

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 February 1992

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

GAMING MACHINES BILL

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

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION BILL

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

PETITION: PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARES

A petition signed by 17 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 the Hon. J. C. Bannon.

Petition received.

PETITION: BRIGHTON POLICE STATION

A petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to establish a police station at Brighton was presented by Mr Matthew. Petition received.

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 74, 155, 191, 257 and 285; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

RURAL ASSISTANCE ADJUSTMENT

In reply to **Mr MEIER (Goyder)** 11 September.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: How many farms have been sold in South Australia in the past three months because of their lack of viability? The banks will not release the number of sales that they have been involved in due to non-viability as they consider the background to each sale confidential. This stance could be expected from any banker-customer relationship. What I can tell you is that in the period from 1 June 1991 to 12 September 1991 the South Australian Department of Lands has recorded 130 sales of rural land designated Primary production. This information however, does not indicate viability. This information is available by local government area and I would be happy to provide the member for Goyder with a detailed summary of the transactions or a full copy of the Department of Lands report, which comprises some 115 pages.

'How many farmers have successfully sought carry-on finance under the revised part B of the rural assistance adjustment scheme?' I have been advised that as at 30 November 1991 there have been 147 applications for the interest subsidy provided under Part

B. Of these, 87 have been approved with the total subsidy paid being \$457 856, 46 have been declined as they did not meet the criteria and 14 are pending. I should point out that carry-on finance is not provided as capital lending under Part B, but is a part of the scheme that was announced by the Premier on 30 April 1991 and provides a combination of interest rate subsidies of 5 per cent on carry-on lending and 2 per cent on existing debts up to a maximum of \$10 000 to be made available to farmers, who would not have been otherwise able to obtain finance from the banks.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Citrus Industry Act 1991—Regulations—General.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Regulations—Obscuring
Number Plates.

Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulation—Traffic
Infringement Notices—Obscuring Number Plates.
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Applications to Lease,
22 January 1992.

By the Minister of Correctional Services (Hon. Frank
Blevins)—
Correctional Services Act 1982—Regulation—Urinaly-
sis.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education
(Hon. M.D. Rann)—
Local Government Finance Authority Act 1983—Regu-
lation—Mannum District Hospital Inc.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier give an absolute assurance that the State Bank Royal Commission will not be curtailed in any way and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, the Government has no intention of curtailing the State Bank Royal Commission, but I would imagine that all honourable members, the public and, indeed, those involved in the commission would like to see it conclude its operations as quickly as possible. Unfortunately, the illness of the Commissioner has resulted in a delay (exactly how long has yet to be determined) and the Auditor-General's inquiries, which relate specifically to the third term of reference in the Royal Commission's terms of reference, have also taken much longer than was anticipated.

That has been further complicated by certain legal action that has been taken by the bank in the interests of natural justice, so it is quite clear that the royal commission's proceedings and the Auditor-General's investigations will take longer than anticipated. That is not in the interests of South Australia and it is certainly not in the interests of the bank, which is trying to continue to trade its way out of its problems. Therefore, I am sure that members will welcome any means whereby we can ensure that the proceedings could be brought to a conclusion as quickly as possible while at the same time ensuring that all those matters are thoroughly and adequately investigated.

These matters are in the hands of the Attorney-General. Therefore, I will certainly convey the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition to the Attorney-General. But, as far as the Government is concerned, we have not sought, nor would we seek, to curtail those investigations. If there are any suggestions as to where they might be accomplished

more efficiently or effectively in these circumstances, obviously the Attorney will look at them.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I ask the Minister of Health: what progress has been made to date in the implementation of the Physiotherapists Act? Further, will this measure eliminate the work currently done by sports trainers and will it be illegal for sports trainers to work on injuries at venues such as football matches as well as being involved as part of an ongoing treatment?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member gave me prior warning of this question, so I have a brief but quite detailed answer for him. The Act is not yet in force. It is expected to be in force at the end of the first half of this year. Work on the preparation of regulations and restructuring of the board is well advanced. The board, not the Minister, will be administering the Act. The new legislation, in defining massage and masseur, provides—no pun intended—some loosening up, and I draw the attention of the House to section 26 of the legislation.

First, it establishes an obligation to be registered and makes it an offence for an unregistered person to practise physiotherapy for fee or reward. However, it exempts certain classes of person, and the important aspect is section 26 (2) (e) which states:

A person who practises physiotherapy only by reason that he or she massages another or provides advice related to massage would be in the exempt classes of person.

It goes on to talk about trainers of a sporting team, club or organisation in the circumstances outlined in section 26 (2) (f). The situation is fairly clear: in the normal circumstances of a rub-down at half time or at the end of a football game, there is no problem at all under the Act. Where a person started to give very detailed advice, which really came under the medical field, that person could well open themselves up to some degree of concern by the board, because they would, in effect, be acting as some sort of medical practitioner.

STATE BANK ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier agree that any curtailment of the State Bank royal commission after the first two terms of reference will prevent public examination of the manner in which the board discharged its responsibilities and lead to speculation about attempts to cover up important matters which this Parliament has unanimously agreed ought to be dealt with in public before a royal commission? The third term of reference contemplates that the Royal Commissioner will not only receive the report of the Auditor-General but also make any other inquiries he deems are necessary to report on the manner in which the board discharged its responsibilities. When legislation to facilitate the royal commission was before the Parliament last March, the Attorney-General said that 'the relationship between the board and the chief executive officer is another matter which should be dealt with by the royal commission'. I have been advised that this will be possible only if the royal commission hears evidence under term three.

When he announced the terms of reference on 4 March last year, the Attorney-General said, 'It is essential we find out the processes leading up to the bank's massive debts, and how we can avoid making the same mistakes in the

future.' Much of the evidence about those processes can be dealt with only under term three.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Under the guise of a question, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is putting, essentially, a particular point of view about the conduct of the royal commission. He is perfectly entitled to have that point of view. At great public expense the Opposition is represented before the royal commission and these matters are appropriately—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Leader is obviously intent on trying to get over this concept that the Leader needs enhancing by a strong Deputy Leader: it is very interesting to see. The solution to the leadership problems of the Opposition are apparently now to be found in the Deputy's hand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Premier resume his seat. Both sides of the House are out of order, given the interjections and the noise raised. I point out to the Premier that Standing Order No. 96 prevents debate in response to a question, and I ask him to comply with the Standing Order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I take your point, Mr Speaker. I did err in responding to the interjections and speculating as to the reason why the Deputy Leader was trying to show that he had life in him, because he has already been written off as somebody who has not. The member for Coles is necessary to bring new life to the leadership—an exciting move that would be very popular. I suggest that the Deputy Leader should control—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call on the Deputy Leader, there must be order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you have given a ruling about the scope of debate, and the Premier has gone against your ruling.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will make that decision. I would draw the Premier's attention to that Standing Order and ask him to comply with it, not debating in his response.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I note all his colleagues coming to his defence. To get back to the question, this is a matter that obviously the Attorney and the Commissioner will discuss, coming to some appropriate resolution.

PUBLIC ACCESS TO PASTORAL LANDS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Lands advise the House on that progress of agreement for public access to pastoral areas in the Flinders Ranges?

The Hon. S.M. LEHENAN: I thank the honourable member for her ongoing interest in this matter, and I can certainly give an update on the whole question of access to pastoral areas. Recently, I released documents outlining a proposed network of tracks providing access to pastoral areas within the Flinders Ranges. The proposed routes of these tracks were determined following an extensive period of consultation and meetings with affected pastoral lessees, indeed I think with every interest group that has either expressed some concern or felt that they should have some input into the designation of these access tracks.

The draft network of access routes is marked into three categories: those where no significant problems are envisaged; those which are acceptable in principle but which will still require discussions with lessees on site-specific issues, such as the bypassing of stockyards, etc; and those where the routes cause significant or unresolvable problems that are likely to lead to their deletion.

In identifying these three categories, I would like to pay tribute to the people who have been involved, and I am sure, as the local member will attest, it has been a very long and involved process. There are still some key, general policy issues to be resolved, including questions of maintenance, liability and, indeed, camping, because I think these are things we must have resolved as quickly as we can. The Pastoral Board—the new Chairman of which, Mr John Bromell, I met this morning—has agreed that the final network will not be gazetted until agreement has been reached on these issues with the United Farmers and Stockowners Association and the Conservation Council of South Australia.

I am aware that many members share with me my concern that it has taken some time to actually get the first of the access routes to this stage. However, I believe that the consultative process and the way in which we have gone about it in looking at the Flinders Ranges will serve as a model for other areas within the pastoral lands. I would like to give the House an assurance that I am keen to get this whole matter resolved as quickly as possible, not only through the Pastoral Board but also in consultation with the UF&S and the Conservation Council.

STATE BANK ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Premier agree that the Attorney-General misled the Parliament when he said last Wednesday:

The Government did not make the decision to call the royal commission before the Opposition decided to propose it.

The minutes of a meeting that the Premier had with the Under Treasurer, Mr Emery, and other Treasury officials on 4 February, more than a week before the royal commission announcement, record the Premier as saying:

Royal commission will come later and we will have it.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know what minutes the honourable member is referring to, but there is no question that, in relation to the State Bank problems, the concept of some sort of investigation by the Auditor-General or by royal commission was under consideration, and it would have been quite wrong if it had not been. In fact, the action we took was to commission the Auditor-General under that section of the Act—the powers that the Auditor-General has—to conduct an investigation.

The Attorney-General did not mislead the House at all. It is a fact that on day one when the Parliament convened on this mode as a kind of grandstanding effort by the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, he is guffawing—the man who needs his leadership enhanced. What is he carrying on about? Rather than, in fact, looking at the situation in any kind of balanced way, he leapt in with his strident call for a royal commission, which would have made that fairly inevitable. The Attorney-General did not get it wrong. There is no question of the way in which this developed. The Opposition jumped right in, hard and with full boots and, in fact, if the Government had not been prepared to move for the establishment of a royal commission, no doubt

the Leader of the Opposition would do so. I remember him ingenuously asking me a question about whether this would be possible, or is it an appropriate way to do it, knowing full well that he was sitting on a release in which he was going to rush out to the media after Question Time, big deal himself and call for it. The question was a bodgie one. It was a complete set-up, and he got a lot of egg on his face. And he has had much more since.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Bragg is probably hoping that it is actually not the person sitting on his immediate left but himself who will vault into this Deputy Leader position.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The leadership can be enhanced—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leadership is not in question here.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suspect it is hoped that the instalment of a strong deputy will help, and perhaps that is what the honourable member has in mind. Those are the facts. The Attorney did not mislead the Parliament in that statement in the context in which he was expressing himself.

RECYCLING

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning provide the House with information on investigations into the re-use of old clothing? Each year charities have an expensive problem of disposing of more than 5 000 tonnes of unusable old clothing. Much of this material has a potential for recycling.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Today I announced a grant of some \$17 000 from the State Government's Recycling Development Fund, which will assist the National Association of Charitable Recycling Organisations to investigate the potential to transform discarded synthetic clothing into geo-textiles. Geo-textiles are a range of civil engineering fabrics currently manufactured from raw plastic. These include such things as filter cloths and moisture barriers that are used under concrete.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am sure that the member for Murray-Mallee knows all of this, but other people will be interested in hearing it. At the moment in Australia something like 5 000 tonnes of this discarded synthetic clothing goes to land fill. This was causing a great problem to the charities, because they were having to pay to have this material disposed of. This grant will provide a seeding grant or catalyst for the establishment, we hope, of a new industry that will give an added benefit in the reduction of the amount of waste going to land fill.

This project is an excellent example of the cooperation between the Marlestone College of Technical and Further Education, the University of South Australia, the newly established Waste Management Institute of Australia and, most importantly, the National Association of Charitable Recycling Organisations. The intent of such grants has always been to provide seeding money to ensure that the proper investigations and development take place.

Having this morning visited the St Vincent de Paul site in Edwardstown, in the electorate of the honourable member, to see how this can take place, I feel extremely optimistic that we have the beginnings of a new industry; we will be looking at the creation of some new jobs and, if this

is successful, we will be looking at going Australia-wide with this process.

I am informed that there may even be the potential to export the process overseas in terms of being able to use as a potential resource what we currently throw into land fill as waste. I believe all members of the House will support such a move.

STATE ASSETS

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Does the Treasurer agree with the Victorian Auditor-General who, in his 1989-90 report, said that the sale and lease-back of State assets is 'simply another form of borrowing and should have been taken into account for Loan Council purposes and reported' by the Treasurer, and will he say by how much the State's \$6.6 billion debt would increase if all borrowings from structured financial deals were included?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am delighted that the possible Deputy Leader has finally got a guernsey. I am not exactly sure that that was an exciting question breathing new life into the leadership, because it really is very much old ground. What I can say about structured financing is that the benefits have been in the order of \$200 million, and that is a lot of nurses, police, teachers, and so on. They have been very successful. I pay due tribute—

An honourable member interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —to the Tonkin Government, the Cabinet on which the honourable member first sat. So, she would have been party to these transactions as a reasonable way of handling Government finance. Why do I say it is reasonable? Every Government does it. I would agree that, in a sense, one could characterise it as a different kind of borrowing, because it is raising the funds that are necessary at better margins that are achieved by a straight borrowing transaction. However, the benefits are then returned to the public sector itself. So, there is nothing secret or covert in any of these transactions: they are all fully reported on; they follow standard presets; tax rulings need to be obtained in some cases; provisions are made where there is some uncertainty about the tax benefits as to whether they may not accrue and, if they do not accrue, it is just the same as a straight cost of borrowing in those circumstances. Loan Council guidelines are affected by those particular transactions. Summing it all up, we have gained extremely significant benefits, and I hope we will continue to do so in future.

FORBES PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Education advise the House on progress being made on the redevelopment of the Forbes Primary and Junior Primary Schools as part of a local community initiative to gain upgraded facilities by consolidating those two schools on the one campus?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: I thank the honourable member for his question and, indeed, for his interest in schools in his electorate. The Forbes school is currently undergoing substantial reorganisation and restructuring. It was once the largest primary school in South Australia, and it is now much smaller than it then was. It had many surplus buildings and a large expansive campus on which there were a primary and a junior primary school. Over a number of

years, a strategy was developed to rationalise those facilities and the functions of those two schools, whilst remaining as two separate entities. A great deal of sharing of resources and staff between those two schools has now been achieved, and a great deal of educational leadership has been shown in the process.

A new school and community recreation centre has now been completed at the school and is due to be opened in the near future at a cost of some \$270 000, to which the community has contributed a substantial sum. That will enable those school facilities to be made available to the broader surrounding community for community use as well. That helps to protect our investment in the education of that local community and to achieve a sense of community ownership of those facilities.

Last year I opened another part of that redevelopment; that is, the amalgamated staff facilities and other combined administrative structures at that school, which brings the total overall expenditure at that school to some \$450 000. However, that has released a number of buildings and other facilities and resources for the use of other schools in our system. So, it is an interesting development of not seeing an ageing process that allows buildings to run down and a school to become less effective in the community, but one in which the school has certainly accepted that challenge and has become more effective in the life of that community.

POLICE STAR FORCE

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I direct my question to the Minister of Emergency Services. Is it normal for the Police STAR Force to escort Correctional Services vehicles transporting a high risk security prisoner such as Marcel Spiero and, if so, why was no such escort being provided at the time Spiero escaped last Tuesday?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will make inquiries on behalf of the honourable member.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TAFE COLLEGES

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of the plans to better provide for the training needs of young people and others through the provision of new TAFE college buildings?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am certainly delighted to answer that question. Members on both sides of the House will be aware that in recent times a range of new TAFE colleges has been commissioned, such as those at Millicent, in the Leader of the Opposition's electorate; Berri; Ceduna, which was opened, I think, in November or December last year; Mount Barker, which is in the member for Heysen's electorate and which will be opened on about 4 March; Tea Tree Gully, the \$35 million TAFE college of the future, which will be opened on 29 February—which is very appropriate for a great leap forward—and also the Coober Pedy college, on which construction is currently under way and at which I certainly hope we will be able to have some major ceremony later this year.

I am very pleased to inform the House that approvals for two new colleges have recently been made for Port Adelaide and Salisbury. Of course, the member for Price and the member for Semaphore, who is a member of the

Port Adelaide TAFE college council, will be delighted to hear this news. The college at Port Adelaide will cost \$15.5 million and is expected to be completed by December 1993. Of course, it will be a major part of the redevelopment of the port waterfront area. Obviously, it has a broader role in terms of the upgrading of that area. The college will operate in close cooperation with the nearby colleges at Croydon, Regency Park and Adelaide, will provide a State-wide focus for marine and maritime programs, quite appropriately, and will provide increased training opportunities for young people, especially in community services, business and computing studies.

Investigations are presently under way to provide for the training needs of the aquaculture, leisure boating and fisheries industries. The college will provide a special focus for the training needs of industry in the region. It will do this by establishing programs to cater for fields such as materials handling—which is very important industrially—and for a range of other issues to support on-the-job training initiatives for local industry. This college will obviously have a very strong link with the MFP and will certainly be known colloquially as the MFP TAFE. The central feature of the design objectives of the college is to create a college which is flexible and which has the potential to accommodate the changing needs of further education, rapid changes in technology and facilitates commercial and joint ventures which may occur in the future. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and I are delighted that construction will begin on the \$8.5 million TAFE campus in Salisbury, and work is expected to start in June 1992.

The new campus is planned to meet the educational and training needs of the community, with a particular focus on disadvantaged and unemployed youth. This superb, attractive new TAFE centre—I have seen the design plans—will enhance the Salisbury business district, and its construction will generate jobs. As regards both of those projects, the \$15 million plus at Port Adelaide and the Salisbury campus, about 50 per cent of the money generated will be spent on jobs, so it is a good boost to our construction industry. Of course, when it is up and running, the new TAFE in Salisbury will work closely with local businesses, schools and high technology firms to ensure that the courses are relevant to local needs.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister of Emergency Services tell the House why he is withholding a \$5 million budget allocation from the Country Fire Service, and whether this is an effort to force amalgamation of this service with the Metropolitan Fire Service, contrary to the Minister's statement of 19 September?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member knows full well that I have said on a very large number of occasions that I have no intention whatsoever of amalgamating the Country Fire Service and the Metropolitan Fire Service. One wonders how many times a Minister has to stand up here and in other public arenas before the Opposition will get it in through their thick skulls that it is actually meant by that Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The situation is quite simply that I have requested the Country Fire Service and the Metropolitan Fire Service to amalgamate some of their functions where it is reasonable and sensible for them to amalgamate those functions. The ones that I have suggested

to them and the ones that are being looked at are training and communications, because there are many savings to be made as some of the training for both organisations is similar and they can learn a lot from each other and combine a lot of their communications functions. Indeed, as the MFS and the CFS coordinate their efforts in areas where they adjoin each other, it is sensible for them to have common communications functions wherever possible.

I would have thought that the Opposition, which is always so keen on saving money and so on and pointing out Government waste, would be well behind this and only too keen to make sure that such amalgamations of functions, where possible, should exist. One of those amalgamations, under the training function, is whether or not Brukunga gets upgraded and to what extent. As there is a package before both services as to what training situation should occur, I have asked that they do not separately spend money on separate training functions in order to ensure that we do not go off in several directions, but that it is held together until such time as all of those functions can be put together and put to the best economic advantage of the State and of the two fire services.

MILK

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Agriculture tell the House whether regulation of the retail price of milk will be continued?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The situation with the dairy industry is that I hope to have before this Parliament at the next session legislation to alter existing legislation. A green paper has been out for discussion, and I met the industry late last year to discuss proposals for a draft white paper that I would propose taking to Cabinet. There has been some public coverage of some of the principles involved in that proposed white paper, and I am in the process of receiving comment from a number of avenues of industry on different proposals.

I do not intend to go through all the proposals I put to industry, first, because some issues need more work still and, secondly, because there are too many there to take up the time of Question Time. Particularly referring to the one mentioned by the honourable member with respect to retail pricing, at present we have a maximum and minimum retail price for white milk, and it is being proposed that we move away from that to a recommended retail price situation with no minimum. That proposal, which might at the outset seem contentious with respect to certain sections of the dairy industry, is receiving very widespread support from a number of areas, including the Milk Vendors Association, which argues that that would be a better proposition than the maximum/minimum regime that we have had since 1987.

In fairness to them, I need to acknowledge that they did not support the growing gap between maximum and minimum, and the ideal position, I guess, might have been to move right away from that and to have a simple maximum price that would be the same as the minimum price. As for other areas, milk is sold in stores or delivered and does not have a maximum price; it is up already to recommended retail price situations from the supplier. That is broadly the proposal we are looking at. I am not in a position of advancing the dairy white paper at this stage, because there are interstate ramifications.

As recently as last Friday I met with Ministers of Agriculture and the Federal Minister of Primary Industry and Energy in Perth at the Agricultural Council of Australia and

New Zealand at which we discussed what should be a coordinated approach to some of the issues of common interest to all States; we cannot go running off as one State in isolation. It was agreed that, where there is still more work to be done, we are partly dependent on the discussions of the Dunkel proposals at the Uruguay round, believe it or not, because, in an odd sort of way, the dairy industry is one sector that receives subsidy for its exports in this country, and that may have to change. The very question of price maintenance, even farm gate pricing mechanisms, could be under some threat in the context of those negotiations at the GATT. Until we know what is happening there—and that will not be until the middle of April—it is a bit difficult for the various States of Australia to work out what they should be doing with respect to farm gate pricing for both market and manufactured milk. There will be another meeting of Ministers in the next couple of months.

That also relates to another issue, referred to as a section 38 proposal, which again provides for farm gate pricing, and there are questions over validity. Those issues are being pursued by a number of States. The guarantee I have given is that South Australia does not intend to go off at a tangent from the general trend of change in the dairy industry in the different States of Australia. We want to be part of a united approach on this matter, although we reserve our right in certain particular areas, which have unique South Australian significance, to have some kind of different response, but in general terms we want to be part of a national approach to much needed reform in the dairy industry.

STA FARES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I direct my questions to the Minister of Transport. What assurances will the Minister give that fares for Hills dwellers will not increase beyond the normal STA levels if private operators take over bus routes 820, 828 and 193, which the Minister has announced will be abandoned by the STA? The STA has an estimated taxpayer subsidy of \$136.1 million this financial year and it is estimated that a further \$31.3 million will be paid by the Government to the STA as a concessional fare reimbursement. Constituents have told me that they are concerned at both their loss of STA services and that, if subsidies are not shared across the State on a fair basis, their fares will be increased.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, does the question asked by the member for Heysen have any impact on Notice of Motion; Other Motions No. 4, to be moved by the Hon. D.C. Wotton on Thursday 20 February 1992?

The SPEAKER: No.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Heysen for his question. The answer is that I cannot, of course, give any guarantees about what private enterprise may or may not do. I am not quite sure what is the import of the question—whether the member for Heysen or even the member for Kavel wants me to demand certain assurances from the private sector. However, I will give some indication of the type of figures that we are talking about, and I want to make the point that the STA is not withdrawing entirely from the services in the Hills. The service from the city to Aldgate via Mount Barker Road will remain—a well-patronised service and one that we intend to keep. The problem we have with the other services can be demonstrated quite clearly and graphically.

The subsidy to which the member for Heysen referred translates to \$140 per bus passenger per year in the metro-

politan area. For example, on the 820 route, about which the most fuss is being made, the subsidy per passenger per year is \$413 as opposed to an average of \$140. On the 193 route, for example, the subsidy is \$397 per passenger per annum compared with the \$140 metropolitan average. It is a very significant increase indeed. If the argument is that, irrespective of the cost, the STA must supply a service into these areas, which the private sector may well be able to do at no cost to the taxpayer, and if the argument of the member for Heysen is precisely that it does not matter how much it costs, if they are his constituents they must be serviced, all the arguments about small government and about getting out of the way of the private sector mean nothing at all. The figures are \$413 per passenger per annum and \$397 per passenger per annum for two of the routes in the Hills compared with an average of \$140 across the metropolitan area.

Every household in this State, irrespective of whether it is a farming household in Kimba, for example, whether it is a household where members are unemployed in any of the metropolitan seats, or whether it is a household not within 1 000 kilometres of the STA, pays approximately \$350 to the STA. I think that can be justified only if that taxpayers' money is used wisely. I do not think it can be justified in running services which are exorbitantly expensive and which may be picked up by the private sector at much less cost. If we are to have a sensible debate about this, everyone ought to remember the figures, and everyone in the Liberal Party Caucus ought to be aware of those figures when we get fatuous questions such as this from the member for Heysen.

BICYCLE HELMETS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Is the State Government considering some measures to help parents obtain bicycle helmets for their children? Can helmet manufacturers be encouraged by Government to keep prices down on these necessary and legal safety items of equipment?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am happy to advise the member for Playford that we were well ahead of the game. Before bicycle helmets were made compulsory by the Parliament, a very significant rebate scheme was in place, and clearly, from the take-up rate—

Mr S.J. Baker: Did it belong to your faction?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I would have thought that the Deputy Leader would have the sense to keep his head down. I look directly opposite me and see the member for Coles sitting there like a Cheshire cat, like the cat who got the cream, and it really is a pleasure to behold. For all the well publicised problems we have on this side, you ain't seen nothing yet until you see what is going to happen opposite. All the fun is yet to come, and I look forward to it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister back to the response.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I apologise, Sir. I have been here long enough to know that I should not respond to the Deputy Leader: he is too easy a mark. We did have a rebate scheme, which was very successful and, in effect, the market for that scheme was saturated. Towards the end of the scheme a few thousand dollars was left over which had not been taken up, so the take-up rate indicated that that scheme had run its course.

What has happened since, with bicycle helmets having been made compulsory, is that the manufacturers and retail-

ers have far larger volumes to manufacture and sell, and that has brought down the prices—in some cases, quite dramatically. So, through the normal retail process, bicycle helmets are now available to school children and the rate of wearing them is very high, something of the order of 98 or 99 per cent. It has been very successful.

STA REVENUE

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. What is the STA's estimate of lost revenue on the trains since the decision in May last year to phase in driver-only services, and what initiatives is the STA taking to stamp out fare evasion? While the Government reversed its free travel scheme for students last August, information provided to a Liberal Party phone-in last Sunday from STA field supervisors (formerly ticket examiners), train drivers and passengers, identified that unpaid travel is rife on train services and that the problem has escalated since the decision last May to phase out guards.

Apparently, increasing numbers of passengers now believe they can travel on trains without validating their ticket and face little prospect of being caught, because the STA assigns few of its complement of field supervisors to trains. I have been informed by STA employees that up to 40 per cent of train passengers at night and at weekends do not validate their tickets.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have already answered this question in the House, but I will go through it again for the benefit of the member for Fisher—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —and, obviously, the member for Bragg is very interested. The estimates are somewhere around 1 to 2 per cent, and that is not a figure that has been plucked out of the air. What happens is that the field inspectors, in the course of their normal duties, make an assessment of this and, from time to time, do a blitz on a particular train. We virtually close down the system and check everyone on the train at that time. People are unable to validate their tickets after the inspectors have got on, without the inspectors being aware of that, so it is not difficult to do. The estimate is about 1 or 2 per cent.

Also, we are purchasing ticket machines to put on trains. We believe that we have found a ticket machine that will be effective without costing the \$100 000 that the ones we use at the moment cost. Obviously, that is uneconomic. When guards were employed on trains (and, of course, about half the guards are still on the trains so about half the trains have guards), the estimate of fare evasion was somewhere around 1 per cent. I understand from public transport professionals that if you get fare evasion down to 1 or 2 per cent you are right up there with the best in the world, because there is always an element of fare evasion in public transport.

The question is how much you want to spend to avoid that fare evasion, if you could eliminate it completely. I am very happy to make available any of those statistics to members of the Opposition, if they choose to ask me for them. A simple letter will provide them. Fare evasion is a problem on public transport all over the world. We believe that our fare evasion is no higher than it is in many places and, in fact, is lower than in a great number of countries of which the transport professionals are aware.

HEALTH UNITS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Health say what flexibility is available to health units in

the management of their budgets? I should like to explain that it was the member for Adelaide who suggested last week that a Liberal Government would allow hospital managements to carry forward unspent funds beyond the financial year.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will remain on his feet when he is speaking—not resume his seat.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I recall that the member for Adelaide made this statement in relation to a number of other statements about pigeons at Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and so on. I should say in passing that we do have a problem with the pigeons down there. We have been humanely catching and releasing them and, as one might guess, they come back, so we will have to try a little harder. At this stage, I would not suggest saltpetre or anything like that, but they do come back.

When I heard the bit about flexibility in budgets, I thought, 'Hmm, it sounds a bit familiar.' Indeed it is very familiar, because I now have the details chapter and verse, and in the budget letter (sent to all the health units at the end of July each year) in 1991 the following statement occurred:

The Treasury has agreed to allow change in the financial operations of the Health Commission which will result in greater flexibility in terms of carryover in funds between years, easier access to increased revenue and transfer of funds and capital. . . . Further details regarding the impact this will have on health units will be provided before the transfer occurs.

Those further details have been supplied, and they come under four headings. First:

Health units can transfer funding from their current budget to the capital budget to enable them to utilise savings in their recurrent budget to buy larger items of equipment or perform minor capital works.

Secondly:

Health units can increase their recurrent payments budget by any additional revenue collected over their original budget. This introduces incentive to maximise revenue from all sources as the benefit flows directly to the health unit.

Thirdly:

Any unspent funds will automatically be carried forward to the following year. Previously the Health Commission had to approach Treasury for approval to do this.

Finally:

The Health Commission has the flexibility to transfer from the capital works budget to recurrent if necessary.

I am sure that the member for Adelaide will rejoice in the fact that this policy was implemented in the Health Commission before he enumerated it or perhaps before he even thought of it.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

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

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

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

LAND VALUATION

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Does the Minister of Forests continue to support last year's amendments to the Valuation of Land Act, which have resulted in large additional council rates being levied on private sector timber companies, but not the Woods and Forests Department? The amendments to the Valuation of Land Act were opposed by the Liberal Party last year, on my recommendation as Party spokesman, because they allowed \$350 000 in annual council rates to be levied on SEAS-SAPFOR and on CSR Softwoods, yet no rates were payable on the 75 per cent of

forests owned by the Government, in the hands of the Woods and Forests Department.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The issue to which the honourable member refers has been raised in Cabinet again and is subject to Cabinet discussions. We have not yet reached a final position on the matter. I understand that the Minister for Local Government Relations has had discussions with the local councils involved and, until such time as a final decision is made, obviously I cannot give the honourable member an answer.

FERRY SERVICES

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Marine advise the House of the latest information he has in relation to the proposed gulf link ferry service between Wallaroo and Cowell? Also, what impact will such a ferry service have on the communities of Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Stuart for her question. The current advice in respect of this proposal to operate a two-vessel ferry service between Wallaroo and Cowell is that the proponents have finalised a very extensive feasibility study, that they are seeking financial equity in the company and that they are successfully doing that at the moment. If they are successful in gathering together all of the capital and financial support that they need and they get into operation, it is anticipated that their business will be large transports operating between Perth and the eastern States, that they will terminate at Cowell and that the cargoes will be transferred trailer-only onto the vessels and another prime mover will pick them up at Wallaroo and take them to the eastern States. It is argued that this will save considerable time and money for the transport companies and in the transport of the goods from the Adelaide region to the lower part of Eyre Peninsula. It would mean considerable changes in heavy traffic volume through the northern towns beyond Port Wakefield and possibly Whyalla. However, I wish the company well. It is an imaginative scheme and if it comes off it will be due to the persistence of the proponents.

SATCO LOSSES

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Following the Minister of Forests' commitment to the House some four months ago that he would provide me with a reconciliation of the difference in the losses of \$11.5 million on the SATCO Greymouth exercise, from a statement that he gave to the House on 12 February 1991, and the actual loss of \$14 million, which was later demonstrated to be the true figure, will the Minister say why he has not yet provided me with that reconciliation and when he will do so?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I clearly owe the honourable member an apology; I thought that I had in fact done so. I will ensure that he gets it in a hurry.

OPEN UNIVERSITY

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education say whether South Australian universities will contribute to the open university program to be screened on ABC television soon?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am delighted to answer this question from a member who takes a very active interest

in higher education as a member of the University of Adelaide Council and also as a keen supporter of TAFE. Members will be aware that discussions were held last year at the highest level with the head of the ABC, David Hill, about some kind of open university. Of course, members will be aware that in Britain in the 1960s the Wilson Government launched the University of the Air. This follows from that type of concept.

The TV open learning project uses ABC television to broadcast university subjects. It is based on the UK model and the project is still considered to be a pilot at this time. However, given the distances involved in Australia, the mobility provided to potential students and the opportunities made available to people who have not previously had a chance to study at university level, it is highly likely to be expanded over time. The project will enable anyone with access to ABC television to watch programs consisting of first year university courses. The open university project cannot be considered, of course, as any replacement for more conventional university courses, but rather as an addition to the system. So, it is not a way of tackling unmet demand; it is a way of looking at giving people who would not normally have access to university education a better chance. That includes women in the home, people in rural areas and so on, particularly mature age students.

Initially, seven first year subjects will be available: marketing, statistics, anthropology, French, religion studies, Australian studies and Australian environmental studies. The University of South Australia is playing a prominent role in this pilot by offering the religion subjects. I understand that 120 students have already registered interest in this South Australian component of the course. Viewers may either just watch the programs on the ABC at a cost, as we know, of 8c a day, buy support materials to study the subject at greater depth, or they may undertake formal assessment.

This group—those undertaking formal assessment—may then apply for credit towards a degree at another university if they enrol in a complete course at a later date. The cost per unit in this formal way is \$300 to \$400 for textbooks, study guides and assessment. The project is run as a consortium of five universities across the nation: the University of South Australia and Monash, Griffith, New England and Deakin Universities. We understand that this will be up and running on 2 March. I am sure that every member will give the open university project their strong support.

AUSTEREO

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Why did the Treasurer allow SGIC to double its shareholding in Austereo so soon after the Government Management Board review revealed that SGIC's original holding of Austereo shares was worth \$10.7 million less than SGIC paid for them, and from whom were the new shares purchased?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: SGIC was involved in the capital reconstruction of Austereo, for which I think everybody should be grateful. It is a South Australian-based company—

Mr D.S. Baker: The taxpayer.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, the taxpayer in particular, as the Leader suggests, because the State Bank was obviously a lender to Austereo and Austereo has been enormously successful in terms of its product. It has developed a network of leading radio stations around Australia, and it has been a very important part of the South Australian scene. I think that the reconstruction, which allowed Austereo to

continue to trade and to prevent receivership, should have been welcomed by everybody. SGIC took part in that in its commercial interest with that benefit.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: FORBES PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: During Question Time I was asked a question about the redevelopment of the Forbes Primary School. In my answer I think I said the activity hall had been completed. In fact, building work is about to commence.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: I put the question that the House note grievances.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I rise to express my disappointment at a serious deficiency in the Liberal Party's methods of going about preselecting candidates. An honourable member in another forum had a lot to say about the Labor Party's preselection process, but in view of what has come to light regarding the preselection—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Adelaide is out of order. No member may speak in this Chamber unless they are in their place and standing. Wandering through the Chamber interjecting is definitely out of order. In fact, any interjection is out of order. The member for Walsh.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was about to say, in view of what has come to light in the media regarding Colton, those who live in glasshouses should not throw stones. Any Party selecting a balanced range of candidates to run in 47 local districts faces two separate problems. The first is getting a balanced range of candidates to meet the needs of the Parliament, the Party and the electorate at large, and the second is selecting appropriate local candidates, or what is sometimes called horses for courses, to maximise the Party's chances of winning enough electorates by meeting the pressures of the local communities.

There is a degree of conflict between those two approaches. For example, catering exclusively to local pressures can produce locally accepted candidates but who nevertheless have a parochial parish pump view of things and insufficient width of vision for the State as a whole. It also militates against providing balanced teams of men and women, professionals and blue collar workers and other categories that need to be represented in the Parliament.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is the member for Walsh reading his speech as would appear to be the case? I cannot understand what he is saying.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made his point. He cannot debate the point. The practice in this House has developed over the years to refer to notes—copious notes at times. The House has had the opportunity to bring in Standing Orders to prevent reference to notes if members wish to do so and it has refused to do so. I would bring to the honourable member's notice the fact that reading speeches is out of order.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: It appears that in Colton the Liberal Party, through the preselection clash that exists between local Henley and Grange Mayor Bob Randall, who occupied pride of place in here as the Liberal member for Henley Beach from 1979 to 1982, and the imported candidate, Steve Condous, Lord Mayor of Adelaide, may soon be learning the opposite lesson of what can happen when a non-resident candidate, with no apparent desire to live in the district, is imposed upon an electorate because of the internal machinations of a political Party.

Mr Randall is a local political figure and is entitled to be outraged at what he might call an eastern suburbs carpet-bagger—not that Mr Randall is the person who coined that phrase: the member for Henley Beach alongside me here was the one who used that phrase to describe Mr Condous, who lives, I believe, in Beaumont. The definition of carpetbagger that one finds in Webster's Dictionary is as follows:

A non-resident who meddles in politics.

The Shorter Oxford, referring to the origin of the phrase, gives the following definition:

A scornful appellation for northerners who went south after the American Civil War of 1861-65 seeking private gain or political advancement.

Further and more relevant it states:

Political candidate in a locality with which he is unconnected.

Having made that remark about an eastern suburbs carpet-bagger, the member for Henley Beach got a very strong reaction in the Messenger Press, but I will not dwell on that. However, I draw attention to the loophole in Liberal Party rules that allows for rorts such as that described by Randall Ashbourne in the *Sunday Mail* and by a political reporter on the front page of yesterday's *Advertiser*. For example, on Sunday Randall Ashbourne had this to say:

Big Steve seems to know a thing or two about how to get the numbers. In fact, in the Liberal Party they're wondering just what constitutes branch stacking.

It seems the Henley Beach branches have had a rapid influx of new members in the past three months—up from 50 to more than 150. Most of the new members seem to have Greek surnames and addresses in areas like Burnside and Springfield.

In the Labor Party, this would be called crooked. With the Liberals, I guess you'd say it shows a sort of entrepreneurial flair. It is very strange that a system designed to cater for local communities should have a loophole that does not restrict the local sub-branch to local constituents but instead allows memberships to be signed up from all over the metropolitan area and perhaps all over the State. I make no reflection on the ambition of Mr Condous to join this Parliament, although it is somewhat of an anomaly given his recently expressed view about the abolition of State Parliaments, but Mr Bob Randall must think that Mr Condous views Colton as perhaps the best seat money can buy.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): We asked the Premier three questions about the royal commission today. In reply to the first one, he said, 'I will refer the matter to the Attorney-General and we will discuss it.' In reply to the next two, he did not say unequivocally that he would not curtail the royal commission. If he in any way attempts to curtail the royal commission, it will be one of the biggest political coverups in this State's history of one of the State's biggest financial disasters. The Opposition will not agree to any limitation of the commission's inquiry. I ask the Parliament to take note of that. The inquiry has been continuing now for some 12 months and has been diligently taking evidence. If the Premier had taken advice from the Opposition from day one, we would not have the problems we have today. Initially we said that there needed to be three commissioners: we needed to have the Auditor-

General on the royal commission, we needed a commissioner and we needed someone with banking experience. What did the Premier and the Attorney-General do? They said, 'No, we will not listen to that.'

Now they are caught with legal action against the Auditor-General's Report, and I am told that that may hold things up for seven or eight months. What will that cost the taxpayers of South Australia? Lately today the Premier got up and said, 'Tell us what the Opposition's costs are.' What about the Premier telling us what his costs are? He is the one who got the royal commission going: do not worry what the Attorney-General in another place says. The questions we asked clearly showed, in the minutes presented to Parliament today, that the Premier was intending to call that royal commission because he had had discussions with his Treasury officials.

So, do not let anyone misunderstand the situation. The Premier was going to call the royal commission, but he did not have the guts to do it on day one. Of course, the Opposition stood up and said, 'We think you should do it. Stand up and tell the people of South Australia that you will have an inquiry into this.' The most important thing about the royal commission, aside from the bunglings of the Government, is that it is not only finding out the problems and how they occurred but making sure that this Parliament enacts legislation so that it will never happen again in this State's history. That is the obligation we have to the taxpayers of South Australia and that, it seems, is the obligation that the Premier will not honour to the people of South Australia.

Mrs Kotz: It is shameful.

Mr D.S. BAKER: As the honourable member says, I think it is shameful that he will attempt to curtail any facet of the royal commission, because it is only under the third reference that there is the ability not only to consider the Auditor-General's report—if it ever gets to the royal commission—but to recommend to the Parliament the legislation that is needed to make sure we do not get caught again. I think we lose sight of the fact that all the evidence taken so far in the royal commission—and there are thousands and thousands of pages of evidence—is very important, but it will be lost if two things happen: first, if the Government does not allow sufficient time for the present Commissioner to recover from his operation; and, secondly, if the royal commission is curtailed in any way. All that evidence will be lost.

I think this State deserves better. The Premier should say unequivocally to the people of South Australia that he will have an open and honest inquiry, as he said on 12 February he would have. He also said that it had to be as complete as possible, and he further said:

The Government . . . [has] no other interest than that.

I question now whether there is no other interest. If there is a cover-up, it will forever rest around the Premier's neck, because it was the State's greatest financial disaster, and he is trying to do something to stop the truth from coming out.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): On 20 November in the *City Messenger* a letter was printed, and I feel sure the House would be only too pleased to take notice of it. The letter is headed, 'Proud of Working Class Background' and it states:

Your report in the *City Messenger* (November 6) on my interest in pre-selection for a metropolitan seat was accurate, particularly insofar as it indicated that I won't be making any decisions, and certainly not announcing them, before next March.

The closing reference to me, however, by Don Ferguson, as an 'eastern suburbs carpetbagger' was grossly inaccurate, offensive

and uncalled for, as the rest of the article clearly shows that I made no reference, either politically or personally, to the sitting ALP member. Perhaps I should have, especially if he is as wrong on other matters as he is on this.

I am proud of my background which was as a working class city kid living, as a child and youth, on the 'wrong' end of Hindley Street (I happen to think it was the right end), and spending as a young man 22 years further west, in the very working class suburb of Mile End.

Mr Ferguson makes much of his trade union background, and good on him if he learnt something from it. Indeed, perhaps he learnt from the union movement how to damn the 'enemy' with misrepresentation. Perhaps that's the old 'ambit claim' method.

But it doesn't wash on me or with people who know me. I've been a 'Hindley Street kid' myself, and Mr Ferguson will have as little success rewriting history to depict me as an eastern suburbs carpetbagger as I suspect he'll have holding the seat of Henley Beach.

The way I hear it, anyway, despite his claims to the contrary, he'll be standing aside 'for health reasons' at the next election. But he can't say that until his faceless Party machine has decided for him which faction is going to get the numbers to name his replacement. The betting these days is that it won't be a member of the old boilermakers in the once, far-gone, proud tradition of Don Ferguson.

I did not quite understand that reference, because I was never a boilermaker: I was a printer. I want to make sure that we have an absolutely fair election in the coming State elections and, in order to make sure that this occurs, I have written to every member in the Henley Beach Assembly District, and I would like to read into *Hansard* that correspondence which, as I have said, I sent to them to make sure that the election is absolutely fair and without any smears. That letter reads as follows:

Dear member, Attached hereto is a photocopy of a letter written by the Lord Mayor and printed in the *City Messenger* on Wednesday 20 November 1991. I must confess that I did, in a moment of heated retaliation, call the Lord Mayor an 'eastern suburbs carpetbagger' when he announced his proposed candidature for Henley Beach. I do feel that I should have had more control of myself, and it is understandable that our Lord Mayor should retaliate in this way. The definition of a carpetbagger according to *Webster's Dictionary* is 'a stranger, outsider, transient: a non-resident who meddles in politics'.

I would like to make sure that the coming State election is conducted in an absolutely fair way, and I would request members of the ALP not to go out into the community and explain that the Lord Mayor of Adelaide is a very rich man; that he has an interest in many large properties; that he has a very large house in Burnside; that he has a preference for driving Mercedes Benz motor cars; and that he has never had any connection with the electorate of Henley Beach. The reason why I am asking ALP members not to disclose this information is that I wish to make sure that we have a fair ballot in the coming election.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): At a time when we are in the worst recession in living memory, it has been heartening to see a great light on the horizon giving real hope for the future, and I refer to the Federal Opposition's fight-back package released at the end of last year. Today I wish to deal with one element of that package, namely, the goods and services tax and the great boost it will be to farm survival and profit. There is no doubt that the Coalition's revolutionary economic package and related policies will be the major factor in restoring farm viability by reducing production costs.

There are two major elements of farm viability or survival: first, input cost to produce a commodity and, secondly, the selling price. Of the two, cost is the more significant. Studies have shown that over 60 per cent of farm viability depends on domestic decisions that the Labor Party has continually avoided. The Coalition's package addresses these problems and, as a result, farmers' profitability will improve.

Farmers' production costs and, therefore, overall survival will be helped directly by the abolition of a wholesale sales tax that collects, overall, in excess of \$9 billion. This includes \$4 billion to \$6 billion of production costs on industry,

including agriculture, and a tax on exports of some \$1.7 billion. The abolition of the \$6.8 billion fuel excise will have an enormously positive impact on farmers, country town businesses and rural families and, therefore, on regional centres as a whole.

About 50 per cent of on-farm use is petrol. The full rebate of excise of 26 cents per litre will be available for all petrol used on farm. As well, transport costs for stock and grain will be reduced by about 16 per cent, because any goods and services tax payable on cartage will be refundable as a business cost, and the cost of goods landed to regional areas will be cheaper, thus reducing the price of products for sale in regional stores.

The removal of sales tax and fuel excise on the trucking industry will dramatically reduce costs and freight for country people. It will also help maintain the profitability of this very important regional industry. The benefits to truck operators will include the abolition of the wholesale sales tax on prime movers, trailers, tyres, spares and other equipment; the abolition of payroll tax; the abolition of Federal excise in diesel and petrol; full rebate on goods and services tax on all business inputs, including capital costs such as the purchase of a new rig and all running costs; the abolition of customs duties on imported equipment; and the abolition of the compulsory training levy.

More than 70 per cent of domestic freight is carried by road. Any savings in transport costs flow through to all sectors of the economy. For instance, it is estimated that about 18 per cent of the final product price of food represents the transport costs. Transport savings are proportionately even more advantageous to rural people. Abolition of the wholesale sales tax and the full rebate of the goods and services tax will provide dramatic reductions in the cost of trucks; for example, an interstate prime mover, which is currently worth about \$200 000, could be \$40 000 cheaper with the removal of wholesale sales tax at 20 per cent and the full rebate of the goods and services tax.

Further, indirect savings to the rural sector and to the community generally will be through the abolition of other taxes (such as payroll tax of \$5.8 billion) which add to production and employment costs on the items farmers use. Many farmers mistakenly believe that they are already largely exempt from sales tax when, in fact, the effective rate they pay is almost 7 per cent. As the 15 per cent goods and services tax will be fully rebated to them, they will be well ahead.

It is important to remember that the proposed 15 per cent goods and services tax would not apply to health and education services, local government rates, residential rents, welfare, church and charitable associations. As well as exempting all business production costs, the goods and services tax will not be applied to construction costs, financial services, lotteries and gambling. It is time for Australians to fight back against the Labor Party's slaughter of this nation.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): It gives me much pleasure and pride to deliver a valediction to an old friend in this Parliament. Although we are of different political persuasions, our friendship easily bridges our opposing views—and I am referring, of course, to the member who has recently sat down, the member for Goyder. I was pleased to read the following letter in the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* of 14 January, under the heading 'Well Done!':

Sir,

The members of this organisation, and others, take this opportunity to publicly express their appreciation of the hard work performed by Mr John Meier, MP, in his previous position as shadow Minister of Fisheries.

He worked very hard and was always available for discussion to anyone. He succeeded in pleasing the vast majority of both commercial and recreational sectors in his efforts. Well done, John!

That letter is signed by Mr C.R.H. List, Secretary of the Yorke Peninsula Fishermen's Association, 4 Park Terrace, Minlaton. Apart from the pleasure I received from reading that, it is a pity that the organisation did not write in a similar vein to Jim Baker. It is obvious that hard work does not enter into the equation where the shadow Ministry is concerned. Toadyism plays a bigger part, as does cronyism. As for dedication to an allotted task over and above the call of duty, that almost amounts to zilch and, may I say—although it sounds rather rude—bugger-all. That is exactly what the member for Goyder embraced when he picked up that shadow portfolios of Fisheries and Agriculture.

After the member for Goyder was appointed Liberal Party spokesman on agriculture and fisheries, we on this side of the House marvelled at his immediate grasp of that area of responsibility. We found disconcerting the way he put the Government Ministers on the spot with his probing questions. We marvelled at the way that, despite minor setbacks such as when he went into the area of catfish farming (a matter on which I tried to capitalise in this House, for which I plead guilty), he still managed to overcome that situation. It has always surprised me that some of his colleagues on the Opposition front bench did not pick up the way that he acted in a dignified and responsible manner. What happened? We all know that just before Christmas, because he obviously refused to deliver any support or allegiance to the present Leader, the honourable member was dumped and sent into oblivion.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Unceremoniously.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As my colleague the Deputy Premier says, unceremoniously dumped. Again, I have never heard one harsh word from the member for Goyder about the Leader or the other cronies on the front bench with respect to the treatment he received from them. In fact, I went out of my way to try to extract something from the member for Goyder that I could mischievously use in this House, either against the Opposition or the member for Goyder. He remained dignified to the end.

That letter from the Yorke Peninsula Fisheries Association is just the tip of the iceberg because, when I was down there—and, as the honourable member knows, I have a property there and I value my friendship with him as my *de facto* local member—I saw that there is a move to reverse that decision. Those people were aghast at the shabby way in which the member for Goyder was treated.

On behalf of my good friends the farmers and the fishermen of the peninsula, I have undertaken to raise in the House the way in which the member for Goyder has been treated. I would like to think that what I am saying will be picked up by members opposite, because I cannot imagine there are members opposite who do not share my opinion: that dignified man who has an impeccable record in this Parliament, and who has never been known to lose his temper—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): There is still time for the Minister of Education to be made accountable for the mess

that he has made of education in our State schools in general and in our rural schools in particular. Let me put on the record an illustration of the kind of thing to which I referred last week and which has occurred in a number of schools in the Murray-Mallee area. I received a letter from the Chairperson of the Coomandook Area School Council. It states:

On Thursday morning, 6 February, our Principal informed me of the displacement of one secondary teacher.

That was after school had started and the curriculum subject options and so on had all been set and selected by the students. The letter goes on:

The implication of a displacement at this time will be a major disruption for the entire school and the ramifications will be felt in every family who has a student at Coomandook Area School, but particularly secondary students. Over the last 12 months we have lost 3.6 teachers from the CAS staff. Our children do not have the subject range that they once had and this means that they are unable to pursue many career paths because of the limited subject offering. Open access is not an option because, for every student who participates in open access, we lose a percentage of staff time and therefore further displacements occur. We have not lost the student numbers to warrant a reduction of 3.6 of our teaching staff, while the loss of teaching time also means a reduction in ancillary hours. The high percentage of school card holders highlights the financial difficulties being experienced in our community: parents simply cannot afford to make alternative arrangements for the education of their children.

There is no exception in any other schools in the Murray-Mallee area. The Principal has spoken at length with the Assistant Director of Personnel in the eastern area, and he is considering the situation. It is not really his fault; it is the fault of the Minister and the stinginess of the Government and its unwillingness to be reasonable. Further, the letter states:

If the decision is made to go ahead with the displacement then it is up to us, as parents, to change that decision.

And they will—with my help, too. The letter goes on:

I appreciate the effort made by the staff in fighting the displacement but their hands are tied with regard to the statements they can make. You will be kept up to date with any developments. The school council is prepared to meet at short notice and they will be formulating an action plan if necessary.

That was on 7 February, and still nothing has happened. A letter was also sent to parents from the South Australian Institute of Teachers branch in the area school. It is a pity that the letter mistakenly gave the impression that I was in some way responsible for the outplacement of the teacher. Nothing could be further from the truth. That is crook! Notwithstanding that, I place on the record that I believe that the local branch of SAIT has acted responsibly. As I said, it is an illustration of what is going on elsewhere in the electorate.

The other matter to which I wish to draw attention is greyhound racing. The present administration of greyhound racing in this State is a joke. The treatment of the Murray Bridge Greyhound Racing Club, of which I am patron and happily proclaim that, has been a sore point with me and all members of that club. Since 1981 the club has been trying to get a licence and been denied it. It has made every reasonable submission and provided every possible amenity which any club could anywhere, and it would provide a service to dog owners east of the ranges which is not otherwise available anywhere within a couple of hundred kilometres in any direction, apart from this side of the ranges.

On 28 November the board, in *Greyhound Leash*, is quoted as saying that there was no opening still for another greyhound track. That appears on page 3. Yet, on the back page, under 'Tracking About', there is an item as follows:

Just what is happening with GOTBA plans to build at a track at Virginia? The GOTBA announced several weeks ago that it

was 'green light' time. However, not a spade has been turned at the site. According to GOTBA racing manager . . . the track must now be licensed by the Greyhound Racing Board for racing before the Department of Recreation and Sport will actually sign the lease. This, it seems, is causing the delay.

Delay! It is the Murray Bridge club which should be getting that licence, not the Virginia club. It is appalling that it has to learn that it is being ignored and that the submissions being made from elsewhere have the support of GOTBA, even though they are Johnny-come-latelies in the overall approach to the thing. I am equally concerned about the regulations on the Notice Paper which affect the way in which greyhound racing is administered. Like the member for Light, I shall be moving for the disallowance of those regulations. It is outrageous.

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

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for completion of the following Bills: Supply (No. 1), Road Traffic (Prescribed Vehicles) Amendment, and Real Property (Survey Act) Amendment be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

WILDERNESS PROTECTION BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the protection of wilderness and the restoration of land to its condition before European colonisation; to make consequential amendments to the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Wilderness is becoming increasingly rare on our planet. In a very short space of time the seemingly endless tracts of forests, woodlands, and deserts have been destroyed or severely modified by the demands of burgeoning human populations and impacts of modern technological society.

Wilderness, as rare as it is, preserves part of what once was. The conservation of our native plants and animals in functioning natural systems should have the best chance of viability in wilderness. Wild and untouched landscapes should have their best expression in wilderness. The presence of humans in wilderness should be in harmony with the preservation of these remote and undisturbed natural places.

Through legislation Governments in this context act to preserve a range of natural environments. South Australia has proclaimed more area as park than any other State. Our legislation also preserves native vegetation and provides for conservation based management of pastoral areas. Wilderness could of course be identified and managed in national parks legislation. This is the case in many areas of the world.

There is however a widespread view, shared by the Government, and I understand the Opposition, that wilderness is so precious that the identification and protection of wilderness should be enshrined in separate legislation. A stand alone Wilderness Protection Act thus forms the apex in a suite of conservation legislation that includes native vegetation retention, pastoral management and the management of parks and reserves.

As Minister I get more individual representations supporting separate legislative protection for wilderness than any other single issue.

The United States of America passed a separate Wilderness Act in 1964. Australia's first separate legislation was the New South Wales Wilderness Act in 1987. The Prime Minister's 1989 statement on the environment included a Commonwealth Government commitment to examine wilderness management options and the development of criteria to examine wilderness values.

The South Australian Bill proposes a process of identifying potential wilderness areas based on well established criteria. These areas will either be preserved in proclaimed wilderness protection areas or earmarked for future area proclamation as wilderness protection zones as other land use issues such as mining potential are worked through.

The Bill prescribes the management of wilderness areas to be based on a code of management. The obligatory components of the code are spelt out in the Bill with a strong emphasis on environmental preservation, rehabilitation of damaged areas and managed public access. The code adoption process also involves public input and consultation.

The Bill proposes a very high degree of protection for wilderness. Proclamation will only be able to be reversed by resolutions of both Houses of Parliament. Damaging practices in wilderness areas will be prohibited in the legislation except for approved works (for example track relocation) approved in an adopted plan of management.

The management of wilderness areas will be subject to an annual report to Parliament.

The Bill envisages a very high degree of public involvement and accountability. This involves:

- the annual report to Parliament, as mentioned;
- the establishment of a citizens advisory body to investigate potential wilderness and wilderness management issues;
- public input into the code of management preparation;
- public comment on wilderness area proposals before they are considered by the Government;
- public comment on plans of management before they are prepared and again before they are finalised for adoption;
- access to the courts to ensure the wilderness protection obligations under the Act are enforced.

The issue of mining access to areas of mineral potential or unassessed regions of the State is one of importance to the Government, the mining industry and the community. The Bill proposes that suitable wilderness areas unencumbered by mining tenements be proclaimed wilderness protection areas and thus receive the highest possible level of protection envisaged by the Bill.

Some areas of wilderness area potential will be in the process of being explored for mining potential or will have mining activity within them. The Bill will allow these areas to be proclaimed wilderness protection zones in a way which includes a mechanism to facilitate mining activity. The intention would be to undertake that activity in a way that minimises the impact of mining operations on the zone's wilderness values and when exploration or other activity has ceased the area would be available for proclamation as a wilderness protection area.

Wilderness areas around the world are often a source of inspiration and enjoyment to visitors. Such public use in harmony with the wilderness setting is not only appropriate also but fundamentally is important to a growing number of people. The Wilderness Protection Bill prescribes, as part of the wilderness code of management, the setting out of policies in relation to education of the public about wilderness and provision for the recreational use of wilderness. A common perception of public use of wilderness is that it must be available only to walkers. In South Australia much of our wilderness will be in our great deserts. The only safe way the public can travel to and through these areas is by vehicle. The Bill recognises this practical reality by providing for the maintenance of authorised vehicle access. Such use will be described in plans of management released for public comment.

Protection of the features that make an area wilderness is obviously of paramount importance in wilderness protection legislation.

The Bill prescribes strong protection provisions. Damaging activities are prohibited and management must be in accord with the code and plans of management adopted after public input. The Bill provides for a suite of regulatory powers that are aimed to preclude damaging activities and allow for appropriate public use.

The Bill does not set up another bureaucratic structure. The Act will be administered by the Department of Environment and Planning as a complement to the State's park system. The management will be by the department's National Parks and Wildlife Service staff. It is expected that by far the majority of the potential

wilderness areas are in the existing National Parks and Wildlife Act reserve system so additional management workloads are not anticipated.

As previously mentioned, the Bill complements the State's suite of conservation legislation and establishes protected wilderness at the uppermost level of our conserved lands.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 provides definitions of terms. In some cases terms are defined by reference to the definition of the term in another Act. This is usually done when the definitions in the two Acts are to be identical and the other Act provides for the meaning to be narrowed or widened from time to time by regulation. The definition of 'the Minister' ensures that the one Minister will administer this Act and the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. Subclause (2) sets out the wilderness criteria. These criteria are central to the Bill. They reflect the fact that the condition of land has been degraded by modern Western technology and the introduction of exotic animals and plants.

Clause 4 provides that the Crown is to be bound by the Bill.

Clause 5 is a power of acquisition vested in the Minister.

Clause 6 provides a power of delegation that is similar to the power of delegation provided by the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.

Clause 7 requires the Minister to prepare an annual report which must be laid before Parliament and must be made publicly available.

Clause 8 establishes the Wilderness Advisory Committee.

Clause 9 sets out procedures for meetings of the committee.

Clause 10 provides for allowances and expenses.

Clause 11 sets out the functions of the committee.

Clause 12 provides for the preparation of a wilderness code of management. The code must set out policies in relation to the matters set out in subclause (2). These policies must be implemented in the management of a wilderness protection area or zone to the extent at which they are relevant to that area or zone. The clause provides for submissions by members of the public.

Clause 13 provides for appointment of wardens. Wardens appointed under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 and police officers will be wardens under this Bill. Authorised persons and officers and inspectors under the Mining Act 1971, the Petroleum Act 1940 and the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act 1982 will be wardens in respect of a wilderness protection zone in respect of which a relevant mining tenement is in force.

Clause 14 provides for assistance to wardens by other persons.

Clause 15 sets out powers of wardens. This clause is similar to section 22 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. Subclause (2) makes it an offence for a person to fail to answer a question put by a warden to the best of the person's knowledge, information and belief. However, a person is not required to answer an incriminating question.

Clause 16 enables a warden or the Minister to direct a person who is committing an offence or who is undertaking an activity that is likely to result in the commission of an offence to stop it. The warden's direction can be made verbally on the spot and has a life of five days but cannot be renewed. The direction can be continued by the Minister by notice in writing served on the person concerned under subclause (5). This direction remains in force until it is revoked under subclause (8) (b).

Clause 17 provides for the confiscation of objects associated with the commission of an offence and for their forfeiture in certain circumstances. The corresponding provision in the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 is section 23.

Clause 18 is a standard provision relating to the hindering of wardens or persons assisting a warden.

Clause 19 enables a warden to arrest a person who fails to comply with a direction, requirement or order of a warden or the Minister or who hinders a warden in the exercise of powers or functions. Section 25 is the corresponding provision in the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.

Clause 20 makes it an offence to falsely represent oneself as a warden.

Clause 21 provides immunity from liability for honest acts or omissions in the exercise or discharge of powers or functions.

Clause 22 gives the Governor the power to constitute land as a wilderness protection area or wilderness protection zone. Land will only be constituted as a wilderness protection zone if mining is to be allowed on the land. The land will usually be Crown land but subclause (1) (a) (ii) enables private land to be constituted as an area or zone. In many cases the land will already be part of the reserve system under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. The Governor can only act under this section on the recommendation of the Minister. Subclause (5) sets out the categories of land that can be the subject of a proclamation under the section. Before a recommendation can be made the public consultation process set out in subclause (6) must be completed.

Clause 23 provides for the constitution of land that is subject to an indenture as a wilderness protection area or zone with the consent of the indenture holder.

Clause 24 provides for the making of small boundary changes without recourse to Parliament. Section 41a is the corresponding provision in the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.

Clause 25 prohibits mining in wilderness protection areas but allows mining in wilderness protection zones pursuant to proclamation. The corresponding provision in the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 is section 43.

Clause 26 prohibits grazing, other forms of primary production and the construction of roads, tracks, buildings, etc., in both wilderness protection areas and wilderness protection zones. The provision does not apply to mining activities authorised on a wilderness protection zone under clause 25.

Clause 27 makes the unlawful destruction of or damage to a wilderness protection area or zone or the damage or destruction of the native vegetation on such a zone an offence.

Clause 28 provides for the administration of wilderness protection areas and zones. All leases and licences become void on constitution of the land as an area or zone. It should be noted that Crown leasehold land cannot be constituted as a wilderness area or zone without the consent of the lessee—see clause 22 (1) (a) (ii). Subclause (3) ensures that a mining tenement remains in force if it is supported by a simultaneous proclamation.

Clause 29 and 30 provide for the management of areas and zones and the implementation of the code of management in the management of areas and zones.

Clause 31 provides for the preparation of plans of management. A plan of management must implement the policies of the wilderness code of management so far as they are relevant to its wilderness protection area or zone.

Clause 32 provides that the provisions of a plan of management must be carried out in the management of the area or zone to which the plan relates.

Clause 33 provides for the declaration of prohibited areas. The corresponding provision in the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 is section 42.

Clause 34 provides for civil enforcement. Action can be taken under this clause by the Director or by a body corporate that has as its principal object the protection of wilderness and the restoration of land and its ecosystems to their condition before European colonisation. There are similar provisions in the Planning Act 1982 and the Native Vegetation Act 1991.

Clause 35 provides for the commencement of proceedings.

Clause 36 provides for appeals.

Clause 37 is an evidentiary provision.

Clause 38 provides time limits for the prosecution of summary offences under the Bill.

Clause 39 is a financial provision.

Clause 40 provides a general defence.

Clause 41 provides for the making of regulations.

Schedule 1 makes consequential amendments to the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ACTS INTERPRETATION (CROWN PREROGATIVE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

It sets out rules of construction to be applied in determining when an Act binds the Crown.

On 20 June 1990 the High Court delivered judgement in the matter *Bropho v Western Australia* (1990) 171 CLR 1.

Prior to this judgement the general rule was that the Crown is not bound by a statute unless the Crown is bound expressly or by necessary implication. The rule was that there was no 'necessary implication' that the Crown was bound unless the statute would otherwise be meaningless or its purpose wholly frustrated.

In *Bropho* the High Court held that the presumption that the general words of a Statute do not bind the Crown could be displaced by the legislative intent appearing in the statute, and the court could have regard to the subject matter of the statute including its purpose and policy in ascertaining that intent. It seems, as a practical matter, that the test applied is that the Crown (or at least its employees) will be bound if the legislative scheme would not be effective if the Crown were not bound.

Although it is not altogether clear, it would seem that the High Court has also varied the principle that agents, servants and contractors of the Crown share the Crown's immunity, if the Crown's interest would be prejudiced if such persons were bound by a particular statute. It seems that the High Court has decided that it is a separate question of statutory construction whether agents, servants and contractors are bound.

The High Court did suggest that a stronger presumption (that is, the presumption that the Crown is not bound) should be applied to statutes enacted prior to 20 June 1990, in that those statutes would have been drafted in reliance on the previous presumption.

It should be noted that when a statute creates criminal offences there is a very strong presumption that the Crown is not subject to criminal liability. This very strong presumption has survived *Bropho's* case. The situation following *Bropho* is clearly unsatisfactory. It is difficult to guess what circumstances the courts may eventually decide are sufficient or insufficient to displace what remains of the presumption that the Crown is not bound by statute except by express words or necessary implication. It is essential that the Crown comply with the law. The uncertainty as to what statutes do or do not apply to the Crown is most undesirable. If left to judicial decision it is unlikely that the new rules will be clarified for some years.

In these circumstances, and following consultation with the Solicitor General, Crown Solicitor and Parliamentary Counsel it has been decided to clarify the matter by legislation.

It has been decided to legislate in the following manner:

- no general provision is made for statutes enacted prior to 20 June 1991. Whether these statutes bind the Crown will be determined on a case by case basis.

- provision is made that the Crown is bound by all statutes (apart from criminal offences) enacted after 20 June 1990, unless contrary attention appears, either expressly or by implication.

- provision is made for instrumentalities, officers and employees and contractors who carry out functions on behalf of the Crown where they are carrying out obligations or functions required, to share the Crown's immunity.

It is considered these provisions will ensure certainty in the law and will be consistent with good administration and practice.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the insertion of a section into the Acts Interpretation Act relating to the rules of construction that are to be applied in determining whether an Act binds the Crown. It is proposed that new Acts passed after 20 June 1990, (the date of publication of the judgement in *Bropho v The State of Western Australia*) will, unless the contrary intention appears be taken, to bind the Crown, but not so as to impose any criminal liability on the Crown. Where an Act amends an Act passed before 20 June 1990, the question as to whether the amendment binds the Crown will be determined in accordance with the principles applicable to the interpretation of Acts passed before 20 June 1990. The section also makes provision in relation to persons who carry out functions on behalf of the Crown. It is proposed that it be expressly provided that the Crown's immunities extend to such persons where they are performing acts reasonably required for the carrying out of obligations or functions imposed on, or assigned to, them as agents of the Crown.

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

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (RAPE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to widen the scope of the sexual assault offences contained in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act in two specific ways. First, it is proposed to abolish the presumption that marriage necessarily involves consent to sexual intercourse and thus a man cannot be found guilty of rape (or indecent assault) of his wife. Second, it is proposed to reverse, in part, the common law rule that consent procured by fraud to a sexual act is nevertheless still considered to be consent for the purposes of a sexual offence.

Marital Immunity

Until very recently, it was widely held and believed that, at common law, a man could not be convicted of the rape of his wife. It may or may not have been the case that the immunity extended also to other sexual assaults.

In response to a special reference given to it in 1976, the Mitchell Committee recommended a partial abolition of the marital rape immunity. The effect of the recommendation was that a husband could be convicted of the rape of his wife if the husband and wife were living apart and not under the same roof. This was the first time that reform of this rule of criminal law was seriously contemplated in Australia. It was very controversial. The Committee said:

'... it is only in exceptional circumstances that the criminal law should invade the bedroom. To allow a prosecution for rape by a husband upon his wife with whom he is cohabiting might put a dangerous weapon into the hands of the vindictive wife and an additional strain upon the matrimonial relationship. The wife who is subjected to force in the husband's pursuit of sexual intercourse needs, in the first instance, the protection of the family law to enable her to leave her husband and live in peace apart from him, and not the protection of the criminal law.'

The Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Act, No 83 of 1976, did not enact that recommendation—but neither did it fully abolish the marital immunity. The legislation was accompanied by passionate debate in both Parliament and the wider community. As this was a reform new to Australian law, much of the opposition to it was based on fears that abolition would lead to a rash of unjustified prosecutions and convictions. The resulting amendment was a compromise. While Parliament enacted, in section 73, a provision abolishing the presumption that a wife consents to sexual intercourse by reason of marriage, the section went on to say that one spouse could only be convicted of the rape of another spouse where the offence was associated with—

- (a) assault occasioning actual bodily harm, or threat of such an assault;
 - (b) an act of gross indecency, or threat of such an act;
 - (c) an act calculated seriously and substantially to humiliate the spouse or threat of such an act;
- or
- (d) threat of the commission of a criminal act against any person.

If none of these factors of aggravation were present, the marital immunity remained. This remains the position in South Australia.

While South Australia was the first Australian jurisdiction to make inroads on the doctrine of marital immunity, its first efforts have now been overtaken by events. The doctrine has been soundly condemned in almost every common law jurisdiction, if not in every one. As a result, the marital rape immunity has been abolished by every other jurisdiction in Australia, either expressly or by implication. In England, a Working Paper by the Law Commission has recommended abolition but, unwilling to await events, English and Scottish courts have already taken the position that the common law in each of those jurisdictions no longer contains the immunity in any form. Indeed, it was reported recently that the English House of Lords has so decided. It is therefore ironic that the common law now seems to take a more enlightened view than the South Australian statutory reform.

The South Australian law should now be amended to abolish the doctrine of marital immunity entirely. The arguments for retaining the doctrine in whole or in part are not compelling and have not proven to be true in practice. The immunity doctrine has been widely condemned and now attracts very little, if any, support. There is simply no justification for saying that a person is not protected by the criminal law from forced sexual intercourse (or other sexual assault) merely because he or she is married to the perpetrator.

The Bill seeks to achieve that end by simply repealing section 73(5) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act leaving in place section 73(3) and section 73(4) which abolish the common law presumption.

Consent Procured By Fraud

The common law position as stated by the High Court in 1957 is that fraud will only negative consent to sexual intercourse where the fraud is in respect of—

- (a) the identity of the other partner or partners;
- or
- (b) the character of the sexual act.

In *Mobilio*, decided by the Victorian Court of Criminal Appeal in 1990, it was decided that, if a woman was induced to allow the penetration of her sexual organs by the false representation that such a penetration was a necessary medical or health procedure, the consent to the act was effective to negative rape, even where the representation was entirely false and the act was committed solely for the sexual gratification of the perpetrator. It is very likely that this decision also represents the law in South Australia.

There are dangers in providing generally that fraud or false representations negative consent for rape. An example of this would be the conversion of a breach of promise to marry into rape where the false promise of marriage is used as an inducement to the woman to engage in sexual intercourse.

Nevertheless, the specific decision in *Mobilio* is arguably wrong on two grounds. The first argument is based on policy. The decision in *Mobilio* fails to recognise that penetration for *bona fide* medical purposes and penetration for the purpose of sexual gratification are quite different things, even if the act involved is the same.

The second argument is based on consistency. In 1983, the High Court ruled that, for the purposes of trespass to property and theft, if a person acts beyond the scope of a consent given to enter land or deal with property, that person has no consent to the extent that he or she acts beyond the authority given.

Why should the position be different with respect to an agreement to an act which, if committed without legal consent, would constitute a rape or an indecent assault?

The argument in favour of the *Mobilio* decision is that the act does not constitute rape because the victim has consented to everything that was actually done even though the victim was not aware of the motives of the accused for doing the act and, in any event, the accused may well be found guilty of an offence against section 64 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. This section makes it an offence to procure sexual intercourse by false pretences, false representations or other fraudulent means.

The question really comes down to whether the situation posed in *Mobilio* should be classified as rape or as some other lesser (albeit quite serious) sexual offence. The argument against classing it as rape is that this devalues the concept of forced sexual intercourse as being central to rape.

The argument for classing it as rape is as follows: The point of the law of rape is to protect defenceless or helpless people from physical abuse. Women, in particular, are to be classed as 'defenceless' in situations in which they are persuaded by false expert medical or quasi-medical advice to consent to certain procedures.

The argument is finely balanced, but Victoria has specifically reversed the decision in *Mobilio* in the Crimes (Sexual Offences) Act 1991 and the Attorney-General of New South Wales has announced his intention to follow suit. The definition of rape should not be inconsistent between the States on such an issue. For that reason, criminal law officers of all jurisdictions have agreed that uniform legislation on this point is desirable.

The Bill, therefore, seeks to reverse the common law in relation to the specific situation in *Mobilio*. The policy behind the Bill is that, in this particular situation, women are placed in a situation of powerlessness or helplessness. They should be protected from those who take advantage of this sort of situation. The Bill provides that a person who agrees to an act on the basis that the act is necessary for medical or hygienic purposes does not consent to that act for any other purpose. The Bill seeks to distinguish clearly between an agreement to an act for medical or hygienic purposes on the one hand and consent to sexual behaviour on the other.

On the amendment becoming law, the accused in *Mobilio* would be found guilty of rape if the jury was satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that he had obtained the agreement of the patient for an ultra sound procedure with the purpose of committing the act for his own sexual gratification and that he did so knowing, or being recklessly indifferent to the fact, that the patient did not consent to the act for the purpose of his sexual gratification. This is submitted to be an appropriate result.

I commend the Bill to the House, and seek leave to insert the clause notes of the Bill into Hansard without reading them.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 73 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (5) and substituting a new subsection that provides

that for the purposes of the provisions of this Act dealing with sexual offences, agreement to an act on the basis that it is necessary for the purpose of medical diagnosis, investigation or treatment, or for the purpose of hygiene, is not consent to that act for another purpose.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS COMMISSION BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): 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

It relates to the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission and has the following main objectives:

- (a) to repeal the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission Act 1976;
- (b) to provide for the continuation of the Local Government Grants Commission and the exercise by it of its powers and functions;
- (c) to reflect the provisions of the Commonwealth Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act 1986, as amended, relating to the distribution of Commonwealth Financial Assistance Grants to Local Government; and
- (d) to reflect the agreement reached between the State and the Local Government Association of South Australia about the Grants Commission in respect of membership and referral to the commission of matters relating to local government finance.

The Bill also provides for other minor changes to administrative arrangements for the Grants Commission Account and provides for the indemnity of commission members.

Cabinet approval to amend the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission Act 1976 was obtained in September 1991. During the drafting process, on the advice of Parliamentary Counsel, a request was made for the preparation of a Bill for a new Act due to the number and scope of amendments required.

The Bill provides for the continuation of the Grants Commission as an independent statutory body whose primary function is to make recommendations to the appropriate Minister on allocations of Commonwealth Financial Assistance Grants to local governing authorities. The commission continues to have the power to do all things necessary or expedient for the performance of its functions, including making such inquiries and investigations as it sees fit, and in so doing will continue to have the powers of a commission as defined in the Royal Commissions Act 1917.

The third objective of the Bill is to provide for consistency between the Commonwealth Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act 1986 and the State Grants Commission Act in the method and principles used for the distribution of grants. The Commonwealth Act was proclaimed in 1986 and provided for the formulation of new distribution principles by each State, to be approved by 1 July 1987 and in place for the 1987-88 grant assessments. The Bill replaces references to distribution methods that became obsolete following the introduction of these new principles with a more general provision that recommendations of the Commission must accord with the principles and comply with the Commonwealth Act.

Finally, the Bill provides for changes to certain administrative arrangements in accordance with the agreement negotiated between State and local government about the Grants Commission, and signed in April 1991 by the Premier and the LGA President.

In the area of commission membership, one member will be nominated by the LGA, one by the Minister, and the Chairperson will be agreed between the two parties. This replaces the current provision that all three members are nominated by the Minister, one after consultation with the LGA. Existing members of the commission will continue to hold office for the balance of their respective terms under a transitional provision.

The Bill also provides for the referral to the Grants Commission of other matters relating to local government finance by the Minister on either his or her own initiative, or at the request of the Local Government Association. These arrangements are consistent with the spirit of the new relationship between the two spheres of government in this State.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 repeals the current Act.

Clause 4 sets out various definitions required for the purposes of the Act. Specific reference is made to the definition of 'Commonwealth funds', being any amount received under the Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act 1986 of the Commonwealth in respect of allocations approved under this Act.

Clause 5 provides for the continued existence of the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission Account. The account will include income and accretions from the investment of money from the account. The account will be applied towards payments to councils under the Act, and administrative and other expenses related to the administration of the Act.

Clause 6 requires the Minister to publish on an annual basis, by notice in the *Gazette*, the total amount that will be available from the account for payment of grants under the Act.

Clause 7 provides for the payment of Commonwealth funds.

Clause 8 provides for the continued existence of the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission.

Clause 9 sets out the conditions of membership of the commission.

Clause 10 provides for the determination of remuneration and expenses.

Clause 11 sets out the procedures of the commission.

Clause 12 provides for the validity of acts of members of the commission and the immunity of members.

Clause 13 makes it an offence for a member of the commission to use confidential information gained by virtue of official duties for the purpose of obtaining any private benefit.

Clause 14 provides for the staff of the commission and the use of facilities.

Clause 15 sets out the functions of the commission. The principal function will be to make recommendations to the Minister as to the amounts that should be paid to councils by way of grants under the Act.

Clause 16 empowers the commission to hold inquiries and carry out investigations. The commission will continue to be able to exercise the powers of a commission under the Royal Commissions Act 1917.

Clause 17 requires the commission to take into account certain principles when formulating a recommendation to the Minister as to the amounts that should be paid as grants under the Act.

Clause 18 sets out a procedure for the consideration of recommendations of the commission by the Minister.

Clause 19 relates to the supply of information by councils to the commission.

Clause 20 allows the Minister to refer matters relating to local government finance to the commission for inquiry and report.

Clause 21 relates to the provision of an annual report.

Clause 22 provides for the provision of certain information to the Treasurer of the Commonwealth, as required under the Commonwealth Act.

Clause 23 provides for the making of regulations.

Clause 24 is a transitional provision that will allow the present members of the commission to hold office for the balance of their respective terms.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 February, Page 2681.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I am not the lead speaker on this Bill: that will be the Leader of the Opposition. In debating the Bill, I note that instead of addressing ourselves to a mini budget—a change in direction—we are looking at the age old regime of the Supply Bill. This has traditionally provided the House with an opportunity to note the financial position of the State, to comment upon the management of the State's affairs and

to draw some conclusions as to how well the Government is managing those affairs. I will not depart from that old regime except to suggest that it is about time we did.

I have referred, over a number of months and years, to the incapacity of this Government to tell South Australians exactly where it is going with its budgets. We know, for example, that, on every occasion on which we ask for the monthly figures of transactions from Treasury, the Premier says that he will make them available when he feels like it but that they are not relevant anyway. I also note that, even though they are not relevant, under great pressure from the Opposition the Premier finally revealed the July to November transactions on 13 December 1991, but since that time we have had no update.

Yet he says, in his second reading explanation on the Bill, that the Opposition and the people of South Australia should accept that there is only a minor hiccup in the budget and, whilst there will be a shortfall, it will not be of great proportions. The figures that have been canvassed have been of the order of \$60 million—perhaps as high as \$100 million. We know how to achieve that end. If it is \$60 million, which is the lower end of the scale, large sums will have to be taken out of the South Australian Government Financing Authority. It is simply not good enough for the Premier of this State to announce that we cannot rely on the monthly figures, that we can draw no conclusions and that we think there is an approximate idea of what is happening with the budget but we cannot tell until the end of the financial year. He must be one of the most stupid, hopeless and inadequate Treasurers in this world of ours.

Recently I have been looking at budgeting practice in the United States and Canada, and in every one of those jurisdictions monthly figures and quarterly updates are provided. Those figures are made available to the public at large and are enlarged by the media, journalists and finance advisers. They form a conclusion on exactly how those budgets are being managed and as to whether the Government will get through the year in excess or in deficit. Importantly, they know that, if a deficit is looming, they can make some fairly powerful adjustments. Everybody in this House would recognise the powerful position that prevails in the American jurisdictions, whether it be State or local government, to adjust budgets or change direction mid-term because of prevailing circumstances, but not our Premier: it is business as usual.

In his second reading explanation he says that the situation will not be as bad as we thought: revenue is certainly falling behind because of economic circumstances, but we have managed to keep the expenditure under control. That is an absolute indictment, because expenditure was not under control at the beginning of the year, so how can he say midway through that it is under control? We have too much expenditure by Government in all the wrong areas.

The Leader of the Opposition and I, and all our colleagues, have outlined on a number of occasions the way in which Government funds are wasted continually. It is not good enough to say that the Government is thus confident of ending the financial year with an acceptable result in terms of the level of borrowing, as was stated in the second reading explanation. We have to borrow \$330 million to sustain this budget. If \$60 million or \$70 million is added to that bill, we will have to borrow \$400 million. That is not chickenfeed. That could build a lot of houses and hospitals or clothe a lot of people. It is not chickenfeed at all, yet the Premier says that the level of borrowings is acceptable. It is not acceptable. The only acceptable level is zero, and I hope that, when we bring our talents to bear on the Treasury benches, we will achieve that zero balance as

soon as is humanly possible. It is a challenge and one that must be met, because we cannot continue to run up deficits and borrow at the rate that we have.

Of course, the Premier does not mention the profound impact of the \$2 200 million debt of the State Bank. That figure has been repeated on many occasions, but it is worth remembering that it is one of the major reasons why this budget is under stress. Of course, with it is the liability to bring forward \$700 million each and every year in terms of servicing costs.

However, I will not concentrate on those figures: I will talk about, first, what an aimless budget it is and, secondly, what it means in people terms. It is an aimless budget; it is weak, inadequate and shows complete lack of direction. Despite all the problems he was having within his own Party, the Premier of this State had a duty and an obligation to this House to present a forward-thinking budget, something which was targeted to the areas of strength, something which people could hang onto and about which they could say, 'Quite clearly, the Government knew where it was going. It did not want a budget that was so controlled by the finances, the blunders and the failures that it did not give succour, help or assistance to those areas that would assist the Government and the people of South Australia in the long term.' We wanted clear directions. We did not get them from this budget, and we have never got them from budgets produced by the Bannon Government.

I make the point that this is the golden opportunity, the moment when the Premier stands up before this House and outlines that budget. That is the time when he sets his directions. It is not the time when he makes false promises or talks about the marvellous future that South Australia may have. It is budget time, because that is the reality; they are the dollars; and that is what people must cope with. On so many fronts it has been a failure, because he has no sense of direction. He accuses the Opposition of being negative and of having no sight on the future. If we analyse this budget and the previous ones, we see that there is nothing in any of them that gives the business community, the teachers, the professionals and the working people of South Australia any idea of what the Government expects.

We have told the people of South Australia quite clearly that our strategy is to reduce the debt and, therefore, to reduce the costs of servicing that debt in the annual budget. That is quite clear and quite unequivocal, because we believe that that burden must be reduced. We have also told the people of South Australia that we will concentrate on our core activities and we will do them well. We have been quite clear and unequivocal about our direction to anybody who wishes to listen. Importantly, we do not have anything in this budget and, of course, cost cutting measures are imposed, because of budget stringencies, which do not have any direction. In fact, they could take us in the opposite direction to that in which we on this side would wish to continue.

What does this budget mean, and what does the deficit mean? Clearly, the budget does not assist anyone, because it does not have the direction that I was talking about. Part of the problem in South Australia is confidence in this Government, and that cannot be underscored often enough. If the Government has lost the confidence of the people and the business community, the impact on unemployment and business activity will be far worse, and the economy will be far less resilient to ride out an economic recession such as the one we are now experiencing. Therefore, the figure of 80 000 unemployed people will probably blow out to at least 85 000 by the end of February (the figures are published in March). The people know who is responsible

and who is at fault, and it is reflected in the poll figures that we have considered over the past two days. Quite clearly, the people do not believe that this Government has the capacity to run the State in a very professional fashion.

Let us talk about how the people are suffering, because they really do not have any idea of what the Government intends with its budget. They do not have any idea of what the Minister of Health intends when he says, 'We are going to maintain a high quality of health care', because the evidence is quite the opposite. We know that the queues are lengthening and people are going through inordinate pain, despite what the new Chairman of the Health Commission would suggest. They are in incredible pain in some areas that are subject to elective surgery.

People go through pain day after day with arthritis, eye-sight problems or other problems, and the Minister and his Chairman can say that it really does not matter and that they are not feeling pain. But they are feeling pain, and that pain is worsened by knowing that the Government has wasted so much money and simply cannot provide even basic care. Basic care does not include closing down wards when there is such a huge demand for services.

We can look at the education sector, which has been mentioned today. What utter stupidity to see 700 good quality teachers, having served 10 years or more within the system, having to wait around until middle or late January, just before school starts, to receive an appointment. How does the Minister of Education think that these teachers view their future? How does this affect their morale?

That, of course, is just further fallout from a Government that lacks direction and a budget that is under stress and strain because of the Government's own stupidity and malpractice. I have a great interest in the area of special education, in terms of those disabled people who would like a normal education. We would all like them to have a normal education, but how many of those kids today who are no longer able to go to special schools are struggling to cope with the normal school environment?

The Government promised these children that they have as much right to a good education as everyone else. Certainly, they were getting most of that in their special schools but, once they are put into normal education programs, they need a large level of support to ensure that they get proper care. That is not forthcoming, and we find that students are slipping back from the level and quality of education they previously received.

Again because of budgetary stress, we have the situation of Electricity Trust consumers—business people—paying the highest level of tariffs in the country. That is not assisting those of inadequate means, the poor people of South Australia, and it is certainly not assisting our business community. Much evidence is available to suggest that businesses are no longer interested in South Australia: they are going to Queensland or to Victoria, where they can get cheaper power when power is a very important component.

So, by raping the Electricity Trust and taking out money it has no right to, or getting a return on its capital that is far in excess of what one would normally see as appropriate, the Government naturally increases the cost of electricity to the consumers of South Australia, and that is to the detriment of South Australians and of business opportunities in this State.

We can look at such a simple area as domiciliary care. My area has an elderly population, and to obtain domiciliary care in Mitcham is very difficult. Because of the large number of people demanding domiciliary care, many of my constituents do not have it available to them. Many of them live on only a very small sum of money. The line is being

taken that only those who have pension cards are eligible for domiciliary care, so many of my constituents who are on fixed incomes from their investments and who sometimes earn less than the pension do not have domiciliary care available to them—and this is one of the costs of the Government.

It is impossible to get someone to drop in for even five minutes to give people advice on how to change a house around, with some railings and some pans, to make living in their houses a little more bearable, so that it does not fall back on the taxpayer through the cost of nursing homes, and so that the people concerned can thus live in their own homes for much longer than they otherwise would.

In relation to small business, I have mentioned electricity and the level of taxation, but what about land tax? What about the 2 000 bankruptcies that have set new records over the past three years? We have had record bankruptcies in each of those years. What about the high cost of WorkCover, the highest in the country, and of FID? These are all important areas, but we do not hear from the Government or from the Premier in his budget exactly what he wants or expects.

We have a mindless taxation and expenditure system that makes no effort to signal to the people of South Australia the intentions of the Government. The Government thinks that it is all right to go on as before. I know that the Premier has had problems and I know that he is not to be Leader of his Party for long, but that is no excuse for this slack and abysmal effort we see put in week after week, year after year. We expect leadership. He is paid for leadership and he should deliver on leadership. It is all right if the Minister of Agriculture replaces him in some months time but, until that happens, let the Premier perform and let us stop the mad scramble along the benches. I know that the power brokers have an interest in moving the Minister of Water Resources further up the line, but let us stop the squabbling and get on with the job of running the State, rather than worrying about the internal problems of the Party, who is going to share the power and who will be the major beneficiary of any movement along those front benches.

Spare a thought for the people who are the victims in this State, when those who have been committed to gaol for a short period simply have the revolving door treatment—in one hour and out the next—because there is no room for them within the prison system. Whether that is as a result of a fine that has never been paid for a traffic offence or, more importantly, an assault on some unsuspecting person, we find time and again that people are not paying the penalty, because there is no money and no commitment to relieving the tremendous trauma on people.

If those people who perpetrate these crimes do not pay the penalty, they will continue to offend. Instead of helping, this Government is heading us in the opposite direction by its revolving door policy. We have heard about the CFS debt. Let us look at the forests. We have heard enough about the forests, but if we consider the impact on the South-East from the disastrous exercise with SATCO, with the Scrimber plant, and with the Greymouth mill in New Zealand, what impact has that had on the well-being of our forests? It is sheer incompetence on the part of this Government. We now have a situation in which fisheries are closing down. This Government has been in power in this State for most of the past 25 years, yet it is the one that has to close down the fisheries because of its mismanagement—and never let it be forgotten.

We talk about the desperate straits of homeless people. We are seeing less and less capacity to house those people, yet this is the Party that says it believes in the rights of the

poor. I am actually giving examples of what it means, by returning to that original theme. The budget is the document that lends direction, that tells the people exactly what the Government is going to deliver. It should not be a lame duck exercise. It should be something that people can read and clearly understand, because it indicates what the Government intends to do, and it is then up to the people to express either agreement or alarm. Ultimately, however, the Government is responsible for its own fiscal policies.

The fiscal policies are aimless and mindless because they lack the direction we all need. Instead of looking back at the past and making adjustments, going through the cost-cutting exercises—the GARG committee says that you have to lose 100 people here or you have to cut your budgets there by 10 per cent—why does the Government not determine the essential services it has to deliver and get out of the rest, instead of the process it follows?

We expected a mini-budget or a clear statement from the Premier. We were told during his second reading explanation that the Premier will make a statement after the Prime Minister has made his statement on the 26th of this month. The Premier did not have the guts to stand up before that time. He could not take his lead from his colleague in Western Australia, Carmen Lawrence. He could not use his own initiative to think about the changes he was going to introduce or the change of direction he would take in South Australia. He could not do any of those things: he will wait on Paul to tell him how to do it. That is absolutely pathetic! The Premier's responsibility is to lead this State as Premier and Treasurer: not to shrink away from the major decisions and avoid his responsibilities. Until such time as he is replaced, his responsibility is to the people of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the attention of the House the matter of relevance in this debate. This is a Supply Bill debate, and remarks should be relevant to the Bill.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): As you say, Mr Speaker, this Bill is, indeed, a Supply Bill, when the Opposition believes it should be a mini-budget. The Premier is asking Parliament for the allocation of \$860 million in order to maintain the fiscal policies which he laid down in the State budget. On many occasions, particularly since unemployment in South Australia hit record levels in December last year, the Opposition has called for the Premier to restructure the budget and introduce a mini-budget. He has chosen not to do so. The Opposition believes that that is the only measure at this stage which can halt what looks to be an irreversible slide into State bankruptcy. We do not believe that the State can wait another six months for a budget.

We also do not believe that the Prime Minister's economic statement, whatever it contains, will address itself to some of the problems which are specific to South Australia and which only a South Australian Government can address. I refer to the very first problem which besets us and which must be addressed by the State Government, and that is our net State indebtedness. On page 56 of the Financial Statement, the Premier said:

Comparisons with 1990-91 are distorted by the State Bank indemnity payment. Excluding that item—

and I ask the House to note particularly those words 'excluding that item'—

the estimated level of net borrowings of \$352 million compares with an adjusted 1990-91 figure of \$213 million.

The Premier went on to say:

The increase in the level of net borrowings (including movements in cash and investments) mainly reflects the expected

distribution, in full, of the SAFA surplus to Consolidated Account in 1991-92 . . .

Those words are central to this Supply Bill, because what this Bill does, in effect, is simply to perpetuate the strategy outlined in the budget of attempting to deal with debt by deferring it for a generation. In short, neither this Supply Bill nor the budget has addressed the fundamental problem which is dogging South Australia, which is dragging us down and which cannot be met by the Prime Minister's economic statement, however generous he is to the States, unless he proposes—as I am sure he will not—to wipe out completely our monstrous debt by having the Commonwealth pay it. That will not happen: therefore, we must address the question ourselves.

As I said, the Opposition has called on numerous occasions for a mini-budget. One of the principal reasons we did that was in order to address something that the Premier has not even dealt with in his Supply Bill, that is, the question of capital expenditure. In the State budget, the Premier slashed capital expenditure by \$100 million, knowing that unemployment would increase substantially in the current financial year. As the Premier has said many times, we go into recession later than other States. He could time the degree of unemployment that would hit this State, and he has admitted that it has not surprised him. He thinks we may have plateaued but not bottomed out and has said he doubts that there will be an easy ride of it.

Knowing all those things, the Premier hacked one-fifth of the capital works spending off the State budget. That would have been one avenue of ensuring that many of the labour-intensive activities of construction firms in this State were maintained—possibly increased—and could have sustained employment which, in turn, would have sustained those other aspects of State revenue, such as, unfortunately, payroll tax and stamp duty—the two principal sources of State revenue. If people are not earning, they cannot spend. The shortfall in receipts anticipated from stamp duties is certainly having a serious effect on the State budget.

Debt reduction is the first responsible act that the Government should take. The interest bill alone on debts in this State is over \$700 million per annum. That amounts to nearly 50c in every tax dollar we raise. In other words, we are pedalling fast to stay on the spot. We are borrowing money to pay our bankcard interest and that, in turn, increases the problem year after year. Until a South Australian Government addresses this fundamental problem of debt repayment and of debt reconstruction, I believe by the establishment of a sinking fund to deal with the State fund debt, we will never restore business confidence and, without that, we will never improve the job market.

Open tendering, which the Opposition has been urging on the Government now for years, is still not being addressed and, therefore, funds that could reduce the debt are not being gained. There is nothing in the Supply Bill or in the Premier's speech accompanying it which indicates that he is willing in any way to go down that road, that is, the obvious logical road in order both to reduce debt and to ensure more efficient use of the funds that the Government has available for expenditure on both capital and recurrent budgets. Instead of taking those tough decisions needed to reduce the blowout in recurrent spending, the Treasurer increased taxes in the budget by 9.6 per cent and charges by 17.4 per cent. That is not the way to deal with unemployment in South Australia, that is not the way to restore business confidence. No matter what Paul Keating says in his economic statement, there is nothing that the Prime Minister will do to attend to amendments that are urgently needed under the Workers Compensation Act.

If the Premier had recognised in his Supply Bill speech that we are the State with the highest workers compensation payments and the highest level of unemployment, he would have realised that there is an inextricable link between the two. He failed to do that. Until he does that, I do not believe that South Australian employers will make even the most basic effort to create more jobs: on the contrary, what they are doing is trying to reduce the work force in order to reduce the workers compensation payments and to reduce their premiums. That is what many employers, particularly those in small businesses, are doing. In order to ensure that their premium payout is diminished, they are ensuring that if people are lost through attrition those jobs are not re-established.

The area in which I have a particular interest through my shadow portfolio is that of employment and further education. Again, despite the problems of unemployment, there is nothing in this Supply Bill to give any cheer whatever to the young people who cannot find places in technical and further education or in technical colleges.

It is worth reiterating to the House the results of a 1988 study done by the Brotherhood of St Lawrence on the costs of unemployment. The brotherhood identified the economic costs of unemployment as: first, reduced community savings and investment, because income falls by more than consumption as unemployed persons attempt to cushion the impact of the loss of income; secondly, reduced taxation collection due to falling personal income—and I have referred to that; thirdly, reductions in expenditure and increased Government spending on social security and other social welfare assistance; fourthly, increased costs to both the public and private sector due to pressure on health, housing, law enforcement services, crime and marriage breakdowns.

If one-third of South Australians aged between 15 and 19 years who are seeking employment were affected by some kind of epidemic that had an adverse effect on their health, there would be an outcry and we would demand Government action. Yet, everyone in this House knows—particularly the Minister of Health at the front bench—that unemployment is a health hazard. It has been well and truly documented that unemployment leads to physical and mental illness. It leads to depression and a whole range of physical illnesses that cost the taxpayer money. If only the Government would see that this downward spiral is induced by its refusal to address the principal problems of debt reduction, of repeal of laws that inhibit employment, its refusal to introduce enterprise agreements, its refusal to address opportunities provided by open tendering and its refusal to transfer funds to the capital works budget, some of those health problems would simply not be occurring.

It is worth noting a study commissioned by a group of unions in Victoria which found that each increase in unemployment of .5 per cent cost Australia an additional \$1.5 billion in lost output and increased welfare spending. In South Australia, with an unemployment rate of 11 per cent—the second highest in the nation—and with unemployment for those aged between 15 and 19 years still at 37.5 per cent—more than a third of young people in that age group cannot find jobs and very many of them will be put on the long-term list—what is happening in technical and further education?

The State Minister applauds the fact that \$33 million has been put in nationally and that South Australia is getting some share of that. However, it is also worth noting from a report of the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia entitled 'Surplus to Requirements: Youth Unemployment, a Strategic Approach to Employment and Vocational Train-

ing', that Australia's labour market programs are not linked to each other in a way that enables the unemployed person to gain and build on skills progressively in a particular area. On the contrary, anecdotal evidence indicates that unemployed people experience training as a series of unconnected interruptions to periods of unemployment and short-term employment. The report goes on to say that the lack of an employment strategy not only leads to unemployment but also makes levels of employment, and thus the training investment in those jobs, subject to the boom and bust cycle of business. That is not good enough and the Government should address it.

Skills formation, about which the Minister continues to speak—and, I believe, he is sincere about it—is not being effectively coordinated. If a group whose job it is to monitor and identify the problems caused by youth unemployment and the means of addressing it states that our labour market programs are not linked to each other in a way that enables people progressively to gain and retain their skills, I think we can acknowledge that it is not simply a member of the Opposition criticising the Government for the sake of being critical. We can acknowledge that these problems are real, that they exist, that they have been documented and must be dealt with.

I conclude by urging the Premier to advise the House of the full extent of our debt through SAFA borrowings and through SAFA lease-back arrangements. I take this opportunity to do so on a Supply Bill, because it was the Premier's failure to do that, following repeated questions about the extent of the liability under the State Bank's guarantee, that has led us into the debt-ridden mess in which we find ourselves. It is not good enough for the Premier to give bland reassurances—as he did today and as he did last week—with respect to SAFA's lease-back dealings and arrangements by assuring us that they provide tax advantages that are in the interests of the budget.

In the light of the State Bank debt it is not good enough for the Premier to do no more than reassure. He must inform the Parliament of the full extent of SAFA's borrowings. We must know the extent of our mortgages. The people carry the guarantee for SAFA, and at this stage no-one in this Parliament knows (because the Premier has refused to tell us) the extent of that mortgage, the likelihood of its being called up and the interest repayments. We simply do not know. I, for one, believe that that is unconscionable. SAFA has borrowed \$3.4 billion overseas and it has put South Australia into hock to foreigners in order to try to prop up the Government's financial institutions.

SAFA itself is guaranteed. We must know how deep we are in debt; we must know why the Government is starting to sell and then lease-back schools and other properties, because if we do not know the answer to those questions it is quite impossible to deal with the consequences of the debt. It is the consequences of the debt that are coming home to roost in this Supply Bill. The Government must provide not only the simplistic second reading explanation that the Premier gave us; it must provide the facts and figures on which South Australia can set to work to reconstruct its debt over a given period and to address our problems today, this year, next year and in the life of this Parliament—not in some future life in the twenty-first century, when our children will pay the price.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): First, I find it quite amazing that, when we are dealing with a financial Bill, the Premier does not bother to come into the House. There are not very many occasions on which the Premier is asked to be here. I would have thought that on a major financial Bill, such

as the Supply Bill, this House should at least be treated to the presence of the Premier so that he can listen to some of the contributions that are being made by members of the Opposition.

My next area of concern is that as a board member of a private company I know the rules in terms of presenting accounts to the board and, subsequently, to the shareholders. I think it is a disgrace that we have a Bill before us that purely and simply says that a sum of money in excess of \$850 million should be plonked on the floor of the House and we are expected—as shareholders in this State—to comment upon it. There is no other situation in this country like that, and if one goes overseas and visits other Parliaments one sees that there are very few other situations around the world in which detailed monthly statements are not supplied to the Parliament.

It seems to me that this Parliament is again being treated with the same attitude by this Premier and Government, that is, purely and simply, 'Okay, we need \$850 million, we have to go through the process of asking for Supply, but who cares?' That is a disgrace.

I have commented before in this place that we expect the private sector in this country to abide by the rules which are set by Parliaments right around this country, but, as a Parliament, we ignore all those basic rules. Like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I have on many occasions asked for updated monthly figures so that we can at least look at the trends, but when we get those trends we have the Premier's comment, 'You cannot take any notice of those, because they do not matter; they vary every year.' With computerisation, that is absolute nonsense. We should know and be able to have put before the Parliament a simple set of cash flow accounts which clearly show how much money has been paid out for the first six months of this year and the variations which have occurred to budget compared with the previous 12 months.

There is no excuse. Every major company in this country does it as a matter of course. Yet we are expected to tolerate this sloppy financial control that has developed over time since I have been in this place. It is an area which on our side I want to take up to make sure that, when we are in government in the near future, this Parliament is supplied with continual financial information so that the Parliament, which represents the taxpayers of South Australia, can have a continual watch on what is being spent and whether the budgets brought down by the Government of the day are being followed.

We are told by the Premier in his second reading explanation that there are only a few minor hiccups in this budget—a variation of between \$60 million and \$100 million. We have no idea where those hiccups have occurred. We have no information to tell us whether the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology, in which I have an interest, is over or under budget; we have no idea whether the Department of Mines and Energy is over or under budget; we have no idea whether the Department of Health, for example, is over or under budget, and I note that the Deputy Premier is present. I think that is despicable. We ought to be in a position, at least twice a year, to ask the Premier, 'Why is your Health budget, for example, over or under its line? What have you done in excess that puts you in this financial position? Why cannot the Parliament have that information before it?' It seems quite absurd.

Looking at the income derived from taxation in the areas in which I am particularly interested—the effect of taxation on the business community—we see that payroll tax for the year is to bring in \$511 million. I should like to know, because of the unemployment situation in this State—we

have about 11 per cent unemployment—how far under budget that line is and what effect it is having on the budget overall.

The FID, which is the highest rate in the Commonwealth and which has a dramatic effect on business in this State, is to pull in \$115 million. Is that on, under or over budget? Why should we not know, when business in this State at the moment is at one of the worst levels for the past 20 years? Payroll tax and FID are significant income earners for the Government. Yet I do not know, in making this presentation to the Parliament today, what the present position is. It is a disgrace and it ought to be changed. I have complained about this situation in almost every Supply Bill debate in which I have taken part in this Parliament. We just cannot get information, yet we are expected to put forward logical contributions to this debate.

The Electricity Trust of South Australia will this year take \$100 million out of the community. Some 5 per cent of its sales, or \$41 million, has been a traditional take by this Government for four to five years. Its loan repayment is \$14 million. But in the budget there is an extra amount of \$45 million which is to come out of its general operating accounts. This State Government will be taking \$100 million out of the ETSA budget overall. That extra \$45 million means that many people are paying electricity charges in excess of what they should be paying. Electricity charges in this State are already the second highest in the Commonwealth. Yet, this greedy Government wants to take out a further \$45 million so that it can help to balance the very shaky budget that it puts before us in August. How much of that money has in fact gone into general revenue? The budget line says that levies on sales will be \$42 million this year. But how much of that has gone in? How much of the extra \$45 million has gone in? We do not know any of that information, and we should.

Electricity charges have a very significant effect on business operating in this State. In the past two or three months I have been going round businesses in the automotive industry. They tell me that one of their major concerns, apart from WorkCover to which I will come later, is the ever-increasing cost of electricity. We read in the annual report that the overall unit cost of electricity is going down, but the reality is that in a dollar sense businesses are paying more for their electricity every year. This Government should be making sure that its taxes and charges, of which the electricity charge is a vital charge to business, continue to be reduced. There is no point in the Government saying to the community, 'We expect you to tighten your belt, become more efficient and internationally competitive', when the Government, through its own instrumentalities, is not achieving the same thing. We believe that Government charges and taxes need to come down, and electricity charges need to be significantly improved.

The other issue of major concern to businesses in this State is WorkCover. WorkCover is probably this Government's biggest single disaster. Yet, every time we question the direction that WorkCover has been taking, we come back to the answer, 'Well, it's all before the select committee.' The select committee has had only one meeting in the past two months. A private member's Bill, which is before the select committee, has not as yet been dealt with properly. Significant changes to the scheme which have been discussed and recommended have not been looked at. Yet, 12 months ago the Premier, talking to businesses, said, 'One of the things that we are going to do is to make sure that WorkCover charges come down in line at least with Victoria.'

The average cost of WorkCover in Victoria is 3.3 per cent; in South Australia it is 3.8 per cent. There has been no attempt to do anything about the major problems of the WorkCover Corporation or its general philosophy. WorkCover, in its annual report, said that it was able to reduce its long-term liabilities to at least \$150 million instead of the projected \$220 million. Some \$50 million of that reduction came from increased premiums from the employers, and claims on WorkCover were 16 per cent down. Those two factors alone were the principal reason why the WorkCover long-term debt or financial liability came down.

It had nothing to do with the management of the scheme or with the new direction that the Government, through the Premier's statement, was to follow. It was purely and simply that unemployment was one of the major factors and that employers themselves had made a major contribution to reducing that debt. We find also, in looking the other day at the WorkCover annual report, that an extra \$21 million has been added to debt from the previous scheme. Suddenly we have another significant sum of money that has not been explained in the whole WorkCover fiasco. In talking to business in South Australia about what it wants from Government and what it expects to be able to do itself, we find that there are three major areas in which business wants change, all having been created or in which costs have been pushed up by this Government.

I have referred to the WorkCover issue, and that is the biggest single cost to business because it is uncontrollable. The scheme is badly designed, one in which sorting is easy. Electricity charges are another major concern for industry, and they have not been brought under control. Finally, the most significant tax for medium to large businesses is payroll tax. Payroll tax returns to the Government some \$511 million per annum—a massive sum. It is a tax on employment, an anti-growth tax and a tax that ought to go. I would have thought that, instead of introducing a line budget or a Bill that states purely and simply that the Government wants an extra \$850 million to run its accounts, the Government could come in and say that the fight-back package proposed by Dr Hewson contains a lot of positives and that we ought to look at payroll tax, as it is the biggest single problem in terms of employment. In this attempt to have a mini budget the Government should be talking of significant changes to payroll tax.

But what have we got? We have no information on payroll tax, we have only a bland statement from the Premier of the State saying, 'She'll be okay. We are only \$60 million to \$100 million behind, and we will be able to balance out these things in the next three or four months.' With the state of the economy at the moment, with over 79 000 people unemployed—over 11 per cent of the population—with between 37 and 50 per cent youth unemployment (depending on what area of the State one looks at), with massive bankruptcies in small business (which is the heart of the regional economy in South Australia), we hear nothing from this Government about how it will reduce costs on business. Unless we get more jobs in our community and unless we get an economy that starts to ensure that business, particularly small business, in our State has the opportunity to grow, this State is dead. It will be dead because of the direction that this Government has taken over the past 10 years. All it has done is tax and waste. It has done no more than that over the past 10 years.

The biggest shemozzle—the one which is affecting us today and the one which affected the previous budget put down in August—is the State Bank disaster. I cannot place enough emphasis on the fact that this Government has totally mismanaged its role as it relates to the State Bank.

Business and the people who employ young people in this State are being affected on a daily basis by that disaster. Payroll tax amounts to \$500 million, financial institutions duty is \$115 million and many other taxes and charges are imposed on business to operate in this State.

When Tom Playford was Premier of this State business could operate on a reasonably low margin. We had reasonably low transport costs, reasonably low payroll tax and reasonably low rents and base costs for running our businesses, but today we simply have continuing escalation of the number of bankruptcies and continuing unemployment. There is nothing on the horizon, and there is nothing in this Bill that would encourage business in South Australia to say, 'Well, Mr Bannon, you have done a good job. We ought to get behind you.' Not a single thing in this Supply Bill is encouraging to business in South Australia.

What has caused the problem? It goes back to the Federal arena with Mr Keating saying that this is the recession we had to have. Who was behind him? The Premier of our State was one of the chief advisers, through EPAC, in keeping us on that track and ensuring that the recession we ended up with was the one we had to have. Where have we seen the Premier of our State get up and say, 'Mr Keating, payroll tax is a major issue'? We have heard nothing about that: we have simply heard the Premier of this State say that the Hewson package will not work because it needs innovative ideas and it needs to recognise that industrial relations in this city must change.

What has happened in the industrial relations area? This is the only State in which a small business cannot enter into an enterprise agreement unless the unions endorse it. Every other State enables small business to enter into enterprise agreements, to go to the commission and to have them ratified. But not here! What do we do here? We guarantee, and enshrine in legislation in this State, the right of unions to ensure that the small business community cannot enter into enterprise agreements, because the industrial legislation provides that only unions can be involved. The problem with that is that very few union members are employed in small business.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

MR INGERSON: It is interesting to note—and one member opposite who is involved in the retail industry would know—that small business employs a small number of union members. Yet, we have a ridiculous situation in industrial relations in this State where small business, which employs over 70 per cent of employees, cannot enter into a positive enterprise agreement. That provision was deliberately put into legislation by this Government.

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

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I am pleased to address this Bill, and my reason for being so keen is that supply of money in the health area is of great importance, given that the Minister at the table has been going through the health budgets wielding a scythe with all the enthusiasm of the Grim Reaper. All South Australians who are forced to take public health care are suffering because of his actions. To put it into context, I point out that, despite the enormous stress under which our public health system is now suffering, it has been made quite clear from letters cited in this Parliament that there will be cuts in the budget not only this financial year but also for the next two financial years. I will return later to that letter which I released and which the Minister discussed in a certain way. I believe it is of vital importance that we address the issue of supply to the health system in that context.

As I said before, cuts are being made to a health system which is already under enormous pressure and stress. Further putting the issue of supply within the health area into context is the well-known factor in South Australia of waiting lists, and the House well knows, because I have brought this to its attention on a number of occasions, that people in South Australia can wait for more than 4 000 days—that is more than 12 years—to have an operation in a public hospital. The Minister blithely says that this does not matter and that it is not important, but I put it to the House that such an occurrence would simply not ever be seen in the private system because of flexibility.

In the private system, if someone is unable to go into hospital on a particular day, for example next Thursday, because it is their mother's fiftieth wedding anniversary or whatever, they are told, 'If you can't come in on Thursday, I will do you next Tuesday or even over the week-end.' The reason for that is that the only limitation in private medicine is the work to be done, not the salaries payable. But the public system does not treat patients as they are treated in the private system: once people have slowly gravitated to the top of the list, and if they are told by letter that their operation is next Thursday, if that happens to be an important anniversary for them, or if they are having a party, they go to the bottom of the list, because there is absolutely no flexibility in the system.

I also emphasise, having indicated that people wait for over 4 000 days for operations, as I have stressed previously, that they have to wait to get into the outpatients department in the first instance, particularly at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, a hospital of enormous import to you, Mr Speaker, and your constituents. People wait for months to get an appointment at the outpatients department and, once they have that, they have a long wait for the operation. There is a human side to this, and I cite a letter which was written by Mrs Yvonne Parker of Happy Valley to the Editor of the *Advertiser* and which states:

Referring to Dr David Blaikie's [the Chairman of the Health Commission] statement that those waiting for elective surgery were not suffering unnecessarily, what rubbish. Personally, I have been waiting for a complete knee replacement since October, due to arthritis. The unendurable pain, day and night, being unable to walk or stand without a stick and then only for a few minutes, is unacceptable. Being confined to my home every day is a nightmare. If I was an animal I would have been 'put down' long ago to put me out of my misery. So wake up, Dr Blaikie, and have some compassion for those who do consider elective surgery important, even if you don't.

That is the sort of human side to waiting lists, which will clearly get worse because of budgetary cuts. In the past calendar year the number of people on waiting lists in South Australia—natural constituents of people sitting opposite, or so they would have us believe—grew not by a small number, by 1 or 2 per cent, by 3 or 4 per cent or even by the increase in the CPI: the number of people on waiting lists last year grew by 15 per cent, and every one of those 15 per cent would have a story like Mrs Parker's tale. The number of people waiting for greater than 12 months to have elective surgery increased by 27 per cent—not by 1 or 2 per cent or by 15 per cent but by 27 per cent. That is nearly a third of people waiting for longer than 12 months to have elective surgery, and the number increased by 27 per cent.

Let us again put into context the problem of waiting lists. The Bannon Government, the Government of flair and light (what a joke!), came to power in 1982. In that year, waiting lists in South Australian public hospitals were not even measured, because the problem was so slight. In 1984, two years into the Premier's stewardship, occasional hospitals took sporadic readings as a matter of interest, because they

realised that it was a new phenomenon. In 1986, four years into the Bannon's Government stewardship, all hospitals began to keep waiting lists data, because they thought it was really quite interesting. Here we are four years on, and we seem to have a growing number of people on the waiting lists.

In 1988, six years into the Bannon Government's stewardship, the cat was out of the bag. Waiting lists went onto computers, and surveys were done left, right and centre. But once they were on computers, what was done to solve the problem? Nothing. Again, I repeat to the House that there is a human side to these waiting lists, which in 1982 were not even measured because the problem was so slight. The human side is that the people on the waiting lists—my constituents and those of all members in the House—cannot go to bowls, to play golf, to the RSL, to the hotel, to bridge days or to go shopping. They become social recluses, and members opposite seem to be proud of that. Certainly, if they are not proud of it, by their inaction and their tacit acceptance of these figures, they approve of it.

I wonder what they say to themselves when their constituents telephone them and say, 'My child needs a sinus operation, and she has been waiting for three years.' Do they say, as does the Chairman of the Health Commission, 'It's of no consequence'? What do members opposite say when their constituents telephone them and say, 'I have needed an ear operation which would take approximately half an hour, and yet I am unable to walk without falling over. I cannot go to the shops, because last time I went I was so dizzy I fell over in a pool of water, and I could not get up; I had to be helped up. I cannot cross the road for fear of falling over and getting run over by a car'?

What do the members opposite say to their constituents when they tell them those sorts of stories? Do they shrug their shoulders and say, 'It's all too hard'? The Minister says, 'It is no problem. The Chairman of the Health Commission tells me that it is not a worry; it's of no consequence.' Not once have I heard a member opposite complain about waiting lists. The only conclusion we can draw from that is that every member sitting opposite is happy with the situation and with the fact that the number of patients on waiting lists has increased by 15 per cent in the past 12 months and, with budget cuts to all hospitals, those numbers will increase. Members opposite must be happy that the number of patients who wait for more than 12 months has increased by 27 per cent because, if they were not happy, one could assume that, in order to represent their constituents, they would have made some public protest. But no, they sit there, dumbly accepting that those people are suffering because of the ministrations of the Minister whom they support.

I am not sure whether constituents of members opposite bother to go to their local members any longer, because they must get such short shrift. I can tell the House that my electorate office is inundated with people complaining. Is it because I make a bit of a hullabaloo about it, or is it because I am angry that our public health system is overrun? Do they think I am the only one who cares? Of course I am not, but there is no complaint from members opposite. The only conclusions that South Australians can draw is that every member sitting opposite thinks the situation is acceptable. Well, I, South Australians and members of the Liberal Party certainly do not believe it is acceptable, because our constituents deserve better than they are getting from their public health system, for which we all pay.

Members of the Government are simply callous and unfeeling. It is not a problem of resources. As I regularly go around this State and speak to meetings in hospitals and

so on. I am often told that this is a problem of resources: it is all because medicine and health are too expensive. But it clearly is not a problem of resources: it is a problem of management of resources and a problem of efficiency. The resources are there to handle all patients. The private hospitals are only about 60 per cent to 65 per cent full on average, and public hospitals are overrun. They cannot handle the burden, yet private hospitals would love to see the patients.

Why cannot members opposite bring pressure to bear on the Minister responsible and on his Federal counterpart? Why can they not bring pressure to bear so that there is a more efficient use of resources that are already there? It must only be because there is an ideological block: it must be because they are unwilling to reward people who have set up private hospitals. Perhaps they are scared of people making a bit of money. Perhaps it is because they do not want to encourage private enterprise and people looking after and privately insuring themselves. That is a clear answer to redress the imbalance of resources.

Whatever the reason, members opposite are notable for an absolute lack of verve on this subject. There are many other examples of what cutbacks to hospitals and their budgets are doing. A primary example is that they are creating two classes of patient: the haves and the have nots. Let us examine very briefly an edict that came out recently from the Health Commission for country hospitals which indicated that only certain surgery would be paid for by the Government—not that only certain surgery could be performed in certain hospitals, but it would only be paid for in certain hospitals.

What this meant was that if an indigent patient living in a town such as Meningie, with no transport and often with no support, needed a certain level of operation, because the Government was not prepared to pay for the surgery on account of cutbacks to the budget that patient would need to go to Murray Bridge. If there were supports in Meningie, there would be no-one to visit them.

However, if you had money or you were privately insured, you could have the operation at Meningie. In other words, the Health Commission was saying that Meningie is a fine hospital; it is perfectly able to do the surgery and its doctors are perfectly capable of doing the surgery; that the anaesthetists are perfectly valid; that all the equipment is fine and all the after-care is perfectly okay; that it is perfectly all right to do the surgery there and, if you have enough money or are privately insured, in you go. But if you do not have money, you have to go to Murray Bridge. Quite clearly, that is creating two classes of patient: the haves and the have nots. What have members opposite said about that? Zero.

Let us look at country hospitals. The Onkaparinga District Hospital is a case in point, because despite assurances from the Health Commission a mere 12 months ago of a large amount being put into the hospital if certain changes were made—which the board, in good faith, made—the hospital has now been told that it may have to close. I was one of a large number, 1 500 or 1 600 people, at a public meeting, at which I was very interested to hear that the only person who was prepared to put the Government's point of view (because the Minister handballed the responsibility for what was clearly going to be an antagonistic meeting to a member of the Health Commission) was a member of the Health Commission. He said that patients from Onkaparinga, when it closed, could go to Mount Barker, which is a perfectly good hospital. I should like to read to the House some small parts of a letter that I received from a surgeon who knows what happens at Mount Barker. The letter is dated 6 February, and reads in part:

The surgical wing of the hospital has now been closed for six weeks and will probably remain closed until the new financial year. The operating theatre is now restricted to a maximum of one list per week day and no major surgery is counselled. The theatre must be vacated by 3.30 p.m. and no overtime outside these hours is paid to theatre staff. After-hours emergencies requiring surgery continue to be directed to Adelaide, and accident and emergency services are minimised.

It is rumoured that the theatre suite will completely close from Easter until the end of the financial year. Morale in theatre staff is falling, and it will become increasingly difficult to retain good staff.

That litany of troubles at Mount Barker hospital relates to where the Government, the Minister and the Health Commission expect patients from Onkaparinga to be treated when the Onkaparinga hospital closes. If it were not so sad, it would be laughable. I will read again the final quote from the letter by the surgeon about Mount Barker hospital, which states:

Morale in theatre staff is falling, and it will become increasingly difficult to retain good staff.

This is a major concern for everyone interested in health care in South Australia because, despite what the Minister may say, I can tell members of this House, from continual representations made to me, that morale in public hospitals is at an all-time low. Doctors used to have regular sessions after hours to discuss their training methods and to discuss laterally their patient care with clinical nurse consultants, pathology people and so on.

People from the Adelaide hospital tell me that this no longer happens, because doctors are so tired and so devastated from all their work that they are unprepared to stay there. Award restructuring has led to greatly increased demands on people within the public health system, and what worries me—and ought to worry every member of the House, particularly those who sit opposite and make no complaint—is that it may take years to rebuild the morale of a system that used to be so good.

It appals me that the legacy of the Bannon Government may well be a system which is collapsing because of lack of support and which is crying out for everyone in this Chamber to give it decent support and to be enthusiastically saying to people, 'We have one of the best systems in the world: let us rebuild it.' Without that support, all South Australians are likely to suffer.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I should like to pick up the theme of my friend the member for Adelaide, that is, the question of the breakdown of the support infrastructure in the Public Service. It is very timely to address this subject when the Government is bringing in a Supply Bill to finance the Public Service to the extent of another \$860 million. It is interesting that, as a result of GARG, there has been a move interstate by many Public Service professionals, brought about by this lowering of morale, to which the honourable member referred, across the board.

The only department standing up well, going in the other direction and holding many of its long-term professionals, is the Department for Family and Community Services. It must be acknowledged in the House that the CEO and the senior executive of that department have reorganised the department in such a manner that there is now some form of career structure for them so that many of those welfare professionals will start looking to the department for employment—and long-term employment—knowing that they will be suitably remunerated.

I cannot say that I have heard the same thing about the other departments. Quite clearly, we will monitor the progress of the FAC's department. However, it is a sad indictment of the GARG reorganisation that we are now hearing

of highly qualified professionals looking in the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the *Weekend Australian* for positions interstate because they do not feel confident or comfortable with the reorganisations in South Australia. We have seen it in the Education Department, where the morale at the moment is at an all-time low, and we have seen it in the health industry where professionals, such as nurses, doctors and full-time salaried medical staff are looking to see whether better opportunities for advancement exist interstate.

One of the big problems experienced by those going interstate in the past has been the cost of housing compared with that here. However, equalisation is now taking place, and we are now seeing many professionals move interstate. That has come at a time when businesses generally are escaping from the financial constraints the Bannon Government has placed upon them. This State is not a State which has welcomed business in the past few years. Indeed, we have seen businesses escaping over the border as fast as they can to avoid the cost structures that have been imposed upon them by the present State Government.

Over the past eight years, we have seen unemployment rise at a dramatic rate. The number of people looking for full or part-time work has increased by 36 per cent since this Government came into office. In November last year, 73 800 South Australians were looking for full-time or part-time work, compared with 54 000 looking for work in November 1982. This increase has been the greatest for males looking for full-time work, and this has increased by 41 per cent over the nine-year period. That is an indictment of any Government. In the nine-year period from November 1982 to November 1991, 97 700 extra jobs have become available, but 99 200 came into the labour force over that period looking for work. Almost half—I would say 45 per cent—of the new jobs created during that period were part-time jobs. This means that part-time employment now makes up nearly one in every three jobs, whereas in November 1982 part-time employment made up almost one in every four jobs.

I will move into the area of welfare shortly, and I want to link up my comments to the budget line, but I will give a couple of illustrations before I do so. The ABS has surveyed the expenditure pattern of households on a regular basis. The most recent surveys were conducted in November 1984, and again in 1988-89. The results showed that households in South Australia had increased their expenditure by 38.2 per cent over this four-year period, and that their incomes on average increased by only 37 per cent. South Australia was the only State or Territory in which average household expenditure increased faster than the average household income. That is another indictment of the Government.

We can see that the costs of transport imposed upon the private household has increased quite considerably. The cost of a new Commodore car in 1982 was \$11 000; in 1991, the cost rose to \$24 000, which is an increase of 124 per cent. If we go through all the statistics available to us, we can see that the cost of living increase in this State far outstrips the income that people have been generating, and this is having a major effect on the welfare sector. At a time when we are having this massive injection of funds back into the Public Service, I would hope that some of it can at least be earmarked for those programs that have been let run down disadvantaging many South Australians.

One particular matter of interest to me concerns what we are doing with children who go through the Children's Court and who continue to reoffend. The Children's Court has many sentencing options available to it of which members would be aware. One of those sentencing options, which is

a very valuable one, is—rather than detention—diverting children into the INC (Intensive Neighbourhood Care) scheme. Although it was a marvellous scheme when it was envisaged and it is a scheme which should be supported, it has been allowed to run down dramatically, and it has also changed its direction. However, it has the potential to take children who have come through the courts system, including children who have a problem with their parents that they are unable to resolve. Perhaps those children may only need time out for a while from their families. Through this scheme, we have the opportunity to return the children to their families or to put them in a foster care situation or an independent living situation. At least we have an opportunity to do something rather than resorting to the ultimate sanction of detention.

The problem has been that over the past three or four years we have seen the scheme change quite dramatically in direction, with the result that it is not as effective as it initially was. It has been a long time since the court has been able to recommend a YPC order because the funds have dried up and because no youth project centres are open any more. There is an attempt at one in Marion, and I think there is one in the northern suburbs, but basically those centres are in extreme trouble. FACS will say that it is involved in the YPC, but I have yet to hear that any FACS employee is involved on a one-to-one basis in counselling those young offenders.

Youth project centres, as I have said, are not open any more. No-one is available for the important one-to-one counselling of hard-core offenders. There used to be the adolescent support services group, which employed a case worker who was assigned to a child and who would take that child out for a hamburger or to the movies. They would then sit with the child and talk about whatever problems were being encountered and how they could be dealt with in order to accommodate the child's needs.

Then the INC scheme came along, consisting of dedicated people who do try to do something with these children. The problem is that over the past six years the support services have disappeared. Indeed, I link it back, once again, to the budget line in the hope that some of this budget allocation will go towards reinforcing the support services for INC families. Those support services have been there in the past—and this is the way it seems to be developing at present as well—to make sure that the children come before the court on the appointed day when their time is up. The INC families have a system whereby they take their children for six months, at the end of which period those children must be brought back to court. To have a child taken for six months without the department's showing any interest in that period is a criminal waste of resources and support services. INC families have lost many children for whom they have been caring because not enough time has been available to work properly with those children, re-establishing a relationship with them in an effort to get them back into the community.

The support systems, which have broken down, should be designed to evaluate, re-educate and get the child back into society. These children need 12 months of INC family placement. INC families need three months with the child to establish a relationship between themselves and the child. They then need another three months to enjoy a relationship with that child. They then need another three months either to work on that child, re-educating the child or getting it into employment, and they then need another three months in which to say 'goodbye' to the child so that that child is then prepared for independent living or, hopefully, for return to the natural home.

Often all these children need is just to be comforted and eased back into the home after a bit of time out. The cutbacks imposed by the Government, which I think could be countered by this particular budget line, could be turned around and hopefully resources could be provided so that the children involved in the INC scheme can stay with the family for another six months—or the full 12 months—so that something useful can be done with them.

With a six months program the family is just starting to make contact with and getting through to the child and suddenly the child is returned to the court, and therein lies the disaster in this type of scheme. In theory the scheme is fine, but the practical side of it and the lack of support services given to those families who take the children leaves a lot to be desired.

There is also the question of the type of children that INC families are expected to take. At the moment they are expected to take the very difficult children; those with psychological problems as well. That might be okay provided the INC families are geared for them and that there are support services. However, those services are not being provided. The children are just being delivered and taken away six months later. It is not working and, if the Government does not come to grips with it very soon, it will find that once again a program with tremendous potential to keep children out of detention will suddenly fall apart at the seams. The families that have taken these children are highly motivated and very dedicated, but they need support.

I refer again to the breakdown of the support services in relation to one-to-one counselling. I mentioned that a scheme in the Marion area is almost ready to close. The scheme attempted to provide a one-to-one counselling service. It is very intensive as far as time is concerned, and it is expensive. However, if we are to be successful in keeping these children out of detention centres and in returning them to their family, getting some sort of rationale and normality back into the family, the only way to go is to accept that, in times of recession and depression, when families are in trouble and when children are on the streets and are offending, we will in fact put some of the budget to good use in this field.

In closing, I ask the Government to look very carefully at whether funds can be allocated to the support services that back up the Department for Family and Community Services. In my initial remarks I pointed out that FACS has been one of the success stories in the reorganisation that has gone on as a result of GARG and award restructuring. We have seen a lot of professionals who are prepared to stay with FACS and to make a career of it, unlike those in other departments who have decided to move interstate where the pastures are greener. Having those professionals there means that it is time to give them the support services that they need. I will keep talking about the INC scheme for the next few years, until the Government comes to grips with the fact that it needs support.

It is a valuable scheme and it is not the time to see it collapse or fall apart at the seams because the Government is not prepared to give it the infrastructure that it needs. I commend the scheme to the House. I ask Government members and the Minister on the front bench to take my concerns to Cabinet, to their colleague the Minister of Family and Community Services, and to ensure that some of the budget allocation goes in the right direction so that we can see some support infrastructure reinjected into community services, which are desperately in need of support from this Government, which seems to be hell-bent on spending money anywhere else but where it is really needed in this State.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I originally had not intended taking part in this debate, but I must admit from what I have heard so far I am compelled to try to bring some reason and rational thinking into what could otherwise be known as the most boring Supply Bill that you and I, Mr Deputy Speaker, have had to endure in our time in this Parliament. The first two speakers—the current Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the future Deputy Leader of the Opposition—were quite hysterical in their demand that this Government produce a mini budget.

In fact, they insisted that a mini budget was the only answer to this State's financial difficulties. The future Deputy Leader of the Opposition—the member for Coles—even went so far as to dismiss the economic statement that will be made by the Prime Minister. We have all heard conjecture from the business community, the trade unions and political commentators about what track the Prime Minister will go down in his economic statement to be made on 26 February. However, the member for Coles dismissed it and said that it was all wrong. Either she has the benefit of ESP or perhaps, knowing that in the future she will be taking a more active and leading role in the parliamentary activities of the State Liberal Party, Mr Keating has made her his confidante and has told her exactly what he will do.

The Premier clearly outlined in his second reading explanation on this Supply Bill the problems facing the State and the goals the Government is attempting to achieve in times of economic difficulty. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, know as well as I do that the Supply Bill brought down at this time usually has a very short second reading explanation. However, this time the Premier clearly spelt out the objectives of the Bill. There have been long and—I hope and I am sure we all hope—fruitful discussions with the Prime Minister and the Federal Government as to the best way, within the economic statement, of dealing with the problems that this State is facing. I took heart from the comments that the Premier made in saying that the Government was confident that the Prime Minister had heeded the calls and that there were positive signs that, after the Prime Minister's visit to this State some two or three weeks ago, he was picking up some of the problems we are facing.

The Premier also spelt out that, due to the revenue decline in housing, stamp duties, new vehicles and so on, income would be less than anticipated. At the same time, the Government has shown economic restraint to ensure that hopefully the expenditure side of the budget is within the framework outlined by the Premier when he delivered his budget speech. I thought that was good commonsense. However, subsequently to hear every other speaker on the opposite side trot out their usual shopping list of what should be spent in his or her electorate made me aghast.

All the opinion polls show that, despite 'Jim' Baker—I am sorry, the Leader of the Opposition—having one of the lowest approval ratings ever, this Government is some 10 points behind in the opinion poll. Therefore, following logic through, we would be expecting to vacate the Treasury benches in two years' time. We would also expect members opposite to be giving their blueprint for the future—their alternative policies. But where were they? They were nowhere. I have listened to every speech that has been made—

Mr Ferguson: The shadow Minister of Health was appalling.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague the member for Henley Beach reminds me that the shadow Minister of Health was appalling. He wanted billions of dollars to be spent on the Health portfolio. The member for Morphett, who woke just in time to make a speech, wanted us again

to spend an equal amount of billions of dollars on family and community services. So it has gone on. I expect the member for Newland will want two prison officers for each prisoner and a policeman on every street corner regardless of the expense.

I am not quite sure what the member for Hayward will be demanding. He is already on record as demanding billions of dollars to be spent in his electorate of Hayward. Will he suddenly be switching course and wanting billions of dollars to be spent in Hartley to reinforce his aspirations in that area? It may be that the member for Hayward will demand free lessons in how to speak Italian so that, if he knocks off the Hon. Julian Stefani in their preselection battle, he will be able to talk to the Italian community in Hartley in order to win the seat. I do not know what else members opposite will be asking for, but if ever there was a time when we should be talking about restraint it is now.

The Premier and Treasurer, in his second reading explanation, spelt it out clearly. The problem is that members opposite either do not know or do not understand that the recession does not end at Bordertown to the east, Ceduna to the west, Kangaroo Island to the south or upper Woop Woop to the north. The recession is not only within Australia; it is worldwide. The Premier, in his second reading explanation, clearly outlined that not only this country and this State but the whole world is facing a recession. Members opposite are not so thick that they do not understand that. I sometimes have my doubts about some of them, but the few who are listening to this gem that I am delivering are really not thick; they are fairly intelligent. However, their Party's philosophy and doctrine says, on the one hand, 'We have to practise restraint and stop this Government squandering and wasting millions of dollars.'

Mr MATTHEW: Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Prior to the call for a quorum, I was going into the Opposition's typical two bob each way: one minute accusing this Government of squandering its resources and wasting taxpayers' money and the next minute demanding that this Government spends billions of dollars in their electorates. As I said, the member for Hayward really wants it to be spent in two electorates, but I think that the Hon. Julian Stefani will soon sort out that particular problem.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that we are debating the Supply Bill.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am, Sir. That is the trouble. I am going completely on the Supply Bill. That is what is upsetting the Opposition, and I would be the last person to want to upset Opposition members. On numerous occasions, in relation to the financial aspects of this Parliament and the financial aspects or responsibilities that the Liberal Party sees, I have noted that certain Opposition members are completely against the policies of some of their Federal counterparts. They pay lip service to the Federal Opposition's attitude to a goods and service tax in the fight-back program—I realise that is not relevant to this Supply Bill, so I will not mention it—but in relation to restraint they are completely at odds with one of their most senior members and successful businessmen that this State has ever known—Mr McLachlan. He is a most successful businessman who speaks his own mind. He is not a Hewson man. On many occasions he talks a lot of sense. Mr McLachlan has spelt out the attitude of this State Government in relation to selling off the assets of this State.

We all know that if this Supply Bill had emanated from members opposite—should we ever have the misfortune to

see them on this side of the House—they would be talking about selling off the assets of this State. They would be selling off the State Bank, SGIC, Woods and Forests, Marine and Harbors, Housing and Construction—you name it, Sir. They would even sell off your electorate office, Mr Speaker, if they could get away with it. But what does Mr McLachlan say: you sell off an asset only if it is a viable proposition and the State is going to get a good return? I have seen your electorate office, Sir. It is in a prime position, so it could be sold off at a profit any day, but the State Bank, SGIC or Woods and Forests could not be sold at this point in time.

However, listening to members opposite, they would be rushing off to the Stock Exchange tomorrow. I stand corrected. They would not sell these things off through the Stock Exchange; they would sell them off through their rich mates so that they could all make a killing at the expense of the people of South Australia. Again, I digress; it has nothing to do with the Supply Bill. However, I think it is about time that the gentle readers of *Hansard* realised what shonky tricks members opposite would be up to if they were on this side of the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made the point, and I instruct him to come back to the debate.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, Sir. One thing that surprises me is that there has not been one mention by members opposite of how well the State Government's submission was received by the Federal Government and the financial community. In fact, the submission put forward by this State Government in relation to this Supply Bill—it was in relation to this Supply Bill and it was part of the Prime Minister's economic statement—was supported by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, by the *Advertiser*, by the *Adelaide News* and by my bank manager, because we had a very interesting conversation when I went to see him. Yet, Sir, is it a surprise to you or to any other members in this House that it was not well received by Opposition members? Does it mean that, because they could not see anything good in it, they are foolish and mad, that they have no understanding of sound economic planning or of what we really need to get this State moving again?

I suggest that half the members opposite would not understand what it is all about: one only has to sit in this Chamber and listen to them to realise that their IQ is sadly lacking. However, I suggest that the other half do know what it is all about but, for their own mischievous ends, have decided to completely ignore it. If that is an indication of what they will do to gain power, it is a sad day for the community of South Australia. I will leave it there, as I promised the Deputy Speaker that I would speak only for five minutes, and I have strayed past the time allowed to me. However, I urge those members who will speak on the Supply Bill to look at what it is all about: do not use it as a wish list or a toy shop, but make some pertinent comments about where this State is going with its economic future. If they follow my advice, they will be struck dumb, but I urge them to do what I have requested.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): It gives me great pleasure to follow in this debate after the contribution of the member for Napier, as I am always conscious of the fact that anyone who follows him must by nature sound twice as good as they do if they follow anyone else. Today I wish to speak for the vast majority of South Australians who are not only represented by members on this side of the House but find themselves, in such matters as the consideration of appropriation, disfranchised in that they are represented by members on the Government benches who, in the capacity as

their members, are silenced and have no tongue to speak and to say that which should be said on behalf of all South Australians.

In this matter I speak not so much to members on the Government benches, for they clearly have themselves focussed into a Walkman which is filled with the bureaucratise of their public servants. I will address my remarks to you, Sir, to members on the cross benches, to my own colleagues and, through the media, I hope to the people of South Australia, for I have long lost the belief that the Government members in this place listen to anybody but themselves. It is a sad lament that they have been listening to for a couple of years.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Albert Park says that it is terrible. I agree: it is terrible. This Opposition has been saying that it is terrible for two years, and it is about time members on the Government benches unstopped their ears for long enough to listen to the people of South Australia and to realise that the situation truly is terrible. On the matter of the appropriation of \$860 million—

Mr Quirke interjecting:

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

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

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

Mr BRINDAL: Given the appropriation of \$860 million, this House has the right, since the Bill provides for money appropriated by the Parliament for the use of the Public Service in a manner laid down by the Parliament, to explore in the context of this Bill the very foundations of the Westminster system: if this House is to appropriate from the Consolidated Account an amount of \$860 million to the Public Service, it has a right to know and to expect, in the course of this debate, that the money will remain properly accounted for in this place by those members who sit on the Government benches and represent the administrative wing of government. That is a most valid question and perhaps the key to the whole debate.

What we see opposite (and we had the best example last week) is a Government that so disdains this place and so disdains the people of South Australia that Ministers will not even answer a question. I draw your mind back, Sir, to last Thursday, when the Premier was asked whether one of the Independent members had been offered a ministry. The Premier chose to completely—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Hayward to resume his seat. I pointed out earlier the relevancy requirements regarding debate in this place: comments must be linked to the Supply Bill that is being debated at present. I draw the honourable member's attention to that requirement. The honourable member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: I respectfully say that the Premier, in this place, is responsible to this Parliament. If this Parliament is to appropriate moneys to the Public Service and expect the Premier to account for the expenditure of those moneys, and to expect the Premier's Minister to account for the expenditure of those moneys, surely this House has a right to question the Premier's veracity in this place. If we are to vote the appropriation of moneys to the Public Service, we must expect and be able to explore the Premier's veracity when he comes into this place and gives answer to members on the Opposition benches.

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, in view of your earlier warning to the House, I wonder whether the honourable member is straying from the subject.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach does not have to wonder any more. I am waiting for the member for Hayward to make his comment relate to the Supply Bill. There has been no further reference to the earlier question, but again I point out to the member for Hayward that his remarks must be relevant to the Supply Bill.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier should make sure that he does not make any more mistakes.

Mr BRINDAL: I will concentrate on my own portfolio interests and make a number of observations with respect to the application of moneys covered in this Supply Bill. We have in this State the largest and most vibrant public housing sector in the country. Some 63 000 homes, home units and dwellings of various kinds are provided by the Housing Trust of South Australia. Those homes provide valuable shelter for many people in this State, ranging from people who are impoverished and needy through to people who choose to pay full rent but to live in the public housing sector. Those people, I fear, are at risk because of the appropriation measures of this Government, for we see in the evidence of this appropriation Bill and in other places a deteriorating economy. It has been put to me that with this Government, it is a case of, 'do what we say and not what we do'.

Members opposite have criticised us and our policies, but they are running around in the back room specifically to bolster their financial position in this State by doing the very things that they are saying we will do at the next election. We have witnessed and have ample evidence of the sale and lease-back of the power stations and various other items around the place. I fear that the game that is afoot with the public housing sector is to sell off and lease back the stock of the Housing Trust so that the trust is in supposedly a better position. The question would be asked in such a scenario, 'Who would buy?' because SAFA already has a great portfolio of housing. SAFA picked up the HomeStart portfolio when the State Bank got into trouble, so I do not know that SAFA would like to expose itself further on the home market or indeed that could it afford to. If these 60 000 homes were to be sold, to whom could they be sold? Some large company perhaps or some overseas investor?

What then is the guarantee for those many people in the electorates of members opposite who live in those Housing Trust dwellings? I for one, if it was to happen, would like to know about it quite clearly and unequivocally. I would also like to know what are the conditions of the lease-back, because I would not like to see old ladies and people in unfortunate economic circumstances turfed out of their homes because a Labor Government had sold the real estate of the Housing Trust from underneath them. And that is what I fear this Government is about.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Members opposite begin to bleat and shout, and they mostly begin to do that when we come closest to the mark. I fear for the public housing sector in this State, not because of what we might do to it, because whatever we do will be publicly discussed and debated and will be up front: we do not go around through the back room making deals, selling things off and letting the people of South Australia know after the next election and after a new Government is in power to tell them. We do it up front and honestly, and I suggest that this Government should do the same in respect of public housing.

I can go on about things like State Fleet. It disappoints me to see every year an increasing number of cars, and

apparently every year an increasing laxity in the use to which those cars can be put. As part of their salary package, many public servants now enjoy a car at conditions that you and I, Mr Speaker, might like if we rented a car—very favourable conditions indeed. There are repeated stories of public servants going all over Australia for holidays and having their petrol paid for and the maintenance of the vehicle carried out by the State. By and large, the people of South Australia are disgusted with the whole affair.

I believe it is about time the matter of Government-owned vehicles was cleaned up and that a complete disclosure was made of all vehicles owned by the State, whether or not they have Government number plates. I also have a personal belief—and it is one that I will put to my Party room—that all Government vehicles should be clearly identified and marked with the name of the department, so that people who see them in unusual places at unusual times may be able to work out whether they think those Government vehicles are being used on some sort of *bona fide* business.

In relation to the reform of State Print and the printing processes associated with this House, it has long concerned me that some of those printing processes are less than one would describe as being applicable in the 1990s. That disappoints me, because I know that you, Sir, and your colleagues on the cross-benches are anxious that, if government is to be effective and efficient, that effectiveness and efficiency must start in this Parliament, for it is no good this Parliament's demanding effectiveness and efficiency of its public servants if it is not prepared to impose the same strictures on itself. I know that you, Sir, and a number of your colleagues have been working on this matter, and I applaud your efforts. I exhort the whole House to get behind you in these efforts, both for the efficiency of this Parliament and for the convenience of the media, and as an example to the rest of South Australia.

In the area of housing, the jewel in the crown of the current Government was surely the failed Homesure scheme, and that is applicable to this Bill simply because it was a promise that, in the context of this Bill, obviously can no longer be afforded. It began, with the Premier's election promise, as Homesafe: it ended up as Homesure and, very shortly after that, there was no scheme at all. It was a scheme which was neither safe nor sure. It was an abject con of the people of South Australia. I believe that it was cobbled together in the space of less than 24 hours to counteract a genuine promise of the Liberal Opposition, should it be elected to government, and it was abandoned just as quickly with the same alacrity as were free fares for students.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Members opposite can talk about dogs' dinners and spitting people out in little pieces as long as they like, but I and every one of my colleagues will answer, as will you, Sir, to the electors at the next election. The only people in this State capable of doing me like a dog's dinner or spitting me out in little pieces are the electors whom I will face at the next election, and I believe that the member for Albert Park and his ilk would do well to remember that they are here not by the grace of the factional bosses but by the grace of the electors of South Australia. They are the ones who vote and elect members to this place, and they are the ones who will or will not return them.

Mr Hamilton: I am amazed.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: I believe that this Bill has been introduced at an apposite time for members on the cross-benches to truly stand up as Independents and demand that this

Government come to account. We could spend the entire afternoon and evening in this place detailing the financial woes of this Government. I will not do that, because you are an intelligent man, Mr Speaker. The members of your Independent factional alliance are all intelligent men, and they know as well as, if not better than, I of the woes in which this State finds itself. I believe they should act in this matter, show their independence and question the Government deeply on this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Supply Bill.

Mr BRINDAL: I am, Sir; I am asking the Independent Labor members to question deeply this matter of appropriation and all matters related to the Government's expenditure of public moneys with a view to showing their independence and bringing this Government down. They are independent; they have said that they are independent. Let them be independent in their assessment of this Government's financial performance, for that is what an Appropriation Bill is. The Bill asks every member of this Parliament to vote \$860 million. If the expenditure of the \$2.2 billion lost on the State Bank and the cacophony of woes that this State has endured for the past two years is not proof enough that this place should no longer be prepared to willy-nilly grant cartoon characters on the other side a great bulk of money, I do not know what is.

The Heckle and Jeckle Show has gone on for long enough: Olive Oyle is trying to reduce herself to Snow White, and she is surrounded by seven political dwarves. But that does not matter. This State deserves good government, and the government is not coming from the Opposition benches. It is about time that the Independent Labor members showed themselves to be independent, questioned this Government and asked it to account for its actions. And they can do so in only one way: by sending the Government to the people.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Napier and the member for Albert Park are quite good at carping interjection. They might do better if, in their Caucus, they talked to the Government about what it is doing. I am not interested in their prattle. I am not interested in the babble they go on with. I am interested in this State's getting good government, and it is not getting it from this Government—and this Government should resign!

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I did not wish to enter this debate, but I am afraid that, after hearing the contribution I have just heard from the member for Hayward, I could not restrain myself and had to put on record an answer to that absolute piffle to which we have just been listening. The Supply Bill gives members of the Opposition a chance—sometimes twice a year but at least once a year—to be able to put before the Parliament their blueprint for the way in which this State ought to be run, and to produce a financial alternative. What we have heard this afternoon is nothing but waffle and piffle. They have had the opportunity to put forward a proposition, and we have not even heard the H.R. Nicholls theory, which is the theory we usually get from members of the Opposition—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, is this relevant to the debate, Sir?

The SPEAKER: As the honourable member would be well aware, there has been a fairly free ranging debate here on the Supply Bill. I am not sure of the point that the honourable member is going to make, but if the member for Henley Beach does not link his remarks to the Supply Bill he will be subject to the same action as has been taken

against other members. The honourable member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON: I thank you for your protection, Sir. I was very annoyed to hear from the member for Hayward his not very well researched thoughts on what he believed was going wrong with the Government in relation to the way that it is spending its money. Although I had difficulty in connecting his remarks to the question of appropriation, I have no doubt that the House will allow me the opportunity to rebut some of the honourable member's propositions.

He made some vague references to State Print. I never cease to be amazed by the unqualified lack of knowledge with which attacks are made on State Print. State Print in South Australia is the most efficient printing shop in the whole of the Commonwealth so far as parliamentary printing is concerned, and the reforms that have been brought in will ensure that the State Print operation compares with a commercial operation of comparable size so that, from time to time, its performance can be compared and, if that performance is not up to scratch, the portion of State Print that is not operating efficiently is then disbanded. I would back South Australia's State Print against any commercial print shop one could name and against any other printing shop so far as parliamentary printing is concerned throughout the Commonwealth.

We have seen before this Liberal Party/H.R. Nicholls philosophy which proposes that everything should be sold off, and the commercialisation of the print shops is one proposition that comes from Liberal Oppositions and Liberal Governments from time to time. We have seen this situation in New South Wales where, following the H.R. Nicholls dictum, the conservative Liberal Government has sold off the print shop, and it is paying for it. It is finding the inconvenience of not having a Government printing shop and the problems that arise from the fact that there is no Government printing establishment in that area.

The cost of printing has escalated far beyond what it used to be when New South Wales had a State Government printer. For anyone to come in here and suggest that *Hansard* as we know it should be abolished is absolute lunacy. We must have *Hansard* in hard copy, because in 30 or 40 years time we want to be able to follow the debates that are being run in this House, and to put these things onto data processing and hold them electronically is nothing short of stupid.

This proposition is something I will have the opportunity to argue against if and when any changes are implemented. There must be a proper record of *Hansard* in hard copy, whichever way you go, and the traditional means of producing *Hansard* in the way in which we produce it is, in my opinion, the best way to go. If we want to supplement that by holding it digitally, in some computer or other, well and good, bearing in mind that as yet no process can provide for the storage for the length of time for which we are able to store our current *Hansards*.

Mr Lewis: Drivel!

Mr FERGUSON: The honourable member says that it is drivel. I challenge the honourable member to get up and tell me where I have gone wrong. The member for Hayward was suggesting that the Housing Trust, by way of instruction from the Government, is going to eject people from their houses and sell the housing stock from under them. I have never heard of anything so ridiculous in all my life! There has never been a suggestion from this side of the House that people in public housing would have their houses sold from under them. That is like putting up a straw dog in order to knock it down: creating a political rumour that has

absolutely no substance, which members of the Opposition can peddle around their electorates; something that is totally and absolutely untrue.

This Government has the best record in Australia, I would say, and might even say in the world, so far as public housing is concerned. This Labor Government took the opportunity of borrowing every cent, of getting hold of every Commonwealth dollar in order to put it into public housing, and what we are hearing from the Opposition is a ridiculous proposal that we should change the philosophy with which we have been running for at least 20 years.

I have never heard anything so ridiculous in all my life! If for some strange reason the people of South Australia return a Liberal Government to this State, what is its policy on public housing? I would be very interested to hear that policy, because policy statements are sadly lacking from the Opposition. I am waiting with bated breath! We know that members opposite would follow the lead of their Federal colleagues and abandon public housing to return to rent relief.

The Hewson policy on housing is to abolish public housing and return purely to rent relief, as the Opposition can see the politics behind this. Everyone will get a little note each month to say, 'From your Prime Minister: enclosed herewith is your cheque for \$20 for your rent relief', signed by John Hewson, and he would hope that that cheer chasing would make up for all the misery and suffering.

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

METROPOLITAN TAXI-CAB (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CROWN PROCEEDINGS BILL

Received from the Legislative Council with a message drawing the attention of the House of Assembly to clause 10, printed in erased type, which clause, being a money clause, cannot originate in the Legislative Council but which is deemed necessary to the Bill. Read a first time.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I was somewhat surprised by the tone of the remarks of the previous Opposition speaker, the member for Hayward. It did not do him justice because he had apparently not done the sort of research on that speech that he would normally do on the speeches he has made in Parliament. I was surprised to see the member for Hayward appealing to the Independent members to take a stand and vote against this Bill. If the member for Hayward believes that this Bill should be opposed, he should have the courage himself to cross the floor at the appropriate time when the vote is taken and vote against Supply.

Mr Speaker, I do not think that I have to remind you of the interesting constitutional situation we would be in if members of the Opposition voted against Supply. It is shades of the Federal Parliament in 1975 to be urging Independent members to vote against a Supply Bill. I suggest that the member for Hayward himself would not dare

cross the floor to vote against the Supply Bill. Such action would be nothing short of being absolutely irresponsible. If an Opposition denies the Government Supply and the Government cannot continue, we would see an election in this State.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Hayward says, 'What's wrong with that?' How could the South Australian public possibly judge what a Liberal Government would do when we do not have one single policy statement from the Liberal Party as to what it would do when it got into office? Here is an Opposition that aspires to Government, but it is not prepared to put before the public one single policy paper about what it would do if the Government should fall and it should have to face the people.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will draw his remarks back to the Supply Bill.

Mr FERGUSON: I accept your proposition, Mr Speaker, and I will come back to the Supply Bill. The member for Hayward's suggestion was very interesting: he said that Housing Trust homes would be used as collateral for homes in a similar way to that involving the leasing of ETSA equipment in this State. Nothing is further from the truth and I do not know whether the member for Hayward dreams up these flights of fancy because there has been no suggestion at any stage from Government Ministers that Housing Trust homes will be put up as collateral in leasing arrangements. The leasing has been of assistance to Government; it has provided cheap finance to the Treasury. If there is to be criticism of that situation then I would like to see it presented in a cold and analytical way, dealing with the reasons why leasing of that sort should be stopped.

The member for Hayward mentioned his concerns about the State Fleet. We are on common ground here, because we have already had from the Public Accounts Committee a bipartisan report about the faults that are occurring—and I hope that the honourable member has read the report. I pay tribute to the member for Mount Gambier, because he was part and parcel of that committee and made a great contribution in terms of what ought to happen in relation to the State Fleet. The Government is well aware of the problems in relation to the State Fleet. Recommendations have now been put to the Government from the Public Accounts Committee and I hope that in very short order we will see some changes. I share some of the concerns of the honourable member. Members of the Government share his concerns, and we have put forward recommendations in relation to that matter. Instead of speaking in a derogatory way the honourable member should be praising the propositions that have been put forward by the Public Accounts Committee.

In conclusion, I hope that for the remainder of this debate we do not hear the carping criticisms that we have heard from member after member of the Opposition. If the Opposition is intending to criticise—and I suppose that is its right—it should be prepared to put up its alternative proposals in relation to what it intends to do about the very problems that it is posing. The member for Adelaide continuously carped about the hospital system in South Australia, but he never told us how he would solve the problems. He did not tell us how he would raise the money to overcome the problems to which he referred. Perhaps he will put a 10c tax on every glass of beer sold in South Australia. Perhaps he will raise the money by imposing another 20c on the tax on every litre of petrol sold in South Australia. Perhaps he will increase charges and fees in order to provide the sort of budget that will provide the funds for the services he wishes for the hospitals to which he referred.

I do not mind members of the Opposition criticising, as long as they are prepared to put up an alternative. We will listen to their alternative and, if that alternative is not worthy of consideration, we will criticise it. Perhaps that is what the Opposition is frightened of. All it wants to do is throw criticism at us for the sort of propositions we put up, but it is not prepared to provide policy papers. It is policy papers that we want to see.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Custance interjects. Do members know that there is not one policy paper from members opposite in relation to rural industries? Not one! They have not provided us with one iota of a plan about what they will do for rural industry. Until they do—

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I know that this is hurting and you are trying to shout me down. However, until the Opposition comes up with positive propositions about what it will do, we can only treat its opposition as nonsense.

The SPEAKER: Once again I raise the matter of relevance to the debate. All members will please remember the rules of debate. The member for Newland.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): As I rise to support the Supply Bill I find it a very sobering thought to reflect that South Australians are now experiencing the most serious effects of recessionary forces driven by failed Labor economic and industrial policies. Political uncertainty and increasing unemployment continue to lower confidence in business and investment potential in this State. Without clear and concise Government direction and positive incentives in those areas, recovery from the depths of this recession would not appear to be forthcoming in the near future. The Premier and Treasurer—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. In view of the point of order that was raised this afternoon, could you give a further ruling on the reading of speeches by members?

The SPEAKER: The Chair is not aware of the substance of the point of order. The Chair has not observed any reading of speeches.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: The point of order is that the honourable member seemed to be reading her speech.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will certainly observe and take appropriate action if it is required.

Mrs KOTZ: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Perhaps if the honourable member were more observant of Government policy, we might have a far better run State at the moment. The Premier and Treasurer of this State was well aware that the budget that was presented in this House was already doomed to failure. With absolutely no vision or forethought to the already excessive unemployment statistics, this State's Treasurer massively reduced capital spending by 20 per cent or, in real terms, \$100 million. This Treasurer, this Leader of the State, with all the resources of Government departments, with all the alleged best intelligence that money can buy—that taxpayers' money can buy—and with the full and absolute knowledge that his budget had failed, has refused to acknowledge that failure or to take action to turn the tide against increasing unemployment.

Mr HAMILTON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the keenest observer would understand that the member is reading from a prepared contribution.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Albert Park that that is almost in contempt of the Chair in that the point has been raised, the Chair has given an undertaking to watch proceedings and it will do so. Once again, I

caution the member for Albert Park on the way that he phrases remarks directed to the Chair.

Mrs KOTZ: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will continue to make the point that the Treasurer has refused to take action to turn the tide against increasing unemployment by failing to cut recurrent spending and by failing to implement a mini budget to address this major State problem and help to slow the increase in unemployment. South Australia may be one of the smaller States in this nation, but there is nothing small in this Treasurer's mismanaged approach to our finances. Having incurred a \$2.3 billion debt increase, the Treasurer did not decrease recurrent outlays, but increased recurrent outlays by 6.7 per cent and increased borrowings by \$147 million to fund that additional increase.

To help this Government retrieve its financial imbalance, the Treasurer increased taxes by 9.6 per cent and charges by 17.4 per cent on businesses and households in this State. By not cutting recurrent expenditure, this Government since it took office has allowed the State debt to increase by \$4 billion to its current debt of \$6.6 billion, and it has effectively laid a debt of \$4 568 upon every man, woman and child in this State for the future.

The outcome of visionless and ill-conceived Bannon budgets has created a new poor, and the youth of this State have become a part of the new poor. These are the new, forgotten poor, cast aside by this Government, who are unable to be either educated or employed. Youth unemployment is a nightmare of indeterminate proportions, but add to that the hundreds if not thousands of young people being turned away from tertiary education and the situation for our youth under a Labor Government is one of bleak and irretrievable hopelessness.

This Labor Government has seriously failed in its obligations to youth. The Premier's mismanagement of this State, his lack of integrity in setting direction, his refusal to be open and direct and his lack of courage with which to make the hard decisions—instead, the Premier prefers to deal in secrecy and subterfuge—all of this misdirection and mismanagement has helped to create a situation where obligation to youth has been lost and has resulted in our young being robbed of job opportunities and of their future education opportunities.

At a time when this State is in dire need of strong leadership and direction, the Premier and the Labor Party have been expending a massive amount of energy squabbling obscenely over the divvying up of the spoils of office. One in three young South Australians are out of work at present. Our major State financial institutions (the State Bank and SGIC) have posted major losses. Our hospitals, schools and public transport systems are reeling from the impact of the latest Government policies, which are in total disarray. This Labor Government's major concern is with which faction will produce the most numbers for the least likely.

Speaking of the least likely, it is unlikely that I would normally agree with the member for Hartley, but on 3 February in a radio interview the honourable member said:

A Party that cannot govern itself cannot govern the State.

I compliment the honourable member on a most profound and positive statement. South Australians are calling on this Government to govern, and nothing short of a major economic statement that boosts investment and jobs will suffice. Has the Premier and Treasurer got sufficient intestinal fortitude to follow the lead of the Western Australian Labor Premier and introduce the reforms which have been blueprinted in this place by the Leader of the Opposition for the past two years and which the member for Henley Beach has refused to acknowledge?

Members interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: If the flapping facial orifices of the members on the Government benches were to cease for a few moments, they might not impede their hearing long enough for them to acknowledge that, in fact, a policy blueprint has been set in this place. The Western Australian Premier's reforms are a draft facsimile of the Liberal Party's blueprint. They include—and I refer to the Western Australian Premier's reforms—selling the State Government Insurance Office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs KOTZ: I quote:

Privatise at least 40 per cent of the State and R & I Banks by share float, amend the State Industrial Relations Act to allow enterprise bargaining, cut business regulations and red tape and set up a one-stop shop, eliminate delays on major industrial and resource projects and publish three-year forward estimates to help private sector investment.

If all that sounds familiar in this House, the memories of members are quite intact. In fact, the Premier has been promising to open a one-stop shop for business since 1985 but, as with most Labor promises, South Australian business is still waiting. The actions of the Western Australian Premier, in initiating this model of economic adjustment, has once and for all put paid to the bleatings of this Premier that action on these matters must come from Canberra. The Premier's attempt to shift the blame to Canberra has been outdated and outmoded by the Labor Premier from Western Australia. As far back as 1982, this Premier promised to abolish payroll tax. That particular promise has been recycled over the years, but the employers and 80 000 unemployed South Australians will find no relief from that promise because it is part of the illusion of substance, promoted by the Premier but never to be brought to reality.

Payroll tax is a direct tax on jobs and encourages employers to replace workers with machines, which do not attract payroll tax. If this Government were serious about helping the unemployed and creating jobs, the Premier would abolish payroll tax without further prevarication. Mismanagement appears to be an epidemic rushing through the ministerial portfolios of those charged with their respective responsibilities in this Labor Government. In particular, I refer to the Minister of Correctional Services whose stated arm's length approach to ministerial responsibility has taken on a new dimension whereby the arm's length approach to budget responsibility is so far delegated down through the system that no-one appears to have any responsibility. The Minister seems totally incapable of ensuring that his departments live within their budget allocation and, according to the Public Accounts Committee report recently tabled in this House, the Minister is incapable of controlling the finances of the Department of Correctional Services.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

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

Mrs KOTZ: The Public Accounts Committee report tabled last week revealed how the Department of Correctional Services, under the supervision of Minister Blevins, continued to mismanage its overtime budget with payments for call-backs totalling over \$3 million for 1990-91. The situation was raised by the Public Accounts Committee as far back as 1982, but the latest figures indicate that the overtime budget is again seriously overspent, with little or no control by senior institutional staff within the department. This arm's length approach by the Minister to ministerial responsibility is reflected in how he has allowed the situation to go unchecked, without remedying a rostering system where top management has no say in this area. The committee also noted the large increase in the number of days lost due

to workers compensation claims, with 53 of the 1 300 correctional services staff off on a long-term basis. The Auditor-General in his 1990-91 report referred to the dramatic increase in the department's workers compensation premiums from \$1 million in 1990 to \$7 million in 1991—a \$6 million increase in a one-year period. Is it any wonder that our prison system is claimed to be the most expensive of all systems throughout Australia?

This completely sorry saga of facts demonstrates what happens when a Minister is too scared to take the hard decisions. The Minister shares the indecisiveness which is such a negative hallmark of this Bannon Government, and the Minister is part of the epidemic of irresponsible Government. The honourable member, who is also the Minister of Finance, cannot even ensure that an overtime cost blowout is brought under control. Is it any wonder that South Australia is suffering from hard labour?

If we look at a further area of responsibility of this Minister, the area of prisoner rehabilitation, we find that inmates released from Northfield prison are now more likely to return to their cells as funding to rehabilitate and educate prisoners has mysteriously disappeared.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: He speaks very highly of you!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs KOTZ: The prisoner education courses, which are the core plum in this Government's rehabilitation programs, and which include the teaching of numeracy and literacy, designed to help inmates familiarise themselves with the community when set free, have also become victims of the Premier's billion dollar bumbles. Or perhaps the Minister with responsibility for this area failed to mention to the Premier that the core of rehabilitation has now been torn out at the throat of the rehabilitation program.

Members interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: I thought so. The key educational programs at Northfield prison have been slashed. Prisoners and prison officers have complained to me that there is now little incentive for inmates to take part and learn crucial skills to enable them to fit back into the community. It is likely that many more inmates will revert to crime and end back in their cells, costing the State far more than any savings made by these cutbacks.

Female prisoners are not the only ones affected. Northfield also holds and trains up to 55 minimum security male prisoners who are placed in the facilities at the end of their terms as part of their resocialisation to society. The TAFE programs were widely respected, and the rehabilitation of prisoners is a key component of both Labor Party programs and Liberal Party prison policy. It is a disgrace—

Mr Ferguson: So you've got a policy?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach has been spoken to previously.

Mrs KOTZ: —that, because of this Administration's financial incompetence, programs such as this are being wound back. In the end, as freed prisoners revert to a life of crime, the South Australian public will have to foot the bill for more of the Government's follies and failures. The Government must explain why these funds have dried up, and act to correct that situation in the best interests of this community. Under the Liberal Party's plans to privatise—and I hope that the member for Henley Beach is taking notes—minimum security prisons contract out many services, the savings made by those contracted out services will be made to ensure that these educational services continue.

Instead of creating a more efficient administration, this Government has attacked services such as health, education, transport, public safety and water with which the public should expect to be provided in a most adequate manner.

These are clearly under enormous threat and are being dismantled by this Government. After months of his playing the secrecy and subterfuge game, the Premier's financial incompetence is now blatantly obvious, even to those who refuse to see it. For the first time, the Premier and Treasurer did not allow for wage increases in the budget, and told his departments that they would have to fend for themselves.

Now the situation has worsened. The Premier's incompetence has become even more clear, and the Government has been forced to sharpen its knives and slice away the very services which the Government's—the taxpaying public's—contributions should and must provide. The Liberal Government's initiatives would give the public a public sector which it can afford and which will look after the people's needs.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): May I say that, in supporting this Bill, it appears some members opposite do not support it. Perhaps those members can put their money where their mouths are. As I understand the member for Hayward has stated by way of interjection that he is not prepared to support this Bill, I suggest that he should have the intestinal fortitude to vote against it. However, I do not believe the honourable member has that intestinal fortitude. In relation to such fortitude, I believe members opposite have had the opportunity to talk on this Bill and, apart from the programmed contribution by the member opposite, to which I do not want to greatly respond for obvious reasons—his contribution may have been well researched, but I question by whom—those prospective Ministers had the opportunity to talk on a whole range of issues about which they purport to be concerned.

I refer to crime prevention, corporate affairs, trade and technology, industry, agriculture, fisheries, ethnic affairs, education, children's services, tourism, consumer affairs, small business, housing construction and so on. Frankly, the contribution by the member for Hayward was probably the worst one that he has made since he has been in this Parliament. It was absolutely appalling, and full of rhetoric and diatribe. Because the honourable member is as an educated person, I would have expected more from him. Is it any wonder that the honourable member is red-faced about his absolutely appalling contribution? He knows it; I know what goes through my mind; and he knows what goes through his.

The honourable member knows in his own heart and mind that he had not even researched his contribution to this Parliament. He had the gall and temerity to say that members opposite were not delivering in terms of the way in which they were elected into this Parliament and are representing their constituents. Yet the greatest diatribe I have heard in this House in many years on a Supply Bill was uttered in this House tonight. After hearing the contribution by the member for Hayward, do not talk to me about its being a matter of one's looking after one's own constituency. The Supply Bill is relevant to the amount of money that is being appropriated for this purpose, and the honourable member talks about those particular issues.

An honourable member:

Mr HAMILTON: Well, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the contributions made by members opposite. I have also listened to the recent contributions by members in relation to their concerns about public transport. In talking to the Supply Bill I, as someone who is proud of being a railway person for many years, have listened to the hypocrisy, the diatribe and the puerile contributions by members opposite regarding their concerns for public transport in this State. I do not know whether mem-

bers are so stupid or dumb or whether they are deliberately misrepresenting the truth in this place. However, I could go back to 1968 when I was a railway man and the Liberal Party wanted to shut down the Adelaide Railway Station after 8 o'clock at night—not 10 o'clock, but 8 o'clock at night! Yet, they have the gall to stand up here now and say, 'We are concerned about public transport.' Rubbish! Absolute tripe!

The other night I listened with a great deal of attention to the shadow Minister who appeared on television, and in my view her words to the people of South Australia were dishonest. She did not and was not prepared to address what the Liberal Party would do after 10 o'clock at night. She tried to escape the question that was directed to her and turned away from the issue. She was not prepared to address it.

Let us look at the history of the contribution of members opposite, because it is relevant to this Bill and to how public servants must address this problem. Mr Speaker, you and I will recall that we were elected to this place on 15 September 1979, and I go back to the chronology of events in relation to railways since that time. Let us look at the so-called 'concern' of Liberal members and the Liberal Party between 1979 and 1982. On 24 September 1979 the Liberal Cabinet agreed to the closure of the Moonta to Wallaroo line and the reduction of the Adelaide to Port Pirie passenger service. On 2 October the Liberal Cabinet opposed the Murraylands line freight service reductions. On 2 November 1979 the Cabinet agreed to a reduction of one train a week on four of the Murraylands lines. On 1 February 1980 AN closed 11 unattended freight stations and altered the status of 31 others, mainly in the Murraylands and the South-East. On 21 July 1980 the Minister requested the deferral of the Adelaide to Peterborough and Adelaide to Gladstone passenger trains and feeder reductions.

I could go on *ad nauseam* about the puerile contributions of members opposite about their so-called concern for public transport. Is it any wonder that my friend and colleague the member for Custance sits there with his mouth wide open, overawed in part by my short contribution thus far, as to what his colleagues did previously in terms of rail services in the rural area of South Australia? Should he want more, I would be quite happy to deliver to my friend the member for Custance a great deal more about what the Liberal Party did to country rail services in South Australia.

On 12 December 1980, after a discussion between the State and the Commonwealth, the Liberal Cabinet agreed to the cancellation of seven return services between Adelaide and Peterborough and the cancellation of feeder bus services between Riverton and Jamestown. Four days after—and, Sir, I know that this is painful to members opposite, because it reflects on how the Supply—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I think this historical tour of the railways is wonderful, but I ask you to rule on its relevance to this Supply Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: This evening the Chair has repeatedly reminded all members of the need to restrict their remarks in the second stage to the Bill under discussion, and I extend the same caution to the member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: I am always guided, Sir—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: —as my colleague suggests, because it is relevant. Members opposite would agree with me that any person who ignores history is a fool. This matter is relevant to the Supply debate, that is, how moneys will be expended and how that will impact on the rural sector, as we have heard from members opposite. It is relevant to

what is happening in the transport industry in this State. I could go on and on, and I will—

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: That is the first contribution I have heard the forgotten member opposite make in a long time, albeit inane. I point out to members opposite, when they stand in here and profess their concerns about how the Supply Bill impacts on every South Australian in terms of public transport, their dismal and appalling record.

Comparing that with the record of this State Government is like comparing chalk with cheese. In 1968 the then Liberal Government wanted to shut down the passenger service after 8 o'clock at night. Members opposite do not want to mention those attitudes but, as I pointed out, people who ignore history are fools, and I do not believe that good leopards change their spots, nor do I believe the Liberal Party, despite all its public utterances. Its attitude will be to decimate the public transport system in South Australia, given the opportunity.

Let me turn to some other matters that have been raised by members opposite in this important Supply Bill debate. They have referred to hospitals, in particular to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, something that is very dear to my heart in more ways than one. What recognition have members opposite given to the amount of money this Government has spent through supply in terms of looking after people in the western suburbs of Adelaide—very little. They are great on rhetoric, but very little has been done in terms of research in these areas.

They have not mentioned the magnificent contribution this Government has made in terms of upgrading the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in so many areas: in the kitchen, in the maternity wing, in the haemapheresis unit, in the renal section, etc. I could go on and on about what has been done down there, but what members of the Opposition want to do is run some cheap stunt about maggots, or something, which has been discredited already by people in the community.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: With the greatest respect to the member for Custance, he may be good in his own area growing wheat but, when it comes to knowing about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, he knows nought, and I suggest that he probably has never been to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, let alone have any knowledge what takes place there. I am appalled that he is prepared to interject in these matters. I have much respect for the man, but I do not respect some of the utterances he has made here tonight.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: No, there is not. I get on very well with the member for Custance, and I do not think that he will take umbrage in terms of our friendship once outside this House. There is bleating opposite, particularly from the member for Hayward—or is it Hartley, if he gets the chance? I understand that Mr Stefani will knock him off up in that area, and it should be rather interesting. The honourable member spoke about the South Australian Housing Trust and what this Government has or has not done. One of the greatest—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The members for Hayward and Custance will cease interjecting. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: People from interstate and overseas have recognised what this State Government and the Housing Trust have done for disadvantaged people in this State, and I pay credit and have done for many years, since I have been in this Parliament, to the wonderful contribution

employees of the South Australian Housing Trust have made. I hasten to add that they are not without fault in some areas but, overall, I applaud them.

I believe that under successive Governments, since I came into this place in 1979, the employees of the South Australian Housing Trust have made a magnificent contribution to assisting the very needy, the impoverished and those who are desperate, who need emergency housing and so on. That is in stark contrast, I suggest, to some of the utterances made here tonight. I look at the way in which this State Government and, in particular, the Housing Trust have addressed the social problems and needs of those disadvantaged in the community, and there is no better example—

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I hear bleatings from members opposite, but I shut them out. I have part industrial deafness, so I do not need to worry about their noise. When I look at Semaphore Park and the West Lakes area, there can be no better example of what the Housing Trust and the State Government have done in terms of housing people. They have not set up ghettos of people in Housing Trust areas.

What the trust has done in Semaphore Park is tremendous. On prime real estate in that area we have seen some of the best, if not the best, housing estates in South Australia. Prime real estate has been used for Housing Trust units, and why not? Everyone can see how good this Government and the trust have been in addressing housing problems. Those trust units have been set up in an area where there is decent public transport and there are hospital, sporting and recreation facilities—the whole bit. Under a previous conservative Government, we saw it putting trust units in distant and isolated areas far apart from any such facilities.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I heard that stupid and inane interjection about being expensive. In my opinion, nothing is too good for disadvantaged people in our community, people who through no fault of their own have been born into poverty or who have been physically, sexually or mentally assaulted. Why should they not have the same opportunities as anyone else to go into decent housing, especially when their situation is through no fault of their own? Yet we have the inane interjections from members opposite that such a policy is so expensive. Such people should have the same opportunities as all members here to be better educated and enjoy all the facilities that the average South Australian enjoys.

I now wish to refer to the work of the Public Accounts Committee. Over the years I have been a member of the Public Accounts Committee, with reports from the committee being made to this Parliament. I believe the bipartisan approach adopted by the committee has been very good indeed. In many cases the reports that came from the PAC were not complimentary to the Government, and that is the politest way that I can put it. Yet we hear members opposite criticising this Government about what it is prepared and not prepared to do. There has been some damning criticism brought down by the PAC while I was a member of the committee but not once in all those years was a minority brought down before this Parliament.

I commend the staff who have worked on the Public Accounts Committee. It is a fair reflection on how public servants in this State, through the assistance given to members, have assisted the committee to arrive at the truth and to provide decent reports to put before this Parliament. That is unlike the situation many years ago when minority reports were brought down in different circumstances. However, time does not permit me to elaborate on those issues.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I would love to debate the matter of State Fleet with the member for Hartley—or is it Hayward—whatever he aspires to be.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I thought it was both customary and courtesy to refer to members by their title. I have listened a number of times while I have been referred to as the member for Hartley.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is also against Standing Orders. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: I am guided by you, Sir. Last but not least, with regard to prisons, I listened to the member for Newland talk about rehabilitation. If ever I have heard hypocrisy flow from people's lips, I heard it tonight. During my years in this place, in debates on law and order the Liberal Party, to be polite, has been extreme, to say the least, in relation to imposing penalties, but rarely do Liberal members talk about rehabilitation. Tonight was the first occasion, in a prepared contribution, that I have ever heard on this topic in this place. It was an appalling contribution. It may read well to put out in the electorate, but what is in the heart is different from the rhetoric and the prepared contribution that we heard tonight. It was an appalling contribution. If ever the Opposition gets into Government in the foreseeable future, and if I happen to be in Opposition, I certainly have a long and vivid memory and I will be most trenchant in my criticism of that puerile contribution by the member for Newland tonight. All mouth but very little action.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, and a well-read speech, as my colleague says. It was an appalling contribution, but this gives members an opportunity to prepare.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): In contrast to the member who has just resumed his seat, I want to commend the member for Newland for the fine contribution she made in this place—so different from the contribution that has just been made by the member for Albert Park. It is a great pity that the type of contribution that has just been made by the member for Albert Park reflects the standards of the members opposite. In comparing the material and depth of the contribution from the member for Newland with that from the member for Albert Park, it is up to those who have the opportunity to read *Hansard* to judge who made the better contribution. I do not think it matters a tinker's cuss how much of the material is read, referred to, quoted, or whatever, but it matters a lot when someone is prepared to do the research that the member for Newland has done and to bring to the notice of South Australians and the people of her electorate the concerns that are recognised throughout the State.

The member for Albert Park has attempted, yet again, to prop up his Government by talking about some of the matters that were previously referred to, in particular by the member for Newland. The honourable member talked about public transport. He tried to prop up the Government in regard to its public transport policies in this State. Those policies are a disaster, and he knows it. I only wish that he had the opportunity to do what I did last Sunday morning and spend some time at a phone-in, where people were invited to suggest to members of the Opposition how they felt about the State transport system, the STA. It would have been most enlightening for members opposite to participate in that phone-in. On occasion, up to 18 calls at a time were being registered on the board as people attempted to get their message through to the Liberal Party.

People in the metropolitan area and throughout this State were expressing a message of concern, anger and frustration over public transport and matters relating to the curfew and to the deterioration of services. In my own area, it would be impossible to say that the service was efficient, because it has deteriorated to such an extent that within a matter of months large parts of my electorate will have no public transport at all.

An honourable member: Remember Choats?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes, I well remember Choats. That firm would still be running an efficient and much better service than we have experienced under the STA had it had been allowed to do so. But no, it was pushed out of business by the Government that is in place at this time. It provided an excellent service, and it would still be providing that excellent service had it not been forced out by a Labor Government.

The member for Albert Park went on to talk about hospitals. He referred to the matter that my colleague the member for Adelaide raised in regard to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is a disaster! The Minister of Health can stand up in this place as often as he likes and prattle on, but the people who work in that hospital and the people who for one reason or another have to attend that hospital understand the situation. If the Minister is too blind or too ignorant to find out just what are the real concerns of those running the hospital, it is the State that will suffer.

A matter which the member for Albert Park conveniently forgot to mention is the effect that this Government is having on hospitals, particularly in country areas. No mention is made of the present Government in relation to the disadvantage that will once again be imposed on people outside the metropolitan area who, for generations, have worked their butts off to build up community hospitals into the very efficient services that exist in those communities. Now, with the stroke of a pen, we have a Minister indicating that we do not need these hospitals. If the Minister had had the guts to attend a public meeting held at Woodside recently, he would recognise the strength of feeling about this subject.

The member for Albert Park went on to talk about the Housing Trust—again, trying to prop up the Government. Is he unaware that there is something like a seven year waiting list for people trying to get into Housing Trust accommodation? Is he unaware that there are some 43 000 people on the waiting list who need that form of accommodation? No, we hear nothing about that. All we hear is an attempt by the member for Albert Park to prop up the Government.

As I said earlier, I commend the member for Newland for her contribution. I think it is a great pity that we have stupid statements and comments flying across the floor. I only hope that some of the members who made those comments will sit down and read the contribution she made. It absolutely staggers me that members on the other side are prepared to hide behind a Premier who has brought about the biggest State corporate collapse that Australia has ever known. They hide behind a Premier who has brought to each South Australian a debt of \$4 524.

They stand behind a Government that made pre-election promises that have been broken one by one, including things like free bus travel for students. How many times did we tell the Government at the time the policy was first introduced that it would not last because the Government could not afford it? In fact, it was the people of South Australia who could not afford it. However, the Government did not listen and unfortunately prior to the last election many people were sucked in by that policy. The Premier used such things to bribe his way into Government.

We saw what was to be the magnificent Homesure scheme: in one day and gone two days after the election. Look at the people who have been disadvantaged as a result of that. It was just a game—a vote-buying gimmick. It got Labor through the election. Now, of course, we have a *de facto* Government in this State. That is even more of a problem, even more of a difficulty, for the people of South Australia, because we now have three, or perhaps four, Independents sitting on the benches opposite. It will be interesting, with respect to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, to see what happens in future as far as the Independents are concerned. Surely, these people must recognise the hurt in the community that has been brought about as a result of the actions of the present Government.

In this State we have a Government that has been unable and unwilling to take the steps which are necessary to put South Australia into a better position in years to come, not in a worse position as it has done. I often wonder how a lot of the pioneers who in the early days came into the driest areas of the driest State on the driest continent would have felt if they could see the situation now. They worked hard to better themselves and to make South Australia a great place in which to live, to work and to bring up children. How would they feel now if they could see the situation in South Australia?

In the past this State has had Premiers who have been able to run the State very frugally. They have used taxes and Government charges to provide incentives for people to come here and to prosper. Let us look at what has happened now. Let us face it, we are a run of the mill State. That is about all we can say. All the things that South Australia has to offer are now mediocre, like those offered by all the other States in Australia, whereas before South Australia was out in front in so many areas. Unfortunately, this is mainly because of the State Bank disaster, which has been perpetrated by the Premier of this State, who did not have his finger on the pulse at the time.

The budget that we have been talking about in this debate and on previous occasions has put the responsibility for the whole problem onto the next generation. When the budget was brought down we indicated that the Premier would have three options when framing it: he could have cut expenditure, he could have increased taxation or he could have increased debt. What did the Premier do? All he did was to increase borrowings. He was not prepared to take the tough decisions that are necessary to get South Australia out of the mire. He has not been and never will be prepared to do that. For the budget that was brought down the Government has indicated it will have to borrow about \$147 million a year for recurrent expenditure for day to day operations just to prop up the situation.

I repeat, ordinary South Australians are hurting, and hurting greatly. Small business has been affected. People are being forced out of small business and out of jobs. The Government has forced up charges for electricity, water, gas, petrol, and so I could go on. The forcing up of water prices has been of particular concern to me. We have seen the unfairness of the Bannon Government's new water rating system that has been hitting consumers over a period of time, particularly with its latest accounts. I am aware that the E&WS switchboard is once more being jammed with complaints about the rating system, which was forced through this Parliament by the Minister and the Australian Democrats. People in South Australia, and in the metropolitan area in particular, are irate that their water bills have jumped significantly, even after assurances by the Minister that the majority of people would be better off under the new system.

What a lot of garbage! Water consumers are finding it impossible to determine how their bills are calculated. They have no idea what part of the formula applies to the property tax component and what part to actual water usage. Many residents are finding that they have used up most of their allocation of water in the first six months. Many of my constituents are finding that they are in that situation. As a result, many of these people have stopped watering their garden. I feel particularly sorry for people with large families because, whilst there is an option for people to stop watering their garden, they can hardly stop four or five children from showering. One can hardly stop a family with young children from washing clothing, etc.

Many of these people are angry and frustrated. Despite the extensive representations made to this Government following the introduction of this new water rating system, the only alteration has been an increase in the property threshold from \$117 000 to \$140 000 that will take effect from July. I hope that those who have to pay the water accounts will remember that it was the Australian Democrats who supported the Bannan Labor Government to ensure that this wealth tax in disguise became law. I feel very strongly for many of those people.

In the last few minutes that I have I want to express my concern particularly about the unemployment situation in South Australia, a situation that is a disaster for so many people in this State. There are 11.5 per cent of South Australians unemployed—the highest rate in Australia. It concerns me greatly that so many of these people have lost their self respect. Day after day they attempt without success to find work. I was pleased to receive today from the ACF some suggestions re job creation for Federal and State Governments to consider. I hope that they do, because the ACF has brought forward job creation package recommendations in forestry and agriculture. I hope that the Minister of the front bench at present will consider the submission we have all received today. Tax rebates for expenditure incurred in combating land degradation was recommended by the joint ACF/NFF task force in 1989 as an alternative to tax deductibility. It has been estimated by the ACF/NFF that this will cost the Government \$1.5 million to \$2 million per annum, but it would help a lot of people.

They also suggest the immediate adoption of National Plantation Advisory Committee recommendations, particularly as they relate to reviewing tax disincentives for the establishment of plantations. They recommend the extension of such incentives to plantation establishment on cleared marginal agricultural land for wood production, and they have identified timber industry supply zones for wildlife habitats and for conservation of biodiversity in accordance with approved catchment plans. They go on to consider working with local government in limiting urban development of agricultural land. They have looked at energy transport, and have recommended job creation in manufacturing and tourism and the export of environmental services. I can only reiterate that I hope that the State Government will consider many of the excellent recommendations made by this group—positive recommendations that I hope the Government of South Australia will pick up and run with for the sake of all South Australians.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I support the Bill, which is obviously necessary to appropriate funds to enable the Government to continue to provide public services during the early months of the 1992-93 financial year. We all realise that it has become customary for this Government to introduce such a Bill each year and I note that on this occasion the \$860 million expenditure authority sought is approxi-

mate 1 per cent more than the \$850 million sought for the first two months of 1991-92. I confess to being somewhat surprised and even suspicious at this moderate 1 per cent increase. However, closer scrutiny of the Premier's second reading explanation reveals the usual escape clauses that are often part of the Premier's speeches. I draw members' attention to those escape clauses. The first one states:

It is unlikely that additional appropriation authority will prove to be necessary.

The word 'unlikely' is there—characteristic of the Premier's many usual escape clauses. The Premier also states further on:

While it is too early in the year to be precise about the prospective budget outcome for 1991-92, I can advise the House in broad terms of budget developments.

The usual escape clauses of 'in broad terms' and 'while it is too early' are all present again in this document, there to be quoted back to the Parliament should this appropriation be insufficient or should there be any errors.

To illustrate further the reason for my suspicion, it is appropriate to look at the South Australian economy and the State's position in general. Many members have already made mention in this debate of the dreadful unemployment situation facing us at present. Unemployment in South Australia is running at 11.5 per cent, seasonally adjusted, the highest rate in Australia. This means that some 82 600 South Australians were unemployed as at December 1991. I hope that all members take note of those numbers, as they are more than just numbers. Those 82 600 people include heads of families or people within families seeking their first job, people who feel demoralised and disparaged. They feel that they have nowhere to go. Worse still, they feel that they have no opportunity for the future because this Government has failed continually, time and again, to come up with constructive policies that provide some hope for people who feel desperate in the hopeless situation presently facing them.

Even more alarming is the youth unemployment figures. Amongst 15 to 19 year olds we see a massive 37.5 per cent unemployed. These statistics conceal the hidden unemployed—those who have gone back to further their education, to repeat perhaps one of the years of school or undertake a course in a desperate hope that at the end of that year of further study there may be something else on the horizon. Too often that has not happened. Last year's unemployed who went through that process now find that they form part of the 82 600 statistical number. Something must be done to turn around the situation, but it is not happening. If we look further into the economy and finances, we can see why it is not.

We note that Adelaide's annual CPI increase at the end of December 1991 was still the highest in Australia and a significant contribution to this increase is our own State Government charges. We also saw last year South Australian business bankruptcies at record levels with almost 2 000 businesses going bankrupt and along with them their employees going on to the unemployment queues. The Australian Bureau of Statistics estimates of the private sector released in September 1991—the latest quarterly figures available—indicate that South Australian capital expenditure fell by 9 per cent, the sharpest drop in the nation. There was an admission by the Premier on 8 February 1992, as published in the *Advertiser*, that his forecast budget deficit of \$330 million will blow out by \$60 million because of lower stamp duty, FID, payroll tax and gambling receipts.

Interestingly, those 2 000 businesses that went bankrupt probably contribute significantly to the shortfall. They were no longer there to have their cash ripped from the till. The issue of gambling receipts is an interesting addition to my comment, because a Bill to increase those receipts will be

presented shortly to this Parliament. Despite the highest unemployment levels in the nation, we still see WorkCover at least \$150 million in the red. We have the highest employer levies in this nation, but WorkCover is \$150 million in the red. The average South Australian employer is levied 3.8 per cent of payroll, which is more than double the 1.8 per cent charged in New South Wales. We have also seen payroll tax remain a direct tax on South Australian jobs and an impediment to exports, but the Premier still has not led his long promised national campaign to get Prime Minister Keating to match Dr Hewson's fight-back policy to fund the abolition of payroll tax.

We have heard much rhetoric but we are still waiting for action. We have seen financial institutions duty at 10c per \$100, already 40 per cent above the next highest rate in Australia. The South Australian Treasury has admitted that our State debt has increased by \$4 billion since the Premier took office, from \$2.6 billion in June 1982 to a massive \$6.6 billion in June 1991. However, this figure excludes the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been borrowed through complicated South Australian Government Financing Authority lease-back deals involving power stations, forests and public transport.

Only last week in this Parliament I attempted to get the Premier to answer what I believed was a straight question. I asked the Premier on that occasion whether it were true that the Hallett Cove East Primary School in my electorate had been sold to SAFA and was being leased back to the Education Department for \$315 000 per annum for 15 years. The Premier did not answer that question, just as he did not answer questions put to him in November last year regarding the Noarlunga hospital. The Premier simply assured the Parliament, in his usual rhetoric, that deals of that nature were returning money to the community. If that is the case, let the Premier have the honesty to expose these deals and put the record on the table.

If these deals are to the advantage of South Australia, why is it that the Premier continues to duck, dodge and weave? Why is it that the Premier will not give this Parliament the answers that it seeks? Why is it that he refuses to let the South Australian public know what is really happening behind the scenes? It is my belief that the answer is quite obvious. The Premier does not want these deals to be added to the South Australian debt because he knows that our debt goes well beyond the \$6.6 billion that has been admitted to date.

One cannot look at the State's problems without of course mentioning the situation with respect to the State Bank. We have heard time and again in this Parliament the fact that \$2 200 million has been lost to date by the State Bank. We have also heard continually that this figure is indeed seven times the profit returned by the State Bank to the Treasury since its inception in 1984. We have also heard that two-thirds of the non-performing loans of the bank are outside of South Australia.

What happened to the State Bank that was established by this Premier and which was supposed to serve the needs of South Australians? What happened to the bank that was established to ensure that businesses and home buyers could obtain competitive finance, and that business in South Australia was encouraged to ensure that homes were built and purchased here to promote enterprise in this State? That all flew out the window. Money was lent willy-nilly interstate and overseas, and we became a laughing stock. It became a common point of discussion among businesses in the eastern States that, 'If you cannot get money in your home town, don't worry about it, go over to Adelaide. The State Bank is throwing money all over the place.' Too right it

was, and most of it has gone down the drain, but at the end of the day the South Australian taxpayer must now foot the bill of \$603 000 a day in interest, seven days a week, 365 days a year—indeed, a bonus of 366 days as this is a leap year—for the rest of this century and well into the next one.

We are told by Government members that, when the bank is restored to profitability, it will indeed pay back that debt. I remind members that the bank's debt is seven times its total contribution to the State Treasury since its inception. There is no way that the debt will be paid back in the short or medium term. Unless intervention occurs, that debt will be with us for not only the rest of this century but also well into the next one. It is interesting that the only three members of the Government who sit in this Chamber tonight all have young families. I do not know how any one of those three members can, in any conscience at all, stand idly by in their Caucus meetings while this sort of nonsense is peddled through those meetings and not have the debt combated.

The Opposition has already put on record that it will have to reluctantly float the State Bank as a private company in order to pay back that debt level. I challenge the three Government members here tonight to do something about it, and it is regrettable that, during an important debate such as this one tonight, the Government cannot even maintain its numbers in the Chamber. That in itself is a disgraceful indictment of the way in which this Government carries on.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Yes, I know the three of you want to bleat about that now, and I can see the member for Playford nodding. I am not talking about those numbers. Perhaps the member for Playford should become the Government Whip. Maybe he could then muster his numbers in this place. The Centre Left faction may be able to fill the Chamber and make its presence felt a little better than it is being felt tonight. Unfortunately, the ailing state of our finances does not end there. SGIC has announced a pre-tax loss of \$81 million. Once again SGIC has set the stage for further losses because of poor profit investments such as the \$460 million it invested into the now notorious property at 333 Collins Street in Victoria, once again, an interstate investment. Of course, one cannot indulge in a speech of this nature without mentioning the South Australian Timber Corporation, which has lost tens of millions of dollars in timber ventures, not just in South Australia or even Australia, but in New Zealand. What on earth is the Government doing involved in ventures of that nature?

It is also important to refer in this debate to the opportunities the Premier has had—the missed and lost opportunities. He had the opportunity to address these problems in his State budget by handing down a constructive, forward-planning document in which he admitted his mistakes. Everyone else in this State knows he has made a mistake. The three members sitting opposite must know that he has made a mistake, unless they are absolutely blind and deaf. The whole of South Australia knows he has made a mistake. Why does not he have the guts to stand up in this Chamber, say that he has made a mistake and start to fix it?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Well, I have no doubt why the Minister and member for Briggs is smiling because, of course, he can—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Member for Ramsay.

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Ramsay, I am sorry. He can see the Premier going down the gurgler fast, and he has designs on the Premier's job by the middle of the year,

and I wish him well. Another leadership aspirant just enters the Chamber, and it is pleasing to see the member for Mawson, who has jumped to Reynell, because that member has not got the guts to face a poll—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright will have greater difficulty in linking this to the Supply Bill, and I suggest that he confines his discussion to the Bill itself.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you for your direction, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Premier's second reading explanation contains some interesting comments that highlight the predicament he is in. He said:

The State Government will therefore provide a response to the Federal Government's economic statement shortly after its release on 26 February, and at that stage the Government will be in a better position to provide a more detailed report on the State's financial position.

Perhaps the Premier is providing yet another out for himself and yet another opportunity to take the Opposition's advice—to hand down a mini-budget and travel on the coat-tails of his Federal colleagues. At this point in time it remains yet another escape clause. To see why he needs that sort of escape clause, one need only look at the manner in which the 1991-92 budget has slashed capital spending by in excess of 20 per cent in real terms—a total of some \$100 million—and increased our State debt by \$2.3 billion.

Unlike other States, the Premier has expanded recurrent outlays by 6.7 per cent in real terms to \$4.8 billion and borrowed to fund \$147 million of that extra recurrent expenditure. That sort of borrowing to fund recurrent expenditure is tantamount to the home shopper purchasing their groceries on Bankcard at the supermarket each week, continuing to blow out the debt and, instead of paying back the amount they purchased, simply paying back the interest.

This State is now being run by a Government with a credit card mentality—if you cannot make ends meet, go out, get some more credit, cover your recurrent expenditure by borrowing and continue to pay back the interest. That is the legacy that this Liberal Opposition will inherit after the next election when we take Government. That is the legacy that the member for Ramsay will inherit when he takes the Premier's chair in June, and well may we wish him good luck during his short term in that office. I will be interested to see how that honourable member tackles the State's finances and to see whether he will have the courage to hand down a mini-budget before the usual budget that is handed down later in the year.

The Treasurer, in his budget speech to this Parliament, made great play of the fact that there will be 'a reduction in the net financing requirement from \$359 million in 1990-91 to an estimated \$330 million in 1991-92'. However, the Premier conveniently forgot, or perhaps deliberately did not say, that last year's budget deficit blew out by \$99 million to \$359 million, and that this year's estimate of \$330 million is likely to be at least \$44 million too low.

The whole situation in which our State has been placed is not the fault of the world economy or the Australian economy, as Government members in this Chamber tonight would have us believe, because the State ingredients that are involved in this State's mismanagement cannot be blamed on the rest of the world, Paul Keating, Bob Hawke or whichever hapless Federal member members opposite wish to choose. The fact is that the buck stops on the Premier's desk. The fact is that this Government has blown it. It has had opportunities to turn it around and it has not taken them up.

Is it any wonder, in the light of these blown opportunities, that the member for Playford has exerted his muscle to try to empty the benches. He knows damn well that as a result

of this Government's mismanagement the Labor Party will be in Opposition after the next election, and no doubt he is trying to buoy his chances to move to the front bench by making sure he has the numbers. We are watching all sorts of interesting numbers games on the other side.

It is interesting, when members opposite reflect on this financial situation, to look at the nominations for seats that the Labor Party would normally have contested. Four marginal seats had only one nomination, and it had to scratch for that! The Labor Party has already thrown in the towel. If it is to throw in the towel to that extent and not even put up a decent fight or put together a decent package, why not have the guts to stand up and say so, resign and give the public the opportunity to throw it out of office? I hope that the member for Hartley takes the opportunity to turn his back on those who carved him up and knifed him and that he turns on this Government, puts it out and sends it to the polls.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I listened to the contribution of the member for Henley Beach, and no doubt he will be in his seat for some interjections. I noted that he said that the Liberal Party had not put forward any proposition whatsoever to drag South Australia out of the mess it is in. In the next few moments I will not only give a critique of the Government's 1991 budget but also enunciate what I have already told this House and explain how we will do something for South Australia's future.

Let us look at the 1991 budget and the criticism that we levelled at it when it was brought down. Fancy bringing down a budget that slashed capital expenditure by 20 per cent, about \$100 million, when unemployment is rising dramatically and when we in this State are crying out for jobs! All the Government did was increase the State's borrowings by \$2.3 billion, thus passing on the problem for future generations. I guess that is what this Supply Bill is all about: making sure there are more funds to prop up an inept, corrupt Government.

Not only did the Government slash capital expenditure by \$100 million and increase borrowings by \$2.3 billion; but also, unlike the other States of Australia, it expanded its recurrent outlays by some 6.7 per cent to \$4.8 billion. To fund that recurrent expenditure, increased borrowings of \$147 million went into recurrent expenditure. I do not think it is very easy for the Treasurer to stand up in this House and tell us that he has slashed capital expenditure by \$100 million and then strut the stage nationally and bleat to his friend Mr Keating and his ex friend Mr Hawke that he wants extra capital expenditure in South Australia, when he has made the most savage cuts in capital expenditure in this State.

Of course, the hypocrisy of it all is now becoming quite clear to the people of South Australia. Instead of taking the tough decisions that were needed, the Treasurer wimped out once again, and taxes went up by 9.6 per cent, charges went up by 17.4 per cent and businesses went bankrupt in record numbers, all because of the decisions made by the Treasurer and the inability to take those tough business decisions that every other business in South Australia had to make.

Most private people on the other side of the House would have had to make some cuts in the past 12 months—even though I note that they passed a big increase in salary for themselves. The member for Henley Beach would have put it into shares to bolster his already considerable wealth, but

the rest of us have had to live within our means if we are operating businesses. It is hypocritical of the Premier to stand up and try to defend what he has done to South Australia. The interest bill alone on our State's debts now exceeds \$700 million per annum, or 50c in every tax dollar.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: What would you do?

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member for Napier interjects, 'What would you do about it?' When I have finished carving up what the Treasurer has done about it, I will tell the member for Napier and, when I have told him, he might tell me who he will be supporting at the next election in his electorate, because the House also wants to know that.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr D.S. BAKER: In his budget speech the Treasurer made great play of the fact that there was a reduction in the net financing requirements from \$359 million in 1990-91 to an estimated \$330 million in 1991-92, but he forgot to say that the budget blew out by \$99 million in 1990-91 (and that was included in the \$359 million); the Premier conveniently also forgot to say that the \$330 million that was needed to prop up the budget was already at least \$44 million out, in our opinion, in October, and I referred to that in this House on 8 October last year.

Interestingly, the Premier has waffled between \$60 million and \$100 million as to how much the budget is out. It is difficult for us to find that out because we cannot get hold of the accounts, but it is obvious the budget he brought down in this House was not only rubbery but also deceitful and not in the best interests of South Australians. It was decidedly not in the best interests of the 80 000 people who are unemployed in South Australia.

I turn to the South Australian Financing Authority (SAFA), because the Treasurer makes great play about it. He said that we will get an increased contribution from SAFA this financial year from \$270 million to \$400 million. Let us look at SAFA, because \$93 million of that contribution came from abnormal capital profits, from the sale of financial assets, and that was included as income. We all know—even the member for Henley Beach would know—what happens if we keep selling off assets and calling the proceeds income. One day things do not match.

SAFA has other little nasties in it. SAFA has \$100 million for provisions to the Australian Tax Office in respect of those sleazy little deals that have been done. I refer to those lease-back arrangements that have gone on, those arrangements that have been kept secret from South Australians until, one by one, they are prised out of the Premier only as a last resort to let us know what is going on in South Australia.

SAFA also borrowed \$3.4 billion overseas, and that has put us in hock to foreigners, something about which many of us are not proud. All these things have gone on while the Treasurer claimed that SAFA was going to pay into the budget in South Australia this year \$400 million, an increase from \$270 million the year before. Would anyone believe that as being credible? Let us look at other financial areas that the Government manages. Let us look at the financial results of the other institutions where the Government has had its nasty little fingers in the pie. Look at the State Bank. The Treasurer has been telling us for the past seven or eight years how much the State Bank was going to return to the taxpayers of South Australia.

We have started probing in that area over the past two years most aggressively, but all the time the Treasurer has said, 'Don't you worry about that. I am managing it well, and it is going to reap millions of dollars for the taxpayers

of South Australia.' Now we know what has happened: it is the greatest financial disaster in this State's history, perpetuated by the South Australian Treasurer.

Let us look at the other area where the Treasurer says he will do great things for South Australia, namely, the SGIC. The Treasurer has told us for the past four or five years what a wonderful instrumentality it was and how much it would return to the taxpayer. We built up our hopes, until we started to tear it apart limb by limb to have a look at what was really going on. Of course, we now know that the SGIC had lost \$81 million. How can the Treasurer get up in this House, given the situation of the State Bank, the SGIC, the debacle of Scrimber (which, of course, was not the Minister's fault, even if he had read the report—it was the fault of middle management), and claim that SAFA will put \$400 million into the State coffers this year. It just does not wash. The Premier cannot convince me that it is factual.

I refer to other matters in the State budget of which we were critical and which will have an effect on all South Australians. Electricity charges are the second highest of those in any State of Australia. The Government rips out \$100 million from South Australians and puts it into its coffers. It does that by a 5 per cent levy on all electricity sales, which is \$41 million, the 13 per cent interest on SAFA's \$110 million loan, which is \$14 million and an extra \$45 million, which is taken into consolidated revenue. All that money is a direct impost on South Australian individuals and, more importantly, on South Australian business. Therefore, it is a direct impost on jobs in this State. Not only is the Premier slashing capital expenditure (goodness knows why, because that could help jobs) but also he has these devious levies on our Government instrumentalities that are a direct surcharge on business costs in this State. That is why the Institute of Public Affairs awarded the Treasurer the lemon award for the worst State budget for the second year in a row.

We have questioned the Premier on that, and his response was absolutely typical of the management of the finances in South Australia for the past few years: he said, 'They got the figures wrong.' IPA, one of the most respected instrumentalities in this country, got the figures wrong. I know who got the figures wrong, and it was not the IPA; I know why the Premier got the lemon award for the second year in a row. It was because he does not understand the figures, and that is the fundamental problem that we have in South Australia.

Not only did the Premier get this worst State budget award but also he got another award from the IPA—the Sir Humphrey Appleby award. It takes someone of considerable talent to do that, because that is the award for the most closed Government in Australia. That means that this Government is most professional at misleading the South Australian taxpayers as to what is going on in their budget. I do not think that is something anyone should be proud of. Every year during Estimates Committees we diligently question the Premier and all his Ministers—however hapless they may be—about their portfolio areas, and every year we are prevented from doing that in a professional manner because the ground rules are changed as the Government goes along: it is hiding from the South Australian taxpayers the true financial position of its departments and of South Australia.

What this really shows is that the Government does not have the guts to allow the public of South Australia to compare factually what happened last year with what is happening this year, and to budget forward for what will happen next year. If it did that it would show very plainly that South Australia has been going downhill for eight years,

and in the past 12 months it has gone downhill faster than at any other time in South Australia's history. The chickens are all coming home to roost. I will make one comment about the deficit and the budget. We forecast in October last year that at that stage the budget was \$44 million out of kilter.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: As the honourable member interjects, I think we were wrong; I think we underestimated it. In December the Premier started waffling about \$60 million and then one of his economic advisers made a terrible slip. I love to have been a fly on the wall and heard what happened, because in December he said that the budget could be \$100 million out. No doubt the Premier had some words to him, because we went from what we believed was a responsible estimate of \$44 million; the Premier said \$60 million; and his chief financial adviser—who I guess was probably buried for a couple of weeks while he retracted the statement—said about \$100 million. That is how out of control the budget is.

I wish to cover the disastrous effect the budget outcome has had on South Australia. In South Australia 79 000 people are unemployed. That is the highest unemployment since the Great Depression. That is all caused by the financial ineptitude of the Government; its inability to manage in a financially responsible way, the cutting of capital expenditure and record business bankruptcies in South Australia. This is all caused by the impost on business and business costs by this Government's taxes and charges, which have been increased consistently above the promises made by the Premier when he said the CPI rate. Any person with any financial nous can see that the increases have been far in excess of CPI. Of course, the further blow-out in the budget deficit will take our total State debt to over \$6.6 billion.

In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer admitted that it is possible that we have a sizeable shortfall on taxation receipts. He is admitting what we said when he handed down the budget—that it was rubbery. Already he says it is in trouble. Although he knew that the budget was in trouble, he has failed to do anything at all that any good business manager would do to try to get things back on track. He has ignored calls for a mini budget; he has ignored calls to tighten up expenditure; he has ignored calls to start managing things properly; and he has ignored calls to be hands-on instead of running for cover and hiding, saying, 'Someone can do it; I am not prepared to.'

All of those things could have saved a considerable amount in this budget. If the Premier had become involved in contracting out; if he had become involved in competitive tendering this would not have occurred. Before the last election we said—and I have identified—that competitive tendering and contracting out in a four-year term would save this State \$347 million. It is as simple as that: doing something; managing; controlling the departments; replacing Ministers who are totally incompetent and inept in managing a portfolio; and getting more financial control in South Australia. The Government has listened to none of that. It just goes on in its merry way blaming someone else. The hapless Minister of Forests said that it was someone else's fault; the Premier said that IPA got it wrong, and so it goes on.

While this has gone on the Premier has had the hypocrisy to strut the national stage and say, 'Paul, help me, please help me. We need some more capital expenditure in South Australia. I am in trouble; I am not prepared to do anything about it; but give us another handout.' The IPA again, when

the Premier was strutting the national stage, called it utter hypocrisy.

The Treasurer has concealed the true budget situation by not releasing the monthly statements. Since I have been in this Parliament it has been usual that, on the fifteenth day of each month—which the Treasury says is the earliest we can get them—we get a statement of accounts of South Australia so that we can see how the State is being run. But all of that went out of the window 12 months ago. It is no good telling people what is going on; and he might have been able to read them himself, which would have been a bit of a worry. The statements for the first five months from July to November 1991 were not released until Friday 13 December. That would be black Friday, I would think.

However, fancy the Treasurer not being able to manage his own department to get out monthly statements of the accounts of South Australia for five months and fancy, since then, the financial statements for December and January still not being presented.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I think they might have been buried. Why would a Premier, who is trying to portray himself to the public of South Australia as a responsible financier—I do not know how he will do that now—not want to present them? Can any Minister tell me why he would not release the monthly statements for five months and why he has concealed them for the last two months? The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, the next Leader, is sitting there. I should have thought that he would want to get up and make a statement to the House, because it must be embarrassing to sit there and see this total financial ineptitude. The next Independent member is not in the House, but I feel sure that he would be very worried about it.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: He has got off cobweb corner. I think it is pertinent not only that the financial management of South Australia is in trouble, but that things are being hidden from us. It does not matter what one's political views are; I think it is incumbent upon us to keep pushing the Treasurer to make sure that those facts and figures are available to the media and to the taxpayers in South Australia.

One of the greatest effects of this budget has been on business and unemployment. We have had 2 000 business bankruptcies in the past 12 months, which is a post depression record. I do not have to tell this House what a tragedy youth unemployment is—37.5 per cent. Some electorates of members on the Government side, the champions of the working class, have up to 50 per cent youth unemployment. I would have thought that any member who represented an electorate that had 50 per cent youth unemployment would have been going and tapping on the Premier's door and asking him to do something about it or tapping him on the shoulder and saying, 'You might as well let the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology have a bit of a go, because he could not do any worse.'

South Australians are demanding that something be done. We cannot go on in this hiatus with no decisions being made, the State Bank Royal Commission floundering because the Government did not take the measures that we said should be taken at the start, and this State paralysed by the Premier as he trembles through the evidence that he has to give under oath in the next few months.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will return to the debate, which is the Supply Bill.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I want to reiterate what one large business in South Australia—Mitsubishi—had to say, when the shadow Minister and I visited

it the other day, about what it is facing. Mitsubishi is one of the most efficient manufacturers and largest employers of labour in this State. It has been told by its parent company that if it is to become competitive on the world market it must cut all its costs by 20 per cent in the next few years; no ifs, no buts—do it! Mitsubishi tells us that it has the ability to do that and that it will be able to maintain employment, to become part of the world car market and to provide long-term jobs for South Australia. But that is where it ends. Its greatest problem is when it meets with Government. The Government says, 'We are only going to increase taxes and charges in accordance with the CPI.' That is no longer an option. If Mitsubishi is to stay competitive on the world market and to employ people in South Australia it has to cut its expenditure by 20 per cent.

For the past six years, this Government has been trying to hide under a policy of only increasing taxes and charges in accordance with the CPI. Indeed, it has followed that policy dramatically for more than six years, but no longer can it be sustained in this State. We wonder why people are going bankrupt and why businesses are shifting out of South Australia. It is because of a complete lack of confidence in what is happening in this State. I want to spend a few minutes on how the Labor Government managed to get us into this mess.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: Perhaps it was the member for Gilles who mentioned that. The first problem that we have is that Mr Keating said that it was the recession we had to have. It is no good resiling from the fact that the National President of the Labor Party was residing in South Australia. Not only was he supporting the policies that have caused the recession but also quite deliberately on many occasions he said that he was fighting for South Australia. He certainly did that, and 79 100 South Australians are looking for him to see how hard he fought!

The other great problem is South Australia Inc. We have heard about Labor Inc. and WA Inc., and we have heard the denials by the Premier about SA Inc. I assure the House that SA Inc is alive and well. I will run through a few of the SA Inc. deals and a few of the decisions that need to be taken to terminate SA Inc. To members on this side of the House it has become very obvious that the Government is more interested in clinging to power than in taking the tough decisions necessary to turn South Australia around. There is mounting new evidence that the Government in this State is not prepared to do anything about the Labor Inc. model. With a lot of Government instrumentalities the situation seems to be 'If you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours; if you buy from me, I'll buy from you.'

It never ceases to amaze me how public servants allow SASFIT, which will provide their pension in the future, to be used in sleazy, underhand deals by this Government. All the Government is doing is making sure that the future pensions of those public servants are decreased. Last year, SASFIT returned to its employees 4.2 per cent, one of the lowest returns of any pension fund.

Mr Ferguson: Well, I don't know.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member for Henley Beach says that he does not know, and I would understand that. It is quite obvious that those employees have been conned by this Government to allow their funds to be traded around to other instrumentalities and in other deals without their best interests at heart. Look at the Remm deal, which involved massive exposure by the State Bank—\$485 million on an SGIC put option. Concurrent with that was the SGIC's purchase of Centrepont.

SAFA did a side deal with Coles-Myer, about which we do not know a lot. We are trying to probe through the Premier to find out what it is about. The whole Remm arrangement is a looming disaster, but we do not quite know the outcome. It has involved SGIC, SAFA and various other Government instrumentalities with promises being made and side deals being done: it is not in the best interests of South Australia. We can look at SGIC and Austereo—we questioned it in the House today—with the \$9.4 million bale-out by SGIC. We asked the question. The Premier said that it was a really good deal for South Australia. His voice was receding so quickly that I would have thought that he would fall back in his chair. How could anyone say that to bale out another failed business, Austereo, for \$9.4 million after SGIC lost \$10.7 million on it for the year, is a good deal for South Australia? Once again, SASFIT is involved and once again it should be asking questions as to what is happening to its pension fund.

We looked at the State Bank. Some tough decisions had to be made with \$2 200 000 lost already. Mr Paddison is still there, with no decision made. We tried to fire all the board members, but somehow some of them got back. I wonder what that deal was? We will wait and see. SGIC has \$81 million in losses. Mr Gerschwitz is still there presiding over it and its legal inter-fund loans.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Are they still on bonuses?

Mr D.S. BAKER: I know the bonus that they would get from a Government of this side of the House. Mr Kean is still there and still in charge of SGIC. The independent report on SGIC was absolutely damning on the management, and there is the Treasurer's involvement, but nothing has been done and no tough decisions have been taken. Why make tough decisions? The taxpayers of South Australia are demanding that something be done in those areas and demanding that people be held accountable for the losses. The Premier said, in justifying the State Bank debt, that the bank was there to help South Australians and that its main role was to look after South Australian business, but we now see that 66 per cent of the State Bank's massive non-performing loans are interstate or overseas, with only 3 per cent of non-performing loans pertaining to the rural sector. The Premier and some of his Ministers have blamed the rural scene for the problems of the State Bank. What has the State Bank done for South Australia when 66 per cent of its non-performing loans are outside the State? Surely someone has to be accountable.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

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

Mr D.S. BAKER: Briefly I will look at some of the deals that have been done by this Government to cling to power. We had the deal that we revealed only a few months ago—the \$2 million behind-the-scenes deal for the State Bank to hold down interest rates before the last election. The Premier said that that was justified, so it is a \$2 million bribe to the people of South Australia.

I think that is one of the most despicable acts that we will ever hear about in political circles. The Premier blatantly went out and did a side deal with SAFA to hold down interest rates so that they could go to the electorate in South Australia with the State Bank saying, 'Our interest rates are lower than other banks; we are there to help you,' and the Premier is in it right up to his neck. Political hypocrisy! How can he stand up here and try to justify it?

What about the State Bank's under-provisioning in the 1988-89 year of \$97 million? Quite clearly that is seen now as a sham. That was to boost up the profits of the State Bank. We heard in an election year what a wonderful bank

it was, but soon after that we started taking it to pieces limb by limb and showing that that was not correct. However, the Premier was in it right up to his neck. He knew what was going on. He was part of that scam to tell the people of South Australia that he had a very profitable bank that was good for the taxpayers of South Australia. What about free student travel? We all remember that promise before the last election. That promise—

An honourable member: It was a gimmick!

Mr D.S. BAKER: That gimmick before the last election probably did more for the graffiti problem in South Australia than anything else. It was perfectly obvious that, soon after the election, the Government was going to curtail that free travel. Most parents in South Australia said that they did not want their children travelling all over the State on free transport without supervision, and the parents were the people in the end who brought pressure to bear, but it was just an electoral scam, just a bribe—a bribe that cost the taxpayers about \$20 million to try to buy the Government's way through the last election.

Do members opposite remember HomeSure, the \$35 million that was going to help people with housing loans in South Australia? The ink was hardly dry on the electoral papers when that had to be withdrawn. I know that you got only 47.9 per cent of the vote, and I know you should not be there, but you got there.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, Mr Speaker. Since those election deals were done the Treasurer has not done one thing to take the hard decisions necessary to turn this State around. There has not been one attempt to try to manage the State in a more businesslike fashion, and in a minute I will get to what some of his counterparts in other States are doing.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: If the member for Napier can contain himself, all will be revealed. This State stands alone in not being able to contain its debt. We went from \$4 billion to \$6.6 billion in 12 months. We now owe \$4 568 for every man, woman and child in South Australia. Quite obviously the Treasurer could not care two hoots about that because all he is doing is continuing to borrow and mortgage the future of the people. Look at some of the other things that have happened with the SAFA lease-back arrangements—these deals which we have been talking about but which we cannot obtain information about. Some members on this side have raised the issue of the Noarlunga hospital recently—another deal that we did not know about. Others have raised the Tricontinental issue, whilst another member has been claiming that another school is involved. This has just been a smokescreen for the increased State borrowings and liabilities.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: If the member for Napier would just listen for a moment, he might learn something. The Victorian Auditor-General says that these deals just increase the State's borrowings. The Treasurer still has not honoured in this Parliament the promise he made in November to give the details of those deals. It is important that we offer some alternatives. I was sitting in my office when I heard the member for Henley Beach in his very vociferous discourse to this House, say that he had not heard one alternative policy from the Liberal Party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: We have said that it does not matter who or what you are: if your debts get to such a level that you cannot afford to sustain them, you must do something

about it. The tax burden on South Australians and South Australian business has reached such a level that they can no longer afford to run their businesses profitably, and they can no longer afford to employ people. That is one of the main reasons for the massive increase in unemployment and bankruptcies in this State. What we have said is that, if you must take some of the tough decisions that are necessary to reduce the State's debt, you must do some things that you may not necessarily have done, and we have said quite clearly that, if we cannot decrease the State's debt by \$1.5 billion, we will never be able to reduce the burden of taxes and charges on South Australians in order to provide the incentive for them to get going again in business and employ people.

It is very simple: you do not have to be Rhodes Scholars on the other side of the House to work that out. Get your pencil and paper out, and you can follow that through. It means that, whether we like it or not, we must sell the State Bank. We must transfer its ownership from the public to the private sector. Whether we like it or not, we must sell SGIC and transfer its ownership from the public to the private sector. Whether we like it or not we must continue to sell State assets to reduce the State debt by \$1.5 billion. That will be the only level.

The SPEAKER: The debate is on supply, not the sale of State assets.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I was trying to give some policy direction to the members opposite, and I just had to slip that in as I was going through. Another area that is costing this State a massive amount of money is WorkCover, which of course the Minister and Treasurer have said is far too expensive in South Australia. It averages 3.8 per cent of payroll in this State compared to 1.8 per cent in New South Wales, and the Treasurer has given an undertaking to the taxpayers of South Australia that it will be reduced. But it should never have reached that level. Mismanagement got it to that level along with lack of control not only by the Minister but also by the Treasurer. He knew, when that Bill came in, and we kept telling him in the debate that took place, that there were not enough controls or appropriate management levels applying to WorkCover to keep it sustainable within the State.

There is not much point in having the best wages and workers compensation set-up in Australia if you are unemployed. That is a fundamental business axiom which I think people on the other side of the House should understand. We must break away from this madness of the centralised wage system. We must break away from the confrontationist attitude with the union movement in setting wages. We must make sure that we bring in enterprise bargaining and its benefits.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member for Henley Beach keeps interjecting on that point. I do not think there is any question that, when employment contracts are freely available within this State and this nation—

The SPEAKER: Order! Once again I must remind the Leader that the Supply Bill and not work contracts is the subject of this debate.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is about reducing the cost of Government in this State, and employment contracts will go a long way to doing that as will competitive tendering and good management in many areas of Government. I note that some Premiers in Australia have been biting the bullet. The *Financial Review* of 13 February states:

The Lawrence Government's decision to sell 49 per cent of the R&I Bank and 100 per cent of the Western Australian SGIO

makes sense both politically and economically which must rate as something of a novelty for Western Australian taxpayers.

It would rate as something of a novelty for South Australian taxpayers if the Premier were to bite the bullet and do something. We cannot continue going further and further into debt while we pass off the problems to future generations.

Members on this side of the House have been talking privatisation for the past four or five years. It amazes me how every other State Government around Australia has embraced it, some by good financial management and some (such as Western Australia) because they are in a corner, are financially bankrupt and have to do it.

Everyone realises that we have to get this State's debts down if we are to lessen the burden on taxpayers. What we need in this State is a little vision, and we want a little vision in this State that goes beyond the next election. It is no good holding on and putting off the evil day, and passing the burden on to our children. Let us do something.

Mr Venning: It won't go away.

Mr D.S. BAKER: As the honourable member said, 'It won't go away' so let us do something. I think that everyone on this side of the House and everyone in South Australia is desperate and is praying that the Treasurer will make a decision—just do something to give business some hope about becoming more profitable in the future and being able to transfer that profit into employing South Australians.

There are 79 100 people unemployed in South Australia—the most unemployed since the last depression—and the Treasurer will not admit the damage that it is doing to families in South Australia and the long-term damage it is doing to this State's future. There is 37.5 per cent youth unemployment—and the Treasurer will not acknowledge the damage that that is doing to families in South Australia. In fact, he will not even start to do something about it because any Treasurer who slashes capital expenditure by 20 per cent in years like this obviously does not care about anyone in South Australia. Mr Speaker, this budget is out of control. The Premier does not have the ability to manage it and we should do something about that.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I appreciate the opportunity of speaking to this Bill. I am very pleased to be able to follow my Leader after his excellent speech—a speech that I noticed kept the Government benches very quiet. In fact, members opposite squirmed in their seats as they were told the truth of what has been going on and as the facts were pointed out to them, when they realised that they, together with their Premier, are the ones who have wrecked this State, brought it to its present situation and have contributed to the recession we had to have and unfortunately are still in—a recession that could well lead to a depression. I think all members, particularly Government members, should note and acknowledge some of the many facts that the Leader brought to the attention of the House—the fact that nearly 80 000 people are unemployed in this State; the fact that we have record bankruptcies and it looks worse rather than better for the future; the fact that unemployment is around 11.5 per cent, and the fact that youth unemployment is close to 40 per cent, and in some areas 50 per cent.

These are tragic and terrible consequences for South Australia. There is the State Bank's \$2.2 billion loss, and the

fact that two-thirds of that bank's massive non-performing loans are interstate and overseas and only 3 per cent, as the Leader pointed out, involved the rural sector is a factor that should be recognised and acknowledged from the point of view that the rural sector has gone through one of its worst times in living memory. It was a speech of which I hope all members will take note, and I hope that members of the public will realise where the real trouble is in this State.

Tonight I want to highlight an area which I hope has been accommodated in this Supply Bill and which I hope the Government will consider further for the sake of some of my own constituents and those in adjoining areas. Last Christmas and the Christmas before were rather tragic times for quite a few market gardeners in my area, because on three consecutive occasions they lost over \$100 000 each, in some cases, because of what I regard as negligence and mismanagement by the E&WS Department and the Minister of Water Resources. The area to which I refer and which I hope is accommodated in this Bill relates to Bolivar irrigation water.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Yes, we hear from the opposite side, 'Oh, dear; oh, dear.' Wait until my constituents hear the comments of the people opposite. They will realise only too well the way they are treated by the Government: constituents who deserve much better than they receive from the Government. Last Christmas and the Christmas before, as well as back in 1988, these irrigators found without any prior warning that the salt content of their water increased to such a proportion that it killed many of their crops, causing tens—and, in some cases, hundreds—of thousands of dollars worth of damage that some of the market gardeners can no longer sustain; damage that may unfortunately lead to some of them going broke; and damage that I firmly believe they need to be compensated for by the Government, which has been supplying this water for many years. When the first incident occurred in 1988, I took up the issue with the Minister of Water Resources—the same Minister as is there today—and the whole issue was thrashed out. It was acknowledged that the E&WS personnel—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will link his remarks to the Supply Bill.

Mr MEIER: Indeed I will, Sir, because I wish I had access to the specific details in the supply figures of exactly where all the money is being spent, which I will get to as soon as possible. After meeting with the Minister and many of the people affected at that stage, the Minister gave an assurance that she would see that such a mistake did not happen again with Bolivar irrigation water. Never again would growers have to suffer massive losses.

At the time, I asked for and was denied compensation for the growers. I also took up the issue of having compensation in the method of rural assistance and for the growers to be able to receive appropriate loans to enable them to continue, remembering that, in some cases, the contracts they had with companies who had bought potatoes, say, from them for years were cancelled overnight because they said, 'We can no longer be guaranteed a sure supply.'

The Minister in her reply at that stage indicated that condition 14 of the licence states:

The Minister shall not in any way be liable to the licensee for the quality or quantity of water in the proclaimed water course at any time, and the licensee shall not be entitled to any damages or compensation for any loss or injury suffered by him directly or indirectly caused by and arising out of the quality or quantity of water available under the proclaimed water course at any time.

That virtually put paid to that. Nevertheless, we had the Minister's assurance that it would not happen again. Yet, 12 months ago it recurred. It only needed to be for one day

when the salt content in the channel, because of neglect and the water level dropping, rose to such an extent that the potato, cucumber, lucerne and corn crops were burnt.

Again in this last year, after I had taken up the matter with the Minister a year ago, we had the same situation recurring. I have many details before me identifying exactly what happened: on 24 December the water in the Bolivar irrigation channel was observed to be at a satisfactory level, yet on Thursday 26 December—two days later—the water was observed at a less than satisfactory level. A whole series of events occurred thereafter.

Obviously, growers are demanding to know why the channel level has been varied without consulting users of water as previously agreed. That was agreed at the meeting with the Minister. They want to know how Bolivar water users can obtain lasting assurances of close monitoring of water salinity levels so that they can obtain irrigation water comparable in quality to that which leaves the Bolivar ponds.

They want also to know why salinity levels in the channel further up, namely, near the St Kilda bridge, increased, and if the water is to be piped around the district huge changes in monitoring need to be undertaken. We are debating the Supply Bill under which money is allocated for projects and for the day-to-day running. Funds are allocated for E&WS personnel who work at the Bolivar plant. Under this Bill funds are allocated for people who may be able to assist in getting better quality water, and this is the crunch because, after a personal examination of the whole area, the problem was described to me.

I can understand that one of the key reasons why the salt content increases in the Bolivar channel when the level drops is because of an adjoining drainage channel between the ICI salt lagoons and the Bolivar irrigation water. This small channel involves only a small depth of water, but it is very salty and in some places there is virtually a crust of salt on top of the channel.

It was pointed out to the Minister some years ago that the channel has to be deepened so that it will not filter underground into the Bolivar channel if the water level falls. Having inquired how much money was needed for this work, I was told that they hoped about \$5 000 might be available immediately. I assume that that allocation might be made in this Bill. I was also told that that would not be enough to undertake the necessary work. If we assume that \$5 000 is not enough, it could be doubled to \$10 000 and hope that we were getting close to the mark. Perhaps \$20 000 would do it, and the whole channel could be deepened sufficiently so that this whole problem would be considerably negated.

I hope that the Minister, who was present in the Chamber briefly, will take on board the necessity to spend some money in that area urgently. In fact, it would be good if that work could be done in the next couple weeks, because it is at this hot time of the year when the damage can occur. In the winter there is no problem, because the growers rarely rely on irrigation water continuously: they can allow a break for a while if adjustments need to be made to the level of water at Bolivar. That is an important point.

It is also important that proper monitoring occurs. Again, this comes right back to the Supply Bill before us because, if sufficient E&WS personnel are not available to monitor that water, provision should be made for them. In her meeting with us in 1988, as I indicated earlier, the Minister gave a categorical assurance that the quality of water would be up to top standard from then on. However, that has not occurred. The Minister also indicated that the water would be tested weekly, and apparently that did occur for a year or more. Lately, however, testing has occurred as infre-

quently as once per month. In other words, the quality is not being tested as often as it should be. Proper testing of the water needs to occur to ensure that its content is such that growers can be guaranteed that it is the right part per million and that, if a variation is detected, they can be contacted immediately so that they will not irrigate. Two types of irrigation are used, namely, overhead sprinklers and drip irrigation.

The next aspect that is equally critical to this whole issue relates to the Northern Adelaide Plains proclaimed wells area Draft Management Plan 1991-2000, which was released last year and which plan deals with the same area about which I am speaking. It examines the underground water supplies for the whole of the Northern Adelaide Plains and, of course, the Bolivar irrigation system is supplying water to a part of that area right now. This report came out in July last year, and much discussion has occurred in relation to it. Public meetings have been held about it and, because certain suggestions were made that did not please the growers, the whole thing is being reconsidered, and that is fine. However, the facts given in this report are still current: an enormous number of people are employed in the production of crops in this area. Some 2 000 people are producing crops worth about \$40 million per year, or approximately 30 per cent of South Australia's vegetable production.

The private investment in land and improvements required for the horticultural operations in this area is approximately \$165 million. It also goes through the average underground water usage over the past 10 years, being some 18 500 million litres per year, or about three times the estimated rate of natural recharge, and that is critical. In other words, three times more water is being drawn out of the basin than is being put back in. Obviously, something will give sooner or later.

Mr Hamilton: What are you going to do about it?

Mr MEIER: It is a question not of what we are going to do about it but of what the Government is supposed to do about it. I have been leading up to this and, if the honourable member had been following what I have said, he would have known that. Just listen! This paper, which goes on further with various statistics that I will not be able to go through, recommends that an alternative water source to the Northern Adelaide Plains underground irrigation water is needed: I agree fully with that. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, can probably understand what that alternative water supply should be. In fact, it is recommended on page 4 of the Draft Management Plan, as follows:

Increased agricultural use of reclaimed water would be an acceptable alternative to marine disposal and would achieve the objective of conserving the underground water resource while providing opportunities for further agricultural development.

The Bolivar treatment works effluent water was identified. What hope is there if, as I have said, we have had three major muck-ups over the past four years, resulting in millions of dollars worth of damage to the market gardeners in the Virginia area? What hope is there if the Minister is trying to sell this plan to the northern Adelaide plains growers and saying, 'Use Bolivar water, because that will enable less underground water to be used'? She should have made it her business, particularly during the past few months, to ensure that there was no mess up in water quality. To have that occur over the past Christmas period is absolutely disgraceful, and it will lead to a loss of confidence amongst the many people who were starting to think about ways of connecting their properties to Bolivar irrigation water, or who were at least prepared to give it a try. Many of the growers have some doubts themselves, even though it has been shown now that at least since 1980 excellent crops

have been grown, although growers have found it difficult to grow some vegetables.

Given that we are debating the Supply Bill, I hope that the Minister is well aware that additional moneys need to be provided to ensure that the quality of water from the Bolivar irrigation works is maintained at any cost—literally—that the channel that currently needs excavating to take away the brine or the salt water from the ICI works is deepened and that we start to ensure equality across the board in order to guarantee that anyone wishing to use Bolivar water will have the right quality water at all times. However, a lot of homework now has to be done to try to get back what was there.

There is enormous potential for this State. It would enable so much money to come into the State coffers as a result of the extra production in that area. It would lead to much greater optimism amongst growers, who would see the future laid out before them. At the present time they do not know where the irrigation water will come from if Bolivar does not succeed; they know that the underground water supply is failing, but they have lost confidence as a result of the latest muck-up last Christmas.

I urge the Minister to give compensation to those people who are affected; they need it. If she is to gain any sense of credibility in this area and to sell the draft management plan and, eventually, the management plan, people must know that they will not lose out as a result of using Bolivar irrigation water.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): This document is an indictment of a Government that has lost its way. I say that knowing full well the circumstances that exist in South Australia at the present time: the loss of jobs, the bankruptcies and all the other issues that have been mentioned by a number of my colleagues and, certainly, by the Leader earlier this evening in his excellent portrayal of the circumstances. The Government has taken no opportunity at all to show that it is cognisant of what has been taking place or to attempt to rein back costs directly associated with government. The Government has laid claim to making redundancy payments available to a large number of people, to winding back the Public Service, to reducing a number of employment opportunities, and to refusing to take in young people just out of school, and I am fully appreciative of why that is.

Yet, with all these claimed benefits or claimed approaches to better controlling Government expenditure and Government employment, we are asked to increase the ongoing amount for the purposes of the Public Service in the first two months of the new financial year. If ever there was an opportunity for a Government to show that it was determined to come to grips with the problem that faces us, as the worst recessionary State on the mainland of Australia at present, it was with this document. But all that the Government has done is to turn around and increase the amount of money that it is making available.

I would be the last—I have said it publicly on many occasions and I repeat it tonight—to put people out of work because they are in the Government service, but I am fully appreciative of the need to offer alternative opportunities for work for a number of those people in the public sector and for the Government to show a bit of nous and to assist the non Government sector to get in and provide many of the services that the Government has been unable to provide effectively and cost efficiently. The Government has shown that it will be more of the same. There has been no attempt like that of Premier Lawrence in Western Australia or of Premier Kerner in Victoria.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I am not going to comment upon personalities in that way. I give credit to the lady that she has at least been out there trying to pursue a course of action which is responsible for a Government in the doldrums and in so much debt as is occurring in Victoria at present. I have been there recently and I know the sorts of problems that they have. Yet, with all the problems that they have, at least the Government is out there trying to give a lead. Obviously a degree of that is associated with the fact that there is an election coming up and the Premier is trying to curry favour with the electorate by giving the impression of attempting to assist the public.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I did not pick up the honourable member's comment.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should not repeat it and the member for Light should not concern himself with listening to it.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I do not resile from the fact that I have repeated this a couple of times already: at least the Premier was out there showing a genuine concern for the people whom she represented. What have we got here? We have a Premier who has brought in this increased cost to the people of South Australia; a Premier who, over many months, has refused to answer relevant questions in respect of finance; a Premier who is hiding documents and has hidden documents from this House for a long time; a Premier who, at the time of the last State election, conveniently lost the monthly returns for almost five months, refusing the Opposition, the public and those who have a need to know an indication of what was taking place with regard to the State's finances. Of course, as has been alluded to earlier this evening, part of the fix, part of the shonky dealing that was going on, was the activity, directly associated with the State Bank, of buying votes by putting up a quite facetious argument in relation to the home loans and interest rates directly related to them.

I want to take another tack. The Government has been trying to pump up the economy of South Australia. I do not damn it for that in the total sense, because the Government needs to give a lead, but I say to the members of this House that it has been giving a false lead. There are two ways in which to present information and fact to the people we represent: one is to show the positives of the information that is available; the other is to add to it and to pump it up. Regrettably, a number of instrumentalities directly associated with Government have been party to those same questionable deals.

I used to believe that the Quarterly Economic Report published by the State Bank of South Australia was a reasonable type of document. I used to believe that it really sought to put on the public record for all to see precisely where we were going and what position we in South Australia found ourselves in relation to the rest of the world. However, in the September and December quarters of 1991, this publication, which was made available to members within the past two or three weeks, states on the inside of its front cover:

All opinions and estimates included in this report constitute our judgment as of 20 January 1991 and are subject to change without notice.

I believe that that date should be January 1992, because this report has only just been forwarded to members and, if it is reporting on the September and December quarters of 1991, quite clearly the date of January 1991 is incorrect. Allowing for that printing error and accepting that this

document was prepared within the past three weeks or so, we find on page 3, under the heading 'South Australia' the following remarks:

Economic activity in South Australia slowed further in the September quarter but appeared to steady in the December quarter as the level of employment remained unchanged.

Unchanged—when we have found ourselves going higher up the scale. Economic activity remaining steady—when nearly every indicator tells us that business in South Australia has decreased.

Mr Blacker: There is a graph later in the same document.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Exactly. The graph shows the reverse of the statement that has been made. I am not necessarily taking to task those people in the State Bank who are responsible for the preparation of this document, but yet another statement on the inside of the front cover reads as follows:

Although the information in this report has been obtained from sources which State Bank believes to be reliable, we do not guarantee its accuracy.

I hope that they do not guarantee its accuracy, but surely they have a responsibility to make sure of what they are saying. This document does not reflect what has been said by the business world in December 1991 and January 1992. Quite clearly, this first paragraph is at variance with the statements which have been made and which have been concurred with by the Government under the pressure of deterioration in employment and difficulties in the business world. The document continues:

Furthermore, there was some lift in consumer demand, with retail sales increasing, while the decline in sales of new motor vehicles levelled out.

Go and tell that to the people who are selling motor vehicles in South Australia. Go and tell that to the people who are manufacturing motor vehicles in South Australia. Look at any of the details that have been published by General Motors, Mitsubishi, Nissan and Toyota since 1 January 1992 and relate that statement to what is realistically happening.

Go and talk, as every member should, to those in their own district who are selling this product and ask them what is taking place. It is very clear that this statement is a hype, is picking up some aspects of general business activity but not presenting it in a correct manner. Nor does the Government or the Premier in answering questions in this place come back to the realistic truthful answer that one would expect of a person in his position. The next paragraph states:

Notwithstanding these early indications of a probable bottoming of the recession, it is likely that the recession has not fully run its course in South Australia.

That is a truism. Why, if it is possible in the second paragraph to state what is factually correct, does the group responsible for this document present the first paragraph which is a statement of misinformation associated with all the other indicators that are abroad amongst us? It further states:

Household expenditure is expected to remain weak in the first half of 1992.

Go out and talk to the retailers who have had not one but two post-Christmas sales in an attempt to rid themselves of the over-stocking that is there: over-stocking because people do not have the capacity to buy, even at the reduced prices. Yes, there have been big sales, but in total those sales do not relate to the sales of the past and again we have been presented in an official document with a set of circumstances that is not factual and which does this Government and this State a great disservice by presenting a false image. A further paragraph states:

South Australia is expected to lag the national economy out of the recession as there is not the same potential for an upturn in home building activity as nationally since it has been sustained at very high levels in South Australia throughout the recession.

I ask members to look in the Library or the public generally to look in the Adelaide *Advertiser* of January and thus far in February to see how many conflicting statements there are from within the building industry of precisely where we are at present. We get one story one day motivated by the Minister, that it is up and away, that we have turned the corner and that everything will be lovely, while a few days later the industry comes out and tells us that the contracts that were expected for a given period have flagged and that we are no better off than we were previously.

We can go and talk to people who provide the manpower in the services, whether it be bricklayers, carpenters or whoever. We can find out how many of those people are getting overtime or getting work five days a week. Some of them do, but collectively they are not getting it as they did in the past. Go and ask the brick manufacturers how many bricks they have at grass. Have a look at the piles and one can quickly realise the circumstances prevailing in this State. Why are we in this position? It is because the Government has not given the lead in a number of vital directions.

We have the highest tax on financial transactions—2.5 times higher than any other State in the Commonwealth. We have a WorkCover cum occupational health and welfare system gone berserk, adding tremendous costs to the workplace. I have here material that has been provided to me within the past week of an organisation which had employed a person as a casual kitchen hand. That kitchen hand had an accident and their position was taken up by another person. After a time the casual kitchen hand said that she wanted to come back to work.

The organisation said, 'I'm sorry, but we have no casual work available; nor do we have any light work available for that person to come back into.' What do we have—an organisation which is responsible for getting people back into the work force, a rehabilitation organisation, saying, 'You must provide an opportunity for this person to come back into the workplace. We will map out a program'—and I quickly add that this is another semi-government organisation, but it is also happening elsewhere with other organisations—'and you will provide that program of work for this worker.' Even though the work is not there, the program is prepared.

However, what does this program also show? For the benefit of their organisation, the programmers have charged up against WorkCover \$1 608 of supervision of a job which is not available. They have charged up over \$440 for travel because they happen to be at one spot and the worker is at another. The original document is signed from mid-January 1992, and over the period until 31 March 1992 they will add up \$440 worth of travel as part of that \$1 608. They will charge \$88 per hour to arrive on the spot to see if the worker is happy in the work that is not there and is not offered. I could give further details of these charges, but I make the point to all members here that we are continuing to cost ourselves out of an effective operation because of the red tape and the excesses that we have built into our WorkCover and rehabilitation systems.

I am the first to want a fair go for the worker. I have demonstrated that in over 20 years in this place, but I seriously question a Government that is so much out of touch with the real world that it allows to continue this sort of fiasco of charging up against a semi-government business \$1 608 for a job that does not exist, plus the wages that are expected to be given to that person for a job that does not exist, yet it is supposed to provide a service to the com-

munity at the other end which is cost-effective. It is impossible to do that whilst this sort of activity is going on. In presenting this Supply Bill, the Government has not given any indication to this House or to the people of South Australia that it has learned a lesson or that it is prepared to take proper action.

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

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 19 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 February 1992

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PRIVATE PLATED GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

74. Mr BECKER (Hanson) asked the Minister of Transport: How many Government owned private plated motor vehicles are attached to each Government department and/or statutory authority, and what are the reasons for the increase in the past 12 months?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Accurate and comprehensive information relating to allocation and use of private vehicles could not be provided by State Fleet and Motor Registration Division. Each Minister was requested to supply information relating to private plated vehicles allocated to departments and authorities within their responsibilities. Each Minister has subsequently responded and their replies have been transposed onto the tables attached as Appendices 1, 2 and 3. Appendix 1 provides details of private plated vehicles allocated to departments. Appen-

dix 2 provides the same details relating to statutory authorities and details relating to WorkCover is attached in Appendix 3. The total number of private plated vehicles allocated to Government departments at December, 1991 is as follows:

Reason for Vehicle	Number (Total)
Chief Executive Officer's/Statutory Office holders	41
Executive Officers EL-2/EL-3 or equivalent	135
Remuneration Tribunal	15
Surveillance/Privacy	206
	<u>397</u>

The provision of vehicles to Chief Executive Officers/Statutory Office holders has remained constant over the last 12 months. There has been a slight net increase of two vehicles to Executive Officers EL-2/EL-3 or equivalent. A decision by the Remuneration Tribunal to provide vehicles to Puisne Judges of the Supreme Court resulted in 12 additional vehicles in this category. There has been an increase of 30 vehicles over the last 12 months relating to surveillance/privacy, and three vehicles were provided to the Attorney-General's Department for use by Government Investigation Officers. The other 27 relate to Cabinet's approval at the request of the Police Commissioner to increase vehicles used for surveillance/privacy purposes.

APPENDIX 1

PRIVATE PLATED VEHICLES ALLOCATED TO DEPARTMENTS

Agency/ Authority	Chief Executive Officers/ Statutory Office Holders	Senior Officers EL-2/ EL-3 or Equivalent	Remuneration Tribunal	Surveillance/ Privacy	Increase in past 12 months	Reasons
Agriculture	1	4	—	—	None	The Rural Counselling Service uses private plated vehicles for privacy reasons with Cabinet authority.
Arts and Cultural Heritage	2	3	—	—	None	
Attorney-General's	3	11	—	3	3	(Includes JIS, Equal Opportunity Commission Office of the Advisor for Deregulation and State Business and Corporate Affairs). The increase of 3 relates to provision of government cars to Investigation Officers for surveillance purposes. 3 CEO vehicles are for Solicitor-General, Ombudsman and CEO of Department.
Children's Services Office	1	2	—	—	None	
Correctional Services	1	1	—	—	None	
Court Services	1	2	14	20	12	Increase due to allocation of vehicles to Puisne Judges of the Supreme Court approved by Remuneration Tribunal.
Education	1	9	—	—	Decrease 1	
Electoral	1	—	—	—	None	
Employment and Technical and Further Education	1	4	—	—	None	
Engineering and Water Supply	1	8	—	—	None	
Environment and Planning	1	6	—	—	1	Officer transferred from SACON.
Family and Community Services	1	1	—	24	None	
Commissioner for the Ageing	1	—	—	—	None	
Fisheries	1	—	—	5	None	
Housing and Construction	1	3	—	—	None	One contract employee has use of a private plated vehicle.
Industry, Trade and Technology	1	5	—	—	None	
Labour	1	4	1	—	Decrease 2	With the amalgamation of Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations and Department of Labour there has been a net reduction of 2 private plated vehicles allocated to both agencies.
Commissioner for Public Employment (Unattached Executive)	1	2	—	—	Decrease 1	There has been a reduction of 1 vehicle allocated to this group in last 12 months.
Lands	1	5	—	—	None	
Marine and Harbors	1	6	—	—	None	

Agency/ Authority	Chief Executive Officers/ Statutory Office Holders	Senior Officers EL-2/ EL-3 or Equivalent	Remuneration Tribunal	Surveillance/ Privacy	Increase in past 12 months	Reasons
Mines and Energy	2	3	—	—	None	2 CEO vehicles are allocated to Director-General and the other to Director, Office of Energy Planning.
Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs	2	—	—	—	None	Vehicles are supplied to CEO and Chairperson of the Commission.
Police	1	6	—	150	27	Cabinet approval obtained to increase vehicles used for surveillance/privacy purposes.
Premier and Cabinet	3	4	—	—	4	Increase due to addition of Planning Review Unit, Multi Function Polis—Australia and Government Agencies Review Group.
Public and Consumer Affairs	1	2	—	—	None	
Recreation and Sport	1	—	—	—	None	
Road Transport	1	6	—	—	None	
State Aboriginal Affairs	—	1	—	—	None	
State Services	1	3	—	—	1	Reassignment from Department of Local Government appointed Director of State Records.
Office of Tertiary Education	1	—	—	—	None	
Tourism, S.A.	1	—	—	—	Decrease 1	The Chief Executive Officer has been seconded to Department of Premier and Cabinet.
Office of Transport, Policy and Planning	1	—	—	—	None	
Treasury	1	10	—	3	1	A new position at the EL-2 level was created and an officer appointed.
Woods and Forests	1	2	—	—	None	In addition, 1 vehicle is provided to a contract employee. This is not an increase since last year.

PRIVATE PLATED VEHICLES ALLOCATED TO STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

APPENDIX 2

Agency/ Authority	Chief Executive Officers/ Statutory Office Holders	Senior Officers EL-2/ EL-3 or Equivalent	Remuneration Tribunal	Surveillance/ Privacy	Other	Increase in Past 12 months	Reasons
Technology Development Corporation	1	—	—	—	—	—	
Lotteries Commission	1	—	—	—	—	—	
Casino Supervisory Authority	Nil	—	—	—	Do not hire or use Govern- ment owned motor vehi- cles	—	
State Bank SGIC							
State Transport Authority	1	4	—	—	—	None	
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	—	—	—	—	1	—	Vehicle allocated to Performing Arts Collection
S.A. Film Corporation	1	—	—	—	9	10	9 vehicles on short term lease for production personnel engaged on production 'Hammers over the Anvil'
State Theatre Company	2	—	—	—	—	2	Lease expires at end of November 1991. Vehicles allocated to General Manager and the Artistic Director
Parks Community Centre	1	—	—	—	—	—	
West Beach Trust	1	—	—	—	—	—	
WorkCover						See covering note as Appendix 3	

Agency/ Authority	Chief Executive Officers/ Statutory Office Holders	Senior Officers EL-2/ EL-3 or Equivalent	Remuneration Tribunal	Surveillance/ Privacy	Other	Increase in Past 12 months	Reasons
S.A. Metropolitan Fire Service	—	—	—	—	173	—	Fire appliances 97; vans, trucks, utilities, 41; sedans, station wagons 35. There has been no increase in vehicles other than fire appli- ances over the last 12 months.
Country Fire Service ... ETSA	1 1	2 18	— —	— —	— —	None 17	Increase in accordance with Government pol- icy for Executives
Pipelines Authority	1	4	—	—	4	None	3 vehicles used by Senior Engineers and one 4 wheel drive for outback use.
S.A. Timber Corporation	—	—	—	—	17	—	Details are below
Head Office	—	—	—	—	—	—	Mangt/ 1 Fin/ Prodctn 1 Admin 2
IPL Division	—	—	—	—	—	—	2 — 1
MGPI Division	—	—	—	—	—	—	2 — —
Victoria Branch	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 4 —
Scrimber Partnership	—	—	—	—	—	—	3 — —
Total Vehicles 17	—	—	—	—	—	—	9 5 3
SATECH	—	—	—	—	4	—	3 vehicles are leased from State Fleet. One is owned by SATECH. All costs covered by funds generated by business operations.
Racecourse Development Board	—	—	—	—	1	—	Assigned to Chairman of the Board who is also the Director, Racing Division, Department of Recreation and Sport.
S.A. Housing Trust	1	5	—	—	—	1	New executive position established.
Senior Secondary Assess- ment Board of S.A. ...	1	1	—	—	—	None	
Legal Services Commission	2	—	—	—	—	None	The Chief Counsel is enti- tled to a CEO standard vehicle.
Adelaide Convention Centre	1	—	—	—	5	None	4 vehicles are allocated to contracted staff as part of their salary remunera- tion and 1 commercial van for outside catering activities.
Small Business Corporation	1	—	—	—	1	None	1 vehicle is used for gen- eral business of the cor- poration.
Health Commission, IMVS and Incorp- orated Health Services	1	22	—	—	1	None	2 additional vehicles are allocated to contract employees with Cabinet approval.

APPENDIX 3

WorkCover

The WorkCover Corporation have 115 private plated motor vehicles which is an increase of three over the same time the previous year. Seventy-three of these vehicles are salary sacrifice, paid for by the employee. Charges are set so that the corporation incurs no cost. Thirty-eight are tool of trade vehicles, for employees spending more than 75 per cent of their time out of the office; they contribute 30 per cent of the annual cost. The remainder are pool vehicles paid for by the corporation.

Remuneration vehicles have been increased by two; tool of trade vehicles have increased by three and pool vehicles reduced by two.

	November 1990	November 1991
Remuneration Package CEO	1	1
Remuneration Package Chief Managers	5	5
Remuneration Package Senior Managers	13	13
Remuneration Package Employees ...	52	54
Sub Total	71	73
Tool of Trade	35	38
Pool Vehicles	6	4
Total	112	115

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY

155. **Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Treasurer: What was the cost of brokerage on the sale of SAGASCO shares and how much of this amount was paid to South Australian firms?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The cost of brokerage on the sale of SAGASCO shares was approximately \$60 000. All of this amount was paid to South Australian firms, because brokerage was only paid on those shares (approximately 2 million) that were intended to be sold to the South Australian public. No brokerage was paid on those shares that were sold to major institutional buyers. However, an underwriting fee of \$1.5 million was paid to a major interstate broking firm, to ensure underwrite and the successful placement of a large volume (40 million) to SAGASCO share with institutional investors.

SHARES BROKERAGE

191. **Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Treasurer: What were the approximate fees paid by SGIC, SAFA, State Bank, WorkCover and SASFIT, respectively, for selling of shares during 1990-91:

(a) to sharebrokers with their head offices in South Australia; and

(b) to interstate and overseas sharebrokers?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:

SGIC

The total amount of brokerage paid was \$1 546 180 of which \$811 250 was the brokerage paid in South Australia on orders placed within the State. Orders placed outside South Australia resulted in brokerage of \$734 930. No orders were placed overseas. Much of the brokerage paid interstate is the result of acceptance of shares offered to SGIC, and not in respect of orders placed by SGIC.

WORKCOVER

During the 1990-91 financial year WorkCover Corporation paid approximately \$40 000 to interstate sharebrokers for selling of shares. As WorkCover's share trading activity is conducted by external investment professionals, the decision on where brokerage business is directed is taken independently by the professional fund managers, based largely on:

- the overall level of service provided by the brokers
- the price charged by the brokers
- the quality of investment research provided by the brokers.

WorkCover has consistently encouraged SA-based sharebrokers to market their services to the corporation's professional fund managers. WorkCover has facilitated this by introducing any interested SA-based brokers to the major investment firms interstate with whom WorkCover has a relationship.

SAFA

In 1990-91, SAFA paid to sharebrokers whose head office is in South Australia approximately \$60 000 in fees for selling shares, and approximately \$1.5 million to interstate and overseas sharebrokers (and institutions).

SASFIT

SASFIT's portfolio of domestic listed entities was transferred to BT Asset Management Limited (BT) on 1 August 1990. Prior and subsequent to the physical transfer of stock and cash totalling \$89.5 million, no listed share transactions were undertaken outside the auspices of BT by SASFIT during 1990-91.

As the investment manager of SASFIT's Listed Equities Portfolio, BT has the responsibility of administering the share transactions efficiently and cost effectively. The commercial arrangements between BT and its brokers have not been sought by nor disclosed to SASFIT.

STATE BANK

	S.A. Brokers \$	Interstate Bro- kers \$
State Bank	2 241	3 959
Beneficial Finance (and subsidiaries)	460	—
Ayers Finnis Holdings (and subsidiaries)	12 464	—
Executor Trustee Aust. Ltd.	435	—
GROUP TOTAL	15 600	3 959

DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES

257. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)** asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many committees were created in the Department of Agriculture in 1990-91?

2. What is the name of each of those committees and the reason it was created?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. In the financial year 1990-91 20 committees were formed.

2. Administrative Services Stream

Formation Date: 23 May 1991

Reason: To implement award restructuring in the department specifically for administrative services.

Agricultural Geographic Information System Steering Committee

Formation Date: 1 April 1991.

Reason: To manage the progress of the geographic information system for the soil project based at Northfield.

Award Restructuring Overview (Consultative) Committee

Formation Date: 23 May 1991.

Reason: Award restructuring—Industrially promoted measure agreed to by the Commissioner for Public Employment and the Public Service Association that department would have overview committees. It is the responsibility of the consultative committee to ensure that the committees are running appropriately and set up correctly.

Central Hills Soil Conservation Board.

Formation Date: 2 January 1991.

Reason: Formed due to community request. The public required assistance in various issues affecting the central hills area.

Eyre Peninsula Study Coordinating Committee

Formation Date: 29 August 1991.

Reason: The committee was formed to examine the rural problems of Eyre Peninsula, that is debt management, soil conservation and readjustment.

Information Technology Consultancy Steering Committee.

Formation Date: 1 June 1991.

Reason: To oversee the progress of the DMR consultancy to establish a strategic information technology plan for the department and to acquire and install hardware and software for the implementation of the department's systems.

Inter-Agency Committee on Rural Issues Coordination.

Formation Date: 1 November 1990.

Reason: The department believed that it could play a central role in coordinating human service delivery in rural areas. In convening the committee from appropriate State, Federal and non-government organisations with a view to resolving any blockages and in providing a collaborative approach to human service delivery in a social justice context.

Liaison Forum on Chemicals in Horticulture.

Formation Date: 1 April 1991.

Reason: To provide a technical communication mechanism between the horticultural industries and the Department of Agriculture on chemical issues.

Middle East Trade.

Formation Date: 3 April 1991.

Reason: To assess the export opportunities for South Australian companies and to develop and facilitate contacts with companies and organisations in the Middle East for South Australian exporters of goods and services.

North East Pastoral Soil Conservation Board.

Formation Date: 2 January 1991.

Reason: Formed due to community request to assist them in the North East Pastoral Region.

Northern Adelaide Hills Soil Conservation Board.

Formation Date: 2 January 1991.

Reason: Formed due to community request to assist them in the Northern Adelaide Hills Region.

Northfield Research Laboratories Occupational Health and Safety Committee.

Formation Date: 2 January 1991.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of the Act.

Operational Services Stream Classification Committee.

Formation Date: 23 May 1991.

- Reason: To implement award restructuring in the department specifically for operational services.
- Organisation Development Review Steering Committee.
Formation Date: 27 September 1991.
Reason: To assist the Chief Executive Officer to successfully manage a major restructuring of the department.
- Professional Services Stream Classification Committee.
Formation Date: 23 May 1991.
Reason: To implement award restructuring in the department specifically for professional services.
- Rotavirus Development Board.
Formation Date: 1 July 1990.
Reason: Established by the Minister of Agriculture in 1989 to oversee and direct the development and commercialisation of the Rotavirus project.
- Rural Tree Planting Committee.
Formation Date: 8 November 1990.
Reason: A Government initiative to provide support to the revegetation program. As a result of landcare the Federal government has encouraged the launch of the 'one million trees' program.
- South East Horticultural Development Group.
Formation Date: 2 August 1990.
Reason: To encourage and facilitate the development of horticultural industries in the South East of South Australia.
- Western Eyre Peninsula Soil Conservation Board.
Formation Date: 2 January 1991.
Reason: Formed due to community request to help people in the Western Eyre Peninsula Region.
- Working Party to Review the Bulk Handling of Grain Act 1955.
Formation Date: 1 March 1991.
Reason: Request from the South Australian bulk handling company to repeal the Act.

285. Mr MATTHEW (Bright) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: How many formal and informal committees exist within the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education and in relation to each—

- (a) what is the name;
- (b) what are the terms of reference;
- (c) when was it formed;
- (d) when is it expected to achieve its objective; and
- (e) what is the budgeted cost for paying members and servicing it for 1991-92?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The replies are as follows:

Obviously, there are very many formal and informal committees within the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education which includes seven central office divisions, 19 colleges plus over 70 individual campuses and office locations. To respond to the five separate sections of the question for each of the committees in all the divisions, colleges, campuses and offices would involve prohibitive expense. Therefore the response below is restricted in detail to those committees for which members are paid fees. By regulation, this refers to committees on which there is 'external' representation as in most cases public servants are not entitled to sitting fees for departmental committees.

However, before moving to that level of detail, it should be noted that there are many committees on which there are unpaid external members. A few examples are given to illustrate the level of unpaid contribution made by the community to the conduct of the department. Each of the 19 colleges of TAFE in South Australia have councils, generally not exceeding 15 members, the majority of whom are representative of employers and employees in the industrial and commercial fields in which the graduates of the college are likely to work. In summary, the functions of the councils is to take a leading role in the promotion, development and extension of technical and further education in the community. The councils can make representation on matters affecting the well-being of the college and on technical and further education matters to the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education, or to the Minister of Employment and Further Education.

The college councils have a peak association called the South Australian Association of Councils of Colleges of Technical and Further Education. It was incorporated in 1981 to support the common interests of college councils. Its major aim for 1992 will be to increase the profile of college councils and the South Australian Association of Councils of Colleges of Technical and Further Education as community advisory groups to the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education. The peak reference committee of the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education is the Planning and Program Management Committee (PPMC). The role of this committee which

commenced operation in 1988 is to assist the corporate management of the department, to give direction in respect of planning, priority setting, and resource allocation. The committee has an unpaid member of the community who is a member of a college council and nominated by the South Australian Association of College Councils to provide a college council perspective to the discussions of PPMC.

Other examples are found in the area of the Kickstart program, which was initiated by the Government in August 1991 to devolve considerable control of labour market programs to regional committees. At the present, there are four focus regions with committees involving as a minimum local employers, trade unions, local government and community organisations, Commonwealth Department of Education Employment and Training, and local TAFE college representation. The task of each of these management committees is to conduct activities in its region using the funds provided, augmented by any other like funds that can be identified from other sources, to achieve the objectives listed below. No fees are paid to committee members.

The objectives of the Kickstart strategy are:

Employment Development: within existing businesses, regions and the State;

Enterprise Development: through the establishment of new enterprises/businesses;

Employment Retention Strategies: to counter the cyclical effect of economic downturn and industry restructuring; and

Maintenance of Training Effort: to prevent skill shortages in the post recession period.

A Ministerial advisory committee has also been established to provide more general across-the-board advice to the Minister of Employment and Further Education on the operation of the labour market programs generally, including the Kickstart strategy throughout South Australia.

The role of this committee is to:

monitor the implementation of the regional strategy and advise and make recommendations to the Minister as appropriate;

advise the Minister on outcomes of the regional strategy in terms of meeting government labour market and social justice objectives;

advise the Minister on trends and further directions for labour market programs in South Australia.

The membership essentially reflects the interests on the individual Kickstart regional committees, but by virtue of its overall nature, the representatives come from the peak organisations. The committee also oversees the Home Assist scheme and its membership includes a representative of the home and community care administration from the Department of Family and Community Services. The chair of the committee is chosen from members who are not from public service agencies. No fees are paid. State Youth Affairs, within the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education, reports to the Minister of Youth Affairs. Included in the detailed list below is the Ministerial Advisory Committee on Youth Affairs. It is included in that section because there is provision for the payment of sitting fees to external members.

However, there is a network of regional youth strategy committees which include several unpaid external members. At this stage there are four of these committees: northern, southern, and western metropolitan, and Whyalla, each formed in November 1990 to act as a source of advice to the State Youth Strategy Coordinating Committee and the regional senior project officer. The State Youth Strategy Coordinating Committee was formed in April 1990 and also has unpaid external members. Its terms of reference are to develop a three year strategy plan, monitor and evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the strategy, recommend modifications to improve the effectiveness of the strategy, and ensure effective linkages with corresponding strategies of other government and non-government agencies.

The following committees are listed in more detail as there is at least some provision for the payment of fees:

1. (a) The Women's Employment Strategy Ministerial Advisory Committee (WESMAC).

(b) The broadly based committee is not a DETAFE committee as such. However it does report to the Minister of Employment and Further Education and through him to the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology on major issues relating to women's employment.

WESMAC's activities involve the development of strategies and the coordination of efforts across all sectors, to further the goals of the Australian Women's Employment Strategy, which has been endorsed by the South Australia Government. The eight goals of the Australian Women's Employment Strategy are:

to improve women's access to and participation in employment, education and training;

to improve working conditions and arrangements for workers with family responsibilities;

to improve employment and training opportunities for women as part of industry planning and restructuring;

to reduce gender segregation in education, occupations and industries;

to improve women's access to and participation in forums for consultation and decision making in employment, education and training;

to improve women's occupational health and safety;

to promote pay equity; and

to develop appropriate awards and conditions for especially disadvantaged women.

(c) WESMAC was formally constituted in October 1991 replacing a two-committee structure which had been operating since early 1989.

(d) Ongoing.

(e) At this stage no claims have been made for sitting fees.

2. (a) Ministerial Advisory Committee on Youth Affairs (MACOYA).

(b) The Ministerial Advisory Committee on Youth Affairs provides independent advice to the Minister of Youth Affairs on youth issues by:

bringing together individuals with expertise in policy development;

prioritising strategies to improve policies and the delivery of services to young people in South Australia, both in the short and long term;

improving the accountability, and evaluation of programs and services in the youth field;

developing strategies which will highlight both the achievements of young people and developments within the youth field.

(c) 19 October 1990.

(d) Ongoing.

(e) The budgeted cost for MACOYA is \$5 000.

3. (a) Industrial and Commercial Training Commission.

(b) To inquire into, and keep under review, the training that is being, or should be, provided in order to develop the knowledge and skills required in industry and commerce.

To make recommendations to the Minister relating to the occupations that should constitute trades or declared vocations.

To determine the objectives, nature, syllabus content and duration of training in—

(i) trades and other declared vocations;

(ii) trainee schemes;

(iii) schemes of pre-vocational training.

To determine matters relating to the entry into, observance, discharge, assignment, transfer, variation, suspension or cancellation of contracts of training (not being matters related to disciplining a party to a contract of training).

To determine matters relating to the training to be provided by employers to persons employed under contracts of training.

To approve facilities provided, or to be provided, at governmental or non-governmental institutions for the purposes of training in—

(i) trades and other declared vocations;

(ii) trainee schemes; or

(iii) schemes of pre-vocational training.

To assess by such means as the commission thinks fit the competency of apprentices or other trainees.

To grant, or arrange for the granting of, certificates to persons completing programs of training determined by the commission.

To determine credits to be allowed in respect of the training required under the Industrial and Commercial Training Act on the basis of training previously undertaken, or on any other basis.

To enter into reciprocal arrangements with appropriate bodies with respect to the recognition of industrial or commercial training qualifications.

To assess by such means as the commission thinks fit the competency of persons who have acquired qualifications or skills otherwise than through programs of training determined by the commission and, in appropriate cases, to issue certificates recognising such qualifications or skills.

To collect data and statistics in relation to industrial and commercial training.

To promote and encourage—

(i) the implementation of industrial and commercial training programs and participation by others in such programs; and

(ii) the establishment of off-the-job training centres by employers or groups of employers.

To advise the Minister—

(i) on matters referred by the Minister to the commission for advice; and

(ii) generally in relation to the administration of this Act.

To carry out any other functions and duties assigned to the commission by or under the Industrial and Commercial Training Act.

(c) 1981.

(d) Ongoing.

(e) \$20 000 (including the Disputes and Disciplinary Committee).

4. (a) Disputes and Disciplinary Committee (of Industrial and Commercial Training Commission).

(b) To inquire into:

disputes between parties to a contract of training;

The aggrieving of one party to a contract of training by the conduct of another party;

the suspected contravention or failure to comply with a provision of a contract of training by a party to that contract;

the suspected contravention or failure to comply with a provision of the Industrial and Commercial Training Act by a party to a contract of training.

(c) 1981.

(d) Ongoing.

(e) The members of the Disputes and Disciplinary Committee are also members of the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission and the budgeted cost is included in the overall figure for the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission.

5. (a) SATECH Board.

(b) SATECH is the marketing and business arm of the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education.

The Board of SATECH is responsible for:

policy on the operation of SATECH;

policy for the operations of DETAFE business activities;

marketing of DETAFE business activities;

approval of DETAFE business activities;

overseas projects;

policy on the commercialisation of DETAFE intellectual property;

policy on the remuneration of staff involved in DETAFE business enterprises;

approval of business plans and annual reports from DETAFE business enterprises;

venture capital function.

(c) 14 July 1988.

(d) 30 June 1992.

(e) \$3 876.

6. (a) Elizabeth Techsolve Board.

(b) Elizabeth Techsolve is the business arm of the Elizabeth College of TAFE.

The Board of Elizabeth Techsolve has responsibilities as follows:

to produce and market educational/training programs primarily for the business and commercial enterprises in the Northern Adelaide Development Area;

the preparation of resource materials of a technological and vocational nature to meet the needs of the northern area;

to prepare resource packages and provide consulting services to Commonwealth and State Departments, and industry;

to cooperate with industry, Chambers of Commerce and the Northern Adelaide Development Board in investigating the training needs in the area;

to hire facilities and equipment to the community, business and government departments.

(c) 14 July 1988.

(d) 30 June 1992.

(e) \$2 424.

7. (a) Regency Applitech Board.

(b) Regency Applitech is the business arm of the Regency College of TAFE.

The Board of Regency Applitech has responsibilities as follows:

to enhance the Regency College of TAFE program by the creation of teaching and learning environments which are relevant to college programs;

to increase the product use of the staff;

to generate revenue;

to increase cost effectiveness of education and training services;

to develop enterprise skills amongst staff and students;

to enable the college and Regency College of TAFE Council to assume increasing levels of responsibility in project development and management.

(c) 14 July 1988.

(d) 30 June 1992.

(e) \$1 212.

8. (a) ADTECH Board.

(b) ADTECH is the commercial arm of the Adelaide College of TAFE.

The Board of ADTECH has responsibilities as follows:

to increase the productive use of the expertise of Department of Employment and TAFE staff;

to generate revenue which can be used for staff development, equipment and technological update, student amenities, new entrepreneurial ventures and other improvements in technical and further education;

to increase the cost-effectiveness of Department of Employment and TAFE education training services;

to foster in DETAFE staff and students, an increasing competence in entrepreneurship, innovation and technology transfer in industrial, commercial and technology ventures;

to enable the college and the council to assume increasing levels of responsibility for initiating and managing entrepreneurial projects.

(c) 14 July 1988.

(d) 30 June 1992.

(e) \$808.

9. (a) CROTECH Board.

(b) CROTECH is the business arm of the Croydon Park College of TAFE.

The Board of CROTECH has responsibilities as follows:

to enhance the technical and further education program of the Croydon Park College of TAFE through the creation of

teaching and learning environments which are linked with existing and future technological, employment and commercial activities relevant to the schools and specialist units of the college, and to the trades, professions, occupations, industries and communities serviced by the college;

to increase the productive use of the expertise of DETAFE staff;

to generate revenue which can be used for staff development, equipment and technological update, student amenities, research and development, new entrepreneurial ventures and other improvements to technical and further education;

to increase the cost-effectiveness of DETAFE education and training services;

to foster in DETAFE staff and students an increasing competence in entrepreneurship, innovation and technology transfer in industrial, commercial and technology ventures;

to enable the college and the council to assume increasing levels of responsibility in initiating and managing entrepreneurial projects.

(c) 19 April 1989.

(d) 30 June 1992.

(e) \$808.