to confer a power of delegation on the Minister.

Clause 5 repeals and replaces sections 42 and 43 of the principal Act. New section 42 requires ministerial approval for any agreement to transfer a licence or an interest in a licence, or to confer any right to share in petroleum produced from the area of a licence, or profits derived from the production of petroleum. New section 43 requires joint licensees to file with the Director copies of agreements relating to the carrying out of operations under the licence or the sharing of petroleum produced from the licence area.

Clause 6 makes a minor amendment to section 64 of the principal Act to allow the Minister or the regulations to approve the disposal of wastes.

Clause 7 inserts new section 80ca into the principal Act. This section defines 'pipeline' for the purposes of the licensing provisions. The new definition will cover pipelines that traverse the State as well as those that originate from petroleum fields within the State.

Clause 8 amends section 80h of the principal Act to provide that the Minister may enter into agreements under which the Crown may acquire title to pipelines.

Clause 9 repeals and replaces section 80i of the principal Act to provide for variation or revocation of conditions of a licence at the time of renewal. The power to vary will not however apply to Pipeline Licence No. 2.

Clause 10 amends section 80j of the principal Act to remove obsolete references to the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act.

Clause 11 widens slightly the provisions of section 80/ under which the Minister may require a pipeline licensee to carry petroleum for another licensee. New subsection (2) empowers the Land and Valuation Court to review and vary the terms on which petroleum is to be conveyed.

Clause 12 makes amendments to section 87 of the principal Act that are consequential on the introduction of divisional penalties.

The Schedule introduces some divisional penalties, increases some monetary amounts prescribed by the Act and allows for others to be prescribed by regulation.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

(Continued from 8 October. Page 939.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): When we considered the payments to the Department for Family and Community Services during the Estimates Committees, I intentionally focused on the lines concerning juvenile justice, because of the role that the department plays in the handling of children, both before they go into courts and after they come out of the courts. Indeed, I did that because the day before the Estimates Committee hearing we had an attack on the Children's Court by the Attorney-General of this State, where he blamed the judges and magistrates for the rate of crime that we have in this State.

I decided then to focus my line of questioning during the Estimates Committee on the role of the Department for Family and Community Services in the handling of children. I firmly believe that one of the major reasons that we have a high crime rate amongst juveniles in this State is because of the role and policies of the Department for Family and Community Services. These policies extend from the children's families, to the schools, and so on. Unfortunately, a lot of children end up in the streets and in trouble. I am telephoned many times a week by women who say that they can no longer discipline their child.

Mr Hamilton: Nonsense.

Mr OSWALD: The honourable member might say 'nonsense', but I know that many of his colleagues are getting similar telephone calls—because they tell me so. However, there are women—and I guess there are some men as well, as parents, who do not know where they stand. They do not know because this mythical 'they' is saying that these people cannot discipline their children.

Mr Hamilton: Why do they say that?

Mr OSWALD: That is a very good question, and I will answer it. It is because these children in schools are being crammed with knowledge about their rights. Information is poured in at a great rate. In many cases they are not mature enough to understand that knowledge. These 12, 13 and 14-year-olds are coming home and taking on their parents and saying, 'We have our rights, you can't discipline us.' Family disputes are erupting, and these children are coming into conflict with their parents. When the time comes and benefits become available to them, through the Commonwealth DSS, we find that those children leave home and they become street kids. The next step, of course, is that they

become offenders. The member opposite who delights in throwing around about the only four adjectives that he knows—one of which is ‘puerile’—says that what I am saying is puerile. I suggest to him that he is very much out of touch with what is happening in the real world.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OSWALD: What I am relating to the House this afternoon is in fact what is actually happening out there amongst a section of our community, who indeed need assistance.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

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

Mr OSWALD: We have listened to the member for Albert Park many times, and no doubt he will use an opportunity in a grievance debate, or at some other time, to respond to what I am saying. He is, though, a man very much out of touch with the real world when it comes down to what is motivating children who are out on the streets and with what is causing them to re-offend. I believe that there should be some re-implementation of discipline. It flows right through from the homes and into the schools. If the children are taught in schools that they have their rights and it flows on, it ends up in the court system as well.

We have the situation here where the Attorney-General has chosen to attack the court system, attack the judiciary, when in fact what we should be talking about are the reasons why we have 200 children in this State who are constantly being recycled through the courts, recidivists who are serious offenders. We should be examining why the department keeps putting them up for bonds with supervision, when in fact they may have been involved in a dozen cases of stealing motor vehicles. I imagine that, if the member for Albert Park was the owner of the eleventh vehicle that was stolen, he would not be impressed.

Mr Hamilton: I have had mine stolen twice.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OSWALD: In that case, the honourable member should be adopting a much harder line than he is in relation to these matters. Bonds and supervision by the department are a joke. Nothing that came out of the Estimates Committee has made me believe anything otherwise. Also, we were told in the Estimates Committee that the Department for Family and Community Services makes community service orders too cumbersome. The Attorney criticised the bench, but when one talks to the bench one finds out just how long it takes for children to come before the court—which is sometimes up to 12 months, for a simple case of shoplifting.

When a serious case comes before the bench and the judge or magistrate decides that the list of offences is so serious that that child should have some period of detention, we find that those children go back out to SAYTC, but in some cases are back in the court the same afternoon for reconsideration by another judge. We also find that the children, with their legal advisers, in actual fact ask for the name of the magistrate who will hear their case. They do that so they will get a magistrate who will not give them some sort of detention. I find it extremely difficult to understand that, when they do receive a detention, they are recommitted by the department that same afternoon against the wishes of the magistrate.

Also brought to our attention is the fact that the department does not always give the relevant information to the training centre review board. Many members would be aware that juveniles who have committed offences and who

have attracted fines can work off those fines in the community in the form of community service. As an example, a juvenile who had a \$1 200 mandate failed to pay and was then required to do detention. However, on the recommendation of the department (and FACS was involved in this), that person was released after four hours. This juvenile was let out ‘to help his girlfriend look after their child’. Nobody from FACS had told the review board that the child had been removed from its parents because of allegations of abuse and that a restraint order existed on the father not to go within a certain distance of the mother and child.

FACS appears to be paranoid about the number of children in the detention centre. I have never subscribed to the need or urgency to detain children but, if we are to come to grips with these approximately 200 children around town, FACS will have to curb its obsession to keep children out of institutions. The impact of these children going before a magistrate and knowing when the magistrate gives them a detention order that they will be released in the afternoon is a disaster.

It is also a disaster that children who were serious offenders and who came before the court up until the day of the Estimates Committee had to be released by the magistrate because it used to take six weeks to obtain a report on that child. When I debated the matter with Sue Vardon the following day on the ABC, it was pleasing to note that the department had decided overnight to change its policy. I applaud the department for that, because it no longer takes six weeks. We had a situation prior to the Estimates Committee where a child had the opportunity to go out and reoffend on many occasions.

The Intensive Neighbourhood Care (INC) families came up for discussion during the Estimates Committee. These families try to do something with the children who have been through the Children’s Court. They are families trained to take on children and provide some sort of normal home life. Unfortunately, they can only take them on for about three months before the children are moved on again. I suggested to the Minister that the period should be for 12 months to allow the children to settle in. At the moment the INC scheme is in danger of collapse due to a lack of support for INC parents. Constant recruiting is going on but, on talking with INC parents, I find they are strained to the limit, and many of them are considering pulling out of the scheme.

I asked the Minister what he knew about truancy from school of juveniles who had been through the courts and were living in foster care. He replied that the department had no idea how many children who had been through the courts were placed in foster care. These children are placed on bonds and are supposed to be supervised by the department, but my advice from talking with foster parents is that the children do not receive supervision. However, worse than that, if they are supposed to be attending school and fail to do so, the department never hears about it. I thought that the department had a responsibility in this area. I also suggested to the Minister at the time that he has a responsibility when, of all crime being committed, 50 per cent or more is committed by juveniles. The Minister denies that responsibility. I am not sure why, but he denies that he should share some of the blame. If the department cannot sort out its procedures so that children know the guidelines from which they can operate, they will continue to offend. I am pleased to be a member of a select committee looking into all aspects of juvenile crime, and I look forward to the work of that committee.

During Question Time both yesterday and today, I raised a concern that juvenile crime has escalated dramatically,

yet an institution with only 36 places is planned at this time of escalating crime. The 36 places were determined by the Government, based on its policy of keeping children out of institutions. I do not disagree with that: children should be kept out of institutions. There is no joy in locking them up. If we are to have a crackdown on the really hard core juveniles, we might find after the committee has deliberated that 36 places is grossly inadequate. Certainly, if we are to spend \$11 million, we might re-design it so that we can provide more than 36 places. I thought juvenile justice and the juvenile system were all about providing a deterrent. It is interesting that, once a child turns 18, the rate of recidivism and the way that child treats the authorities changes. Indeed, the level of offending cuts back dramatically.

In summary, I believe that the Government has a very real responsibility, and it has shirked that responsibility over the past six to eight years. It must accept the responsibility for the increase—not because of the judges and magistrates but because of the procedures in the department. I do believe that some judges are lenient in some of their sentencing—and, I do not resile from that. If the department is actively involved in recycling these children through the courts (and that is looked at in the same light as having an escalating crime rate), if the INC scheme is in danger of collapsing, and the parents who take on these children say the scheme is a joke and there is no supervision of these children, and if the management of SAYTC is aiding and abetting bringing children back for reconsideration whenever they have a detention order, so we are now at the stage where the children thumb their noses at the system and can select on many occasions the magistrate they appear before, FACS has a real problem and must answer to it.

FACS must also answer to the attitude of children in schools, because they have their rights rammed down their throats to the extent that parents and teachers feel they cannot get involved in the disciplinary process because the children are so full of their rights. At the end of the day, discipline in our society is starting to crumble because of the actions of the Government and the lack of direction from the Minister in this whole area of discipline and community behaviour.

I refer now to the Minister of Recreation and Sport's Estimates Committee. We were very concerned when discussing the sport lines that the South Australian Recreation Institute met only twice during the year. Something is going on down at the institute that we were not able to get on top of in the Estimates Committee. It is probably connected with the problems in the whole of the Department of Recreation and Sport where this power struggle has been going on for the past 12 months.

This power struggle has resulted in open conflict between the Director of the Sports Institute and the former CEO of the department, now the present CEO of the department, and it is well documented around sport that the Director of the Sports Institute found it necessary to go over the heads of both his CEO and the Minister by going to the Premier to resolve where they are going.

The present CEO appears to be an immovable object at the moment. A campaign was urged by the Director up to the time of the Estimates Committees to try to undermine the CEO in the sporting world and to have him removed. No Minister can tolerate that type of insubordination in a department. The fact that this brawl has been going on for the past year, to my knowledge, and perhaps even longer, is something that may connect with the problems in the institute when the Director was sacked. We had several minutes of debate in the Estimates Committee over this alleged sacking. The Minister chose to say that the Director

was relocated, but in actual fact we all know (the Minister and I know) that this conflict has resulted in a clash of personalities, and the gentleman found himself sacked from the position of Director and was shifted sideways.

If the Minister does not sort this out very quickly, I would think there would be a public outcry, because sporting bodies are having great difficulty in knowing with whom to associate—the CEO of the department, the Minister of Recreation and Sport, the Director of the Sports Institute or the Premier himself. I have great sympathy for the Minister of Recreation and Sport on this matter, because I know that on a number of occasions he has been overridden by a Director of the Sports Institute. How can a Minister preside over any department if other officers in the department are constantly undermining him? I trust that the Minister will have this matter in hand very quickly. He gave assurances to the Estimates Committee, and I trust that those assurances will be put into effect.

In the last minute I have available I would like to appeal to the Minister of Housing and Construction to give a sympathetic hearing in relation to the lease of the Brighton-Glenelg Community Centre and to not proceed and sell the property. Each week 1 600 people from 50 groups use that property. It is a very valuable resource in Glenelg and it would be of grave concern to all of us in the district if the property were sold. It is on the agenda to be sold. It is probably one of the jewels as far as community centres go in the metropolitan area. It would be a travesty if we saw that property sold just to raise some more money to cover the State Bank losses.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It was not my intention to enter this debate but, given some of the inane responses from the member for Morphett, I feel angry, to say the least, about the attitude he displayed. I have dug out of my briefcase a cutting from a Perth newspaper that I picked up interstate; dated 7 October 1991, it stated in part:

[Mr Justice Walsh said] 'The lock-em-up mentality is an easy one to promote, but it's contrary to overseas trends... It's contrary to proper thinking and I can assure you it will not solve the deep complex problems that are behind juvenile crime.'

Justice Walsh strongly defended the Judiciary against community outrage that sentences imposed on youth were too light. [He went on to say] 'But I can assure you the most difficult task that a judge has in sentencing is to adopt a humanitarian point of view.'

The article continues:

Judge Walsh [from Western Australia] said he expected problems of law enforcement would be high on the political agenda in the lead-up to the next State election and he appealed for sensible debate.

One would have thought that this very debate that was taking place here today was a prophetic illustration or understanding of the attempts of the member for Morphett to put this issue on the political agenda, and there is no doubt that he has done so. I have been in this place long enough to understand some of the tactics used by the member for Morphett. In my humble opinion (and I hope I am not impugning him), he is more interested in political aspects than in addressing the real social problems in our community.

I journeyed to Western Australia last Thursday and had a meeting with the controversial 'No Action Jackson', the Judge of the Juvenile Court in Western Australia. I spent a considerable length of time with him. I got his comments on tape; he was aware of this, and he said that I could use them. Similarly, I took it upon myself the next day to go to the Department for Family and Community Services in Western Australia to speak to those people about the very issues in which the select committee is involved. I will

come back to that in a moment. In the afternoon I went to get a good overview of what was happening in that State in terms of this real social problem that besets every State in Australia, not just South Australia.

I spoke to Assistant Commissioner Riseborough, who was in charge of Aboriginal affairs, and (I think I am correct in saying) of youth matters. I also spoke to one of the very senior detectives involved in that area, Bob Kachura, who is well known in South Australia. I was having lunch today with a couple of prominent business people who said they had helped to sponsor Mr Kachura on his Churchill scholarship under which he spent 14 weeks touring the United States and the United Kingdom, after looking at what was happening in France and other European countries. Overwhelmingly, these three groups—diverse, but all involved in this very important area of juvenile crime—were saying that the lock-em-up mentality is not the answer.

I believe that to be the case. Members might like to check whether I am correct, but I believe that perhaps the big-stick approach might have been the answer; I was involved in 1981 in the question of the need for stronger penalties for vandalism and graffiti. I was involved in the introduction of Neighbourhood Watch in South Australia. I was also involved in the introduction of the reparation scheme that is currently in vogue. Further, I was involved in having the Act amended, particularly where no conviction was recorded for juvenile offences: I had that changed by writing to the Attorney-General. No-one can say that the member for Albert Park has not been addressing those issues. So, I went interstate not at the request of any of my ministerial colleagues but off my own bat, as I believe members of Parliament should do. During the video-taped interview, one of the things that Assistant Commissioner Riseborough said was that it was a pity a few more of my colleagues would not do what I was doing. I leave to the House to work out whether I am sincere in my approach on this matter. It is interesting that the member for Morphett walks out, but he wants to blame the schools. To use his words, they cannot discipline children, but he accuses the Education Department and teachers of ramming children's rights down their throats.

I will circulate my contribution to all teachers in my electorate. That is an outrageous allegation, because inherent in it is that teachers are acting in a manner which is improper and which is creating problems within families. It is an outrageous allegation. Teachers are there to teach children, and those children have a right to know their entitlements. I believe that one of the covenants of the United Nations covers the rights of children. I have a fundamental belief that children are entitled to know where they stand. Equally, I believe that parents should and do have a right to discipline their children, but they do not have the right to beat their children; they do not have a right to thrash or assault their children, nor do they have the right to physically or mentally abuse them.

It is those extreme right-wing people who, in my view, do not have the rights of children at heart who are prepared to use this forum to make cheap political points because they want to get onto the Government benches. I do not want to remain on the Government benches if that is the length to which members of Parliament have to go—to use children. I do not want to do that, and I do not believe I have ever been guilty of that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable member will return to the subject of the Appropriation Bill at the earliest opportunity.

Mr HAMILTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I noted your favourable consideration to the member for Morphett when

he was discussing this matter. He raised a number of issues in relation to truancy and said that I was out of touch. I believe that, in the interests of fair debate in this House, you, Sir, will allow me—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will determine what is the appropriate form of debate in the House on the subject. I remind the honourable member that he is required to link his remarks to the Bill.

Mr HAMILTON: I am linking my remarks to the Bill in that reference was made to what took place in the Estimates Committees in relation to family and community services and, indeed, delays in the courts. I addressed all those matters when I went to Western Australia last weekend. They are of concern to the community at large, and quite properly so.

As all members would be well aware, this House recently established a select committee to investigate juvenile crime. Members on this side of the House—whom I will not name—were intent on pursuing the setting up of a select committee on juvenile crime. If we do not address the problem of juvenile offenders, the community will pay one way or another. We can lock them up if we like, but I believe that that will harden those juveniles. Conversely, I believe we should look at the social problems that are besetting the community, whether unemployment, sole or single parenting, the manner in which delays occur in the courts or the necessity for this Parliament to amend the appropriate Acts so that children are not forced into the court situation to have these problems addressed.

This problem was discussed during the Estimates Committees. As I said, Assistant Police Commissioner in Western Australia, Mr Harry Riseborough, and Mr Bob Kachura talked about these very issues, which impact not only in Western Australia but also in this State. My colleagues will know that I have raised the problem of truancy on many occasions. Mr Riseborough and Mr Kachura were applauding the programs that the Gosnells City Council had implemented. The council was facing these problems time and time again. As an aside, members may be interested to know that Councillor Pat Morris, who is Mayor of that city, will be here on 21 October as one of the keynote speakers on vandalism and graffiti. I commend this brilliant woman to the House.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: It has a lot to do with the court system and how juveniles are being prosecuted. The member for Murray-Mallee is renowned for his inane interjections, and that was another illustration. We are talking about the question of truancy. The Western Australian situation demonstrates that, where the police can work with the appropriate departments—the Education Department, schools and, indeed, with employers—we can turn around many of these problems.

It is interesting to note that in Western Australia 80 per cent of juvenile offenders offend only once or three times: after the age of 15 there is a marked decline in the number of offences by these juveniles. I am not out of touch in terms of addressing these problems. I have walked every street and I have knocked on every door in my electorate. I am not saying that I am the most mobile member, but I think I move around my electorate as much as most members in this Parliament. A lot of survey work has been carried out in my electorate. So, I refute the stupid statement of the member for Morphett. It is no good members of this Parliament blaming the teaching profession; that is not the answer. The answer is to provide disadvantaged people in the community—and in some cases Aboriginal

families who, for many reasons, find themselves in this position—with the tools to get back on the right track.

Discipline is a very important issue. I was brought up in a very disciplined and regimented family, but that does not mean that one always toes the line. I believe we should be trying to find out what motivates these juveniles and what we can do to assist them. The court system is a problem and there are delays; those delays cause frustrations for many people in the community. I offer some advice to the Parliament, and particularly to the select committee, to which I hope to make a contribution: perhaps we should be looking at an overview of what is happening in this whole area. I am not offering this as a criticism, although it may sound that way, but instead of each department going its own way, they should come together and intermesh more to try to resolve these problems. It may well be that we need to establish within the Police Force a juvenile unit—if we do not already have one—to address these problems.

Those are some of the issues that deeply concern me, not only as a member of the community but also as a person who, like many others in the community, has come through, having been a bit of a redneck as a kid. Perhaps like many others in this place I was guilty of an offence for which I was not caught; for instance, pinching plums. I admit to that freely and it is not something I am proud of, but there are things that most of us in this place would not like disclosed. I would like to leave the House with the following quote from the *Western Australian* of last Monday:

Some people chose to whip up public emotion for political mileage. But the fear and terror that this created in the community did not reflect the reality of youth crime. . . .

While concern about juvenile offenders had prompted calls for the media to be banned from the Children's Court, Justice Walsh said it was only a small minority who acted irresponsibly.

I believe a similar situation could apply here in South Australia. I look forward to the opportunity to make a submission to the select committee and to the member for Morphett contributing—and I hope he will make a contribution—because, if members of the House are genuinely concerned about juvenile crime in the way the community is concerned, then I hope they make a submission to this important committee. With tongue in cheek I thank the member for Morphett for goading me into standing up and making a contribution on this issue.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): On 17 September I was a member of Estimates Committee B which questioned the Minister of Employment and Further Education and officers of his departments. During the examination of the Minister's portfolio relating to the Department of Technical and Further Education, I asked how many lecturers per thousand of population were employed by the department in the various colleges. I asked that question because I was more than sure that the level of lecturers provided by the Government in the Riverland was much less per head of population than the level applying in other parts of South Australia. The Minister had been expounding at length what he had done and achieved at Whyalla and Port Augusta.

It became apparent that his same enthusiasm did not carry through to other colleges throughout South Australia. So, I asked the Minister whether he could provide me with a breakdown of the number of lecturers employed on a population basis. It is interesting to examine the figures. The Riverland has an estimated catchment population of 32 930 people, with 31.9 effective full-time lecturers, which means that there is one lecturer for every 1 032 people.

Whyalla has a catchment population of 24 986 people and 59.6 effective full-time lecturers at the Whyalla college.

For every 419 people there is one lecturer, which is almost 250 per cent higher than the number in the Riverland. In the Estimates Committee I said that I was not seeking any special advantage for the Riverland but that I wanted to see a fair go for all South Australians, that they should all be treated equally. Obviously, this is not the case.

In the two Labor held rural seats of Stuart and Whyalla we find that in Port Augusta there is one lecturer for every 667 residents and, in Whyalla, there is one lecturer for every 419 residents. Looking at the Riverland, Eyre Peninsula, the South-East and the electorate of Goyder, one finds that in the Riverland there is one lecturer for every 1 032 residents, on Eyre Peninsula, one lecturer for every 988; in the South-East, one lecturer for every 779; and, in the electorate of Goyder, one lecturer for every 1 114 residents.

No-one in their wildest imagination would believe that that represents a fair go and it is high time that the media and journalists in this State highlighted some of these facts for the people of this State. These figures show an absolute blatant disregard for the overall population of South Australia when the Government provides double the number of lecturers in TAFE colleges per head of population in Labor held seats that it provides in Liberal held seats.

Comparing the resources available in the metropolitan area with elsewhere, we find that there is one lecturer for every 562 residents in the metropolitan area. Once again, the metropolitan area has almost double the number of lecturers on a per capita basis than has the Riverland, the electorate of Goyder or Eyre Peninsula. That is an absolute disgrace. The media should highlight that and the Minister should hang his head in shame for allowing such a situation to develop or for having deliberately created that situation.

I was heartened a few months ago when Malcolm Newell wrote a worthwhile article that highlighted what a number of us have been saying for years, that is, that in South Australia less than 30 per cent of the population lives in country areas, yet that 30 per cent generates 50 per cent of the wealth of this State's economy. Yet, when we look at the services provided by the Government to people living in the country, it is an absolute disgrace.

We come to a situation where not only are meagre resources provided to people in country areas, but now the Government wants to shut down many of the resources that already exist. A good example of that is its attempt to close down ferries servicing small communities on the Murray River, yet there is no other way residents of small communities like Cadell can cross the river. A portion of that community lives on the opposite side of the river. To remove the ferry and cut the only approach to Cadell for the residents who live on the opposite side of the river is, once again, another disgrace. It is absolute victimisation, or whatever one likes to call it, of people living in country areas. It is just not giving those people in rural areas a fair go or anything equivalent to the sort of services that are provided in the metropolitan area. Not only are they taking away the ferries: there is no public transport system in country areas.

In the metropolitan area we have a public transport system supported by all taxpayers of South Australia to the tune of about \$130 million annually. A fair portion of that \$130 million subsidy that goes into the STA public transport system in the metropolitan area is provided by people living in rural areas, and they are exactly the same people from whom the Government now wishes to take away ferry services to make life even more difficult for them.

I now refer to the Minister of Marine. On 10 September the member for Spence asked the Minister:

Will the Minister of Marine say whether he intends to review yachting regulations with a view to implementing simpler, less

interventionist rules, that are more consistent with Commonwealth regulations?

That was the basis of the request by the member for Spence. In response, in part, the Minister replied:

... there should be no compromise on safety ...

The Minister went on to say:

I have had extensive discussions with the principals of Lincoln Cove Yacht Charter and understand their views. However, I do not share their views on how boats ought to be used for hire in this State. I note that the member for Goyder wants us to have different laws in South Australia from the rest of the Australian States and to bend the uniform shipping law code that controls all shipping regulations in this State and provides safety for people.

Of course, that is absolute rubbish but, in fact, that is exactly what the Minister of Marine in South Australia has done and is doing with his new regulations. The Minister went on to say:

The member for Goyder wants fewer standards and regulations and to put people's lives at risk.

Once again, that is sheer stupidity, and it is unfortunate that we have a Government in which, in many instances, the Ministers concerned have never had any practical experience in the portfolio areas for which they have responsibility. The Minister of Marine went on to say:

All States except South Australia regulate the operations of hire-and-hire drive craft, including bare-back boat charter. We intend to do that in the interests of safety, and we have had considerable discussion with people involved in this industry as we are moving to legislate to regulate this area. These regulations are based on the experience of other States as well as the laws that cover passenger-carrying yachts with crews.

Of course, what the Minister said is absolute rubbish, and I refer to an article in the *Australian Yachting Monthly* of September 1991, headed 'Marine authority rejects AYF safety rules'. Keeping in mind what I have said in relation to the Minister of Marine, the article states:

Recently drafted boating regulations in South Australia have safety standards which fell well below those required by the Australian Yachting Federation (AYF). This has occurred, despite industry's call to establish uniform safety regulations on all sailing vessels to AYF Blue Book rules. Vessels equipped to the South Australian Government's proposed regulations would not be eligible to enter any club event anywhere in Australia. In rejecting industry's call, the South Australian Department of Marine and Harbors has lost the opportunity to do away with the current ridiculous situation of vessels in the same waters having three different sets of safety requirements. Not only would uniformity lead to higher levels of safety, but it would give both charter companies and private owners of vessels more flexibility in the use of vessels.

Unfortunately, the Minister of Marine, whilst he believes he is doing this, is actually doing exactly the opposite. The article continues:

The proposed regulations also confuse the AYF's move to give potential boat builders the opportunity to build vessels approved by classification societies. The proposed regulations give the director power to reject vessels that have been built to the standards of listed, approved classification societies. These powers throw doubt in the minds of any potential investor about the validity of construction of any vessel, and are presently being strongly opposed by industry. The proposed regulations fall well below the charter industry's requirements and they are calling for a full review before the new regulations are implemented.

Vital items of safety equipment, such as compasses, safety harnesses, bolt cutters, lights and buoy lines, are all missing from the department's regulations. The AYF have been calling for the various State marine authorities to recognise the federation's safety standards, as well as manning certificates. Surely it is time the AYF's vast experience in administering safety standards throughout Australia, and their internationally accepted standard, is recognised by the various State authorities. The benefits to the community will be an increase in safety, plus the lowering of costly bureaucratic charges.

Various members of this House have raised this issue on numerous occasions over the past five or six years with little success, and the efforts of the member for Spence on

10 September were no more successful than the efforts made in years gone past by me and other members on this side of the House. It is a tragedy that South Australia remains out of step with the rest of Australia, and that boats fitted with safety equipment and subject to standards laid down by the Department of Marine and Harbors—or by the Minister of Marine in this State—do not qualify to compete or race in any other State in Australia. Yet the Minister has the hide to stand up in this House and claim that any alterations made to come into line with other States would reduce the standards. Now, plainly, that is absurd: it is time the Premier appointed to portfolios Ministers who knew something about the matters they are meant to be administering instead of allowing such a situation to prevail.

Mr Ingerson: You're not talking about the Minister of Marine?

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I certainly am talking about the Minister of Marine, and you could relate the same criticism to a number of other Ministers of the Government who have absolutely no knowledge whatsoever of a particular portfolio area. On numerous recent occasions in the House Ministers have stood up and admitted that they know virtually nothing about their portfolio areas of responsibility.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Several of them don't know about responsibility, full stop.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Unfortunately, that goes for virtually all of them and, of course, the Minister in the House at the moment has stood up on more than one occasion in recent times and admitted quite openly that he knows nothing about the subject for which he is responsible.

I do not know whether that is the fault of the Minister or the fault of the Premier who appointed him. When one looks at the Premier's record, ultimately the responsibility has to come back to him. I draw these matters to the attention of the House and to the attention of the Government in the vain hope that the Ministers responsible for the two main areas to which I have referred will take on board what I have said. Justice must be done in relation to people living in country areas. Also, the Minister of Marine should bring into line the yachting and marine regulations of this State, which would mean that vessels and yachts not only meet the standards set in South Australia but would be qualified to compete in events in all other States in Australia.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I enjoyed the privilege of serving on the Estimates Committees. I would like to congratulate the Tonkin Government on having the foresight to introduce these committees as an institution of this House. As a new member it was a very valuable experience for me to be able to sit quietly, without the pressure, and to learn how the Government ticks, and to look at departmental spending and the budget in fine detail. I commend the Tonkin Government for this procedure, and I enjoyed the experience. I sat on several committees but I shall dwell mainly on the committee that dealt with agriculture, farmers and the rural community.

I appreciated the comments made by the Minister of Agriculture. I refer in particular to comments made about the relocation from the Grenfell Centre, commonly known as the black stump, to the Waite premises. Buildings are to be constructed at Waite. There has been some controversy about that, but I am glad to find that this is ongoing. The concept of 'agricultural park' I think is admirable, and I hope that that will come about over the next few years.

I am pleased to know that the overall plan is being considered with CSIRO, the University of Adelaide and

other participants. The forward capital works budget this year is \$4.5 million. There will be a total of \$20 million for 1992-93 and the budget for 1993-94 is \$25 million. The total package, in today's dollars, comes to \$50 million. I hope that the State Bank disaster does not jeopardise that. This project is 20 years overdue. The Adelaide operations of the Department of Agriculture need to be centralised.

I then pursued the matter of manufacture of farm machinery in this State, which matter I have mentioned several times since I have been a member of this House, for a little over 12 months, and the parlous situation in relation to farm machinery manufacture in Australia generally. It is an absolutely terrible situation, when one realises that Australia has been a design leader in farm machinery manufacture. Today, with harvesters, for example, we have one manufacturer left, namely, Horwood Bagshaw of Mannum. Without denigrating the company, I would have to say that it would be battling, to say the least. I was heartened to hear the Minister say that some money has been put aside to assist Horwood Bagshaw, as might have been the case with John Shearer, the last manufacturer of Australian tillage machinery, at Kilkenny.

It is a terrible situation that these companies are the victims of the rural crisis. If the crisis does not turn around soon, we will not have any manufacture of Australian agricultural machines. None of us can countenance that situation, considering the progress that we have made in the past 30 years, where we have made world-class machines for the world. To see today's situation is just quite ridiculous. Over many years farmers have turned to American machines and other machines, because there has not been an Australian alternative, and this has hastened the end. I have mentioned the merino wool harvesting machines previously, and I again raised this matter with the Minister during the Estimates Committee. It is very sad to see that the technology involved with that process, particularly in relation to the sensing device part of that project, has now been lost to South Australia. It seems to be an ongoing saga.

On a more positive note, I now want to speak on my favourite subject, namely, soil. I asked the Minister many questions on this subject and I was heartened by much of what he told the committee. Some \$320 million has been designated to be spent in the Decade of Land Care—and we are at year 3 at this stage. It is a joint Federal Government-State Government project. However, a check with the people on the ground reveals that all is not well and that it could be much better. Too much expenditure is being wasted in administration. How often do we hear that in regard to things that the Government is involved with?

There is too little assistance with capital costs associated with soil conservation works—for example, contour banking, building dams and, generally, any earthworks. That is what I thought soil conservation was all about. We should be putting the money into the projects to save the soil. It must not be lost on the way in administration costs. We should not be putting out glossy brochures just to tell the voting population in the cities what a grand job the Federal and State Governments are doing in relation to soil conservation. The money needs to be spent on the ground, in the ground. I was very heartened at the comments that the Minister made.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: There has to be an educative process, though.

Mr VENNING: Yes, as the member for Napier says, there has to be an education process—but for the farmers. The farmers in South Australia have led the way in Australia since about 1928. Every farmer now knows his responsibilities. Every farmer knows that his most valuable asset is

the soil. I do not think we need to spend much money promoting that. We must put the money where the projects are. If the projects are not successful, then we should be telling the farmers why that is the case. We should guide them in that area and train people in soil science expertise. We do not need to put out these flash Harry brochures or have these whiz-bang affairs in Canberra to let all the consultants in the industry and the Federal and State Ministers know what a good job they are doing.

A glance at the balance sheet tells us that too much of the money is not getting through to the ground—and pardon the pun. The Minister agreed with that comment. He made the comment himself. There is little feed-back to the applicants when their applications are not successful. The system is soaking up too much of the money. The Minister said that this is an area in which he will be getting involved and that he will make sure that some of the red tape, some of the bureaucracy, will be cut. The farmers and pastoralists out there await this with much interest. None of them needs to be told where their interests lie, and they are extremely supportive of this measure.

As I have said, I was encouraged by the Minister's assurances. South Australia should lead the way. It has done so for many years. We have 24 soil boards in this State, the first of which was formed back in 1930, a long time ago. We were one of the first States in Australia to bring in contour banking. In fact, in that area we probably lead the world, in soil conservation. Also, the Minister highlighted the fact that this year we have two brand-new soil boards. The money spent on this in 1988-89 was \$2.2 million, while in 1990-91 it increased to \$3.5 million. I am not sure of the 1991-92 figure; the Minister was not able to give us the exact figure, and that does concern me somewhat.

The Federal allocation, under the National Soil Conservation Program (NSCP) last financial year was \$2.6 million, and actual expenditure was \$2.622 million—so that was over budget. This year the Federal allocation to the NSCP is \$2.5 million. That is a real fall in funding, in nominal terms as well as in real terms. I do not know what the State Government's contribution to soil conservation will be for the coming year. I hope that that will not also be reduced. I asked the Minister for details of figures on allocations for land care and soil conservation in general. There was much fanfare on the part of the Prime Minister when the Decade of Land Care was launched. We are now a year or so down the track and already we are losing steam. We cannot afford to see that program diminish. I ask the Minister to stridently put this case to the Federal Government and to other State and Territory Governments.

There is too much at stake for current and future generations. I offer bipartisan support on this issue. At State level, South Australia cannot afford to lose resources and staff currently employed by the Department of Agriculture in the soils and land conservation area. It is too important for the future viability of the State, with respect to both rural landholders and urban consumers.

We are the national leaders, and our farmers are keenly supportive. They are keen on the ground. I am not sure where the cuts will occur in the Department of Agriculture extension services. As I said to the Minister, my concern is that they should not be at the wrong end—that is, the extension or farmer end. I am concerned that our graduates in the Department of Agriculture are not obtaining local jobs as they were three or four years ago. I refer to our farmer scientists. We can greatly increase production, but we must get this research. For the Government to cut expenditure in this area would be false economy in the extreme. The way this State can get out of its malaise is to

produce. The former Minister of Agriculture, who is in the Chamber, would know that putting the rural sector back on its feet will lift this State and change its direction and get us back on the road to some sort of recovery. We cannot just go cutting the advisers to those people who will do this increased production.

Last Monday I went to the Crystal Brook Field Day and was very heartened with what I saw there. There are very positive feelings out in the field at the moment. The legume and wheat crops are looking good. We are looking for rain within about a week, and there are very positive feelings out there. This could be a good year, which in turn should give many of our rural producers some heart. As I have said before, the problem is that farmers have little or no tertiary education, and that is getting worse as the farm population gets older. I am glad to hear that the furphy that positions in the Department of Agriculture are to be chopped by 200 jobs cannot be substantiated.

There is some doubt in relation to funding for rural counsellors, and I did raise this with the Minister. He intimated there was a small problem in that he did not know which line the money would be coming from, but he assured me that the funding would be ongoing. I wonder whether the Minister knows now. I would like to hear from him about that. I pay tribute to the good work of rural counsellors. These are the people who are first cab off the rank when it comes to farmers' problems—not only financial, but personal and others. As a rural member of Parliament, I work very closely with them. Often the work they do is passed on to me or I pass work on to them. I would like to welcome a new counsellor in my district of Custance, and I refer to Mrs Kathy Ottens from Lochiel. She was appointed only a few weeks ago and is already off to a very fine start. I look forward to working very closely with her.

I noticed in both today's and yesterday's newspaper that my colleague the member for Bright mentioned Government committees. I will refer to a few in the Department of Agriculture. I know that the Department of Agriculture leads the field with more than 100 committees. I will mention three or four that I hope are recognised as doing a very good job. First, I refer to the South Australian Rural Advisory Council (SARAC), which is doing a sterling job. It is a very underestimated committee. The former Minister of Agriculture would know about that committee. Last week I picked up a small book produced by SARAC under the auspices of the Minister, and I recommend that small book, which is simply called *The Country Book*, to every member of this House. The information contained in it overwhelmed me. Everything one needs to know about the country area is in it, even the phone numbers of the local members of Parliament. I would recommend to the Minister that he obtain a copy for every member of Parliament. I am sure they would all be very grateful to receive a copy. I pay a tribute to the Minister and the Chairman of SARAC, Mrs Diana Penniment, and also John Goodall, the research officer, who put that book together.

The Advisory Board is an ongoing committee of the Agriculture Department and, for what it costs the department, it is extremely good value. I know that the former Minister would know that board very well. He makes no comment, so I gather that he supports it. It costs the department very little to run that committee. It gives very valuable advice to a Minister, particularly a Minister who does not know a lot about agriculture, and it gives them a tremendous insight into the industry. The Minister could almost pick and choose whom he wants for that committee.

I also refer to Rural Youth. As I said before, it is battling at the moment, but the funding provided by the Govern-

ment for Rural Youth and its executive is money well spent. I would like to see all these people given a home at the new Waite Agricultural Park.

The Department of Agriculture is going down the fee-for-service path. I agree with that, but I wonder whether it should be fully implemented right now. Farmers are not in a position at the moment to pay for these things, although in the long run I expect they will be. Six packages are ready, and a further nine will be ready for June 1999. I agree with cost recovery in some areas, but not all.

With respect to rural assistance, in the past three months a total of 130 properties have been sold for an average of \$159 554. Banks will not refinance many properties after 31 December this year. I think the crunch in this area is still to come, and it will be in January next year. I hope that the Rural Assistance Branch will be able to lend more money than has been possible in the past. It has not been extremely successful in lending money purely because its clients have either been judged as not viable or they have not exhausted other avenues of finance. There is a very fine line in the middle, and I wonder how a person can avail themselves of that money without falling into one of those two categories.

In respect of the money that comes from the Commonwealth—and more comes in than is spent—the Minister was asked to explain what happens to the interest. My colleague the member for Goyder, the shadow Minister of Agriculture, very cleverly and capably brought that up. The Minister assures us that the interest earned will be spent within the department to assist farmers. I would like to know the fine detail of that. Rather than seeing interest earned, I would sooner see the grant put where it will help, particularly in the next two or three months when the crunch will come.

I was interested in the comments about the Egg Board. I have several constituents, particularly Mr Johnson from Napperby, who have a big problem. Many of these people have purchased egg quotas over many years to keep their operations viable. Deregulation means that these people now have to trade in the open market. Usually they have a debt situation as a result of buying egg quotas. This is what happens when a Government changes direction. The Minister assures us that this was flagged early, but he did not flag it well enough because many producers were not aware, and this is a problem.

I was also assured that the Minister will consider the snapper quota. This is important when we realise that this year's 20 tonne quota was taken in 36 hours. I was pleased that the Minister intimated that this matter will be factored in a green paper in the discussion process, which will take place soon. SAMCOR has been a favourite subject of mine for many years. I have been to SAMCOR over many years, visiting it first as a young child and sitting on the gates of the yards. It always distresses me, and I often wonder why, that South Australia's chief and biggest abattoir always seemed to be in some sort of financial trouble. It was very enlightening to hear from Mr Dingwall, one of the Minister's departmental advisers. I will accept his invitation to inspect the works. I offer bipartisan support—and I am sure all my colleagues will make the same offer—to make sure that SAMCOR is given a go to trade fairly and at a profit. Mr Dingwall assured us that that process is well on the way. The Minister also gave that assurance.

I was pleased to hear that the sheep and cattle yards are to stay there for at least the immediate future. That is good, because traditionally that has been the major market for livestock in South Australia. It is extremely handy to Adelaide and it is very convenient. If it were put anywhere else,

it would be at great cost and inconvenience to the industry. I hope that the yards will always remain where they are. I notice that the Minister's assistant is in the gallery. If the yards are relocated, I am sure the Minister and his staff will feel the wrath of the people.

I now refer to the straw paper mill at Balaklava, which was examined by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology's Committee. At the moment it is foundering. We have heard many speakers in this place talk about value adding. This would be a classic case of value adding—manufacturing paper from the raw product of straw and used paper—but it is running into trouble. Yet another Australian company is in trouble because it cannot get over the hurdle of the EIS. It cannot get funding for the EIS. The local producers—farmers—are hesitant to put money into a study like this because they cannot see that they will get anything for their money. I also appreciate the money the Government has already put in. I am not sure of the exact figure, but I believe it is some \$75 000. I would like to see the Government fund that EIS but not fund the other, because I am sure the industry will fund it. I hope that that problem is overcome very shortly, because it could be another glorious opportunity for an industry outside Adelaide to really flourish.

Today is the Pasmenco smelters picnic at Port Pirie; they have a day off today, and I notice that the member for Stuart agrees. I am distressed to learn that Pasmenco BHAS has had a pretty tough year, and the comment this morning from the boss is that it will have to produce more and to employ fewer people. That is not what we want to hear. It is very bad. In closing, I would stress that the Government must put the money where the jobs are and must give incentives. This budget is not exactly a budget that provides incentives; in fact, it is almost an election budget. The Government must turn around and put the money where the jobs are and stop giving the wrong direction and stop getting involved in things it should not be in.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I had the privilege to serve on four Estimates Committees, three as they related to my shadow portfolios of agriculture, fisheries and marine, and I particularly want to address some remarks on the subject of those Estimates Committees. At the outset I would like to say that in respect of two of the Estimates Committees, namely, agriculture and fisheries, I would pay a compliment to the Minister for the way he endeavoured to answer as many questions as was possible in the time allowed.

It is a matter of continuing concern to me that, whilst the Estimates Committees give a great deal of opportunity for all members of Parliament to question the Minister and his officers, the portfolio of agriculture, which currently contributes about 50 per cent of the resources to this State (in other words, it makes up for just about half this State's income), only gets (if we have been blatantly honest) three hours out of the whole two weeks. I realise the Minister has the areas of industry, trade and technology, ethnic affairs and fisheries, and I acknowledge that my colleague, the shadow Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, had to seek a reasonable amount of time. He was very generous to give agriculture and fisheries the amount of time they were given but, as it happened, I had to take time from fisheries, which is also an important industry to this State, to ensure that answers were provided in agriculture.

It is an issue that needs to be pursued further in respect of next year, so the portfolios are reconsidered and looked at in terms of the contribution they make to this State and

perhaps the effect that some of the portfolios have on this State, as well. There is the example of health, which I know comes into that. Nevertheless, I pay a compliment where a compliment is due. On the other hand, in respect of the Minister of Marine, I was not 100 per cent happy with the way questions were answered in his case. I felt that there were some attempts to try to limit the amount of questioning that the Opposition was able to undertake, and I certainly did not get through anywhere near the number of questions I had to ask the Minister. Again, it must be recognised that the amount of time there was somewhat limited. Nevertheless, I feel that considerable progress was made during the Estimates Committees.

I would like briefly to canvass some of the points made. First, I refer to the Egg Board and the restructuring of the whole egg industry in this State. A whole series of questions were asked and various answers were given. I will not go back over any of the information there, other than to thank the Minister for his follow-up replies to some of the questions. I note in an answer I received only yesterday that the current debt of the South Australian Egg Board and SAEG Ltd fluctuates between \$2.1 million and \$2.4 million, depending on trading results.

The Egg Board has the Treasurer's approval to operate within a borrowing limit of \$2.5 million and is operating within that limit. That information is fine but, as the Minister would probably appreciate, it is a very significant capital debt and one that the industry is worried about. It is very concerned at a time when the Bi-Lo food chain is seeking to undercut the price of South Australian eggs with the contention that it is giving South Australian egg consumers a cheaper price. Certainly, it is doing that, but the negative effects it has had on the South Australian industry are being felt now. Those negative effects include the fact that many producers have had to cut back their quotas. One might say, 'So what'. I have had representations—and we heard the member for Custance say that he has had representations, also—from the egg producers indicating that it is causing enormous hardship.

I suggested various things to an egg producer in this State in a letter that will be sent to him tomorrow. The letter states that it is imperative for him as an egg producer to liaise with the committee that has been set up under the chairmanship of Mr Michael Shanahan to get the producers' point across, because the big concern is that some of these producers have debts of some hundreds of thousands of dollars. If they have budgeted on a certain minimum egg quota in relation to projected sales and then find that those egg quotas have decreased in real terms and that their sales are not there, simply because a new factor has come into play—in this case, cheap eggs through Bi-Lo—suddenly they cannot service their debt. These people are very worried that they will not be able to continue in the industry. They have debts of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The egg industry is concerned that it will be totally deregulated by 1 July next year. A lot of careful thinking and careful consultation must occur between now and then, otherwise it will cause unnecessary hardship to another sector of the rural area. We do not want that at this time when our whole State's economy is in a crisis situation. I do not have to remind members of the State Bank fiasco and all the follow-ons from that.

I would now like to refer to rural assistance, and I acknowledge some of the answers that the Minister gave in his follow-up answer in relation to the deposit of rural assistance scheme funds. In fact, the Minister indicated in an answer to me yesterday:

The Rural Finance and Development Division (RFDD) receives funding from the Commonwealth under the Rural Adjustment

Scheme for Part A assistance measures on a monthly basis. These funds are merely transferred through the Consolidated Account as required under the Public Finance and Audit Act to the rural finance account for use by RFDD in its lending activities. The rural finance account is an interest bearing special deposit account held by Treasury for RFDD. Interest on cash balances is credited to the rural finance account on a quarterly basis by Treasury, and is calculated on the daily balance of the account at the average 90 day bank bill rate.

As such, funds are not invested in SAFA, but are merely held in an interest bearing special deposit account in Treasury, with expenditure from that account only being operated by the Rural Finance and Development Division under my authority as Minister.

I appreciate that information and some of the other answers the Minister gave during the Estimates Committees, because we are now talking about a very large amount of money—about \$20 million—that this State is handling for rural assistance, and it would be very easy for unacceptable accounting practices to be implemented in this area. Because of this—and I did not have a chance to bring this up during the Estimates Committees—I believe that the Minister has to consider the establishment of a publicly accountable board to administer the affairs of the Rural Finance and Development Division. I will pursue that matter at some time in the future, but I state now that there is no doubt that other States are going this way. In my opinion, it is not appropriate to link the Rural Finance and Development Division with the Department of Agriculture because, whilst many people in South Australia are upset with the Rural Finance and Development Division, at the same time people throughout this State have had a very high respect for the Department of Agriculture as a whole. It does some wonderful work for the farming sector and it needs to be encouraged in every way possible.

I was also interested to note that my Federal colleague, the member for Barker (Mr Ian McLachlan) has had a few comments to make about rural finance, particularly under part A. I give him full credit for his statements, because Mr McLachlan has had a chance to look at other States, in particular Western Australia and also the eastern States. I know that when he released his first statement some weeks ago seeking a change in the current policy, the Minister's initial reaction was not positive. When it was explained to him he appreciated that some changes were possible. Mr McLachlan has acknowledged that, in his latest discussions with the South Australian Minister of Agriculture, the Minister indicated that he was aware that there was a need for farmers to have access to professional financial advice and that the rural counsellors were providing this service to a number of farmers.

Furthermore, the Minister gave an undertaking that the South Australian Government would look at broadening the guidelines of part A to include some funding for financial management advice. That is very good news. Without doubt, the solutions to this State's problems lie to a large extent in the fact that the farming sector has lost out on huge amounts of money recently: it has not had the return for a variety of reasons. If we want the State's economy to start picking up in one respect, it is imperative for us to have a very good harvest and for the prices to be up. At this stage, there are some positive signs on the horizon.

In early September I received a letter from people at Lameroo who indicated that they had written to the Minister. In a follow-up letter they said that they had had discussions with their rural counsellor and with the Rural Finance and Development Division. It is disappointing to note that they are frustrated with their relations with the Rural Finance and Development Division. They stated:

We have appreciated the encouragement and support that we have received in the several contacts we made with the Murray-

lands rural counsellor. However, we are disappointed with the lack of response from the Rural Adjustment Coordination Service who were 'too busy' to see us early in the year. We are frustrated by the RFDD who were painfully slow in processing our application for debt reconstruction, and we are further frustrated by this apparent lack of concern in regard to the matter raised by us in our letters of 15 June 1991 and 12 August 1991.

It is quite clear from that letter that the RFDD needs to be looked at. There is probably a strong argument for restructuring and, as I indicated earlier, as it now deals with such a large amount of money, an independent authority may need to be set up.

I was interested to receive a response from the Minister of Agriculture in relation to my question about the establishment of a tripartite committee on wine grapes. Most members would be aware that wine grapes pricing has been a contentious issue for quite some time. This Government removed the minimum price some years ago and at that stage the Opposition objected. We have seen massive and wild fluctuations since that time. Three seasons ago the price for wine grapes was very high. Without having detailed knowledge, I believe new record prices were set in some areas. Unfortunately, last year or the year before the bottom collapsed out of the wine grape market, and producers have suffered accordingly.

The whole issue of a price stabilisation scheme—in fact, of an indicative price—needs to be looked at very carefully. However, it is useless South Australia's going down that track unless we get the support of Victoria and New South Wales. Therefore, a tripartite committee on wine grapes has been looking at this matter between three States, and it was pleasing that the Minister indicated that he is giving further consideration to the establishment of an indicative price mechanism and that discussions are continuing in this area. As I pointed out—and I re-emphasise—the important thing is that we need to move with all haste. I recognise and acknowledge that it is almost too late now if we want to implement a scheme for the next season. If that is not possible, let us not procrastinate or delay further in putting a mechanism in place so that at least for the season after next we will have some new incentives for wine grape growers that will give their industry a little bit of stability.

I also considered the swine compensation fund. I had been told that the fund could be wound up. Of course, this was a concern to many pig producers, who realise the importance of this fund; they contribute to the fund and it provides an advisory service and considerable assistance to the pig industry. I was very pleased that the Minister emphasised that there is no such move afoot, that the fund is still seeking to undertake the various activities in which it has been involved and, hopefully, will continue to do so.

The issue of Northfield was raised, and I re-emphasise my great concern that this Government is selling a massive amount of land at Northfield. For what purpose? Basically, it is for housing. Yet, this same Government is quite happy to dedicate areas around the State as reserves thus establishing natural vegetation areas and ensuring that there are large open areas. One would have thought that with Northfield's being so close to the city the Government would have retained this open area of land. It was an ideal, once in a lifetime, opportunity to reforest much of the land and to provide an open area to which city people could travel just a few kilometres from their home.

It is a tragedy for this State, and it is something that I hope we can still stop. As to the argument that it is great to have new housing developments close to the metropolitan area, sure, that is fine, but what about in the years to come when people want to relax in open parkland and forest land without having to drive long distances to areas about which

they have heard only to find that they are not up to their expectations anyway?

Time will not permit me to make detailed comment on fisheries or marine. I felt this year's Estimates Committees did produce many answers that I had been seeking, and I hope there can be restructuring in the future so that a proper allocation of time is guaranteed.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I will refer to the parlous state of South Australia's coffers and the problems that I see in industrial relations. If I have time, I would like to highlight the general direction that we would like to take in industrial relations. As we have seen nothing from the Government other than continual regulation, it might be an appropriate time to highlight the directional changes that I believe should occur.

First, I would like to discuss briefly the economic and industrial environment in which South Australian businesses have to operate today and then to indicate to the House the general direction we should be taking in respect of restructuring of our State's finances, a direction that has been outlined clearly by our Leader but one that I believe needs to be reinforced. Secondly, I would like to consider what we could do in the industrial relations area.

What is the position in South Australia today? The Premier recently put to Parliament a balanced State budget. It is 'balanced' if we accept the borrowing of \$370 million to adjust for the difference between income and expenditure. That seems to be called a balanced budget. In essence, the Premier has maximised his expenditure and minimised his income in certain areas, bled the business community and statutory authorities to the maximum amount, and borrowed \$370 million just to balance the budget. Those borrowings are outside of the \$2.2 billion that the Premier borrowed to salvage his pride and the pride of all South Australians by putting that money into the State Bank. Apart from that \$2.2 billion that we have had to borrow to save the State Bank, we have had to borrow another \$370 million to balance the State budget. That is what the Premier calls a balancing act, but I think it is one of the most disgraceful, hypocritical and covered-up budgets that the Premier has put before the people of this State.

The tragedy is that the media in this town have just glossed over what has been done, and in my opinion the Government has nearly got away with a tragic position not just for the present residents of South Australia but, more importantly, for every one of our kids in the future. As well as the \$370 million required to balance the budget, the Premier has also had to borrow \$147 million to balance our everyday expenditure. As part of the whole balancing exercise and for the second year in a row, the Premier has had to borrow to balance our everyday financing needs.

Mr Ferguson: Just like Sir Thomas Playford.

Mr INGERSON: Tom Playford did not have to do that every year. He did it over about seven years in his last 10 years in office, but he did not borrow in every single year. At the end of the Playford era we had assets to cover the debt. Today the only thing we have is an investment in the State Bank of \$2.2 billion and questionable coverage of that investment. That is questionable and, at the end of the royal commission, we will really see how questionable that coverage is.

There is a significant difference between investment to create wealth and investment to create jobs. When we look at the history of the Bannon Government, we see that there has not been a great opportunity for our young people to stay in this State and achieve a future. No-one here can deny that our State is going backwards. We need look only

at the manufacturing, retailing and agricultural industries. Everything that the Government has been involved with, all its major initiatives to develop this State, set South Australia back. South Australia needs a dramatic change in direction: we need more enthusiasm and new people to give us changes in direction.

There has been a deliberate attempt by the Premier and his Ministers in the budget papers to mask this serious situation. I emphasise that I do not believe there has been a positive analysis by the media in this town of what has been going on behind the scenes. As well as the State Bank's corporate losses having inflated the debt by 50 per cent in this one year to the tune of \$2.2 billion, the ongoing interest bill confronting taxpayers in South Australia is \$220 million a year.

A serious comedian recently advanced what he thought was a serious concept: if every person in the world put in 50c, we would just repay the bank debt and the interest for the first year. That really puts into context how bad a position this exercise has placed us in.

Unfortunately for the South Australian taxpayers, the State Bank loss is the second biggest corporate loss in Australia's history, behind Mr Bond, and we will all have to pay for it. I would like to point out that the total interest cost in this budget is \$694 million and is the fourth largest budget item behind the treasury, health and education areas. Further, 46c in every dollar of tax revenue will be needed to pay for this year's interest bill, and overall taxation in this budget is up by 11 per cent. Who is paying that 11 per cent? It is the people we want to employ our kids.

If there is one single message coming out of this budget it is that this Government does not care about the kids of this generation or the kids of the future. The Government just does not care at all about the future of South Australian kids, and this budget shows that clearly. We have an 11 per cent increase in tax for business, and that will have a significant impact on economic growth in South Australia. Every business tax and charge under this budget or under the regulations prior to the budget has increased, in a time of recession, significantly greater than the increase in the rate of inflation. The payroll tax collected from this State—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I know that I am not supposed to answer interjections, but I am referring to the payroll tax collected from this State, and that is what the bottom line is all about: it is not about percentages—it is about how much businesses must take out of their income each week to pay the debt, their interest and to employ people. This year the payroll tax is \$40 million more than it was last year out of the same community. This nonsense about having lower percentage levels—and the member for Henley Beach knows this as well as anyone—is all about how many dollars come out of the community, not about percentages and whether they are higher or lower. As the member for Henley Beach knows, in the previous year there was a very significant increase in the amount of payroll tax that came out of the community. As he knows, nobody in this State pays any bills with a percentage; you pay them with the dollars that you must put into or take out of the community, and it is all about the amount of money that must be paid by business, not about the percentage.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: It has not gone down. The amount of money in the community has increased. As well as a significant increase in borrowings, this year statutory authorities are being raped for their development funds and their retained profit. For example, SAFA will contribute an extra

\$140 million, making a total of \$400 million in 1991-92 which, in a time of falling interest rates, will be impossible to achieve. ETSA will contribute an extra \$20 million and will require extra borrowings of \$16 million for its capital works projects. That is a nonsense if ever there was one. Fancy asking a statutory authority to put more money into the budget and then say, 'Well, what you have to do is go out and borrow funds so that you can do capital works.' If that is not a back to front method of financing I do not know what is. This Government shows every sign of using what one would call inglorious accounting procedures.

As I have said, ETSA will contribute an extra \$20 million. The E&WS Department will contribute \$8 million this year at the same time as having to make borrowings for its capital works. For the first time, the Pipelines Authority of South Australia will contribute more than \$5 million. That means that electricity, water and gas prices must increase for the consumer. The fancy footwork that has been done by the Premier and this Government in this budget is all about covering up today's costs which should be increasing and transferring them to tomorrow. That is what this budget has been about, as anyone who looks at the future costs of electricity, water and gas will realise. WorkCover has an estimated unfunded liability of \$260 million in just four years of operation.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: All these questions were asked in the Estimates Committees—every single one.

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier will get the call.

Mr INGERSON: As the member for Napier knows, he will get the call later on, and will have an opportunity to do his usual circus act, but I hope he will let me just finish my contribution.

It is hardly surprising that the latest actuary report made public says that WorkCover not only has the highest benefits in Australia but is the most expensive workers compensation scheme—perhaps the most expensive in the Southern Hemisphere (not just in Australia). Workers compensation is a massive burden on business today, particularly on all the small businesses struggling in this State because of the massive increases in taxation that this Government has heaped on them.

If we are going to have a future as a State, business must prosper in South Australia. We must return to the stage when young men and women had the opportunity to set up businesses in this State, knowing that they could do three things: first, if they invested their money in their business, they would have a fair and reasonable chance of being successful; secondly, they would get a reasonable return on that money; and, thirdly, they would be able to employ people and guarantee them a future. This Government has done nothing to encourage that environment. All it has ever done is guarantee that small business, in particular, which is the lifeblood of our city and country, is devastated.

We need only look at some changes in on-costs that have occurred under this Government. At the moment, if you are a small manufacturer in this State, you have lists of labour on-costs, the majority of which have been extended or increased by this Government in the past two years. However, at least three of these on-costs are specifically controlled by the State Government, and something could be done about it. Payroll tax had an on-cost of 6.25 per cent; WorkCover, 7.5 per cent; occupational superannuation, 3 per cent; and training guarantee, 1 per cent. Then there are things such as long service leave, annual leave provision, annual leave loading representing 1.6 per cent of salaries, sick leave provision, bereavement leave, public holidays and general holidays, all of which are traditional

award conditions. However, the first two—payroll tax and WorkCover—are costs about which this Government could do something.

The single biggest increase has been in workers compensation. A Government member recently interjected and asked whether I believe in workers compensation. Everybody believes in workers compensation provided it is fair, that it goes to those who are genuinely injured, and that there is a fair and reasonable cost. When the system is abused and when the costs—and benefits—are unrealistic, it must change. We cannot afford to have in this State a system in which workers compensation ruins the future of small business.

I would like to mention the difficulty that the Government is having in its own workers compensation area. The Auditor-General pointed out this year that for the second year in a row there has been a \$4.6 million increase in workers compensation costs. The Government has no idea of what is happening in the workers compensation area, and that is substantiated by a statement in the Auditor-General's Report indicating that the Government's liability for outstanding claims was not readily available. That is the second year in a row that that statement has been made. In answering my question on that issue, the Minister said in the Estimates Committee, 'Look, the Government never worries about its long-term liabilities, because it never has to pay them.' That is a cop-out of responsibility and of acknowledging the need to ensure that the costs of the scheme are properly monitored. If you do not know what your liabilities are, how can you properly manage the scheme? Basically, we have exactly the same problem with workers compensation and the Government's role as we have with regard to superannuation, in which the long-term benefits are never properly calculated.

The other argument put to me was that, because the Government will be in business tomorrow, there is no necessity to know what are the liabilities. Well, that is absolute nonsense, and it just shows that this Government is quite happy to go out and put certain restrictions on the private sector, screw it down, and make sure that it is subject to all the compensation laws and restrictions, not caring or doing enough about its own work force.

Look at the blow-out in costs and recall the comment made by the Minister in the Estimates Committee that, if you take stress out of the claims against the Government, all claims have come down. If we look at the claims for stress in education, correctional services, the police and road transport, we see that there has been a massive increase of some \$5 million in stress claims in the Government sector. If the Minister then turns around and asks, 'Can we take the stress claims out?', everything is well in the Government's workers compensation area. What absolute nonsense! There is no control over what is going on in the Government sector.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: We did pursue it. I am raising the matter again now because I think it is important. All the business people out there want to know why the Government is setting rules in the private sector in relation to workers compensation but not bothering to enforce those same rules and apply the same arguments in the public sector. I want to touch on one other issue briefly, namely, age discrimination. In the past few days I have received numerous telephone calls from small businesses in relation to the ludicrous procedure they have to go through in advertising jobs. During the Estimates Committee I asked the Minister about the matter of age discrimination, but as yet I have not had a reply. It is the most important single

issue and it is affecting young people's opportunities. A person cannot now advertise for young people in the workplace—and that is nonsense. We need to fix this up immediately.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Having regard to some of the speeches that we have heard so far in this Appropriation Bill debate, it seems that I saw the Estimates Committees differently. This year's committee sessions disappointed me terribly. Members will recall that last year as Committee B Chairman I attracted quite a lot of criticism from members opposite—after the committee sessions, mind you, not during the actual proceedings, because Standing Orders 273 and 274 cover quite adequately any disagreement with the Chair. So, this year I reminded members participating in my Committee that if they had any disagreement with any decision or ruling that I made they were perfectly able to use Standing Order 273, although had a motion in this respect been carried it would have required you, Mr Speaker, to chair a meeting the following day.

Last year I was quite stunned by that criticism and so this year I made sure that I could not be faulted. I made terribly sure that I could not be faulted. I read *Erskine May* every night for two weeks prior to the commencement of the Estimates Committees. For two weeks I denied my wife our nightly game of scrabble, so that I could come into this place well and truly prepared. I memorised the Standing Orders so that, at the drop of a hat, I could quote chapter and verse a Standing Order. As I say, I came in as the most prepared Chairperson that this House has ever known—even including you, Sir, with due respect. What eventually transpired? I found that, even worse than usual, members opposite had done no groundwork at all, with all the information that was available. Countless budget documents are provided by the Government. One could even say that there is an oversupply of information provided to all members of this House on the budget papers. Once again, with the Liberal Party members, their laziness proved to be their downfall.

A Bill is currently before the Parliament which deals with an extended committee system. It is currently being delayed and stuffed up in the other place—but I cannot make any mention of that, Sir. However, eventually if reason prevails and the other place comes to its senses and agrees with the legislation that we have passed, the Estimates Committees will no longer be a thing that we have to suffer year after year. I understand that the member for Alexandra fully supports me in that regard. He cheerfully accepts the blame. He was a member of the Tonkin Government and he was a culprit in instituting a system whereby we ended up having to deal with Estimates Committees. In any event, no-one will applaud more loudly than I the demise of the Estimates Committees. Let us consider the budget documents that we have before us. There are eight budget documents that are prepared by the Government—three financial papers and five financial information papers.

Dr Armitage: And they are wrong.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The ones that really give us the nub of what is happening are the Financial Statement, the Estimates of Receipts and the Estimates of Payments. In all my experience, not just this year but previous years as well, there is very rarely a question asked on those three documents. Sadly, I can only come to the conclusion that the reason is that members opposite do not understand the financial implications of what those documents are saying, or is it that they are too hard? So, what do they do? They

all go to the Program Estimates and information, what we used to call in the old days the yellow pages.

Why do they go to this document? It is because it lists exactly what each portfolio area has done in the previous year, what it is doing currently, and what the forward projections are. As you, Sir, being a very intelligent person would know, that presents a natural line of questioning: 'I draw your attention to page . . . what do you mean by . . . and . . .?' The Minister, thinking that all his birthdays have come at once, then just has to read through the briefing papers that he or she has had prepared, and can give a quite adequate answer. Members opposite then complain that the Minister has not given them certain information. The fact is that they do not understand the financial documents that are placed before the House. Let me give an example.

Dr Armitage: Well, they are wrong.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Adelaide is continually interjecting. He is on the list and I will see that he gets the call, at which time he will have every opportunity to make a contribution.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir. I always know that I have your protection. I do not want to embarrass any member opposite in particular, but, to give an adequate example about what I am saying, I need to, and I refer to the member for Newland. Actually, she did lift her game this year, compared with last year. The member for Newland was questioning the Minister of Emergency Services in relation to his responsibility for the Police Force, and wanted to know certain information regarding speed cameras and road accidents. A question was asked and the Minister gave the answer.

I was in the Chair and, thinking that, fortunately because I would be out of this Parliament before too much longer and so would not need to keep any friends on the Government side, I sent a little note to the member for Newland, saying, 'Well done, you are on the right track, keep it up,' or something like that. I then fully expected that the member for Newland would look through the Estimates of Payments which would enable her to really deliver the *coup de gras*. But the member for Newland did not do so. When I asked later why she had not she said that she did not understand. I do not want this to be taken as a criticism of the member for Newland. She has only been here for two years. However, it does highlight the point that I have been making, that if one does not understand the Estimates of Payments and the Estimates of Receipts, one might as well not turn up, and Government members would gladly go to the other side and make sure that the Minister delivers a creditable performance in the House.

There were two areas that could have caused acute embarrassment to the Government, namely, WorkCover and health. In relation to the examination of the health lines—and this was in Estimates Committee A—with all the psyche that had been built up by the member for Adelaide, as Opposition health spokesman, one had been led to believe that he was really going to put the Minister of Health under the hammer. What happened? At 4.30 in the afternoon the whole show folded. There was health; there were these delays in the hospitals; there were all these people seeking acute care; there was the member for Adelaide continually saying that the Minister of Health had mismanaged his portfolio. So, he then had the chance to question the Minister, with all his advisers around him. What did he do? At 4.30 in the afternoon he gave up. He threw in the towel and said, 'I have had enough'.

Then what happened? If my memory serves me right, the Committee dealt with Family and Community Services, again an area in which the member for Morphett has con-

tinually accused this Government of mismanagement. But what did the member for Morphett do? He had approximately five hours remaining to put the Deputy Premier under the hammer. Mind you, you have to be pretty smart to put the Deputy Premier under the hammer, but there he was with nearly five hours to do so. Well, if you read the *Hansard*, Sir, you will find that after we returned at 7.30 p.m. the member for Morphett started regurgitating the questions he had asked prior to the dinner break and, at 8.30 p.m. he gave up without a whimper. We were working in the other place right through until 9.59 p.m., but suddenly I heard the bells ring for the House of Assembly, and they had all gone home. My colleague the member for Henley Beach put his head through the door and said, 'Hard luck, mate, I'm off!' That might be all right for the honourable member to have an early minute, but it does no good for the parliamentary system when we are trying to probe Ministers and find out more about their budgets.

Let me now refer to the Committee which examined WorkCover, which I was to chair also. With all due respect, I approached that session with a fair degree of trepidation, not because I had any doubts about the Minister concerned—I am sure that he was well able to handle himself—but the media had hyped up that the Minister would be asked probing questions about WorkCover. They were saying that the Minister had failed to give information during Question Time and this would be the Opposition's big chance. But what happened there? The sleepless night I had worrying about that committee need not have happened: at 4.30 p.m., we finished. But I could not go home as the member for Henley Beach had done, because the Minister's portfolio of Marine and Harbors was following at 7.30 p.m.

From what I can understand, the Minister had given adequate time for WorkCover to be questioned, but the Opposition threw in the towel and I had to go and sit in my office and wait until 7.30 for the next session. Well, that does not say much for the background work and all the media hype that had been put out by the Opposition. I suspect that the Opposition had decided that, as this was the last one, why worry: let us get it over and done with and all go home!

I will now refer to the Committee for the Minister of Emergency Services. Members opposite were so lazy that they actually spent 45 minutes repeating in an identical fashion the questions they had asked the previous year. There was not even a subtle change. It was almost word for word the same as the questions they asked the previous year. They regurgitated them to the Minister this year. However, to give the Minister credit, he did not give them the same answers word for word, although it was basically the same. A total of 45 minutes was wasted in that area.

We spent an hour with the Minister of Marine while the member for Goyder trumpeted the case of one marine charter operator who did not want to obey the rules on safety at sea. Everyone else obeyed the rules and was quite happy with the legislation and regulations that had been put through the Parliament. No-one wanted any change—they were quite happy with it. However, one operator actually decided that it did not suit his purposes because it would eat into his profits, so the member for Goyder came into the Committee and argued that case for one hour on behalf of that operator. In fact, he even threatened the Minister that that charter operator would leave South Australia and go to Queensland. What did the member expect? That the Minister for Marine would suddenly collapse and say, 'Please don't send that man to Queensland; I'll immediately change the regulations.'? We also found out during that question and answer session that the member for Goyder had already

gone through the same situation with the Minister not only in the House during Question Time but also by writing letters. I have no—

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The comments made by the honourable member are quite spurious. You would be aware that only this day I have moved for the disallowance of those regulations. The honourable member is trying to belittle my attempts before the Estimates Committee.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the point of order?

Mr MEIER: The point of order is that the honourable member has it completely wrong as to his comments on my contribution to the Estimates Committee—totally wrong.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I said that I do not question the member for Goyder's right to champion the cause of a shonky charter operator. I have no question with that whatsoever. What I do question is the abuse of the Estimates Committee system. I have stood up in this House during grievance debates and championed a particular cause. I may well have been wrong, but I have done that. I would never do it in an Estimates Committee. The member for Goyder should not be so touchy.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Sir, I think it is disgraceful the way the honourable member has referred to a person as 'shonky' when he has no idea to whom he is referring in the first instance.

The SPEAKER: Order! I assume that the point of order is in reference to the term 'shonky'?

Mr MEIER: Yes.

The SPEAKER: I did not pick it up as being personal. I ask the honourable member if he did use the term in a personal sense to withdraw it.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will withdraw it, but *Hansard* will show that reference was not in respect of the member for Goyder.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member withdraw?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will withdraw. I say again that the member for Goyder has every right to champion the cause of any individual in this House. That is his right as a member of Parliament. I am just saying that the venue to do it is not the Estimates Committee. I thought that that would have been a point that is not lost on you, Sir; it is certainly not lost on my colleagues on this side, and I do not think it is lost on members opposite. One can only say: thank goodness that the Estimates Committees as we know them now are hopefully gone forever, although, one never knows, the other place might create such a fuss that we will have another one.

My advice to members opposite, who through lack of work, complete laziness, lack of knowledge or complete ignorance—I do not know, but they know which category they fall into—do not do their homework, is that if we do have to suffer another Estimates Committee they do their homework, as you and I do, Sir, and come prepared so that ultimately, through the pages of *Hansard*, the public of South Australia can see exactly how the Government is performing, through probing from the Opposition. Sadly, though—and I know I am treading on touchy ground here—too often in the Estimates Committees outrageous claims are made by certain members of Parliament against other members, and I will just leave it at that.

My Committee heard of another case of when a person had gone into the Casino and altered a chip. There was nothing to back it up—nothing at all—and the Minister was expected to give a reply. No information was forthcoming to back up that allegation. Again, that is not what Estimates Committees are for. In a ruling with which I

thoroughly agree (I always thoroughly agree with you anyway, Mr Speaker) you said that, if we wish to make allegations against individual members of Parliament, we do it through a substantive motion and not through the Estimates Committees. I am glad that has been cleared up once and for all as a result of what occurred yesterday.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Let me commence by apologising for being disruptive earlier on. I know that, should members opposite choose to interject during this speech, they will accept your ruling, Sir, with the good grace with which I have accepted it and make no further comment during my contribution. I did not actually intend to comment on the previous speaker, given that there are far more important matters to discuss in relation to the Appropriation Bill, but I have been goaded into making comment because of the member for Napier's championing the budget papers and the various estimates of receipts and payments and so on. The reason I have been goaded into commenting on that is that during questioning in the Minister of Health's Estimates Committee, about which I will talk in much greater detail later, the Minister who is responsible for the presentation of the facts contained in those health estimates admitted that the information contained in those papers was wrong. He admitted that the information that was being put to all South Australians so that we could assess the performance of this lacklustre and tired Government was wrong. He admitted that the figures we were given were incorrect.

All the championing of the backbenchers opposite will not get away from the fact that under Opposition questioning the Ministers responsible for the presentation of these papers to Parliament were forced to make the incredibly embarrassing admission that what they were doing was trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the South Australian public and of this Parliament. Two specific examples were quoted in the health area where the Minister said, goaded by his advisers, that he was sorry; that information was wrong. So, let us have no further talk such as that which we have heard from the member for Napier where he said how wonderful these budget documents are, because I repeat: the information in them is wrong, by the admission of the Ministers of the Crown. That is a disgraceful admission.

As we know, the Appropriation Bill has been brought down at a particularly sad time for all South Australians. It is a very sad context in which this Bill has been presented to Parliament. The reason for that is that all South Australians, because of the Government's financial incompetence—or, perhaps, let us be less damning and say, because members opposite just do not care; because of this *laissez-faire*, couldn't-care-less, she'll be right attitude of members opposite (and they are all collectively responsible)—have a particularly bleak financial outlook. The reason they have a bleak financial outlook is that unfortunately the State is paying for the Government's disasters through taxation. The State—the people of South Australia—through taxation is making up for errors which the Government—supported by 47.9 per cent of the people at the last election—has made.

What this bleak financial outlook means for every person in South Australia in every electorate is that services will be cut. The police, who are already under enormous financial pressure, may well be under the hammer even more. We all know the effects of the apparent breakdown in law and order in our community. We certainly do. Perhaps the people who sit opposite me in this House are no longer in touch with their communities; perhaps they do not go around and hear people at Neighbourhood Watch meetings who are devastated by the increase in crime; and perhaps they do

not know how people come out to me in my electorate office and say that they desperately want more police services in their electorate. They desperately want their local police station to be opened up. Perhaps members opposite do not know how I speak to people in the Police Department who have the ability to put people in the local North Adelaide police station. These people say to me, 'We are sorry; we cannot do it. We do not have enough money.'

Let us talk about the cuts in education, which have been well documented. We are supposedly heading down the line towards a great (in my view, ungraspable) goal to make us a clever country. The Prime Minister has latched on to this as an easy catchphrase and, like most things, he has taken it as his own, although in fact it was a phrase coined by a former Minister whom, because of factional dealings, the Prime Minister was only too happy to ditch. However, we are heading down the road towards this laudable goal of being a clever country. How do we become a clever country? What are we doing in South Australia? We are cutting schools. Why are we cutting schools? We are cutting schools because we are paying for the State Bank disaster, the Scrimber disasters and SGIC. We cannot open schools in marginal seats, but we can buy a building in Collins Street.

Let us now look at the health situation. I will deal with this later in greater detail, but the cuts are dramatic in the health area; and with the same drama as with a slip of the scalpel the Government is causing a terminal haemorrhage in the health system in South Australia, and the Minister fiddles. It is in a further sad context that this Bill is brought into the House because of the lack of forethought, foresight and, indeed, activity by the Government. What greater example could we have of this than when the Premier was talking about Scrimber and the way the State was expected to put \$60 million into that project. The Premier and Treasurer—the man responsible for this huge corporate collapse for which we are all paying—had the gall to say in this House, 'If only Scrimber had worked we could have provided more hospital beds. If only Scrimber had worked we could have done more for the people of South Australia.'

It is Alice in Wonderland economics, and from a Treasurer it is disgraceful. If only Scrimber had worked we could have provided better deals for our constituents—if only, if only, if only. How sad it is for South Australia. If only Scrimber had worked we would not have had to cut hospital beds—if only, if only, if only. So, what has the Government done, having been faced with this economic disaster? It has handballed the responsibility for its economic woes, which follow increasing debt as sure as night follows day, to people who are completely and utterly blameless for the decisions that have caused those economic woes. Those people are the electors of South Australia and, perhaps more importantly, the people who will be paying the price for this Government's economic performance.

I repeat: members opposite have a collective responsibility for this situation. The people who will be paying the price for this Government's cloud cuckoo land management of our economy are the children of tomorrow, who have absolutely no possibility of having any say in this State's current financial management. Indeed, this Treasurer—this Alice in Wonderland financial manager—at one stage said, 'The buck stops at my desk.' Unfortunately, it is not one buck that stops at his desk; it is 2.2 billion bucks that stop at his desk.

Mr Lewis: And then some.

Dr ARMITAGE: And more, as the member for Murray-Mallee says. However, what does the Premier, the Treasurer, say, 'If only Scrimber had worked everything would have been better.' What does the member for Ross Smith do?

He flick passes this \$2.2 billion loss to future generations. Indeed, it is a particularly sad context in which we address the budget estimates procedure. It is sad to all students of democracy and to students of the democratic process. While saying that, I would like to take a little time to thank the two chairpersons of the Estimates Committees—they did a good job. The first sad thing about the whole proceedings of the budget Estimates Committees is their scheduling.

It is unfortunate that, for the convenience of Ministers and Governments, we often see particularly important portfolios examined on one day. For instance, the member for Napier made some comments about the health Estimates Committee. If we are looking to make some changes, perhaps we could consider the line of reasoning that, because the health portfolio involves responsibility for approximately 25 per cent of budget expenditure, perhaps it could be given more prominence than sharing a day with three other important portfolios. I would be very happy to take that extra time. There are many questions that were to be answered and are as yet unanswered.

One of the things I found particularly interesting was that when the member for Napier was having his little sly dig—and I report to the member no longer opposite that sly digs get nowhere; I have broad shoulders and I am happy to let them slip off—he said he was disappointed in the health estimates and, in fact, because of ‘all these delays in hospitals’. That is wonderful because finally we have a member opposite admitting that there are some delays in hospitals. Admittedly, it was done in a sly, snide, underhanded manner, but the member for Napier said ‘all these delays in hospitals’. I regard that as a compliment because for a long time I have been saying to members opposite, who are collectively responsible for the way health care is provided to South Australians, that there are delays in getting into hospitals and onto waiting lists, and nobody opposite has been prepared to admit that, despite the fact that it is their constituents and mine who are being affected. So, I am grateful to the member for Napier.

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

Dr ARMITAGE: I was saying just prior to the dinner break how perceptive the member for Napier is and how clearly he has grasped this whole health matter in that he indicated that large numbers of people were listed on hospital waiting lists. All I can seek from the member for Napier is that he spread some of his knowledge of what is going on. Clearly, it is generated from the intimate contact with his electorate. People no doubt come into his electorate office saying that they have been waiting for eight months before gaining access to the outpatients department; once in there, they wait another six or eight months before a hip operation.

Maybe people tell him that they have been waiting for a prostate operation for a year and a half and meanwhile have to get up six, eight or 10 times a night. Maybe he can spread some of that knowledge around members opposite, because he is a lone figure, the light on the hill, on that side of the House, being the only person who has admitted that there are problems in the health system. I congratulate him on that. Regarding the democratic process and the Budget Estimates Committees, I was taught when I was doing some politics as part of an arts degree at the university—

An honourable member: How did you go?

Dr ARMITAGE: I did very well.

An honourable member: I heard the opposite.

Dr ARMITAGE: That is incorrect. In fact, if I was not over-modest, I would bring my results in and show the

honourable member. One of my lecturers indicated that the strength of a democracy is measured by the facilities provided to the Opposition. Indeed, the major facility required by an Opposition to do its work as Her Majesty's loyal Opposition is correct information. We cannot do our job unless the information with which we are provided is correct. Without correct information, the whole democratic process is weakened. Accordingly, I was at first amazed and then appalled, and as I thought more about it, horrified, that there were at least two examples that we discovered in the very short period in which we were allowed to ask questions about 25 per cent of the State's expenditure where the information provided to Her Majesty's loyal Opposition was incorrect—straight-out errors.

This is particularly worrying, because it makes me wonder how many other mistakes are in the budget and in how many other areas South Australians are being provided with incorrect information. It is a worrying feature for those of us who are interested in the democratic process, but the Minister, when asked whether this meant that the budget papers were incorrect, gave a one-word answer: ‘Yes.’ I then asked him whether he was worried that the budget papers were incorrect, and I got another one-word answer: ‘No.’ This was from a Minister of the Crown who is given the task of spending taxpayers' money. The only way in which Her Majesty's loyal Opposition can question that expenditure of taxpayers' money is if the information is correct, and clearly it is not.

Another concern about this sort of matter was that, when the South Australian Health Commission's errors were revealed by our questioning, the Minister said in effect, ‘Is that not what the Opposition wants?’ That is not what the Opposition wants. The Opposition may wish to find errors in the way in which the Government is running the portfolio, but it does not wish to find incorrect information. We can do our job only if we are provided with correct information.

The short-term political view that the Minister took is like watching a fight at the grand final while one's opponent goes on and kicks a goal. There is no vision and no grand plan. It is a worrying feature. The whole budget is a worry. The perturbing feature for me and other members on this side of the House is that South Australians will be worrying about paying for this budget for years, and for generations, to come, long after the Premier and Treasurer and every one of the members opposite, who take collective responsibility, have left this place.

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

Mr Brindal: Welcome back!

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The member for Hayward can say ‘Welcome back’. At least I know how far to go. I thought that the Estimates Committees performance by the Opposition was very creditable. In fact, it was probably one of the better times that we have witnessed during the Estimates Committees process. Back in 1979 I campaigned very strongly as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee in the Tonkin Government, with the support of that committee, for the introduction of the Estimates Committees system. My idea was to provide research staff to the Parliament from the Public Accounts Committee. In other words, our staff would have been available to assist members of the Government as well as the Opposition to research the budget documents, because the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committees are all about accountability. They are all about obtaining information: the estimates are concerned with money being provided for expenditure, whereas

the Public Accounts Committee comes in after the money is spent to ascertain whether the taxpayers have received value for money.

I do not go along with the comments of the member for Napier. I well remember his performance in 1980-81 when the Estimates Committees were established, because at one stage I was acting Chairman. As members know, an Independent member who is not a member of the committee can request permission to ask questions. On that occasion, when I was chairing the committee, the member for Napier was representing his Party. I gave the call to the member for Mitcham (now His Honour Justice Robin Millhouse), and the member for Napier got into such a huff that he walked out, took his team with him and stayed out of the Chamber for half an hour. That gave the member for Mitcham and also the Government members an opportunity to ask several questions while the Opposition members were out of the Chamber. It just showed the pettiness and the attitude in those days.

I believe that the present Government does not understand or accept the worth and benefit of the Estimates Committees. The whole tragedy of the system is that it has developed into a game: them and us. I find that disappointing. The Estimates Committees should be a bipartisan exercise. I do not object to the Government's nominating the Chairmen of the Committees, but each member of the Committees represents their side of the political spectrum; they are there also to obtain information in the taxpayers' interests and to endeavour to ascertain exactly what the Government has in mind, program by program. This is not happening. It has become increasingly difficult as the Ministers become confident in their own minds that they can stall or fob off the answers to the questions. Sometimes, members do not get an answer at all.

It reminds me very much of a passage in the book that the member for Coles launched today; she said that some Ministers were coming into the Chamber with prepared answers to questions and giving those answers even though the questions were not asked. In other words, they were not able to match the question and the answer. The observation of the member for Coles in her book *A chance for life* is correct. It just demonstrates, unfortunately, that members of the Government have not accepted the principle behind the Estimates Committees. If members want to change the system, we can go back to the previous practice when we sat here until 3 o'clock, 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock in the morning asking probing questions and the whole of the Parliament was available to ask the Minister questions about his budget line by line.

I can assure members that, in those days, especially in the early days of the Dunstan Government when there were not as many Ministers (there were three or four fewer Ministers), the grilling those Ministers received without having any departmental advisers at their elbow was intense, and Ministers certainly earned their money in those days. We had a clear demonstration to the Parliament and to the parliamentary system whether the Ministers had total knowledge of their departments.

Today, with computers and the fortunate improvement in the standard of members of Parliament—and I instance the crop of five new members on this side of the House—Ministers certainly need their advisers, because administration is a complex issue. We are handling much more money spread over a broader field. Ministers need advisers and they need to be right on the ball concerning the budgets that are presented to Parliament.

Although the basic documentations have not altered in the 22 years that I have been here, the detailed information

and the knowledge of members has improved, and thanks for that is due to the Auditor-General. I want to place on record my appreciation of the work that the Auditor-General has done. I refer to the service provided by the Auditor-General and his department over the 22 years that I have been here. I have seen tremendous change and, when I first became a member, I would study the Auditor-General's Report. I remember Steele Hall coming up to me and asking, 'What are you reading, what is the red book that you are reading?'

I said, 'It is the Auditor-General's Report, and there is a tremendous amount of information here. It tells us all about Government departments and about all the activities undertaken over the past 12 months, their shortcomings and so on. The report represents the ultimate in accountability.' Steele Hall said, 'No-one reads that. Do not bother with it.' However, I made a study of that report and I am probably the only member with a complete set of Auditor-General's Reports since 1969, and every page is covered in hieroglyphics and there are bits of paper sticking out from between the pages.

I have obtained a wealth of knowledge from the reports, and I remember that, when we first got into government in 1979, Ministers came to me asking what the Auditor-General said about their departments. They asked, 'What does it mean?' I did not mind advising the Ministers. Indeed, when the Government changed hands in 1982, at least two members of the Labor ministry came and asked me what the Auditor-General said about their departments.

Mr Brindal: Can you name them?

Mr BECKER: I will not name them, because we became close friends. I did not mind them asking me what the Auditor-General meant by his comments about departments, but the point I am making is that the Auditor-General is available to help and serve the Parliament, and the information provided in that document is of immense benefit to all members. I hope that more and more members are reading it. If not, it should be compulsory reading for all 47 members in this House. Certainly, when people ask me what is the best book I have read for the year, I say that it is the Auditor-General's Report, because I get more questions, knowledge and information out of that book than from any other source. It has certainly helped me greatly to understand the complexities of Government financing, the arrangements of Government funding, and how money is spent and where it is spent. The beauty of the whole system is that it brings to the forefront the accountability of Government.

The tragedy is that we have never given the Auditor-General the authority to audit all our statutory authorities. I have always believed that, had the Auditor-General been given that authority and opportunity to look at the accounts of the State Bank and some of the larger statutory authorities, perhaps we might have been able to foresee some of the problems that have befallen the State. I have always believed that the Auditor-General has never been given credit for providing information to Parliament—and in the shortest possible time.

It is incredible that, between the end of the financial year on 30 June and the first few weeks of August, his report is tabled in Parliament. In the past few years we have had supplementary reports being provided because not all statutory authorities and departments have had the information readily available for the Auditor-General. I point to the efforts of departments in making information available to the Auditor-General and the Auditor-General's role, especially given his limited staff. It is one of the tightest managed and operated departments and, if ever there was

justification for an increase in staff (although there has never been any criticism from me about his staff), it is in that department.

Not enough credit is given to the Auditor-General and his staff, who work under difficult and trying conditions in a stressful period to get that information to us. The accuracy of the information is a credit to each and every officer involved. It just proves that we are able to compete with the commercial field to obtain outstanding auditors, although it is difficult to retain them in that department. Fortunately through the Public Accounts Committee we have often had the opportunity to second staff from the Auditor-General's Department, as we did in the early 1980s, to give them additional training so that they could understand the role, demands and needs of members. There was another area that stood out during the budget examination. The member for Goyder asked questions of the Minister of Agriculture about an appointment to the South Australian Egg Board. I refer to page 28 of the Estimates Committee A report: the Minister of Agriculture became upset and insulting towards the member for Goyder for having the audacity to ask questions about the appointment of a new Chairman of the board. Unfortunately, I was not present at the time as I was overseas with the Minister of Recreation and Sport representing the Adelaide 1998 bid committee in lobbying delegates at the All African Games. Certainly, at some future time I hope to relay to the House my experiences of those visits in promoting South Australia.

The member for Goyder was correct in bringing to the attention of the Committee the appointment of this person to the board. He was correct, without making any great implication or reflecting unduly upon the appointment of that person, in bringing to the Minister's attention that the appointment could be in question. I believe that Parliament should have the right to scrutinise all appointments to Government boards and statutory authorities, especially where remuneration is paid to appointees. Where anyone appointed to a board or committee is paid, Parliament should have the right to look at the nominee. Parliament should have the right, as is the practice with the Subordinate Legislation Committee, to have the nominations lie on the table for 14 days. People could take up their appointments and, if Parliament does not object, the appointment would stand: if it does object, there would be a resolution of the House and the person would not be appointed.

I believe that we must institute a system where there is scrutiny of people appointed to boards. It is left mainly to Government departments to nominate somebody to a Minister. On some occasions the Minister says that he has received advice of a vacancy and that so and so ought to get that position. We know that, traditionally, appointments to the boards of the State Bank and the Electricity Trust for South Australia have involved a member of the Government and a member of the Opposition. Other boards include those of statutory authorities to which former members of Parliament have been appointed. The tradition was established many years ago to supplement the superannuation retirement benefits for members of Parliament who had served the State, particularly in certain fields and with special knowledge in those particular areas.

With the present standard of the superannuation scheme for politicians, I do not know whether that is now necessary. However, what should be necessary, at least when a politician is appointed to a board, is that everybody knows about that person; that the person concerned has been in the public arena; and that there is general knowledge that that person may or may not have the ability to hold down the position.

In 99.9 per cent of cases, that person has the expertise to do the job, so I do not question that at all.

When it comes to members of the public, it is a different ball game and, in the case of the appointment of Trevor Kessell to the Egg Board, I can categorically state here and now that that is not an appointment that I would recommend. In my opinion, Kessell is under an examination; he has been named, and there is documentary proof that he witnessed documents containing forged signatures. In my opinion, that in itself is quite a serious offence for a banker. At that time he was a bank manager; he lent a building company a considerable sum of money; and, on the evidence, it appears that there was a shuffling of documents. One partner of the company was embezzling funds and forging signatures of not only his wife but also his partners. As the manager of the bank, if Kessell was doing his job, he had to know what was going on. All he wanted was the security to cover his own tracks within his own job.

As a former banker, I believe that one of the most dangerous practices is to witness the signatures of your clients on your own bank's forms. It is always best to get other parties to do that and, if you are lending money (and the sums of money involved in this particular case were in excess of \$250 000), you always prepare a minute which you read and which advises the clients of the type of funding and arrangements made. These people had no idea of the funding that they were obtaining; they had no idea of the amounts of money being borrowed, because one partner was fraudulently converting money out of those funds. The banker was interested only in obtaining the security and, in fact, it appears that some of the security may even have been back-dated anywhere up to two years to cover his tracks.

Mr Kessell was given a very senior appointment in Westpac at that time and, within a short period, he resigned. Inquiries were made, and I was asked to intervene on behalf of two of the partners of that company. I saw the management of Westpac, and Mr Kessell was gone in a very short space of time. The matter may now be subject to court proceedings and to negotiations between the clients and the bank. If the bank had any brains, it would write it off, because I do not think it has a leg to stand on. It was pretty poor banking tactics, and it was certainly very poor banking ethics on behalf of this person. It is not the type of conduct or behaviour in which I believe a person should be participating if that person is to be appointed chairman of a Government authority. An attack was made by the Minister of Agriculture on my colleague the member for Goyder, who in all sincerity and innocence raised a very valid question as to the ethics of the person who was given the appointment. To call for the resignation of the honourable member for Goyder, and to attack and abuse him, was wrong—absolutely wrong.

As I said, it was a pity that I was not here at the time to help defend the member for Goyder, because I believe that this person's appointment should be suspended until all the court proceedings and hearings have been processed, and that could take some years, or it could be cleared up very quickly. Certainly, Westpac could clear up this issue very quickly if it wanted to talk about it. It has already been the subject of discussion within the Federal parliamentary hearing on banking practices relating to guarantees, and I have here a copy of the document relating to the particular incident. However, as I have said, I believe that Parliament from now on should scrutinise all persons nominated to boards and statutory authorities. It may mean a lot of names being put up, but we may be able to save the Government some embarrassment.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I would like to make a few comments on the operations of the Estimates Committees and express some concern and perhaps disappointment in the way in which the Committees have degenerated over recent years. I do not wish to be critical of any one side of Parliament or of any individuals, but I think that we all have to agree that the real function of the Estimates Committees, which were set up some 11 years ago, has degenerated to the extent where all members of Parliament and, indeed, both sides of Parliament, are questioning their real value. I, for one, believe that there is a very real value in the Committees if they are approached by all sides with a reasonable degree of support.

The structure was set up to give a committee of Parliament the opportunity to examine and question Ministers and their senior departmental officers in respect of portfolios that they represent. I was involved in the old Estimates Committees system when we had a Committee of the whole House and, on those occasions, that meant that departmental officers were not able to participate in the same way as they now participate. The only way in which up-to-date advice could be given to a Minister was through a messenger service that ran between departmental offices, conveying messages to Ministers; and, in turn, Ministers would repeat the information just given to them.

On that basis, the information was gradually given to Parliament but the new system, as it then was in 1980, enabled Ministers, and as many departmental officers as that Minister would care to bring before the House to be available for that sort of questioning, to provide information concerning departments which was so much more detailed and, therefore, of much more benefit to members of Parliament. Regrettably, that concept has degenerated, and I seriously ask that all members have a good look at it.

Mr Groom interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BLACKER: I suppose that there are a number of reasons and, to foreshadow what the honourable member may be thinking, I believe the reason for that degeneration could well be the Dorothy Dix type of questions being asked, each of those questions being more Party-politically motivated than in the interests of obtaining information on the subject under discussion. I believe that, if we allow the procedure to further degenerate and members decide that the system is no longer relevant, we will lose a very valuable opportunity of cross-examination. I hope that all members can review the position, because I am concerned about the net benefits that members of Parliament and departmental officers may derive from presenting themselves at the House. Enough has been said about that.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I am not casting aspersions on one side or the other. I think we know that we could all lift our game, and I leave the matter at that. I am not directly a member of a Committee, but I attended more Committee meetings on each day than did any other member of the House. Representing my electorate, I believed it was necessary for me to be acquainted as much as possible with the operations and questions asked of respective Ministers. A few issues caused me some concern during those Committees and, through the good graces of the Chairman of those Committees and the members concerned, I had the opportunity of asking relevant questions. One of the questions that really disturbed me when the Treasurer was being

examined on the matter of the State Bank involved the amount of money allegedly attributable to the rural sector. It has been the general belief, and many questions asked and answered in this Parliament would tend to suggest, that a lot of the problems of the State Bank involved the rural crisis.

I guess that many of us who have been involved in the rural crisis might have accepted that some of the blame could lie in this area. However, answers to questions asked in the House have given a completely different picture. Of the total loss that the State Bank has incurred, including the debts that potentially could occur under the guise of non-performing loans, which in total amount to \$6.5 billion, only 38 per cent has been accrued within this State, and 62 per cent of those debts and potential losses are in fact outside the borders of this State. However, of more and even greater concern to me is the fact that only 2.9 per cent of the total debt is attributable to the rural areas of South Australia. So, we can quite clearly see that we cannot place the blame on the rural area for anything other than a minute portion of that debt—when only 2.9 per cent of the debt is attributable to country areas.

The thing that I still have difficulty with, as do many of my constituents, is appreciating the size of the debt that we are talking about and the gravity of its implications. I have put some of these figures through a calculator. If we divide the figure of \$6.5 billion by the total number of rural establishments in South Australia, we get a figure of \$451 000 for every rural establishment in South Australia. Effectively, that means that country South Australia has been mortgaged to the extent of \$451 000 for every property.

Mr Lewis: And that is over and above what is already on them.

Mr BLACKER: Yes, that is over and above the private debts of the present incumbents whose names are on the titles at present. Without being flippant, and in an endeavour to try to get through to people the extent of the debt, we can consider the proposition that, if we were to put one dollar down every second of every minute of every hour of every day of every week of every month of the year, it would take us 206 years to pay it off—and that is without interest. To draw another analogy, if we were to pay it off using the Premier's salary, on a per annum basis it would take something like 50 000 years to pay off the debt.

This sounds flippant and as though I am making a mockery of a very serious issue, but I am not. What I am saying is that the amount of money we are talking about is astronomical. We are saddling not just the present generation but the next generation and the one after that. I do not think it is right that the Parliament, the Government, or any statutory authority should tolerate a situation where that is allowed to occur. Whilst that position remains, all I can say is that future generations and members of Parliament will be confronted with the very problem with which we are confronted now, that is, how in their lifetime can they overcome this massive debt?

Having said that one must try to look to the future and perhaps ask a few more questions to try to work out where we are at. I have been trying to visualise what is happening to our rural communities, what is happening to our country businesses and to the fabric of these country communities, including the sporting teams, the church groups, and just about every section of those communities. They are all being undermined and in many cases lost. Football teams are having to amalgamate not just with neighbouring teams but with neighbouring associations. We have seen 10 teams amalgamated to become four. We have seen churches finding very similar problems. All this is taking its toll.

Next one asks, who will be the farmers of the future? Who will be the small business people in the community? How will the fabric of these communities ever survive? Recently I was glancing through a recent edition of the *Agriculture and Resources Quarterly* and at some figures put out by the ABARE. It is interesting to note that some \$2 billion has not been spent by the rural community in buying tractors, plant and equipment, and new machinery. It corresponds that, with the figures we are talking about, they are almost the same as the extra amount that the rural community is facing by way of interest paid to the banks. In the current downturn, farmers have not spent their money in the businesses that employ, manufacture and create a turnover, but the money has gone into a sector of the community that is not productive, the banks, by way of interest.

One could argue whether it is the fault of the banks or the Government, or whoever, but, collectively, the monetary system has effectively taken that money out of the producing or manufacturing sector. We must turn that around and channel that money back into the manufacturing sector and into the support services sector and get those communities back on the rails. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* these ABARE figures. I assure the House that the table is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

Real expenditure on inputs by the farm sector in 1990-91 dollars

	Annual Average 1977-78 to 1979-80		Annual Average 1987-88 to 1989-90		1990-91	
	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%
Fuel	907	5.0	1 070	5.1	1 110	5.7
Fertiliser	951	5.2	1 112	5.3	890	4.6
Chemicals	420	2.3	884	4.2	820	4.2
Seed and Fodder ..	2 064	11.4	2 115	10.2	1 950	9.7
Marketing	2 605	14.4	2 196	10.6	2 180	11.2
Repairs and						
Maintenance	1 425	7.9	1 753	8.4	1 545	7.2
Other a	2 405	13.3	2 879	13.8	3 585	18.4
Wages	1 968	10.9	2 585	12.4	2 660	13.7
Interest paid	1 050	5.8	2 839	13.6	2 450	12.6
Capital Expenditure	4 325	23.9	3 363	16.2	2 250	11.6
Total	18 118	100.0	20 796	100.0	19 440	100.0

a Large increase in 1990-91 due to a sharp rise in the wool tax, s ABARE estimate.

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics (1990, 1991)

Mr BLACKER: The point I make in particular is that in the period from 1977-78 we see that previously interest accounted for 5.8 per cent of the total farm input sector, whereas now it is at 12.6 per cent. It has more than doubled. The article in the *Agriculture and Resources Quarterly* clearly shows that the number of tractors bought by farmers peaked at nearly 19 000 in 1980-81 but that it has now dropped to some 6 000 units. One can well ask: just what has happened to our manufacturing sector and our agricultural machinery sector? We have a clear indication that these sectors are in very big trouble.

Looking a little further at the multiplier effect and at the adverse effect that this has on rural communities and on the rest of society, we see that farmers in many areas are now reducing input expenditure. The current rural downturn is severe and is now more prolonged than has been the case for any period during the 1980s. Farmers are reducing input expenditure. They have done so over a series of years and they are now cutting everything to the absolute bone, because they just do not have disposable income.

From the point of view of a conventional multiplier analysis of all this, there are three main channels through which the reduction in the value of farm outputs or farm incomes will affect the output from the non-farm sector. First, as farm income falls, consumption and investment expenditure by farmers will fall, and that will reduce the demand for some non-farm goods and services, with subsequent multiplier effects there. Secondly, if fewer immediate inputs are used in the farm sector—in other words, the farmer cuts his expenditure to the absolute minimum—demand for farm goods and services in the non-farm sector will be reduced, with similar multiplier effects. Thirdly, the income in non-farm households, such as households of hired farm employees and in-farm households, which depend on off-farm incomes, might be reduced directly in response to a fall in the value of farm production.

If consumption expenditure by such households falls in response, the demand for some non-farm goods and services will fall with subsequent multiplier effects. Although there is some uncertainty about the size of these multiplier effects, the most likely size of the non-farm multiplier is about .5 to one. In other words, the estimated fall of \$4 billion in the real gross value of farm output in 1991 is likely to induce a decline of about \$2 billion to \$4 billion in non-farm outputs in the short term.

I think I am saying something which most people should understand; that is, if the productive sector is not working and working well, first, it is not creating export earnings by direct export income; secondly, it is not in itself a market for the manufacturing commodities on which many other sections of the community survive. It is that particular aspect that I think metropolitan people are now starting to realise, and it is starting to hurt. The people out in the bush have been hurting for years. People in the metropolitan area are now finding that their ability to produce goods and have a market for those goods is in fact much more reduced. Who will be the farmers of tomorrow? What we are finding in general terms is that the young farmer of today has the ability to obtain off-farm income. In other words, many young married farmers on Eyre Peninsula have gone to Roxby Downs, other mining centres or undertaken other employment if they can get it, because their parents who remain on the farm have less of an opportunity to be able to acquire that additional income to help out in the family situation.

So, the real dilemma is that the young people who should be on the farms gaining experience, working through the agricultural system now, have in fact gone. Therefore, the average age of our farmers is that much higher. We are talking of an average age of farmers now in the mid-50s. When those people are no longer able to farm, where will the next generation come from? That is a problem that this Government and this Parliament needs to address. Otherwise, there will be a brain drain in the agricultural community that will not be able to be filled. We will find that, whereas Australian farmers were in fact the most efficient and effective entrepreneurial farmers, who displayed a sense of ingenuity and could once hold their heads up proudly, the farming community will no longer be able to keep up with the system of today.

I was also given an opportunity in the Estimates Committee to ask questions about the Port Lincoln Hospital. I was somewhat concerned that the statistics presented to the Committee by way of the blue book indicated a drop in bed capacity at that hospital from 72 to 61. I have since received from the Minister a form of explanation about that, but the explanation does not satisfy what I believe are the demands of the community and, more particularly, the

direction in which management of that hospital is going. I am now confronted on a very regular basis by many senior citizens of the Port Lincoln community expressing concern that the Health Commission has eventual plans to phase out any form of long-term geriatric type of accommodation at the Port Lincoln Hospital.

At present, because there is a 40-bed Matthew Flinders nursing home, it is claimed that that should cover the needs of the geriatric community. We all know that that is not the case. There is a very long waiting list for persons to get into the Matthew Flinders nursing home, and even now we are finding many senior people who require 24-hour care, although not acute care, in a nursing home. As an example, recently an elderly patient was moved to Elliston. The tragedy of that situation was that the family and friends who normally visited that person in hospital on a regular daily basis do not have transport by which they can travel to Elliston regularly to visit their aged relative. The tragedy is in human terms: it is not in terms of providing the care and medical attention necessary for that aged person. It involves the human aspect, where it is necessary and, I think we would all agree, highly desirable. The friends and relatives of that person should be able to visit regularly. Had the person remained in Port Lincoln, that would have been possible.

Through this new system under the Health Commission, the Port Lincoln Hospital is now hiving off patients—if I can use that expression—to Elliston, Cummins and Tumbay Bay, all in an endeavour to make the Port Lincoln Hospital responsible for providing an acute care service only. However, it cannot be at the total expense of geriatric services which are so necessary. I will leave it at that point because I believe they are issues that need to be raised further. I believe that the Minister and the Government will recognise the points I have raised and follow them through to see that all persons on Eyre Peninsula get a fair and equitable health system.

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

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): The financial performance of this Government is now a matter of public record. The financial mismanagement of that performance has become a matter of public record only because the Liberal Opposition has forcibly and determinedly fought to extract from a secretive and evasive Government the true situation regarding the finances of this State. It is of immense concern to me and to an increasing number of South Australians that secrecy and evasion appear to be the cornerstone of this Government's policy and financial performance.

The Opposition has been able to determine through continued and extensive questioning, and the subsequent assistance of the royal commission, that this Government is the most inept in the history of the State; that this Government, having taken this State and its taxpayers into massive debt, refuses to face the realities of financial responsibility. It refuses to present to this Parliament and all South Australians the necessary and realistic budgetary measures that would counter the horrendous effects of inept management—inept and negligent management that has placed a debt burden upon every man, woman and child in this State. It is a burden of debt the ramifications of which will mean that all South Australians will suffer the indignity of reduced quality of lifestyle, reduced incomes and increased unemployment—unemployment which has already broken the 10 per cent barrier. The ultimate result will condemn another generation of this State's children to unemployment benefits, joining the already unacceptable 30 000 unem-

ployed youths fast becoming the statistical majority of long-term unemployed.

During the recent sittings of the Estimates Committees, it became appallingly clear that this Government totally lacked any understanding of the small business sector or of the impact of small business on our economy. The Minister of Small Business unashamedly dismissed any recognition of the importance of small business in the economy. Through this budget, the Bannon Government has contemptuously denied the existence of small business. Small and large business complement each other's roles in the economic environment of this country. One cannot survive without the other. Large commercial enterprises succeed because of the growth, viability and, indeed, profitability of the small business sector. Why, then, is this Government driven to deny any formulation of policies to direct and ensure the viability of small business? Incentive and encouragement to boost this vital area of business would assist in the employment of thousands of jobless South Australians. This contemptuous rejection of small business by the Bannon Government is evident throughout the budget documents.

Nowhere in the program estimates and budget papers will one find a reference to the Government's policy for issues relating to small business. Small business as well as all other South Australians must pay the massive \$220 million annual interest bill to finance the inglorious State Bank debt. They must also suffer the effects of this Government's unpredictable WorkCover scheme—the most expensive scheme in Australia, the unfunded liability of which is running at a \$12 million per month blow-out rate. It is conservatively estimated that by 30 June 1992 the current level of \$260 million unfunded liability will reach \$400 million.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: Neither can small business. The effect on small business is, to say the least, draconian. One accident in an otherwise accident free employment arena can mean a severe rise in the industry rate levy over a two year period to an unbelievable 7.5 per cent rating. The average WorkCover levy paid by South Australian employers of 3.8 per cent is already more than 50 per cent greater than the national average, which stands at 2.4 per cent. Of the many hardship stories related by my own constituents, one example that is most typical is of a self-employed businessman with one employee who had maintained an accident free environment for the 20 years they worked together. The first and only accident occurred in 1988 but, due to WorkCover's creative formula to determine industry rate levies, the employer in this case is now faced with a massive 150 per cent increase in workers compensation premiums. In dollar terms this has meant a jump from \$3 000 a year to almost \$8 000. This is a burden calculated to bring disaster to small business and increase unemployment levels.

What was the Premier's action to reduce this burden? The Premier promised to introduce amendments to the WorkCover scheme, and members may rightly ask what happened to that promise. The masters of all economic wisdom in this State—the unions—told the Premier to back off, and he did. That was another worthless promise by the Premier, leaving small business to face the onslaught of further Government policies. It is nothing short of harassment of small business, which is a substantial, responsible, participating and contributing sector. Small business is a substantial sector within our economy, obviously unrecognised and uncared for by members opposite. This Government's message to small business is, 'You are on your own'.

Turning to another Estimates Committee of which I was a member, I found once again that incompetence bludgeoned any responsible allocation of funds to resource man-

agement due to the insatiable desire of Government Ministers to raise revenue at the expense of good management principles within their portfolios. None were so blatant as the Minister of Emergency Services, who managed to find the staggering sum of \$3.558 million and insert it into one of the divisions of the Police Department. This increase will provide salaries within the Police Department for 30 additional staff. To make the point very clear, they are not 30 police officers; they are 30 civilians or non-police staff. The police division that received this windfall of over \$3.5 million is the traffic infringement notice section. Last year this section ran on a budget of \$336 000, employing 12 staff members. The same section now has a budget of almost \$4 million and 42 staff members for this coming year.

I want to make it very clear and place on the public record, particularly for members opposite, that I am pleased to acknowledge that speed cameras have had a positive role in reducing the offence of speeding on our roads and, more importantly, they appear to have had a positive role in reducing the road death toll. Having placed that acknowledgment on record, I would also state that I do not consider that the questioning of a massive injection of otherwise scarce funds into this area of speed cameras and infringement notices is in any way contrary to my previous acknowledgment. In answering questions on the subject, the Minister of Emergency Services stated:

... since the current level of speed cameras began operation in October 1990, there has been a reduction of 15 per cent in road deaths from 1 October 1990 to 31 July 1991, when compared with the same period in the previous year.

The Minister was less sure of the actual number of lives saved represented by that percentage and, in his words, had to take it off the top of his head and from a radio report heard a few days previously. The Minister was also unsure about the extent of the role speed cameras played in this, although he did think speed cameras were a variable in the equation over the past few years. The Minister was unable to say why the estimated receipts for 1990-91 for infringement notices were \$24.694 million and the actual amount received was \$14.827 million, a reduction of about \$10 million in receipts from expiation notices. The Minister answered:

... it was certainly true that the department indicated that it expected to get a considerably greater income from fines from traffic infringement notices than it did. The proposed receipts for 1990-91 were \$24 694 000 and the actual receipts were \$14 827 000. That decrease of \$9 867 000 was due mainly to a reduction in the number of expiation notices.

The Minister also stated:

It was also certainly due to the fact that the percentage of people speeding decreased quite significantly.

In the Minister's own words, there was a reduction in expiation notices, which suggested to the Minister that the percentage of people speeding had decreased significantly. I refer the Minister to page 163 of the Auditor-General's Report. Under the heading 'Recurrent operations', the Auditor-General states:

The increase in receipts from infringement notices of \$3 million to \$14.8 million is due principally to an increase in the number of notices issued of 51 500 to 203 000.

On the same page, listed under point four, 'Receipts', the Auditor-General states:

Receipts for the year increased by \$3.7 million to \$28.1 million due principally to an increase in infringement expiation fees of \$3 million, resulting mainly from the introduction of speed cameras with a resultant rise in the number of notices issued and expiated.

As a member of this State Parliament I expect to receive accurate and honest answers to questions presented to Ministers of the Crown. I do not expect to receive half-baked opinions taken off the top of one's head or passed on from

information gleaned from a radio broadcast, particularly when Ministers have the assistance of numerous advisers and departmental heads on hand to accurately present answers.

We appear to have a contradiction between the Auditor-General's Report and the Minister of Emergency Services' statements to the Estimates Committee. Perhaps this is another report that the Minister did not get around to reading. Perhaps it is another portfolio this Minister has no interest in or understanding of, such as the Scrimber project, notable for its \$60 million loss of taxpayers' money and under this Minister's control and responsibility. Or, perhaps the charge of incompetence is justly deserved.

I put to members of this House that if we accept that the Traffic Infringement Notice section increased its productivity by increasing its output of expiation notices and increasing its revenue by \$3 million and reducing speeding offences, thereby reducing road deaths—all of this taking place with a budget allocation of \$336 000 and 12 personnel—in all economic logic why is it necessary to increase the budget allocation by \$3.558 million and to provide a further 30 personnel in this section? The Minister has a responsibility to provide for the safety and security of all citizens. Surely an equitable distribution of resources into all areas of policing would have been the most rational approach, considering the increased crime rate rampant throughout our community. Under-resourced police facilities are pushed to unreasonable limits and have been for the past five budgets under this Labor Government.

I find it totally inconceivable that this Government can justify the salaries of 30 personnel into what is most definitely and outrageously a revenue-raising stunt. I ask the Minister to explain to the residents of my electorate and to the greater Tea Tree Gully area why excessive salaries for 30 non-police staff can be found within the police budget when it is proposed that the Tea Tree Gully police station will lose one police staff member, which will effectively close that police substation between the hours of 11 p.m. and 7 a.m. One police salary—a non-revenue raising salary—will reduce the protection for our community's safety and security; one staff member to be transferred to shore up a lack of police numbers in the Para Hills and Salisbury area because the budget allocation does not allow for much needed extra personnel in community policing areas.

This over-kill injection of \$3.5 million and 30 non-police staff in the traffic infringement notice section occurs at the expense of proper policing and protection of our community. I totally condemn that action. I assure the Minister and this Government that the residents of Tea Tree Gully will fight to maintain the 24-hour service at their police station, and they will condemn this Government and its Ministers if such a proposal threatens to become reality.

In the last few minutes available to me I bring the attention of the House to page 161 of the Auditor-General's Report. Under the heading 'Civilianisation', the Auditor-General states:

The previous report conveyed that a new police officers' award was introduced in 1988 at a significant cost to the taxpayers and recognised the issue of civilianisation... the department responded that it was optimistic that continued progress would be made with respect to civilianisation over the next three financial years...

The 30 positions funded by the \$3.5 million are new positions, certainly not positions identified under the audit review as occupations to be civilianised—and most certainly outside the award definitions as occupations to be civilianised on a natural attrition basis.

Will the Minister clarify the current status of civilianisation, and have the new positions created within the traffic infringement notice section halted the progress of civilian-

isation over the next three financial years? Have police trainee intakes been diminished by the expending of such funds for the salaries of 30 non-police staff in a purely revenue-raising exercise?

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): In the first instance I would like to make some general comments about the Estimates Committees, where they came from, what they do and the ways in which we might improve the situation. More commonly at present we find people expressing dismay or disaffection with the system rather than satisfaction with it. That is against the background that they believe that there will continue to be an opportunity to obtain information, department by department, indeed, division by division, about why the Government is appropriating revenue for the purposes stated.

Those members in either House who believe it would be appropriate to include members of the other House in the process need to bear in mind that the Estimates Committees are in fact the Committee stage of debate on the Appropriation Bill. It is not only inappropriate to include members of the other place in the Committee debate of a Bill in this place—which they in turn will have the opportunity to debate when the measure is introduced there, regardless of what it is—but it is more importantly inappropriate—and I am sure the member for Hartley will agree—to include members from the other place in those Committees because this piece of legislation is the money Bill itself.

This is the House in which the Government procures Supply and, therefore, this is the House under our State's Constitution in which the loss of Supply to the Government is a clear vote of no-confidence in the Government. In that event the Premier would have to advise the Governor that he or she could no longer govern. If in the course of the Committee debate an amendment is passed and it is subsequently reported to the House at the third reading, clearly the Government loses a vote of confidence and it would have to resign. It is impossible for members of the other place to sit here during the third reading and, so, it would be an anathema for them to participate in the Committee stage of the debate, being able, in consequence, to vote on the decision of that Committee, which is seen to be a Committee of this House for the purposes of the Committee stage of the budget Bill.

I hope all members in this Chamber and in the other place understand that point. It arises in consequence of the particular interests that members in the other place have in aspects of policy relevant to particular departments and the desire therefore to participate in debate, discussion and inquiry into the reasons why certain policies are pursued and not others, the extent to which money is spent on one thing as opposed to another part of the total program, both within a particular department and between that department and other departments.

Neither is it appropriate in my opinion for either shadow Ministers or any other member in another place who has a deep abiding interest, however sincere that may be, to ever be part of the Committee consideration of the Appropriation Bill in the House of Assembly. Just because their interest in what the Government is doing or proposing to do or has done exists is no reason for us to bastardise, as it were, the arrangement of business in the Parliament to the point where we finally destroy the obvious benefits that a bicameral system has otherwise provided for South Australia and for every other place in which it exists. The issues to which I have then drawn attention are sufficient to dissuade, discourage and otherwise therefore prevent any

further consideration of a proposal to include members from another place as members of the Committee.

Let me now turn to another mistaken perception that, I think, some members have about the composition of those Committees. At the time it was decided to form such Committees Ministers who sit in another place were invited to be witnesses before those Committees, as were Ministers of this place. Therefore, the Ministers are not members of the Committee but are witnesses before it, hence in the record of the proceedings of those Committees *Hansard* prints the names of Ministers in lower case and the names of members of the Committee in upper case. That illustrates that *Hansard* understands the significance of the point I am making, even if the members about whom I am speaking do not.

Therefore, the Minister does not participate in the debate of any procedural matter before the Committee: only members of the House, excluding the Minister before the Committee, can do that, and only members of the Committee can vote after such a debate, whether the debate is about sessional orders or other procedural matters. Upon the point being taken, it has to be reported to the House forthwith. That is by and by and I am just filling in the record for the interest of members. Therefore, it is important for us to try to understand how the Committees came to be so structured, whereby members who are otherwise members of the Committee stage in consideration of a measure and where they are Ministers appear as witnesses and not members of the Committee.

I guess we need to look at the history of the Estimates Committees. The Hon. David Tonkin, former member for Bragg and Premier, along with some members of the then Opposition, noticed two things that encouraged them to act during the term of office of the Tonkin Government to introduce this system for the consideration of the budget. The first of those two observations was that the committees of the Parliament before whom members of the public appeared as witnesses were effective in discovering information and truth about evidence presented to those committees of the Parliament relevant to the matter for which they were established.

That was regardless of whether the committee was a standing committee of the Parliament, such as the Public Works Standing Committee, the Public Accounts Committee or the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation; or select committees (that were not standing committees of either House or both Houses) obtained the same result. Moreover, they noted that in other legislatures, particularly in the United States and other places around the world that have a system of government that is democratic and similar to the system that we have here, used the Estimates Committees approach to examine why the Government was appropriating the revenue it sought to apply to the purposes for which it intended to spend it.

Of course, this is particularly true in the United States Congress. The difference between Congress and our Parliament is that no Ministers sit in Congress: the equivalent of Ministers there are all secretaries of departments who are appointed by the President. The President is an elected office that is politicised in the process. Therefore, the President appoints people whom he believes to be of professional competence to run the policy areas of the departments of the Federation of the United States of America and, as I said, they are called secretaries.

They appear before Estimates Committees of the Senate for the same purposes as Ministers appear before our Estimates Committees. The difference is that those secretaries of the departments are not elected by the people at all. They do not have a vote on whether or not the information that

they and officers of their department in company with them provide to the Estimates Committees is passed; they do not have a vote in that. They have to convince the committee before which they are appearing that the purpose for which they seek the revenue is valid, is legitimate and is in the public interest in the opinion of the Chamber of the elected representatives of the people. They have to do that: that is their task.

Compare that with our situation, where the Minister appears before the Committee as a witness, and the Minister is already a representative of an electorate (in this place) or the total State as an electorate (in the list system of election to the other place), and has an allegiance to a political Party that will determine whether that Minister is re-endorsed to be elected at the next election and, indeed, whether that Minister even retains responsibility as a Minister in the whole process through the Party system of which they are a part.

Their loyalties naturally are to the Party to which they belong for those two reasons. Moreover, they have complete control of whether or not departmental and divisional heads or whatever other people they bring along with them as advisers to them will address the Committee and the extent to which they will address the Committee about any inquiry put to the Committee by any member of it or by any other member of the House of Assembly who is permitted by the good grace of the members of the Committee to make an inquiry of the Minister through the Chairman of the Committee and, if the Minister then allows, to one of his so-called advisers from the departments.

So, there is a big difference between that and the practice in Congress. There is a big difference for other reasons, as I said earlier, between that and the standing committees of either House or both Houses or select committees of either House or both Houses. It is for that reason that the Estimates Committees have not worked as well as those who set them up in the first place thought they might—for all those reasons. That does not mean they cannot work or will not work: it just means that we now have to re-examine why it is that we have the Estimates Committees. As a Parliament we must do that and we need to put aside, for the sake of our responsibility to our society, our partisan allegiance in the process of devising the means by which we examine the purposes for which revenue is appropriated and the way it is spent.

If we do not do that, we abuse the trust given to us by the public who elected us, individual by individual, and we abuse the trust of the public in this institution as the means by which they can trust someone from amongst their ranks not only to make laws in their interests but also, and more importantly, to decide how much of their income they should forgo and in what form they should forgo it, that is, as a tax or a charge on one or another service or transaction. In return, we provide for them the kind of society in which they wish to live. However minutely, that will vary according to the number of individuals expressing opinions about it, and that is at the nub of democracy. If we do not understand that, we fail in our duty as elected representatives of all the people on the electoral roll in South Australia who are citizens of this State and, indeed, of all other people for whom we have the collective responsibility to govern. That would be tragic.

Yet we seem to focus more particularly on the agenda of either or any political Party than on the agenda of public responsibility that we have, as members of Parliament, to the public at large. That does not mean that there ought not to be an Opposition and a Government. That is a system in which I believe very strongly. There must be a loyal

Opposition to ensure that a Government is kept accountable and to ensure also that, in the process of debate, the public can consider contending points of view which tend to indicate the majority point of view and then, alternatively, the largest point of view of the remainder, notwithstanding and not excluding from that the contributions made by Independent members from time to time.

However, particularly in relation to this legislation, the public must not see us as being involved in an exercise of scoring points for the advancement and benefit of our political Party against their interests, as they see it. That is up to us; it is up to our wit and wisdom to subjectively decide what the public see in their collective subjective opinion as 'the public interest'. I do not think that is beyond the wit of somebody elected to this place; nor do I see it as beyond the wit of all members of this place to, collectively, make the system work more effectively.

In the course of making these remarks, I do not preclude the option of the Parliament being able to scrutinise the budget through a system of committees comprised of members from both Houses. However, if that is to be the case, the Government must submit itself to the process of those scrutinising committees after the budget has passed both Houses. The Government must have Supply, and it must be seen to have been given Supply so that its confidence can be seen to be held in the Parliament without the bastardisation of that process by involving members from the other place as members of the committees. The Government would therefore need to have Supply passed before any committee comprised of members of both places examined why it is being done in the way it is.

If we followed that procedure, a committee—or several such committees—of both Houses of Parliament would examine public servants who appear before such committees without the presence of the Minister controlling what they can say in answer to questions they are asked. The Chairmen of such committees would be charged with the responsibility of preventing questions being put to those members of the Public Service who provide information to the committee that is outside the ambit of the responsibility of any of those public servants to answer. Such Chairmen should not be appointed on a partisan basis by the Government for the Government's interests. If that were to be the case, again, we would fail, for the Chairmen would do what the Minister now does.

Therefore, if we are to find the means by which we can discover what is really going on with public money in Public Service departments, amendments must be made to this system. We must make a commitment to do that. I have deliberately chosen to examine in some detail the function of those committees and the way in which we pass the budget and obtain information about what is going on in the Public Service to the exclusion of anything political about the good or bad performances of Ministers—and they were mostly bad, filibuster and disinformation. I have done that deliberately so that all members can look at what I have had to say without feeling that it is an attack upon any member or anyone else involved in the process.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I rise to support the motion before the House, which represents the closure of the budget debate. First, I draw the attention of the House to the fact that, very recently, the Naracoorte branch of the UF&S—a branch that is not in my electorate but part of the zone to which my electorate UF&S belongs—moved at the latest zone 13 meeting a resolution that the Governor should be called upon to dismiss the Bannon Government and to appoint an administrator. That is a

very serious motion for any organisation to pass—and the motion was passed.

The realisation of that request may be something of a pipe dream as we do not have the same sort of economic and constitutional crisis that existed at the time of the Kerr dismissal of the Whitlam Government—which was followed quickly by the Fraser interim, temporary administration, which went to the people immediately and permitted the people to confirm Governor-General Kerr's action in dismissing the Whitlam Government—given that the Opposition has, at no stage, suggested that it would withdraw its support for the budget. Nevertheless the passing of that motion must be seen as a reflection of the tremendous concern being expressed in rural South Australia at the almost total neglect of the rural community that is being evinced by the present ALP Government in South Australia.

I believe that to be a reflection not only of the neglect of the rural community but also, generally, of small business throughout South Australia. Last week I made a swift check of the state of the economy in Mount Gambier by telephoning a few key institutions, and I discovered that, in one week, some eight small business organisations—and one of them not so small—were under threat to the extent that they were in receivership or that closure and bankruptcy was imminent.

This is occurring in a community which must, I believe, be regarded as one of the main jewels in the crown of South Australia—the upper and lower South-East, with my own electorate around the city of Mount Gambier. It must be regarded as one of the prize districts of the State. During that same period we have seen four or five organisations opening new premises or expanding premises. I have been pleased to take a personal role in at least four out of those five, and I attended the opening of the other one. While we have some pleasure, nevertheless, it is mixed with a great deal of pain.

I would say to members of the House that the pain of the South Australian taxpayer, the South Australian elector, South Australia's small business people and South Australia's rural community is being exacerbated by State Government and Federal Government policies, instead of being ameliorated as it should be, were there any humanitarian sentiment and any ability to assess the community left within the powers of these Governments. Instead, it would appear that what we have been saying for some several years, that the Labor Government in South Australia is unimaginative and has been riding on the back of initiatives that were laid down during the Tonkin era is fully evident.

However derisive members on the other side of the House might have been, nevertheless, they have been riding on the back of those initiatives, such as the so-called Roxby mirage, as the Premier was fondly calling that project when he was in Opposition. It is one of the most profitable mines anywhere in the world. There was the Stony Point petrochemical complex and the pipeline built from the mineral deposits in the Far North of South Australia. There is the O-Bahn, which benefited Adelaide, but which was derided, as were many other Liberal initiatives.

However, they were officially opened by the Labor Party which by then was in Government. I do not think they even invited the members of the Opposition—they were so proud of their achievements with the O-Bahn. Perhaps we can laugh in hindsight but, really, it is a sad indictment of this Government that there has been very little by way of initiative, other than the Grand Prix and the Entertainment Centre. However, the Government certainly cannot lead an entertainment-led economic recovery. There is also the submarine project and I give the Government credit for initi-

ating that—although, there again, the Opposition has supported it and we are not taking credit for it. We are at least glad that there is some industrial prospect to emerge out of that for South Australia, although it does seem to be a much longer term rather than a shorter term project.

I was somewhat perplexed at two communications that I received over the past three or four weeks and during the budget Estimates Committees. One was from the SGIC, which seems to have spared no small amount of time and expense to send out to everyone of its customers an important message from the Chief General Manager of SGIC, who personally signed it and it has his photograph appended on the verso of the copy. I noted that one of the reassurances given was that SGIC is a profitable organisation, with no suggestion that it was unable to meet its debts as they fall due. That reassurance is a good thing to offer to people who they hope will continue to invest with them. But there was no mention of the fact that inter-fund loans had been made the subject of a scathing criticism in the recently released SGIC report, that the compulsory third party fund had been administered with an almost cavalier, gambling approach to investment.

It was certainly not the type of approach that I would normally attach to a seriously based Government business enterprise, in that that penniless compulsory third party fund had been borrowing by way of inter-fund loan from what one would normally assume to be a much more soundly investing part of SGIC and had been using that money, which would normally be invested in absolutely gilt-edged blue chip securities, in high return but very high risk ventures, such as the Collins Street property. There was also the Remm development in Brisbane, where Government enterprises seem to have gone on exclusively. They have wanted the whole investment.

The whole of the \$220 million or \$230 million Brisbane Remm investment lies within South Australian Government departments—the State Bank, a statutory authority, and SGIC, and SASFIT and SAFA have had their fingers in there—just as happened with the Collins Street development and just as has happened with an amazingly open-ended development in the Remm complex in central Adelaide. They did not do what any good bookmaker would do in the sporting field, and have a look at the risk and say, 'Ah, high risk, high return, but we will hedge our bets and let other people have this.' They might have looked around and found that there were no other takers, because our Government departments had come in at the tail-end of the field and been the only ones prepared to offer these enterprises, like the Remm enterprise, financial help. But on what a massive scale, with over \$1 billion invested, with no hedging, as I say, taking the entire risk.

Here with this message from the SGIC it is reassuring people, but only a few days after I received this document, as I say in the past two or three weeks, all of us in South Australia then learned from the Premier himself that it might be necessary for the Government of South Australia, which means the taxpayers of South Australia, to assist SGIC with a direct grant—not of a few dollars but of about \$80 million. That made me wonder just what these State organisations are about. Have they not learned from the messages that we have been giving them over the past two or three years? Have they not learned anything from their financial investments that have been turning sour? Or is it that they are still trying to snow the people of South Australia?

Why do they not give an honest appraisal and say, 'Look we are in trouble, we do have some problems, we may not be able to meet all of our debts in the short term, we are

asking the Government for help,' instead of making specious announcements like this and then with the Premier having to contradict them only a few days afterwards.

Mr Lewis: And spending thousands of dollars on television advertising.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, as the member for Murray-Mallee says, spending tens of thousands of dollars in the wider media, on television advertising and full-page newspaper advertisements throughout the State. But that is not the end of it, that is only one Government arm. Another one, the State Bank, has a new General Manager and has a new directorate, or almost a completely new directorate, with a new Chairman. Here, too, it concerned me when I received correspondence—which I assume all members would have received, although I do not know how closely they would have perused it—which, again, was a very reassuring letter, saying, 'We have had our problems, but we were profitable slightly this year,' but ignoring the fact that that profit was only profitable because \$200 million was given to Beneficial Finance by the taxpayers and \$2.2 billion was given to the State Bank by way of direct grant by the taxpayer. However, we were to forget about that and were told that they still managed to make a small profit. What wonderfully creative accounting that is.

But what did they do for the members of the State Bank, for the people who themselves have been under threat? They have been suffering from retrenchment and the scaling down of opportunities within bank employment. However, the few left in employment in the State Bank across the counter were given a table of questions and answers, for State Bank staff. The whole index is interesting but one simply jumped off the page. I was really interested in this one, as I am sure all members of the House will be. Question No. 17 was:

Will the bank repay the State Government for its indemnity? Breathless with anticipation, I turned over to see what the answer was, and there it was at page 4—and once again we have the abominable snowman at work:

The State Bank will repay the Government from profit, over time.

It did not say it would be a million years or anything like that. It states:

The time this will take will depend on the speed at which the bank can return to strong profitability.

Here we have a bank that is scaling down from national and international endeavour and trading to a much more localised bank, with lower profitability and a lower risk (ostensibly, we hope in the longer term a safer trading option) but of course with diminished profitability, as the old Savings Bank-State Bank used to have.

There is none of this high flying, high return, plenty of money in the bank and plenty for the Government and the taxpayer, but a diminished return or profitability rate. From that diminished profitability, which was never a handsome profit by any means, even under the national and international trading regime introduced by former General Manager Marcus Clark and his board, I do not think the State Bank ever returned more than \$80 million at its very zenith. Yet, what do we have? The figure is \$2.2 billion. A modest 10 per cent rate of interest would give us \$220 million which has to be found each year simply to pay off the interest on that debt, and obviously it is a grant, so the State Bank does not have to do that. But has the State Bank shoved that \$220 million aside and said, 'We will forget that and just start nibbling away at the \$2.2 billion debt, \$1 at a time'?

How naive can senior bank administrators be? Surely the State should be able to expect at least some return of that

\$220 million a year. I think the taxpayers are entitled to it. Each of our families are up for about \$4 500 per year extra in order to defray the cost of all these debts imposed on us by this almost gambling style of investment, as I said, which has been the manner in which affairs have been conducted in this State over the past few years. That money has to be repaid. If the \$220 million in interest alone is not paid this year that becomes \$2.42 billion next year which the bank owes.

I suggest that, for the bank to instruct people at the counter who are looking after customers on a daily basis, 'Tell the dears we'll be paying off the debt, and that should reassure them', the practicality and mathematics of this affair simply do not stand up, and a statement like that is nothing short of absolute dishonesty on the part of the bank's administration which has promulgated this rubbish among the investors, customers and clients of the State Bank. Once again it would seem that the bank has not learnt anything. It still believes that it can carry on a petty deceit, small though it may be—trying to reassure people—but it is a petty deceit. That document should be withdrawn.

It should be vetted by somebody responsible, if necessary, from outside the bank, and rather than give people specious answers which are absolutely incapable of fulfilment, such as that one, they should have left it off altogether and said, 'We are thanking the State taxpayers of South Australia for bailing us out of a difficult situation. We are trying to rein in our affairs to the extent where we will become more profitable, and thanks very much for the help you have given us. We have learnt our lesson.' To tell people, 'We are actually doing a wonderful job' as they have done in that document, and, 'We'll pay back that debt, depending how long it takes to return to profitability', is still in the pipe dream stage. It makes you wonder what sort of people are administering the affairs of the bank when they can continue peddling things like that.

'Is my money safe in the State Bank?' is the very first question, and I would not have thought they needed to ask it, because the taxpayer of South Australia has ensured that every single client of the State Bank has money which is safe. The taxpayer has bailed out the bank. I would think that that is a question which should never have been put at the head.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The taxpayers have not done it voluntarily, admittedly. The Government has acted on behalf of the taxpayer and taken out \$2.2 billion from the South Australian Financing Authority, money which could well have been spent elsewhere. That brings me to a number of points which I had hoped to make. The State Bank seems to be absorbing far too much time in debates these days.

The hospital in Mount Gambier is one of the stop-start projects. On 15 August we were told by a spokesman for the Health Commission that the project would go ahead, despite a cut of \$400 000 in the existing 1991-92 hospitals budget. That is no small reduction. Nevertheless, the hospital would proceed. The money will come from capital works next year, and it will be built on time. It will cost \$26 million. In fact, it could be ready by 1995, one year ahead of time, because the plans are similar to the new Noarlunga Hospital. A few weeks after—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It's not even a marginal seat.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It may not be a marginal seat, but your Minister said that that hospital is one of the last remaining country hospitals in need of major refurbishment, and the Government intends to do it. However, a few days afterwards, the Minister said, 'We have to delay it for a year but I give my absolute assurance to the people

of Mount Gambier that it will go ahead. They are not to worry.' That was published on the front page of the *Border Watch*.

A few days later, at the end of September, the board of the hospital stated that it had seen the three-year plan provided by one of the Health Commission advisers, and that they were worried that the Mount Gambier hospital could be delayed well beyond the one year as predicted by the Minister. So, I wrote to the Minister. I believe the Minister. I have confidence in his commitments. I believe that he is a man of integrity and that he acted in perfectly good faith when he gave that promise, and I advised him of that. My faith is in the promises made by the Minister and not in speculation by the board or other commitments made by more inferior beings. So, I look forward with great interest to see whether that hospital commitment is put forward by the Minister.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I have listened with interest to a mixture of suggestions from my colleagues as to possible improvements to procedures in the Estimates Committees, and I can only express my disappointment that so few members are able to be in the Chamber to listen to the exceptional contribution of the member for Mount Gambier. His contributions to debates are always worth listening to. He is a man of enormous experience who considers matters very carefully and who very fairly debates the issue. I feel very sorry that more members of the Government do not take notice of people with the experience of the member for Mount Gambier. They would do well to listen. Had they listened to the member for Mount Gambier on previous occasions, the Government might not have found itself in the mess it is currently in.

I believe that the Estimates Committees are an important part of the parliamentary process, perhaps the most important part because it is the only chance that we get in this Parliament to examine those people who now really run our State. By that, I mean the public servants. Some members opposite might shake their heads, but when Ministers freely admit that they have not read a monthly report of a corporation which is in trouble, and they have not done so because they have highly paid experts to advise them, one realises there has been a real shift, and a very fundamental shift, in the machinery of Government.

For decades people who have been committed to the democratic process and the proper functioning of the Westminster system have deplored the almost inexorable slide towards Executive Government. What we see in this State is not Executive Government, not Government by the Executive, but Government by the bureaucracy. The Executive in this Government has clearly demonstrated by word and example that they are interested only in the exercise of power, and that the prudential exercise of daily leadership and management in the machinery of Government is always left to others. It is little wonder that, as a result, taxis are being driven around Adelaide with billboards on the back stating, 'Bannon's four blunders: Scrimber; SGIC; State Bank; and WorkCover'.

We cannot blame people for saying that because, when those charged with Executive Government in this State refuse to exercise their right to lead the State and leave it to others, we can see what the result has been. Yesterday a member on this side of the House likened some of the members opposite to characters from *Alice in Wonderland*. I thought that was a very curious reflection to make until I realised that in *Alice in Wonderland* the characters were dominated by a group of soldiers who were basically a pack of cards, the only difference between them being the number

of spots they possessed. I thought that that was a very apt description of the backbenchers of the Labor Party, whose contribution seems solely to be Party discipline and putting their hand up at the right time.

It is very disappointing to see that people who came into this House when I came into it whom I know and who I am sure could make valuable contributions, fail to do so, because they are not allowed to and because they are fettered by their Party discipline and the fact that the Government must have all the running in this place. That disappoints me because I know that some of the new members have talent (and I specifically say 'some' because I do not hold all of them in equal regard; some of them have made contributions in this place which less than do them honour, and I will not even honour them by mentioning those contributions), and it is a pity that they must be fettered.

The central piece of the budget is probably the financial fiasco as a result of the State Bank. I want to dwell on it only briefly, but the whole of the State budget and the whole of what people of this State are going through revolves around what happened with the State Bank. Some people out there were making a joke and they were referring to a prominent South Australian as the 'Billion Dollar Boy'. He cannot be referred to as the Billion Dollar Boy any more and it is speculated that it will not be long before he will be referred to as the 'Trillion Dollar Troglodyte'. I and every member of the Opposition hope that will not happen.

The Hon. H. Allison: 'Troglodyte' means he has caved in.

Mr BRINDAL: As my friend says, by 'troglodyte' we mean that he has caved in. We hope it will not get to that situation, but it is a situation that has affected every aspect of this budget. Nevertheless, the Government tries to pretend that it has not happened. According to the Government, there has not been a State Bank fiasco. The great central plank of this Government—the great claim to fame of this Government—is its social justice strategy. The Government is very proud of its social justice strategy and very proud of its accomplishments, because it thought up this idea that it did not have unlimited amounts of money (and I know it does not) so it would apply this money where it was most needed. I compliment the Government for that; it was a bold initiative and it should have been taken up Australia-wide. I put to members that after the number of years it has been in place—and I believe it started in 1988—it shows itself in this budget for what it is: a fairly hollow sham.

I want to read a little into the record from page 21 of the booklet entitled 'The Budget and the Social Justice Strategy 1991-92', as follows:

Issues of access and equity are fundamental to social justice. The major indices of well being, such as health (morbidity and mortality), quality of housing, income, standard of education and employment opportunities clearly indicate patterns of disadvantage within the community.

I do not think anybody who understands social disadvantage and the need for social justice would disagree with that statement. However, it goes on to say:

Emphasis in the budget in the period 1988-89 through 1990-91 on more equitable outcomes for Aboriginal people, women, people from non-English speaking backgrounds and people with disabilities continues in this budget.

As far as that goes, that is fine, but I would like to ask and challenge the Government as to whether it believes that that is anywhere near a complete list of the people in this society who are in desperate need of social justice. It is fine to say that one believes in social justice and to sort out just a few groups and say, 'These people need social justice, so let's concentrate on them'. That is fine unless there are

other groups who are more in need of social justice and who are continually ignored by this Government.

I see my friend and colleague the member for Eyre in the Chamber, and he reminds me that the first people to put on that list are people in rural and country areas—people who have gone through a crisis such as there has not been in the history of farming communities in this State, who are a group of socially disadvantaged people, who do not rate a mention in this social justice strategy and who are continually given sanctimonious claptrap by Ministers opposite in terms of what they will do for them.

I must come to the two groups who are most important to me, because they are groups strongly represented in the areas in my electorate. The first of those groups is youth and the second of those groups is the elderly. We have a Minister of Employment and Further Education who sits in this place and almost daily tries to claim huge accomplishments for his portfolio and the Government. He does so in a climate where about 30 per cent of people in the age group that his portfolio represents are unemployed. I would remind members opposite that they are members of a Labor Government and that Labor Governments have traditionally stood up for the worker, the battler and the average man.

Mr Groom: And woman.

Mr BRINDAL: The average man and woman—I thank the member for Hartley for his interjection. There are many people who are now not in the work force because there simply is no work for them, or who have never been in the work force because there are no employment opportunities for them. How the Minister of Employment and Further Education can come into this Chamber and pretend there is nothing wrong when there is an absolute and serious crisis for the youth, not only of this State but of this country, really bemuses me.

I think the Minister would get much greater credit from all members in this House if he acknowledged that there was a serious problem for school leavers in this State. There are very worthy young people who simply cannot find jobs and it is to all of our shame that a great pool of talent in this State is being ignored. Some members opposite can think it is funny. I do not know how many members of their family are unemployed and young and want nothing other than a job. One has to keep trying to ginger them up, to encourage them and to say it is not their fault. It is indeed a serious problem.

The other group about whom I wish to speak tonight, and the group that concerns me most of all, is the elderly. The elderly are never mentioned in the social justice strategy, but if there is a group that is in need of social justice—if there is a group that is being denied social justice at a Federal and State level—it is the elderly. I believe the elderly are being victimised systematically through no failure of their own, and I for one will stand up to speak for them.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach is out of his seat and interjecting, both of which are out of order. The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: Were I to have heard the interjection from the member for Henley Beach, I would have said that he again calls out, 'What are you going to do about it?' I would remind the honourable member as I have done previously that it is his privilege as a member on the Government benches to tell this House what the Government will do about it, not to keep asking what we will do about it. If he wishes to know what we would do about it, let him convince his Government to resign and let us sit on those benches, and we will tell him what we will do about it.

Other than that, let him come in here and let his Ministers answer to this Opposition and not treat us as if we were in Government. We would like to be in Government, but we do not have to answer for the Government. The elderly in my electorate—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach is interjecting again—although in his own seat—and he is out of order. The honourable member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: The elderly in my electorate are being taxed out of their homes. They are ordinary Australians who were teachers, policemen, factory workers and bus drivers—people from every profession one could think of—and, following the war, they shifted to Warradale and the areas that the member for Mitchell represents. They live in modest, affordable housing—or they did. As I have told this House before, now that there has been an urban sprawl the Valuer-General has determined that their modest, affordable housing is now worth astronomical amounts and they are taxed as if they paid those astronomical prices and to the point where elderly people come to see me and say, 'We have to sell our home because we can no longer afford to live in it.' If members opposite think that is a joke, I do not. Those people deserve to live in those places for as long as they live.

Mr Holloway: Which tax?

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Mitchell says, 'Which tax?' I will give him a list. First, there are the rates and taxes that are fixed, as the member well knows, on the advice of the Valuer-General. Secondly, as the honourable member also well knows, it was his Government that forced councils such as the Corporation of the City of Marion to lower the minimum rate and to have only a small number of people on that minimum rate. The Corporation of the City of Marion had about 80 per cent of its ratepayers on the minimum rate; it believed in a system that was almost fee-for-service.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I am sorry, Sir, I thought it was out of order to interject on matters that had already been decided by this House.

The SPEAKER: What is the honourable member's point?

Mr BRINDAL: I am just being distracted by the babble.

The SPEAKER: I suggest that the honourable member not be distracted and he lets the Chair handle it. The honourable member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: The number of people on the minimum rate has been fixed by this Government, and that has caused financial embarrassment to people in my area. The matter of water rates again affects people in my electorate, because through no fault of their own they find themselves in housing that is considered valuable. As members opposite well know, above a certain level home owners pay an impost on their water rates based on the value of their home. That is a second example of where ordinary people are being taxed as a result of the policies of this Government. Thirdly, if these people live in Housing Trust homes, for the first time ever they are now being asked to pay for their excess water. I am the member of a Party that believes that we should pay for what we use. Those on the Government benches say that they do not inflict hardship on people who cannot afford it. Yet, after all these years, for the first time it is not the Liberal Party that would have it as a matter of policy; it is this Government that is introducing these sort of charges.

We can also consider issues such as transportation. Under the current ticketing system elderly people in my electorate have to walk about three kilometres—1.5 kilometres to pick

up a ticket and 1.5 kilometres back to the station, which is 20 metres from their front door—because that is the only way they can purchase a ticket and catch a train. They do not like that. Finally, we can consider the health area. Unfortunately I had only 20 minutes to speak. I could have spoken for three hours on the way this Government is selling people—especially elderly people—down the tube when it comes to health. One can consider ambulance services—which a few years ago were relatively cheap and which are now prohibitively—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, if you like. They are now prohibitively expensive because this Government decided, for reasons of work practice, that volunteer drivers were no longer suitable. Or, one can consider the fact that Flinders Medical Centre does not have adequate medical facilities, beds and emergency facilities, which directly impinges upon the elderly. One can also consider the Government's infamous practice of keeping people in their own home without providing them with the necessary logistical and medical support services. So, when they are found dead in their home in disgusting conditions, we tut-tut and say that it is a dreadful thing. Yet, every person in this House—because we have let the Government get away with these sorts of policies—must take some responsibility in this matter.

Members opposite can treat this matter as lightly as they like. That will not appear in *Hansard*; I hope what I am saying will. What I am trying to say to this House is that I believe that the elderly are a genuinely disadvantaged group that this Government should be considering and helping. I do not care how many interjections members opposite make; I do not care what light, flippant comments they make about the subject. I believe the elderly deserve our respect—they are the people who worked for years to get this country where it is. They are not the ones who made this country go backwards, yet they are the people this Government is now selling down the tube. If this Government is proud of its accomplishments in relation to the elderly, let it go to the polls saying that it is proud of what it has done for them. I am quite confident that the elderly are not stupid and that they are quite capable of delivering their own decision on this Government, and I do not think the elderly are very enamoured with what the Government is doing.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): In rising to address a number of subjects in response to the Estimates Committees I say from the outset that I listened with some interest to the comments of the member for Napier, who was one of the Chairmen. He went through a lengthy diatribe about the so-called inadequacies of members of the Opposition. I remind the House that, when these Estimates Committees were first established, the member for Napier was the health spokesman for the then Opposition and he conducted himself in a quite disgraceful manner during the Estimates Committees.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I was listening to what the member for Eyre said and it was a pure reflection on me.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has taken objection to the words used. What was the comment?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Eyre said that when I sat on the Estimates Committees in 1980 my behaviour was disgraceful. As you know, Sir, I am very sensitive and I do not think I am disgraceful.

The SPEAKER: I take it that the point of order is that the honourable member objects to the word 'disgraceful'?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: And you wish it to be withdrawn?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Eyre to withdraw the word that the honourable member has found objectionable.

Mr GUNN: Are you directing me, Mr Speaker? I am interested to know whether it is unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: I can only request the member to do so.

Mr GUNN: Therefore, at your request Mr Speaker, I am happy to withdraw and say that the honourable member's conduct was far below that expected of a member who aspired to higher office. I will recount to this House exactly what happened. The member for Coles was the then Minister of Health and the member for Napier was the then shadow spokesman. During the afternoon the honourable member, in a fit of quite discourteous behaviour, stormed out of the Chamber, either because he did not understand the Estimates Committee system or because he did not have any further questions to ask.

He left the Government members on that Committee to ask questions so as to maintain the Committee through the afternoon. That is what took place in the first year that the Estimates Committees were conducted. Yet the honourable member has the audacity to come into the House and criticise members of the Opposition and advocate the end of the Estimates Committees system. The system was designed to give members of Parliament an opportunity to question the Government.

What the honourable member did not say about the Committee on which I was a member and which got up a few minutes early was that there was an arrangement whereby Government members would not ask questions if Opposition members would cut short their questioning. That was the arrangement: to work together in a spirit of compromise in the interests of the people of this State to seek information. That was the approach of the Opposition. It was not that Opposition members could not think of hundreds more questions. It is simple for any member of Parliament with any experience to ask question after question. I was once placed in the awkward position of being the only Opposition member on an Estimates Committee one morning when we were examining the Electricity Trust, but I did not have any difficulty in keeping the Committee going until lunchtime when my colleagues could be found. Unfortunately, there had been some confusion in their diaries. I must admit that at first I had a few anxious moments but, as the day went on, I thought of more and more questions to ask.

Let us look at the facts. When I first became a member of this House we had a budget debate and a capital estimates debate—two separate debates. They have been put together and at least we can obtain answers not only from Ministers but also from their advisers. I remember under the old system hearing a former Deputy Premier respond to all questions with the stock answer, 'I will obtain a report.' He was not interested and the whole thing became a shambles. That is why we have this system. I believe there can be improvements, but they will come about only if the Government wants to cooperate and provide information. When we have a situation where the Government tries to deny the Opposition access to sensible information, and we have wet behind the ears press secretaries and political minders running around trying to manipulate the media, there will not be adequate debates in this place.

I want to address briefly the parlous state of the economy not only in South Australia but nationally. I am concerned that, if we are not careful, we will create a generation of jobless people. We have nearly wiped out one generation of

farmers in Australia and we now have an economic situation that is slowly strangling the nation. I cannot understand why any Government would want to allow the current economic situation to continue.

Governments talk about level playing fields, but I have never heard such nonsense because people in Australia who have been involved in primary industry, mining and secondary industry are not competing on a level playing field in our dealings with overseas countries. Other countries dump products in Australia. We are making Australians unemployed and bankrupting small business. We are bankrupting farmers, yet we continue down the foolish track of talking about competing on a level playing field.

I make no apology for saying that I support orderly marketing. There is nothing wrong with a fair and sensible system of orderly marketing. Such systems have stood Australia in great stead, especially during the time when the greatest progress was made in Australia, that is, during the Menzies, McEwen and Playford era when we had an orderly system of marketing primary products. We protected our industries and had the highest rates of employment in Australia's history. If we allow the current situation to continue with the dollar at only 80c against the American dollar, what hope have we in trying to export and compete bearing in mind the subsidies that are paid to producers throughout the rest of the world?

All we are doing is bankrupting our nation and causing mass unemployment. We are destroying a generation of good young Australians—throwing thousands on the scrap heap. Indeed, people cannot afford to live in their homes. What future is there? The end result is great social dislocation, heartbreak, stress and long-term damage to the nation as a whole. Where is the State Government? What is it doing? What has the Commonwealth Government done? It has done absolutely nothing. The Commonwealth Government has created a situation where it has to keep both interest rates and the dollar high, and it is wrecking the export chances of our producers. I am appalled by what is happening in rural Australia. I question whether the Government understands and is aware of the absolute despair, heartbreak and economic misery impacting on these people who are being affected by these Governments.

At the same time as the Government panders to irrational groups like crazy environmentalists, feminists and other groups who have no place in the lives of decent Australians, the nation is being destroyed. It is about time that Govern-

ments took notice of the needs of average decent Australians. The overwhelming majority of the people of South Australia and Australia are not interested in homosexual activities, sexual deviants and other odd bods and cranks who seem to take up so much of the Government's attention. Such extremists are stopping people from getting jobs, and they are getting millions of dollars of taxpayers' money at the expense of the overwhelming majority—

Mr Holloway: There are a couple of them over there.

Mr GUNN: I do not care where they are: I am stating the facts. Unless commonsense prevails, there is no future for Australia. My concern is that there will be no future. Why cannot our farmers and our industries compete? I will tell the House about subsidies in the United States, as follows:

United States subsidies to wheat farmers have jumped over a year from \$10 to \$83 a tonne and France has now subsidised a sale to USSR by \$107 a tonne. US farmers are guaranteed \$190 a tonne with the world price at \$128 and some buyers paying as little as \$83. US is estimated to have this year about a third of the world export market. It would cost Australia about \$1.2 billion to provide subsidies [to Australian farmers] . . .

That is what is happening. That is what we are competing with and, while the dollar remains high, our farmers will be disadvantaged, as are people engaged in secondary industry.

What else has happened? I refer to the situation in Europe. In 1970-71 Australia had about 17.3 per cent of the world wheat market; Canada 21.5 per cent; the United States 36 per cent; and the EC 5.7 per cent. In 1989-90 Australia had only 11.6 per cent; Canada 18.7 per cent; America 35.9 per cent; and the EC had increased its share by 15 per cent to 20 per cent of the world market. That increase results purely because of Government subsidies paid to EC farmers.

If Governments subsidise farmers in those countries, Governments in Australia have to create the economic conditions to allow Australian citizens to survive, and that involves lower interest rates, a lower dollar, less Government red tape and interference and more efficient industries—certainly not destroying our system of orderly marketing. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* two tables of a purely statistical nature that illustrate what I have been saying. One table is from the Australian Wheat Board Annual Report and the second table shows the indebtedness of the Australian rural sector.

The SPEAKER: Are they purely statistical tables?

Mr GUNN: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

EXPORTS OF WHEAT AND WHEAT FLOUR BY PRINCIPAL EXPORTERS—DISTRIBUTION BY QUANTITY AND PERCENTAGE OF WORLD TRADE TOTAL JULY-JUNE CROP YEARS¹ 1970-71 TO 1989-90

Crop Year	Argentina	Australia	Canada	United States (1 000 tonnes)	EC-12	Others	Total
1970-71	1 704 (3.1%)	9 492 (17.3%)	11 819 (21.5%)	20 140 (36.7%)	3 105 (5.7%)	8 591 (15.7%)	54 851 (100.0%)
1971-72	1 328 (2.5%)	8 736 (16.6%)	13 684 (26.1%)	16 901 (32.2%)	4 656 (8.9%)	7 191 (13.7%)	52 496 (100.0%)
1972-73	3 510 (5.2%)	5 562 (8.2%)	15 681 (23.0%)	31 734 (46.6%)	6 525 (9.6%)	5 041 (7.4%)	68 053 (100.0%)
1973-74	1 106 (1.8%)	5 509 (8.7%)	11 436 (18.1%)	31 273 (49.7%)	5 467 (8.7%)	8 184 (13.0%)	62 975 (100.0%)
1974-75	2 178 (3.5%)	8 049 (12.8%)	10 776 (17.1%)	28 304 (45.0%)	7 122 (11.3%)	6 516 (10.3%)	62 945 (100.0%)
1975-76	3 111 (4.6%)	8 072 (12.1%)	12 334 (18.4%)	31 669 (47.4%)	7 729 (11.6%)	3 953 (5.9%)	66 868 (100.0%)
1976-77	5 584 (9.0%)	8 357 (13.5%)	13 434 (21.6%)	26 080 (42.1%)	3 912 (6.3%)	4 643 (7.5%)	62 010 (100.0%)
1977-78	2 670 (3.7%)	11 144 (15.3%)	16 030 (22.1%)	31 538 (43.5%)	4 479 (6.2%)	6 677 (9.2%)	72 538 (100.0%)
1978-79	3 307 (4.6%)	7 246 (10.2%)	13 081 (18.4%)	32 311 (45.4%)	7 349 (10.3%)	7 906 (11.1%)	71 200 (100.0%)
1979-80	4 748 (5.4%)	15 364 (17.6%)	15 886 (18.1%)	37 198 (42.5%)	10 271 (11.7%)	4 063 (4.7%)	87 530 (100.0%)

Crop Year	Argentina	Australia	Canada	United States (1 000 tonnes)	EC-12	Others	Total
1980-81	3 932 (4.2%)	11 088 (11.9%)	16 260 (17.5%)	41 936 (45.0%)	12 684 (13.6%)	7 254 (7.8%)	93 154 (100.0%)
1981-82	4 281 (4.2%)	11 405 (11.3%)	18 445 (18.3%)	48 776 (48.4%)	13 990 (13.9%)	3 984 (3.9%)	100 881 (100.0%)
1982-83	7 471 (7.7%)	8 530 (8.8%)	21 367 (22.0%)	39 939 (41.2%)	14 084 (14.5%)	5 630 (5.8%)	97 021 (100.0%)
1983-84	9 637 (9.5%)	11 554 (11.4%)	21 764 (21.4%)	38 860 (38.3%)	15 040 (14.8%)	4 642 (4.6%)	101 497 (100.0%)
1984-85	7 966 (7.8%)	15 090 (14.7%)	17 540 (17.1%)	38 092 (37.2%)	17 297 (16.9%)	6 386 (6.3%)	102 371 (100.0%)
1985-86	6 197 (7.5%)	16 014 (19.4%)	17 683 (21.4%)	25 000 (30.3%)	14 386 (17.5%)	3 190 (3.9%)	82 470 (100.0%)
1986-87	4 359 (4.9%)	14 997 (16.9%)	20 781 (23.3%)	28 418 (31.9%)	15 483 (17.4%)	4 982 (5.6%)	89 020 (100.0%)
1987-88	3 824 (3.6%)	12 232 (11.7%)	23 514 (22.4%)	43 429 (41.4%)	14 678 (14.0%)	7 212 (6.9%)	104 889 (100.0%)
1988-89	3 416 (3.7%)	10 848 (11.6%)	12 404 (13.3%)	37 583 (40.2%)	19 382 (20.7%)	9 859 (10.5%)	93 492 (100.0%)
1989-90 ²	5 621 (6.0%)	10 866 (11.6%)	17 411 (18.7%)	33 516 (35.9%)	18 854 (20.2%)	7 126 (7.6%)	93 394 (100.0%)

¹ Canada: August-July.

² Preliminary: Subject to revision.

Source: Statistics Canada 'Grain Trade of Canada' and Canadian Grain Commission 'Canadian Grain Exports'. Does not include bagged seed exports.

USDA 'Wheat Situation' 1970-71 to 1974-75, 'World Grain Situation' 1975-76 to 1989-90.

For all other countries—IWC 'World Wheat Statistics' 1987 and 'Record of Shipments' 1987-88 to 1989-90.

FARM INDEBTEDNESS TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (a)

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

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

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

Mr GUNN: The second table clearly demonstrates the problems about which I am talking. In 1986 the level of indebtedness was \$8 000 million in respect of the rural sector. In 1990 it is nearly \$12 000 million. Unfortunately, the level of indebtedness is increasing and, if we just examine what has happened to agriculture in the short term members will be aware of the cause of my alarm. I quote from the latest edition of *Agricultural Resources Quarterly*. It states:

The short-term outlook for farm incomes and the rural communities and industries servicing farmers remains bleak. By many measures farm incomes in 1991-92 are expected to be the lowest on record. Net farm cash income is forecast to fall by 24 per cent in 1991-92, following a 35 per cent decline in 1990-91. The net value of farm production, which includes depreciation as a cost, is forecast to fall by 74 per cent in 1991-92, following a similar drop last year.

That clearly demonstrates what is happening across rural Australia. The people in small rural towns and provincial cities are being squeezed because of the lack of job opportunities. Attempts are being made to remove services, and there is great hardship and despair. My concern is that Governments of this country have failed to understand or appreciate the situation. One just has to look at what happened in Canada, which contains a large wheat-growing area, compared with Australia. I received a letter from a

Canadian member of Parliament, Mr Ross Stevenson, whom I met recently; part of his letter states:

One of the review's major achievements thus far is the development of two new safety net programs for grains and oilseeds farmers. To date, sign-up figures for the Gross Revenue Insurance Plan (GRIP) are high. According to Agriculture Canada, about 75 per cent of farmers across the country have joined GRIP for the 1991-92 crop year, representing more than 127 000 farmers and an estimated 83 per cent of eligible acreage.

The Canadian Government has implemented a ceiling and guaranteed farm incomes. A ceiling must be put in terms of farm incomes, because I do not believe that the financial institutions, which have had a windfall profit with excessively high interest rates, will ever be able to recoup the large amounts of moneys that are outstanding. The Government has a responsibility to ensure that all citizens are treated fairly, and the most sensible thing to do is drastically to reduce interest rates and the value of the Australian dollar and to get out of the way of people. Such things are very important, because rural people feel strongly that they are becoming second-class citizens. Governments are attempting to remove people's rights by trying to close their schools and kindergartens and by interfering in the running of their hospitals. They do not even want people to have the ability to run their own hospitals, and they do not want them to be an effective voice.

An interesting comment was made today in the *News*, regarding the former Premier of New South Wales, advocating the abolition of States. That is not a course of action I support. However, let me make very clear to this House that, unless State Governments become relevant to all citizens in South Australia and Australia, a movement will be created. Make no mistake about it—a movement will be created whereby people will want to run their own affairs, because the great problem facing many small groups of people in rural and isolated parts of the State is the irresponsible and ridiculous policies imposed upon them by arrogant bureaucracies at the behest of Government. Those people do not themselves have to live under those conditions: they bear no relationship to commonsense or reality.

The people who are attempting to impose those policies do not know what they are talking about and, therefore, there is a great deal of mistrust, concern and anger generated by the imposition of the will of the majority in the metropolitan area. There is a general feeling in rural South Australia that, once we get to Gepps Cross, South Australia ends, and we are second-class citizens. It is quite disgraceful that this Government can waste billions of dollars of taxpayers' money on hair-brained schemes and should allow statutory authorities to get out of control, but there is not enough money to keep the schools open or to fix up the ports so that we can be more competitive. There is not enough money to keep some of the school buses running, but there is plenty of money to spend on odd bod art groups on North Terrace at the Old Lion building—unnecessary, nonsensical expenditure.

We have down the road a large exhibition centre that is rarely used, and there is talk of spending \$15 million on a museum. What is most important: to generate income by improving our ports, or to attempt to pander to the minorities in the marginal seats at the expense of the welfare of the average citizen, and certainly at the expense of job opportunities? It is a disgrace that there are so many young people on unemployment queues, and I ask the Minister of Education, who is now in the House, what will happen to the economy of this State when all the school leavers enter the job market in November and December? Have the Minister and the Government thought it through? What representations have they made to their friends in Canberra? They cannot escape their obligation: they have been in government for 10 years now, their colleagues have been in government for eight years, and the unemployment queues are still growing.

People cannot afford to pay for their homes. People are losing their jobs. About 115 jobs disappeared in my electorate this week, and it is happening across South Australia. Where does the Government stand on these important issues, and why has it not stood up and made stronger representations to Canberra? This budget is meaningless to the average citizen unless some benefit will come from it. I say that there is no benefit. The only benefit is that the Police Department now has been called upon to be revenue collectors for the Government and agents of the State Taxation Department. This Government is bringing the Police Department into conflict with the community. The police have now been asked to double the amount of money they collect, and I say to the Minister and to the Parliament that there will be a very strong public backlash against this sort of conduct. The police have plenty of time to harass motorists and little time to deal with criminals. We have people racing around in stolen motor cars, and the Government should not be worrying about dolphins when it could amend the law to give the courts power to give the cane to those people who are smashing up motor cars.

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

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I support the Bill, and I want to raise a few issues of concern that arose from the Estimates Committees relating to the portfolios for which I have a responsibility. If I had the time, I would go into some detail about the Estimates Committees process. I have some concerns about that process. I think that the overall concept is excellent in terms of members seeking information of both a financial and policy nature. My concern relates to the number of ministerial and departmental staff who are brought before the Estimates Committees when a Minister is being questioned.

Ministers, quite appropriately, bring in their senior administrative officers, Directors-General or whatever the case may be, and senior people from their departments who I would have thought would be quite capable of answering questions. It is no skin off anybody's nose if, after a question is asked, information cannot be provided at that time. I do not think that anybody from this side of the House would be upset if a question had to be taken on notice. In fact, that happens quite often, and there is provision for information to be supplied at a later time. However, in some Committees in which I was involved, 20 or 25 people attended during the day when they could, and should, have been carrying out much more important duties in their departments. They were sitting here in case they were called upon, and that is totally inappropriate.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would have thought that, to a large extent, the accountability rested with the Minister. In fact, now that the Minister of Education has raised that point, if I had my way, I would rather see a situation where the Minister was not present at all so that we could ask questions directly of senior officers. I would have thought that the majority of the senior officers at the table during the Estimates Committees would be in a position to know whether the matter being referred to them was one of policy or one of substance to which they could refer. Again, if that was to happen I think we would cut out a lot of the propoganda and, in some cases, filibustering on the part of Ministers. I think the whole process would be much more successful.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: It is the one time of the year that public servants have the opportunity to come into this place.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I take the Minister's point and it is the point that I, too, make. If those officers are able to come into the House, and I think that is totally appropriate, I believe that the opportunity should be provided for members to ask those officers questions directly, rather than through the Minister. I think we would get a lot more information and save a lot of time. I do not think it would be of any concern to members on this side of the House if those officers said that they believed that a matter being referred to was one of policy and that they considered that it was not appropriate for them to answer the question. If that was the case, the opportunity could be provided at a later stage for a member to put a question on notice or to ask the Minister a question in the House.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: It is a unique opportunity for the officers to be involved in this process.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I do not take away from what the Minister at the table says this evening. I now want to get down to some detail in regard to the overall effects of the budget. I have been extremely disappointed about the budget for the Department for Environment and Planning, and this is at a time when there is increasing public concern for the environment. We find a virtual freeze in Government spending in the budget for environment and planning, and this has caused grave concern to environmentalists in this State. The fact is that, apart from a marginal increase in native vegetation funding to farmers, most environmental programs hardly keep pace with inflation.

In the 1991-92 budget there are actual reductions in budgeted payments in key areas. They include coastal management, air and noise pollution and grants to various organisations. We have seen reductions in real terms in controversial areas such as parks, development planning, heritage preservation, etc. I have certainly received a considerable amount of representation from conservation groups and from individuals expressing concern about this budget as it relates to the environment and planning portfolio.

I refer in particular to national parks. In an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* the morning after the budget was brought down it was stated that funding for the State's national parks had been maintained, with just over \$4 million allocated for visitor facilities, fencing, weeding and fire protection. I questioned the Minister on this matter during the Estimates Committee and I also asked the Minister to confirm that some parks had in fact experienced a 17.5 per cent reduction in revenue. When one takes into account that reduction, plus the additional land that has been made part of the parks system, we can understand why we have some of the problems that we have in the management of our parks, particularly some of the larger parks.

I also asked the Minister to provide a comparison of the staffing levels in the national parks system between this year and the previous five years, and that information is still to come. In regard to the recurrent allocation, I was interested to receive a reply from the Minister a day or so ago in response to the question I asked of her during the Committee. That reply states:

The reduction in the recurrent allocation component in the regional National Parks and Wildlife Service budgets for 1991-92 is 9.7 per cent.

The Minister goes on to clarify the following point:

Funds are allocated to regional areas for use on allocated priorities and not to specific parks as such.

It is totally inappropriate, therefore, for the Minister to be saying, as referred to in the article that we saw just after the budget, that funding for the State's parks is being maintained. That is totally incorrect. I also asked the Minister about management plans. All members would recognise the need to have appropriate authorised management plans in place if we are to properly manage these parks. I was concerned about the response I received to that question, also, where I learnt:

At this stage, 43 parks and reserves have authorised management plans. Ninety-six management plans are currently being prepared.

A schedule is attached for parks that have not yet adopted management plans. There would be between 40 to 50 parks, perhaps more, on that schedule that have not yet adopted management plans. The Minister has informed me that, currently, 13 officers are working on and have responsibility for the preparation of such management plans. I suggest that the Minister needs to give this matter a much higher priority. For a long time now the Minister and the Labor Government have been talking about the need to have

authorised management plans. With the current situation, where 96 are currently being prepared and where a large number of parks have adopted no management plans at all at this stage, there is obviously a real need for giving this a higher priority.

I now refer briefly to the proposed EPA that the Minister for Environment and Planning has announced. We recognise that the establishment of an EPA in South Australia is still at the discussion stage, but it is important that some of these matters be addressed. One of the concerns that I put to the Minister was about determining exactly what input was being recognised and invited from officers from the Department of Environment and Planning and the E&WS Department in relation to the establishment of the EPA. The concerns that I am hearing and the representations I am receiving suggest that a number of people in those departments feel that they are not being listened to. I am particularly keen that this matter be addressed.

The Minister has given me a reply that is not terribly satisfactory. She has suggested that officers of the Department of Environment and Planning, the E&WS Department and the Waste Management Commission had been consulted during preparation of the discussion paper proposing the establishment of an EPA, that the relevant staff were provided with a copy of the summary brochure outlining the proposals and inviting submissions and ready access to the discussion paper. The Minister said that representatives from the departments had been nominated to the EPA steering committee that is overseeing further development of the proposal and a working group. However, I suggest that there is a need to ensure that people who have had all the experience that members of these departments have had should be given the opportunity to have a far greater input in this important area.

I asked the Minister whether it was the intention of the Government to hold back on the establishment of the State EPA until the matter of the Commonwealth role in establishing an EPA was finalised. I was also anxious to find out whether it was a fact that the Commonwealth was moving towards a situation where the Commonwealth EPA sets the policies and standards, the States being required as the regional administrator. I must say that I was not satisfied with the response from the Minister to that question. Discussion papers are now out for both the State and Commonwealth EPAs, and it needs to be clarified whether we are working together in the establishment of both or whether it is appropriate that the State EPA be held over until the Commonwealth is sorted out.

The final matter that I want to discuss on that subject relates to some of the detail provided in an internal document prepared within the Department of Environment and Planning regarding comments on the proposal for a South Australian EPA. I was able to refer to that during the Estimates Committee. Pollution management has caused particular concern, and I referred during the Estimates Committees to an internal document prepared in support of the establishment of the EPA in South Australia. That document is very damning and condemns the present Government. It states:

The current pollution control and waste licensing laws are not built on the basis of openness, public disclosure and true accountability. Licence applications are often not open to public comment. Matters such as the setting of standards, policies and priorities are not open to public scrutiny. In most cases, the public has no opportunity to take part in the decision making process on matters which may affect them, and no right of appeal.

In the case of high risk activities, we lack anything comparable to the European community 'right to know' provisions which require that business informs and involves the surrounding community in matters such as emergency procedures and hazard

management, in the same way that occupational health and safety requirements require the business operator to inform and involve workers.

That paper was prepared by Ms Di Gayler and, when it was released by the Opposition, it indicated quite clearly some of the concerns felt within the department in regard to the need for changes, particularly in pollution management.

I was also able to express concern, and I do so again, about reductions in the staffing of the equality branch. It is important that we know how many inspectors are actually in the field. We are told there are some 5 000 exempted premises under the CFC legislation, for example, and it is important to know how many inspectors are given the responsibility of carrying out that work. Only today I received a deputation from people who were very concerned about the reduction in staffing, and it is quite obvious that the Government is working towards a user-pays principle in controlling pollution. It would appear that it will be left up to industry itself to watch over that. It will be Caesar judging Caesar to a very large extent in the matter of pollution control.

The MFP took up some time in the Estimates Committee. Questions were asked about where the water was likely to come from, for example, and what plans there were for the Government to re-use stormwater. We have heard much about that from the Minister. We have seen many reports in the media, and it is important to know just how far the study on stormwater re-use has actually proceeded. That was a matter of concern.

One of the other issues relates to the Torrens River. I am aware that a report entitled 'River Torrens Reduction in Pollution' has been prepared. I am also aware that there are many concerns about pollution in the Torrens River. These concerns are far from resolved, as highlighted in this report, and they have been referred to publicly in recent times. With respect to the matter of heritage and the heritage review, as I was able to point out to the Estimates Committee, it would seem that the majority of responsibilities of the Minister for Environment and Planning under the environment part of the portfolio are currently under review. In fact, one would hardly know whether there was anything that was not being reviewed by a committee of some sort or through a review process at this time.

I was interested to read in the *News* tonight that the State Heritage Act may be reviewed following a Supreme Court ruling which paves the way for demolition of the heritage listed Gawler Chambers. I was interested to learn from the Minister what action she would take in regard to such issues as the demolition of the House of Chow and other matters that have caused concern, and we now read that many of these issues may be reviewed through an overall review of the State Heritage Act. A number of other issues were referred to in the Estimates Committee, matters that I will continue to raise during this session. I hope that many of these issues will be given serious consideration and a much higher priority than has been the case in the past.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I refer to the environment, the Hills and what people expect with regard to the water catchment area. Before I do so, Sir, I draw your attention to the state of the House on the basis that I would like more members here to listen to me.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I recently made a statement through the Hills paper, the Mount Barker *Courier*, in relation to afforestation of the Hills; I referred to the speed at which some people are setting out to achieve that. I made the point that, if afforestation is completed—in other words, if all the water catchment area is planted out into forest again

except those areas that are roads and on which a home or rural building is constructed—the amount of water that we catch in the reservoirs will be much less. I also stated that more area of the Hills is now covered in some form of bush, whether it be native, exotic, weeds or pest plants, than when I was a boy.

I referred to some other matters including bushfires. If we afforest the whole of the Hills again with natives, the next time a bushfire occurs it will cover an area that we never dreamed would be burnt out, and it will be a catastrophe. I said that there needs to be a balance but, lo and behold, I stirred up a hornet's nest, the result being some rather vicious comments in letters to the Editor from people who were very self-righteous. They had good intentions, but had not read what I said; I did not say that we should not start to plant more trees in the Hills; I did not say that we ought not get rid of noxious weeds; I did not say that we should not plant adjacent to streams or replant trees with the idea of slowing down erosion; and I did not say that if the water filters through debris lying on the ground, or through plants and roots, it may not contain fewer contaminants, although eventually they will get into the stream. I said that there is more erosion if some form of plants are not in the area. So, because a significant amount of money is spent in the hills (and, in a casual comment with the Minister at one time, I raised the matter of reforestation to too great a degree—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: No, I said just a casual comment, I want to just go a little further so that those who want to attack me might think about the other views I have. I say that if an area is grassed and it is irrigated pasture, there is less erosion from that area than from native bushland in its original state, because native bushland in its original state has had erosion. That is the reason why there is no good soil on the tops of hills and all the good soils are in the valleys or out in the sea. That is a fact.

Further, because we have built reservoirs and the farmers have built some dams, a lot of the eroded soil that has been caused either by farmers working the land, sometimes quite irresponsibly (but we have learnt that lesson in most cases) or just by natural erosion from bushland, does not go into the sea as it used to; most of it is caught in the reservoirs or dams. If we want to reclaim it at some time it is possible. It is not lost, but in the natural state it went out into the sea and some of the sand in the ocean or on the beaches is partly from eroding rocks grinding away on the ocean bed and part of it comes from the hills and valleys throughout the world.

When the land was in its natural state and nobody cleared the streams, they used to block where dead trees had fallen or roots had grown across the stream, and debris built up until it formed a dam. Then, the stream took another path and it eroded the whole of the area where it took the new path down to a solid base, and took that eroded material out to sea. That was part of nature's process and there are many parts of the world where streams have changed their course, and our State is no exception in that respect. In the winter, immediately after a fire, there is a massive run-off and also some significant increase in erosion of that soil, because all the plant life is destroyed, so an erosive action takes place.

When my brothers and I had the contract to clear the Mount Bold reservoir and the wall was raised in the early 1960s by another 22 feet (approximately seven metres) to double the capacity of the reservoir, one of the conditions of that contract was that we had to burn and destroy all the eucalypt leaves inside the dam area. It was a damned area

in the other sense too; it was tough going. When we asked the reason, we were told that the eucalypt leaves were one of the worst contaminants discolouring the water. Anybody who has seen eucalypt leaves would know what happens; as they decompose they leave a brown stain on the concrete path or anywhere else. That is also a problem for the department involving the quality of water.

If we reforest the whole of the hills, it is logical; the trees and the scrub must live on something in the winter months and particularly in the summer, because they sap up a lot of water. Later I hope to have the figures on just how much an acre of average bushland is likely to suck out of the soil, whether it be on a hillside or in a valley. The big red gums in the valleys take an immense amount of water every year. That is not a bad thing, but we must consider this matter when we think about the amount of water we want in our reservoirs, because there will be a significant reduction. If I am wrong in that assumption, that is then saying that large numbers of trees and scrub do not need water.

A beneficial point under those circumstances but at the same time a loss factor in water is that the water falls into the scrub onto the debris on the ground that has not been burnt for a couple of years. The water soaks into the soil, is held there and does not run into the stream immediately. So, that is where the reduction in soil erosion occurs, and the water is purified to some extent by soaking through that mass of debris and then the soil. It can only be purified to a certain point to where the soil is saturated with the contaminants, whatever they may be (unless it is silt for instance), which are held in the soil until such time as a fire goes through and erosion starts in the following season.

Another point I found interesting is that one of the writers said that when the particles are washed downstream the fines move on and the large particles stay behind. When the Onkaparinga River and its major tributaries are in flood, the size of particles that do not move would be about six inches in diameter. In other words, the power of the water is so great that it may not take the particles the full distance the first year, but progressively each year it moves anything that is moveable a step closer to the reservoir and, if the reservoir were not there, it would move it a step closer to the sea. The answers are not just clear cut and a matter of saying, as some people are saying, that we want to replant all the hills at the moment that have been denuded of natural bushland, because with it come some other problems.

I have no doubt that some people would like to say, 'Build no more houses in the hills', but it has been proven that people living in residences do not cause any great contamination of our catchment area. If they do, we must stop and look at the principle of encouraging tourists to go to the hills by the 50 000—to the Oakbank races, the Schutzenfest or other tourist locations. It is quite logical; tourists will create the same sort of contamination as that caused by anybody living in the area. I think that many of us would need to think that through. I hope that the Minister will have a department undertake an assessment of how much Hills reforestation should occur, so that in an average year we can bank on having a full intake in our reservoirs. I will write to the Minister about that matter.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The Minister makes the point that the reservoir level is 88 per cent. I accept that; I am not arguing that point. We are reforesting the Hills quite rapidly now and there will be a point at which we will not get enough water to fill the reservoirs if we go too far with that process. There is some benefit in the process of planting along the

streams to stop contaminants entering them. The alternative to water from the Hills is water from the Murray River. It does not cheer me up drinking Murray River water; it does not look much better to me than the stuff that flows out of the Hills. The towns along the Murray River and the irrigation processes that take place appear to me to create the same sort of contaminants as those that people say are generated in the Hills. I may be wrong; people along the River Murray may have different ways of disposing of their waste—personal or otherwise—but I do not think that that is the case.

Some people suggest a recycling process. We may get to that point, but it is expensive and, in the process, quite a lot of water is lost and there is no guarantee that that will be 100 per cent successful in a warm climate. In a colder climate, a better result can occur because one does not have to worry about nitrogenous contents causing eutrophication and the sorts of problems we have experienced in recent times. I am not advocating that we stop planting trees in the Hills. I am saying that we do not have to plant only natives, because I believe natives are a greater contaminant than a lot of the exotics as far as colouring the water is concerned. Nor am I advocating that we should start having huge areas of irrigated pasture, grasslands or playing fields, but they are likely to use less water than the scrublands and will create less soil erosion once they are established. Anyone who thinks that through will agree.

We have in our society a group of people that has the ear of the press and has the single-minded purpose of preventing any more homes being built in the Hills. Those people are saying that there should be no more people in the Hills except those who want to go mushrooming on someone else's property or touring through the area doing other things—but when the locals do it they are terrible contaminators of the environment.

I will now briefly address the issue of the Estimates Committees. I believe we have reached a stage where I should advocate something that I tried to move in this House a few years ago. At that stage the proposal did not relate to the Estimates Committees. My proposition is that we should have independent people chairing the committees. I do not want to reflect on individuals, but it is very difficult if one has a similar philosophy to be tough on Ministers of the day—and usually chairpersons have the same philosophy as the Ministers of the day—and to tell them to cut their answers short or answer questions directly. I believe one person does do that; I gave him credit for that, and refer to the member for Elizabeth. However, that could be done more strictly.

I also find it difficult not to advocate what I have advocated for many years; that is, that at some time in the future the Parliament should move to have an independent Speaker. I do not say that as a reflection upon you, Sir. I believe that the people who have the right to vote should all be on the floor of the House, as happens in some other Parliaments, and only where there is a tied vote—and that is unlikely to happen if all members are present in a 47-seat House or an odd numbered House—would a Speaker have a vote. In those circumstances I think it would be accepted that the Speaker would vote for the *status quo*, if there were a *status quo*. I think that will eventually come about.

I wish to address another area that worried me throughout the Estimates Committees. I do not believe that the people's representatives now have an opportunity to properly represent their constituents. I do not think it is possible for an elected member of Parliament to get the information that he or she needs, either through the process of the Estimates Committees or from the Ministers or their departments.

The bureaucracy is now so big and powerful that it is too difficult to get information and one can be fobbed off and told not a lie but a half truth—and a half truth told with bad intent is worse than all the lies that one can invent—so that members cannot get to the bottom of the issue in question. That is sad because we are paid—an amount that people think is too much—to try to get that information.

I heard the Premier say recently that Ministers are overloaded and perhaps, as the Minister for Emergency Services said, we need a system more like that in Western Australia, which has five more members than South Australia. The offices of the individual members of Parliament are understaffed. It is ridiculous to have one person who is supposed to help a member of Parliament with his or her research and all the other things that go on. That is another reason why members cannot contact departments. One telephones the department and the officer concerned is out, at a conference or at a meeting. It is no good ringing after Friday lunch time—one is even lucky to get them before lunch time on Monday—and members are in Parliament on the other days. That is regrettable.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to comment on three subjects relating to the Estimates Committees. First, I refer to what the budget has really done for South Australia because, indeed, the Estimates Committees process is a means of enhancing the information contained in the budget papers and of tearing away some of the gross figures and understanding what is happening at the coalface in terms of the distribution of resources via the budget.

One thing we did establish quite clearly is that the budget is an absolute fraud. That was well known before, but it was emphasised and confirmed during the Estimates Committees. Importantly, there is no provision for contingencies, round sum allowances or the possibility that something may go wrong in the wage negotiations; nor, indeed, is there provision for costs that could blow out for whatever reason. Against the background of no such provisions, we have already seen that in at least three areas the budget simply cannot sustain itself.

We have seen that in the example of the police wages, where the Minister freely admitted that the wages will be paid because that was the determination of the tribunal and he then went scrambling for an answer and said, 'It will come from somewhere and we have reached an agreement.' Of course I do not believe he is telling the truth. A judgment had been made and that judgment cut across the Government's wages strategy, and because there was no contingency allowance there was no allowance for additional moneys to be paid for the increased police wages. Nor was there any understanding that some money would have to be made available to meet the guarantees made to SAFA as a result of those mortgage transfers to prop up the State Bank.

When the \$970 million, or \$1.14 billion worth of paper which was discounted to \$970 million, was transferred as asset backing for the State Bank bail-out, there was a guaranteed return of 13.1 per cent. Of course, that did not take account of any downward movement in interest rates. There has been a downward movement of interest rates on average of at least 1 per cent since that guarantee was given. Therefore, the Government now has to decide whether it leaves the poor people to burn—and indeed pay the highest housing interest rates in the market for people who can least afford it—or whether it lives up honourably to its obligation in respect of these new home buyers who are paying very

high housing interest rates and find more money for the budget that does not exist because there is no contingency allowance.

We also know that the variety of estimates in respect of the rate of inflation that will prevail in this State vary considerably. The national estimate varies between 3.3 and 3.5 per cent. The State estimate on which the budget is based is a rate of 2.5 per cent, and the State Bank estimate for South Australia is 5.5 per cent. I understand the budget estimate relates more to the movement in money wages rather than the inflation index as such but, if one looks at budgets over a period, we find that blow-outs happen to coincide more closely with the inflation rate than changes in wages.

There is a good reason for that: normally there is a back-up from the Commonwealth in respect of inflationary figures. The budget is fraudulent in that it does not add up, and it does not add up for a whole range of reasons. Importantly, it is a deficit funded budget, a budget that is shallow because it does not meet the obligations imposed by the \$2.2 billion bail-out. We have heard a great deal about that in the Parliament in the past month, both in the Estimates Committees and the budget debate. It has to be emphasised that the budget does not do the job that South Australia needs, and it does not do it from an important perspective. Leaving aside the dollars and cents, the issue that must be foremost in people's minds is what will happen to the future economy of the State, and what will happen to jobs in this State?

Shortly we will be debating payroll tax but, before we do, it is useful to remind members what a serious deterioration in employment levels has occurred in South Australia. I refer to last year's figures. In August this year we had 643 000 employed persons and an unemployment rate of 10.3 per cent seasonally adjusted. In August 1990 we had 665 600 people employed and an unemployment rate of 8 per cent. As to participation rates, we have also lost 1.5 per cent of the population, the number having fallen from 63.5 per cent to 62 per cent, which is a dramatic deterioration. If we look at the fall-off in relative terms, it is a 25 per cent change in the status of unemployment in this State, which is quite horrific in the space of just 12 months. Understanding the background and the circumstances with which we are faced, we then go to the budget to see what it is doing to improve the situation.

Mr Brindal: You'll be looking for a long time.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As the member for Hayward so succinctly says, we will be looking for a long time, because there is not one ounce of hope in this budget that the Government even understands what the problem is or is willing to address it. I go back to the question of taxation, the area that must be addressed if South Australia is ever going to provide jobs in the future for its children. The Government estimates that the land tax take will be the same this year as it was last year, namely \$76 million, yet property values have fallen on average 20 per cent in the commercial and industrial ranges.

Another area that impacts directly on employment in this State is payroll tax. Last year we collected \$473 million in payroll tax and this year's estimate is \$512 million, an 8 per cent increase against a background of inflation running at 2.5 per cent, 3.5 per cent or 5.5 per cent, depending on which figure one takes. This is at a time when we need to encourage the employing population of South Australia, yet all we are doing is increasing taxation. The debts tax is now being collected on South Australia's behalf by the Commonwealth, and receipts have increased considerably because of the full year impact of the changeover. As to the

financial institutions duty, the .04 to .1 increase is dramatic and this year we see a predicted increase from \$92.3 million to \$115 million. Stamp duties impact on both personal and business affairs and are predicted to rise from \$305 million last year to \$331 million this year.

If we look at other areas, such as petroleum taxation, which is going up from \$70.1 million to \$85.9 million, and liquor licensing fees, which are expected to increase by a relatively small \$1.6 million, the overall picture is one of a greater burden on the people who will be providing for our future. There is no understanding whatever by the Government opposite of the real complexities we face and the disastrous impacts of the Government's own policies, or the disastrous impact of Federal policies and ultimately how we will survive and grow as a State and nation over the next few years.

Certainly, no semblance of understanding is contained in the budget papers. If we go through the budget reports, the Program Estimates and the individual figures, we find that there is no attempt to change the system in a way that will assist South Australia. There is not even any help on behalf of those people who would like to be less regulated and less affected by back door taxation. In that respect I refer to the 800 charges that were increased on 27 June. Again, the Government believes that it can induce prosperity by taxing this State and South Australian employers. That is fundamentally wrong and the sooner we get rid of the Government the better off everyone will be.

The issue of jobs must be pre-eminent in any consideration by any Government. It is the most critical aspect. Without jobs and without future economic progress we are doomed as a State and a nation to live in mediocrity. Such action involves fundamental changes, which have been outlined to the House before, yet we did not see one of those changes in the budget speech. We did not see one change contained within the Estimates of Expenditure. We have seen no undertakings to clean up the transport system or the wharves or to create a new regime in respect of industrial arrangements and agreements. We have seen none of those. The Government has not got the dollars and cents right, nor the atmosphere.

Leaving that issue aside—and it is one of the most vital issues impacting on this State—I would like to take up some of the issues that came out in the Estimates Committees. In particular, as I mentioned previously, in questioning the Premier and Treasurer a number of interesting aspects were brought to the fore. They included the fact that the budget simply was not hanging together, and that there is not the level of support for the MFP from the Federal Government that we would expect, given that Adelaide is the chosen site on behalf of Australia.

I remind members that for the 1992-93 and 1993-94 financial years the Federal Government is placing only \$3 million in each of those years in the hands of the State Government to allow it to get on with the job of establishing the MFP in South Australia. It is a disgrace for a national project deemed to be of considerable importance to this State when the Federal Government will provide only \$3 million to put into that project.

As the member for Flinders so rightly pointed out, when we are laying blame as to where the State Bank's problems have emanated from and are ascribing some degree of culpability, it is interesting to note that, looking at the firms that play a part in the \$2.2 billion disaster or the \$4.5 billion non-performing loans, 38 per cent of them emanate from South Australia, which is supposed to be the area of operation of the State Bank. Of course, the remainder of it is either interstate or overseas, so 62 per cent of them emanate

from beyond our borders by our so-called wise entrepreneurs.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, that could be true. Of course, as the member for Flinders pointed out, with all the problems facing the rural economy, the terrible poverty which is now descending on our farming community and the great overload of debts and the high interest rates that prevailed for a number of years with very low returns on grain, wheat and meat, the fact is that, in the State Bank crisis, only 3 per cent can be attributed to that source. They are the people who deserved some help but who got no help because of the way in which the Premier ran the finances of this State and, in particular, looked after the needs of South Australia. Of course he did not do that: he was negligent and, in fact, the farming community would have and should have been helped if, indeed, the money had been available but, of course, that has not been the case.

We had the revelation that there are now 76 off balance sheet companies of the State Bank. We have had various estimates, and we do not know whether this latest estimate has come to the fore, but I have put a question on notice to ensure that we get the 76 names. So, if there are more names to tick off later, it will just be one more piece of the saga in respect of information provided to this House. SGIC paid \$45 million for Centrepoint, and it is now worth \$20.2 million. I estimated the figure to be \$18 million, and I was slightly conservative but, of course, even on my basic estimate, that figure was pretty well in the ballpark and, of course, some very serious questions must be asked about the way in which that deal was put together.

We noted the interesting revelations about 333 Collins Street, Melbourne, the \$50 million interest per annum, the stamp duty of \$13 million and, of course, the collect on that property being only \$6 million a year because of the rent holidays that will be provided to fill the premises. We noted that SAFA gets \$35 million to \$40 million a year out of usury. That means that, by taking a premium percentage off the top (whether it is borrowing or lending), it gets somewhere between \$35 million to \$40 million. That process must be questioned in terms of the funds made available because, obviously, there is an additional cost to the receiving agents, whether they be State Government departments or statutory authorities. Again, we questioned the Premier on HomeStart without any satisfactory results or even an indication that the Premier intended to relieve the burden on people paying high interest rates.

I would like to address the Estimates Committees very briefly. Some Ministers submitted themselves to the process of examination in a fair and open fashion, and we had excellent chairmanship by the member for Elizabeth in facilitating the good workings of those Committees. If some Ministers were a little bit reluctant to do the proper and right thing, the member for Elizabeth attempted, successfully in most cases, to bring those Ministers to order. In the other case, we saw a number of very regrettable examples of Ministers who did not submit themselves properly and, by the way that they approached the Estimates Committees, they showed their incapacity as Ministers of the State.

If a Minister could not perform, the approach was to waste the time of the Committee. They were there to respond to questions from their side of the House which were inconsequential and which involved very long, detailed and, in most cases, meaningless answers. Heading the list was, of course, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, closely followed by the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage; closely followed by the Minister of Water Resources; closely followed by the Minister of Employment and Further Educa-

tion; closely followed by the Minister of Mines and Energy; and, on occasions, the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

Those Ministers did not actually cover themselves with a great deal of glory. They felt so intimidated by the process that they decided they would waste the time of the Committees and tie them up with useless rhetoric or, indeed, make statements best made by press release. They stand condemned. I would hope that, by next year, they will have improved their performance to the extent that they will see it as a very positive process, whereby they can demonstrate their skill and understanding of their portfolio areas, do justice to them and not be afraid that the Opposition will suddenly find out that they are not doing their job; or if they are doing their job, that they are not doing it very adequately.

Mr Brindal: You are too much of an optimist.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My friend and colleague the member for Hayward suggests that I am too much of an optimist. If there is no improvement, there will be change, and I will be researching areas of improvement to Estimates Committees, because they are indeed a breath of fresh air compared to a sitting of the whole House. There are a number of areas in which they commend themselves, including the capacity to talk through the Ministers to the heads of departments. I believe that that process can be much enhanced. There is a great deal of merit to the process, but it can always be improved. With those few words, I support the motion.

Motion carried.

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

That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PAY-ROLL TAX (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 29 August. Page 636.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support the Bill before the House. I will be as brief as possible in my remarks during the second reading debate, because I believe that the matters that need to be canvassed must be canvassed in Committee in areas where there may be some concerns or problems in relation to the legislation. In supporting the Bill, I note that the Government is providing some small element of relief to a beleaguered employing sector of our population and, in fact, the most important employing sector of our population, the private sector, and those who are subject to paying payroll tax. I do not believe that the relief provided in the Bill is anywhere near adequate. Indeed, if I was quite cynical I would say that it is but a very minor sop to the employing fraternity of this State, and meant to stave off the criticism that this Government so richly deserves.

In the process, let us put this in perspective. It is estimated that during this financial year there will be an increase from \$473 million to \$512 million in the payroll taxation take by the State Government. As I said in the previous debate, that is an increase of 8 per cent against a background of inflation of about 4 per cent. There is no real relief. Indeed, if the extra \$10 million had been collected, had this reduction not been made, of course the percentage would have been somewhat larger, but it would still not be significant.

In addressing this measure, I will say that it is the only relief that has been provided in the whole budget. In my previous contribution I mentioned all the areas of taxation affecting the business community that have gone up in this budget against a background of declining employment and prosperity, but I did not mention the record small business bankruptcies.

So there is no real relief for the employing population of this State, at a time when they need it most. In respect of payroll tax, the rate will decline from 6.25 per cent to 6.10 per cent, to take effect from 1 December 1991. The exemption level is to be raised. This is one promise that has been kept by the Premier. It will be raised from \$432 000 to \$444 000 on 1 January 1992, and to \$456 000 on 1 July 1992. This is a 5.5 per cent changeover for the year, which is in advance of inflation. From that point of view, there is some element of relief.

On the issue of whether the other provisions are appropriate and proper, most of that debate will be left until the Committee stage. I will only make the observation now that some of these provisions that have been placed in here have been enacted in other States and subject to considerable litigation, and we are still unsure whether these latest provisions will stand the test of time.

There are general anti-avoidance provisions in the Bill, which give the Commissioner of Taxation the right to deem that contracts of employment or wages paid for employing people in various ways come under the provisions of the Payroll Tax Act. That is a strengthening of the Act, of course, but it allows the Commissioner to wield a very large amount of power, and that power has to be wielded very wisely. I note, for example, that superannuation payments that cannot be claimed against income tax, that is the provision of a nest egg that a person might be setting aside for the future, do come under the general provisions of the Act.

Looking at this from the point of view of the background of payroll tax, we could say, as the Premier has said, that it is the first time in a very long time, for 20 years, or whatever, that payroll tax has been reduced. We hope that this is the first of a number of steps to reduce the burden. I know that the Premier shares the belief of the Liberal Opposition that payroll tax is a tax on employment, that it is a retardant on growth and that, if possible, it should be reduced as far as humanly possible, to allow employment growth to take place. So we have taken one step and I hope it will be one of many. I am hopeful that if a goods and services tax enters the Federal arena we can trade-off payroll tax in the process, and indeed reduce the costs of employing in this State and in every other State.

As regards where we have been in relation to payroll tax collections since the Government has been in power, I note that in 1982-83 payroll tax collections amounted to \$220.8 million. In 1990-91, \$473 million was collected—an increase of 112 per cent, and this was against a background of inflation of 76 per cent. So, payroll tax collections have exceeded inflation by a factor of about 70 per cent, and that is wrong and is regrettable, particularly in the current circumstances. I believe that that is all I need to say in the second reading debate. I support the Bill. It is heading us in the right direction. For the first time in 20 years it does give some semblance of relief, even though last year there was a huge and massive increase in payroll tax rates. I am hopeful that this is the start of a general reduction of the burden that is placed on employers in this State.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance): I thank the Deputy Leader for his support for the second reading.

I thought he was particularly ungenerous in his description of this measure. It will save employers of this State \$13.5 million. Had the measure not been enacted that would have been an additional cost to employers this year. I note that employers were far more generous in their praise of the Government than was the Deputy Leader. I am pleased that the employers have recognised that the Government is doing whatever is possible within our means to lift the burden of what is conceded by everyone to be a very onerous and unfair tax. Unfortunately, no-one has been able to come up with an alternative. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that he would be asking some questions in Committee, so at this stage I thank him for his support for the second reading on behalf of the Opposition.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Insertion of ss.4 to 4c.'

New section 4—'Application of Act to service contracts.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I make a preliminary observation that, when speaking in the second reading debate about the changes in the tax take or changes in the scope of the Bill, I did say that the measure was in place largely in other States and that it had been the subject of litigation. My first observation, then, relates to the litigation in relation to a number of matters on the question of what is a contract of service and how such a contract is affected under this legislation. Information has been given to me about *Odco Pty Ltd v The Accident Compensation Commission* (1990) VR 178 (the Troubleshooters Case), and also there was the case *Mayne Nickless Ltd v McIntosh* (1989) VR 878. In these cases the matters were contested, as to whether indeed a person came within the ambit of the Act or whether the wages paid to particular contractors came within the ambit of the Act.

I note that some of these matters have been taken as far as the High Court. Has the Minister managed to read these cases, affecting the State of Victoria and indeed some of its citizens? Has the Minister read the various judgments, which I have available to me here, and has he formed a conclusion on whether the provisions that are now prescribed under proposed new section 4 of the Act indeed cover some of the concerns that were expressed even during the High Court summing up of the case before it? Even though it found that the employees were covered, there was some expression of concern that, at least with the Victorian legislation, the wording of the Act was very clumsy and indeed that it was subject to individual interpretation. Has the Minister checked on the facts of those cases?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Not personally. It would not necessarily mean anything to me if I did. Like the Deputy Leader, I am not legally trained, so therefore it would not necessarily mean terribly much. However, I do have advisers who have read these judgments and have taken them into consideration when issuing instructions to have these provisions drafted.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will cite a note that I have been given about new section 4. It states:

Neither the report nor the explanation of this clause provides much assistance as to why it is introduced or its justification. It is obviously directed to the practice of some employers avoiding the payment of payroll tax by the engagement of new staff as contractors rather than employees.

We do not have any difficulty where there are false contracts in place, with the fact that they should be covered. The note continues:

Obviously if the proposals were merely limited to adoption of avoidance practices subject to there being no unintended consequences, there would be little debate on this particular issue. However, the provision appears to have been cast considerably

wider. It is cast in the widest possible terms and then attempts to exclude certain transactions.

Initially it deals with this by a number of general provisions, from new section 4 (1) to new section 4 (2) (d). In new section 4 (2) (e) we have the provisions that exempt carriers, insurance salesmen and door-to-door sellers of goods from the provisions of the legislation. However, in the building industry (and the Minister as a former Minister of Industrial Relations would be well aware of this) there have been many attempts over a period of time to class subcontractors as employees. This legislation satisfies that requirement in a way that has not previously applied. That is something we have fought against over a long period. Why has a very selective list been chosen for exemption, that list including insurance salesmen, door-to-door salesmen and carriers, and why have not large industries, such as the building industry, also been exempted where there is a clear case of subcontractors providing a major source of the work in that industry?

I also make the observation that the legislation now obliterates the difference between 'contract for service' and 'contracts of service'. In other words, contracts of service cover contracts of employment; that was discussed previously and we believe it is appropriate. Contracts for services, however, are a different matter, and we note that the distinction that has always been recognised within the law has now been taken away. I would like the Minister's comments on that.

Another difficulty in new section 4, which is the toughest provision in this legislation because it is the longest, is the interpretation of 'payable'. Previously, contracts that were payable could be deemed to be payable at the point of first contract, which means that the majority of the contract still remained to be paid out, yet the liability for payroll tax under these provisions—and they are not clear—could be deemed at the end of the financial year. There were amounts outstanding as being payable at the time. I would like that matter clarified.

New section 4 (2) provides:

A service contract for the purposes of this section does not include a contract—

(a) where the services are ancillary—

(i) to the supply of goods by the person supplying the services;

Of course, it does not take into account the provision of services by a person who is not directly associated with the provision of the goods. Indeed, in the case of the installation of a large plant, somebody may be contracted to install that plant; or, in the installation of a large computer, a person may be contracted to provide the software or the installation over a period exceeding 90 days. That matters remains to be answered. Does new section 4 (2) (a) mean that, if goods are provided, be it a large plant or computer, and if someone is hired to come and make that thing work, that situation falls under these provisions?

I would like the Minister's comment on new section 4 (2) (b)—and this is one of the most fascinating sections of the Act. I understand that it is the Government's intention to catch people such as cleaners. Will the Minister confirm that, if a husband and wife team clean premises, the person who employs that team will not pay payroll tax? However, if only the husband cleans the premises and the wife stays home, for example, will the employer then pay payroll tax, (because that is what this section provides)? Will the Minister reflect on the stupidity of the provision in the first place?

There is a distinction in the Act between a determination and an assessment in that a person who is unhappy with the determination of a Taxation Commissioner can appeal

only against the assessment but cannot appeal against the determination. This is highly relevant to the sections we are considering; it may well be a technicality that includes people in or omits them from those sections. I have a number of other questions, but they are minor compared with those I have outlined to the Committee. I apologise to the Minister, but there is no other way of getting the point across, because we are allowed only three questions on each clause of the Bill.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As he stated at the beginning of his contribution, the Deputy Leader was reading a document; I assume it was drawn up by one of his colleagues in the Upper House. I have no argument with that but it is just not possible to reply to or even to locate, half the time, the questions in the statements. To write them down and to respond to them in this manner is just not practicable. I do not think it is proper or fair that I have to conduct a debate with the Hon. Trevor Griffin or whoever it was who drew up the statement in this way. I will examine those questions and, when the Bill is before the Upper House, the Hon. Trevor Griffin can have the debate with the Hon. Chris Sumner. Had I been given the courtesy of a copy of the written statement that the Deputy Leader has just read out, it would have assisted me enormously in responding to the questions.

In general terms, all I can say at this stage on the questions that have been asked is that generally the provisions are in line with the provisions that have been enacted in at least one other State, perhaps more. They are somebody's opinion until they are tested. They have been tested or are in the process of being tested in other jurisdictions. My advisers have taken account of the various decisions handed down, and I can assure the Committee that what the Government is doing is attempting to close loopholes and not in any way to entrap people who quite properly would not be caught by payroll tax provisions.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Some quite complex matters have been raised; I would be happy if the Minister gave an undertaking that he will have the matters I have raised reviewed before this matter is debated in the other place and that the Minister, presumably the Attorney-General, will report on those matters during debate in another place.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thought I already had.

New section agreed to.

New section 4a—'Employment agents.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This is somewhat easier to address, because I have only one question. It deals with a possible anomaly when tax is properly paid in circumstances where, by actions of faith, somebody has taken tax either within the ambit or outside the ambit of payroll tax because of an arrangement with an employing agency. This provision does not address employers who use the services of an employment agency where their taxable wages do not cross the threshold. In other words, they will be paying payroll tax indirectly in respect of wages on which they themselves would never have been taxed.

Does the Minister agree that that is an anomaly? In New South Wales, for example, it appears that the principal obligation under a similar provision has been imposed on the employer obtaining the services of the agency. However, there is a scheme in operation to allow the parties to elect that the agency will pay the payroll tax. This has been set under Payroll Tax Ruling PT 16 of that State's Revenue Office. This arrangement appears to be outside the legislation. It is a matter whether, because of the different relationship with an employment agency, people are brought under the payroll tax legislation.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: My answer is no, there is no anomaly.

New section agreed to.

New section 4b—'Third party payments.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I make the observation that I am not aware of any equivalent provision in other jurisdictions. This provision seems to have come out of the blue; I understand that it is not repeated in the Victorian or New South Wales legislation. The provision deals with two different situations, first where an amount is paid or payable to a person other than the employee under an arrangement; in those circumstances, the amount of the payment is deemed to be wages. The second situation is where the payment is made by a third party to an employee, such a payment also being deemed to be wages. The example referred to is WorkCover paying wages as a third party, but there are other examples, say, a heat and eat place. It may hire a person to run the galley and the contracting party may pay the wages of the galley worker directly, whereas the contract is with the person supplying the heat and eat services. Can the Minister confirm whether the provision covers both those examples?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am having a great deal of difficulty understanding the questions.

Mr S.J. Baker: It is very complex.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is not just the complexity of it; it may well be the author of the script from which the honourable member is reading. As regards the observation that was made by the Deputy Leader regarding third party payments, I point out that such a provision applies in other jurisdictions, I am advised, albeit in a slightly different form.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Under those circumstances, I will not pursue that point.

New section agreed to.

New section 4c—'Agreement, etc., to reduce or avoid liability to payroll tax.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This is a very important provision, probably one of the most important in the Bill. It provides that the Commissioner can do virtually what he likes if he suspects that someone is fiddling with their payroll tax obligations and avoiding their responsibilities. So, my first question is why the word 'suspicion' was used when the new section provides:

The Commissioner has reason to believe or suspect that the purpose of the agreement, arrangement or transaction is to reduce or avoid the liability of any person to the assessment, imposition or payment of payroll tax.

Would the Minister be amenable at some later stage, perhaps when the Bill is before the other House, to the rewording of that new section to provide:

The Commissioner determines on proper grounds that the purpose of the agreement, arrangement or transaction is to reduce or avoid the liability of any party to the arrangement.

The difference is that there must be concrete objective grounds for the Commissioner to use this provision. It is a very powerful provision; it gives the Commissioner ultimate rights to determine matters that could quite dramatically affect people's employing status and the money that has to be paid to the Taxation Commissioner. Under the circumstances, is it appropriate that those words be changed to ensure the Commissioner does not have an overriding power and a power that could be abused? I believe it is appropriate.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Any amendment that is moved to any piece of legislation, whether in this House or in another place, would get full consideration by the Government. As regards the second question, I can only make the observation again that there is an appeal provision and the Payroll Tax Appeal Tribunal is, of course, available to

anyone who feels aggrieved or that the Commissioner is not acting in a proper manner.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Having read the provisions, I am concerned at what point the Commissioner's deeming provision actually comes into effect. The reason I raise this issue is that under this provision the Commissioner can say that a contract of employment obligates the employer in this case to pay payroll tax and that person has not been paying payroll tax. Under this section 4c, is it possible that that person's liability for payroll tax will be taken back to, for example, 1 January, when this Act comes into force, and should we amend section 4c (1) (d) to read, 'determine that any party to the agreement, arrangement or transaction will, from the date of the determination, be taken to be an employer for the purposes of this Act'?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is possible, because what we are dealing with here is tax avoidance. But, again, I point out that the Payroll Tax Appeal Tribunal is there if the person is not satisfied. Of course, a person can take the issue to court for determination in the usual manner. However, again, I give an undertaking to the Committee to have all these questions examined prior to the debate in another place, should the Bill pass this House.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thank the Minister for that undertaking because it is a worthwhile addition, given that the Minister has received that additional power. Just to emphasise my point, the Act already provides penalties for tax avoidance. Under these circumstances, we are dealing with unclear cases where the Commissioner has to use his or her deeming provision to be able to apply that tax. So, we are not dealing with a clear case of tax avoidance in these circumstances.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Similar Acts in a majority of other States have an identical provision.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—'Application of amendments.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Why does the legislation not allow a right of appeal against a determination as well as against the assessment? The Minister would be well aware that in other jurisdictions there is a right to appeal against the determination in the first place that a person is liable for taxation as well as the assessment of that taxation—the ingredients that make up the assessment. It does not apply in South Australia. Given the complexities of these amendments, will the Minister explain why we do not have that provision in South Australia, and will he consider the inclusion of that provision, because it is different from appeal against an assessment?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There has been wide consultation on this Bill and it is ongoing. The particular provisions to which the Deputy Leader refers are the subject of ongoing discussions with affected parties with the aim of bringing in some new provisions to cover this area at some stage. So, the Bill is sufficient for the day and, as I understand it, the industry agrees with that. However, the provisions are not considered totally satisfactory and I expect that in the not too distant future there will be an amending Bill dealing with some of the issues raised by the Deputy Leader.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 10 October at 11 a.m.