

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 19 February 1992

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

## WILDERNESS PROTECTION 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: GLENELG MARINA

A petition signed by 1 307 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ensure that adequate trailer boat launching facilities for the Patalong outlet are included in the new Glenelg marina plans was presented by Mr Oswald.

Petition received.

## QUESTIONS

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

## SHARK FISHING

In reply to Mr **BRINDAL (Hayward)** 28 November 1991.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: The Fisheries (General) Regulations 1984, paragraph 35C states:

A person must not use blood, bone, meat, offal or skin of an animal as berley (otherwise than in a rock lobster pot or other fish trap) within three kilometres of—

(a) the mainland of the State;

or

(b) Kangaroo Island.

Penalty: \$2 000.

During October and November 1991 a number of bronze whaler, seven gill and carpet sharks were caught by amateur fishers along the metropolitan coast, including from Brighton and Noalunga jetties. Fisheries officers patrolling these areas did not find any evidence of berleying using blood or offal.

The Noarlunga/Brighton areas are frequented by a large number of jetty fishers throughout the year and it is not uncommon to receive some complaints, particularly during the warmer months when diving activity increases. Fisheries officers of the Department of Fisheries conduct regular patrols along the metropolitan coast and pursue any alleged breaches of the regulations. No offences have been detected during the current summer period.

The South Australian Marine Scale Fishery Supplementary Green Paper (July 1991) contains proposals relating to shark fishing in both Gulf St Vincent and Spencer Gulf. As a result the issue of shark fishing and berleying along the metropolitan coast will be addressed further as part of the proposed changes to the marine scale fishery.

## RIVERLAND STORM DAMAGE

In reply to **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey)** 26 November 1991.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: Following the storm on 25 November 1991 the affected growers were addressed by a number of people including the Manager, Mr Graham Broughton, of the Rural Finance and Development Division (RFDD) who advised them of the Rural Adjustment Scheme measures available.

An assessor from the Rural Finance and Development Division was available in the Berri office of the Department of Agriculture on 27 and 28 November to interview growers and assist them with their inquiries for financial assistance.

Of the 17 growers who contacted the assessor, only four formal applications had been received by the RFDD for assistance as at 22 January 1991. This is an indication that the majority of affected growers have been able to refinance their operations from commercial sources.

I have also been advised that, following the storm, Berrivale offered to take all mature fruit that had been damaged or blown off trees as juicing fruit, provided that it was delivered within three days of the storm.

In one case, a grower managed to salvage 30 tonnes of Valencias that had been dislodged from the trees and, while Berrivale rejected approximately 14 per cent of the fruit, the rest was accepted as juicing quality. It is understood that a number of growers did not take advantage of this offer.

I have requested RFDD to continue to provide me with an update on the number of applications received; however, given the small number received at this stage, I do not consider it necessary to amend any of the existing criteria applicable to Rural Adjustment Scheme Part A or C programs.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MARCEL EDWARD SPIERO

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: On Tuesday 11 February 1992 Marcel Edward Spiero escaped while being escorted from Yatala Labour Prison to the Supreme Court. The prisoner was being escorted in a Department of Correctional Services high security vehicle which was travelling along Regency Road in heavy traffic. At about 8.40 a.m., near the Nailsworth High School, traffic slowed and stopped, and two men, with sawn-off weapons, got out of the car in front of the prison van.

One moved to the front passenger side and directed the two escorting officers to get out and move to the footpath, where they were made to stand facing a wall, with their backs towards the prison vehicle. The second gunman directed a third officer still in the prison vehicle to get out and open the rear door. Spiero was let out, still handcuffed. The gunmen and Spiero ran to their vehicle and drove off along Regency Road. The officers pursued the offenders' vehicle but lost it in the back streets.

Both the Major Crime Squad and the Department of Correctional Services have been investigating the escape and the events leading up to this incident. There has been an allegation that the police and the Department of Correctional Services knew that 'there had been talk for days within the prison that a break-out may be attempted'. The facts are that management at Yatala Labour Prison became aware on 27 December 1991 that four prisoners had prepared a plan to escape from within a secured section of Yatala Labour Prison. Information obtained at that time did not include details of a likely escape from an escort vehicle at a later date. Action was immediately taken by the General Manager, Yatala Labour Prison, to ensure that the prisoners involved in this conspiracy were kept apart and were moved to other parts of the institution.

There is no evidence to suggest that the plan, which was discovered on 27 December 1991, was linked to the escape of Marcel Spiero on 11 February 1992. Information of this type that relates to both offenders and ex-offenders is gathered by Department of Correctional Services staff on a daily basis. All information is taken seriously and steps are taken to thwart the intent of the action. The Department of Correctional Services is developing a Data Analysis System, similar to other jurisdictions in Australia, which will improve the gathering and analysis of information.

Approximately 7 500 high security prisoner escorts are made from Yatala Labour Prison each year. The escort

procedures for prisoner Spiero did not differ from that of any other high risk category prisoner:

- There were three escorting officers who were fully trained.
- The written instructions for the escorting officers were clear. The special additional conditions which were to apply for Spiero's escort were:
  - two officer escort, which was complied with;
  - handcuffed at all times, which was complied with; and
  - ensure Dog Squad escort, which was not complied with.

The issue of why the Dog Squad did not accompany the escort vehicle is of concern. The Dog Squad was booked for the escort at 4 p.m. on Monday 10 February 1992 and was instructed to be at Yatala Labour Prison at 9 a.m. on 11 February 1992, in readiness for the escort to commence at 9.10 a.m. The Dog Squad arrived at Yatala Labour Prison at 8.45 a.m.; however, the escort had left the prison at 8.30 a.m. without the Dog Squad back-up. Legal advice has been sought from the Crown Solicitor on whether there have been breaches of procedures by any of the officers concerned and, if so, what action, if any, should be taken against them.

The vehicle used for the transport of high security prisoners in South Australia is a purpose-built vehicle and is the most secure vehicle of its type in Australia. The material of the rear of the high security escort vehicle has been assault tested by members of the Royal Ulster Constabulary and the Police Star Force. This testing resisted penetration, and the material has subsequently been used on a Star Force emergency response vehicle. Further, all high security prisoners, when being transported to court, are handcuffed, loaded into a maximum security vehicle in a high security courtyard within the prison and, on arrival at the court, are unloaded in a secure courtyard and then placed in the secured cells. In the circumstances of the Spiero escape, an officer was directed at gunpoint by the assailants to release the prisoner from the vehicle. Alternative handcuffing methods within the high security escort vehicle would not have unduly delayed the escape, as each prisoner is secured in their own high security cubicle, which is subsequently locked with a stainless steel mesh door.

The Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Correctional Services has initiated the following new procedures:

1. The Star Force will provide additional support to the Department of Correctional Services when exceptionally high (High 1) security prisoners are transported to court, hospital, etc. An escort will now consist of a driver, two prison officer escorts, Star Force and an armed Department of Correctional Services Dog Squad handler.
2. Digital voice-protected radios will be installed in the three high security escort vehicles. This will provide a secure communications link for high security metropolitan escorts, and also communication will not be able to be received by anyone operating radio scanners and FM band radios.
3. A review will be undertaken into the security of the driver's cabin of the high security vehicles. Advice supplied to me is that there is no other correctional jurisdiction or police escort vehicle in Australia which has an assault-proof driver's cabin in any of their escort vehicles.

Concern has been raised about how it was possible for someone outside the prison to know the details of Spiero's court appearance. Spiero knew the date of his court appearance in advance and, therefore, would have been able to communicate this information *via* a visit, mail or telephone.

Information relating to the appearance was published in the *Advertiser* of 11 February 1992 in the 'Cause List'. It read, and I quote 'Court 5 Before Judge Lee at 9.40 a.m.—Crown v. Spiero.' Either Spiero or the gunmen would have been able to peruse the cause list and then approximately determine the time that the escort vehicle would have left Yatala Labor Prison. Steps are being taken to stop this information being printed. Only one high security escort vehicle left for court on the morning of 11 February 1992. Therefore, the gunmen had more than a reasonable chance of assuming that Spiero was in the vehicle.

With regard to the route of the escort, once leaving Yatala Labour Prison, the driver has only two options: to turn left on to Grand Junction Road or to turn right. The gunmen could have parked on Grand Junction Road, seen which way the escort vehicle was travelling and then followed. The driver of the escort vehicle did, in fact, vary his route by turning right into Regency Road from Hampstead Road. Questions relating to the possible need for prison officers to be armed whilst on escort and the need for them to carry radios have been raised. It is my view that, if there is to be a shoot out, the police should be in charge of that operation. They have the training, the expertise and the capacity to handle incidents in public areas. Prison officers do not and could not realistically be expected to. The officers were equipped with radios and used them to contact Yatala Labour Prison Control after the incident. The police were advised of the hold-up within 60 seconds of it occurring by Yatala Control.

All prison officers are trained in the correct procedures of escorting high security prisoners. The General Manager, Yatala Labour Prison, selects the best of these staff and, under normal circumstances, an armed dog squad handler provides a back-up. Suggestions that significant benefits could be achieved in South Australia by using video conferencing facilities to conduct remand hearings and pre-trial conferences have been made. While this suggestion will be considered, there is some concern that the independence of the judicial processes could be compromised by doing so.

In conclusion, the risk of escape has been substantially reduced due to the improved physical security of Yatala Labour Prison. The improved security measures that I have listed in this statement, along with those that are not listed (for obvious security reasons), and which the Department of Correctional Services has implemented, will assist in reducing the likelihood of such an escape occurring again in the future.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GREYMOUTH MILL

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Forests):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** During Question Time yesterday, the member for Mount Gambier asked when I would meet a commitment given in the House last October to provide him with information to reconcile two different loss figures relating to the closure of the Greymouth Mill. Members will recall I apologised to the honourable member yesterday, although I thought I had provided the information required. I did, however, undertake that he would get it in a hurry.

I have now established that my recollection was accurate and that neither the apology nor the hurry were necessary. The promised report was provided in a ministerial statement to the House on 17 October—one day after the honourable member asked his question. For the honourable

member's guidance, he will find the statement in *Hansard* of that date at page 1231.

decision that will be taken in conjunction or in consolidation with the Commissioner.

## QUESTION TIME

### STATE BANK ROYAL COMMISSION

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier. When did the Attorney-General's Department advise the Government to withdraw term of reference three of the State Bank royal commission, and will the Premier make public the reasons given by the department for this advice?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That is a question that could more appropriately be directed to the Attorney-General. All aspects of the future of the royal commission have been quite properly canvassed. I find it quite amazing that the Leader of the Opposition and some of his colleagues, who brayed for the royal commission and who demanded that this should take place, have been racing around saying, 'It wasn't us. We didn't actually do it: the Government did it, and we can prove it to you.' That response is because they are aware, as the Government is aware, that a lot of people in the community are concerned about the length of time and the cost of the royal commission. Their response to that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Adelaide.

**Dr ARMITAGE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I ask you to rule under Standing Order 98, 'No debate allowed', which provides:

In answering such a question, a Minister or other member replies to the substance of the question and may not debate the matter to which the question refers.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair is well aware of that Standing Order: in fact, I invoked it yesterday. I am listening to the response of the Premier, and I will certainly apply the Standing Order if required.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The substance of the question was part of this ongoing, double game that the Opposition is playing, on the one hand, to try to ensure that the royal commission and proceedings take as long as possible, because it believes it is in its political interest for it to do so and, on the other hand, to say, 'It is not our fault or our responsibility if that is so', at the same time, trying to suggest that any reasonable steps that might be taken to ensure that the proceedings are satisfactorily concluded as soon as possible are in some way off limits.

I repeat again, as I did yesterday: the Government has absolutely no intention of curtailing the exercise, of covering up, of ensuring that information is not properly provided—no intention whatsoever. We initiated the Auditor-General's inquiry for very sound reasons, which have been accepted generally. As the Attorney-General has said, it looks as though that will require more time than was originally anticipated. Also, we brought down agreed terms of reference for the royal commission, and the Royal Commissioner is undertaking his duty and doing his job on those terms of reference. That does not in any way suggest that, if during the course of the inquiry it is found that there are other ways of dealing with those issues and those terms of reference, and still arriving at the truth and still looking at the position, that they shall not be explored. So, the Attorney-General is perfectly entitled to accept and his department is perfectly entitled to give advice on those matters. I will refer the question to him, but it is not relevant to a

### HOSPITAL RESOURCES

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** My question is directed to the Minister of Health. Does this Government's strategy on hospital resources differ from that of other States or from national policy and, if so, in what respects?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I have attended three of four Health Ministers conferences, and I think I can discern some degree of consensus which has emerged during that time. It involves things like, for example, putting more resources into same day surgery, reducing to the degree that it is sensible to do so the number of beds in public hospitals, reducing the length of stay in these hospitals, looking closely at the booking lists, determining where deficiencies occur because it is difficult to get certain specialties recruited to the public hospital system, negotiating with the colleges in relation to those matters, and so on. That seems to be very much the broad general outline of the approaches.

That, I suppose in some ways, is politically a risk strategy, because it is very easy to misrepresent the concept of bed closure. I suppose those who want to make political points might try to suggest that this is some sort of Canberra plot being foisted on us all through what, for the most part, are Labor Governments in the States.

In the light of the honourable member's question, I must say that the jurisdiction that seems to be most enthusiastic about this approach is that of the Government of New South Wales under the Liberal Leader Mr Greiner, because I see that the press in the past day or so has reported under the following headline, 'Greiner plan to slash 4 000 hospital beds'. To be fair, that is during this decade—4 000 beds will be closed in their hospitals. The plan that has been released indicates that 45 per cent of all hospital admissions will be for daily surgery.

I should explain the ministerial arrangements in New South Wales. There is a Minister of Health and Community Services, who is the senior Minister and who tends to be the gentleman who says all the good things, whether it be an increase in services into country areas, or whatever. Then there is a quite separate Ministry which, I understand, is junior to that one, and which is occupied by a Mr Ron Phillips, who has all the other sorts of announcements that have to be made, particularly about hospitals.

So, in fact, it is this Mr Ron Phillips who has had the happy job of releasing a report with Mr Greiner which says that, over the decade, 4 000 hospital beds will be closed in New South Wales. Further, when they announced this, some enterprising journalist, Opposition politician, or something, asked the not unreasonable question, 'What is this likely to do to your booking list?' I guess some sort of answer was given that, with the better use of same day surgery, they should be able to attack the booking list.

Mr Phillips was then asked, 'Can you give us a report on where they stand at present?'—and Mr Phillips could not! I quote the article as follows:

The Minister for Health Service (Mr Phillips) was unable to say at yesterday's launching of the plan how long waiting lists are, but said the figures would be released soon.

It is rather pertinent to some of the things that have been said in this place and outside in the past few days. This Government has been criticised because fewer beds are currently open than 12 months ago. This Government has been criticised over booking lists. We publish our booking lists every month. All the information is there: it is all hanging out for everyone to see. Despite the fact that, if

anything, the way in which those booking lists are compiled gives an unfair index of what in fact is happening in the hospitals, it is all there to see.

The Liberal Government in New South Wales does not even know how many people its hospitals have on the booking lists. The question I ask, perhaps rhetorically, is simply this: what is the alchemy that is available to the Liberal Party in South Australia that is not available to Mr Ron Phillips in New South Wales? Perhaps the member for Adelaide ought to be jumping on the Overland, getting over there and sitting down with Mr Phillips because, after all, that Government is perhaps not the most popular around the place, and saying, 'Look, mate, we know what we are going to do in South Australia; if only you would follow our advice, you may be able to get out of this problem.'

But we know that the Liberal Party in this State has no magic, no alchemy, over and above that which is available to Messrs Phillips and Greiner in New South Wales and, indeed, that it is doing very much the same as Governments around the country, although with rather more enthusiasm and alacrity. All I have heard from Opposition members in recent times is a proposition that was put forward by one of my predecessors, Dr Cornwall, some years ago, about the public sector paying private hospitals to take some of its patients. I think that it is a pretty good idea.

The problem is that, when Dr Cornwall put it forward and entered into some sort of tentative agreement with a private hospital, the doctors at that hospital threatened to walk out. So, that very aspect of something that I understand the Liberal Party in this State puts forward is not, so far as I am aware, supported by the AMA. As soon as it is, we will be into it. It is a very promising way to go.

The private hospitals are an important part of our system, and the number of patients they handle has steadily increased in recent years, despite some of the propaganda about the Medicare agreement. So, there it is. It seems to me that we are on track so far as Governments around Australia are concerned, in providing a continuing, compassionate system but one that is cost effective. However, I have to say that, whatever our waiting list might be, the New South Wales waiting list is under wraps; they do not know what it is, and if the Liberals here have any way in which they can help Mr Phillips, as I have said, I think they should go over there and do so.

#### STATE BANK ROYAL COMMISSION

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I direct my question to the Premier. As the withdrawal of term of reference 3 of the State Bank Royal Commission would limit the commission to investigating communication between the bank and the Government and prevent the Commissioner reporting on matters relating to unlawful, corrupt or improper activity, will the Premier now give an assurance that the commission will be allowed to report on all of its existing terms of reference? I refer to the Royal Commission transcript at page 308, where Mr Justice Jacobs makes clear that only he, and not the Auditor-General, has the responsibility to recommend whether civil or criminal proceedings should be instituted relating to 'a conflict of interest or breach of fiduciary duty or other unlawful, corrupt or improper activity'. These issues arise under term of reference 3 dealing with the manner in which board members discharged their duties.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That was not so much a question as a statement or an argument by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He did the same thing yesterday:

he states a case and asks me whether or not I agree with it. It is a case that can be stated and considered. Let me make two points. First, the Government has no vested interest in term of reference 3; it does not involve the Government. Term of reference 1 deals with the relations between the bank and the Government; that is well in progress, and I hope it will be concluded soon.

Term of reference 3 has nothing to do with the Government or the Government's political position, or anything of that nature. So, anything that is done in relation to that would not be the Government's attempting to protect itself, because it has no vested interest whatsoever. Secondly, the Deputy Leader quotes the Commissioner's views. The Commissioner's views have very considerable weight indeed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE RELOCATION

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Will the Minister inform the House whether he is considering moving the Department of Agriculture to Angaston? My question has been prompted by an article that appeared in the *Angaston Leader* on 6 February. The article is headed 'Department of Agriculture may relocate to Angaston' and states:

It is understood the city-based Department of Agriculture is considering relocating its department as there are plans to redevelop the Waite Agricultural College campus. According to Mr Ivan Venning, member for Custance, both Murray Bridge and Angaston are possible areas for relocation of the department and he is of the opinion that Angaston may possibly be the chosen location.

Mr Venning told the *Leader* that he believes land in Angaston will soon be very sought after and the town has great potential for development. He is even recommending that the Angaston railway line be retained as he expects the line to again see regular trains visiting the town.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** We do not intend to relocate the Department of Agriculture to Angaston, and that is because we have spent an enormous amount of effort and energy, not to mention resources, in relocating the Department of Agriculture's central facilities to the Waite campus of the University of Adelaide. That relocation has been going on for a long time. I know that some members on the other side—the member for Davenport, in particular—do not like that policy but other members opposite have actually been heard to support the relocation to the Waite campus.

Whatever the case—and I believe a very sound case can be made for the relocation to the Waite campus, which is proceeding well, on schedule and within cost—things have gone too far to make a decision that all of the resources that have been expended to date will be thrown away and wasted. Certainly it is not my intention and it is not the Government's intention to see a relocation of the Department of Agriculture to Angaston. Of course, what we will continue to do is to deploy—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The member for Hayward says that this is discrimination. Does that mean that, if we send it to Angaston, somewhere else in South Australia will say that it is discrimination because we are not sending it there? We do not have enough people in the entire employ of the department to send one to every settlement, suburb, town or city in the State of South Australia. It is just not feasible. If that is discrimination, I shall have to put up with it.

Quite apart from that point—and I made the point clearly on behalf of the Government—it may well be that there is something more hidden here of which I am not aware. It

may well be that in this situation we do not yet know who the real shadow Minister is. We have the has-been shadow Minister, the member for Goyder; we have the cannot-be shadow Minister, the Hon. Jamie Irwin, in another place, because he has acknowledged that he can never be Minister and therefore he cannot really be a genuine shadow Minister; and we have the would-be shadow Minister of Agriculture, the member for Chaffey; but now it seems to me that we have a new contender who is putting his bid on the Party room table saying, 'This is going to be a real winner. Why not line up behind me, the member for Custance, to be the new shadow Minister?' In this appeal that he is making to his colleagues he is reaching out further and saying, 'It will bring other benefits to Angaston. It will bring tourism to Angaston.'

I have asked my office to find out how many tourists visit the black stump to see the Department of Agriculture in Adelaide. I have to tell the House that it is not very many. In fact, we cannot actually record a tourist, identifying himself or herself as such, coming to the front counter and saying, 'I am a tourist who has come to see the Department of Agriculture.' But the member for Custance is suggesting that this move of the department to Angaston will bring enough tourist trade that the line will have to be reopened to bring regular trains to Angaston so that people can see the Department of Agriculture. I wish him all the very best with that, but I really do not think that is a good bid on his part to be the new shadow Minister of Agriculture. In short, the answer is that the relocation to Waite is proceeding very successfully. I look forward to those facilities being ready in 1993. We do not intend to relocate the Department of Agriculture to Angaston.

#### MARCEL EDWARD SPIERO

**Mr SUCH (Fisher):** My question is directed to the Minister of Correctional Services. Was Marcel Spiero one of the four prisoners known by departmental management in December last year to be involved in an escape plan from Yatala Labour Prison and, if so, why did the Minister fail to acknowledge this fact in his ministerial statement?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Yes, he was, and there were three other names, and I did not name any of the four of them; but, as the member has named him, the answer is 'Yes'.

#### AUSTRALIAN SECURITIES COMMISSION

**Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth):** My question is directed to the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General in another place. Will the Minister seek a report and take any relevant action necessary on the delays experienced in the processing of routine documentation by the Australian Securities Commission? I am advised that the recently established ASC is experiencing substantial delays in the processing of even routine company documents such as, for example, notification of change of directors, and that, as a result, many commercial transactions which require the validation of company structure and management details are being delayed while the relevant documents are processed. I am further advised that these documents are often stored in boxes and that staff are unable to retrieve given documents on request, even where special circumstances justify early processing.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I shall be pleased to obtain the relevant

information from my colleague in another place, and presumably he will also consult his Federal counterpart who has primary responsibility in this area. However, it is a period of establishment of that important office across the nation and it is a new bureaucratic structure based on cooperation between the Commonwealth and the States. I am disappointed to hear, if that is the case, that there are some blockages in the processing of these routine matters.

#### ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy give an assurance that electricity prices will not be sharply increased, and that no consumers will be made worse off as a result of a new Government electricity pricing scheme? The Government's recently published 'South Australia's Action Plan for Managing Energy Demand' states:

The Government is committed to a new pricing structure that reflects the cost of supply. One way of doing this is to introduce a wider range of electricity charges that are based on time of use and cost of production.

Business and household consumers already hard hit by the recession have put to me that, since ETSA's electricity is already the second most expensive of any State, and given the experience of the Government's new water rating system, they want an assurance that no new scheme will make them worse off.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** It is interesting that the honourable member should make a comment like that, because one of the things I hear continuously from industry and commerce is that they want the price of electricity to be a reflection of the cost of supply. One of the criticisms we get from interstate and from consultants to the industry in particular—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** One of the comments we get from consultants to the industry both here and interstate is that South Australia has too few tariffs, and that those that we have are not sufficiently directed towards specific end-use situations. Interestingly enough, since 1988 South Australia has been trying to reflect in its pricing policy the need to more clearly indicate whether the price of electricity is in terms of the time of use, the quantity of use, or the marginal cost of extra energy. Indeed, since 1985 we have consistently reduced the real price of electricity. The interesting comment that one might well make is that when there was a large increase in the price of electricity—an increase well and truly above inflation—it was during the time the last Liberal Government was in office in this State.

#### ACCESS CABS

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Will the Minister of Transport investigate the possibility of negotiating a reciprocal arrangement with other States who operate an access cab concept to enable South Australian recipients of this service to be able to use the service while visiting those States? Recently a severely disabled constituent contacted my office. That constituent had to travel to Perth for important personal reasons. I contacted a colleague in the Western Australian Parliament to see what could be arranged for him during his stay in Perth. To my and my colleague's surprise, it was difficult to arrange as no reciprocal agreement exists between our States.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Price for his question. I am certainly in favour of any policy

initiatives that will assist the disabled in having greater mobility throughout Australia. I am pleased to say that at my first ministerial meeting as Minister of Transport I took up this issue with the other Ministers, but I did not get very far. The argument from one of the largest States in particular was that it would not be in it because it felt it had enough concessions already and, on the contrary, it was trying to get rid of some of them. Therefore, it was not particularly interested.

I have raised this issue on several occasions since then at ATAC meetings, again without success other than the Victorian Transport Minister supporting me. Only two Ministers out of all the Ministers and the spokespeople from the two Territories is not a great number. Nevertheless, I will try again at the next ATAC meeting and, if that is not successful—and I believe that it will not be, given the attitude of some of the States—I will consider a bilateral agreement with Victoria so that, whilst it is very limiting for the disabled, at least it will be better than nothing. I believe that the Victorian Government has taken a very caring and responsible approach to this matter and given me its support. I will certainly make some progress on that over the next few months, if not Australia wide at least with Victoria.

#### HOUSEHOLD ENERGY EFFICIENCY

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** My question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy. What direct financial incentives and financial schemes are under way to promote household energy efficiency, and will the Minister outline to the House what he considers to be the five most important of the 25 demand management programs which have been established?

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** That question really has to take the cake. I suppose I ought to be grateful that the honourable member did not ask me to take on all 25 programs and put them in the order in which she wanted them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat. It is Question Time in the House of Assembly, and the behaviour of some members leaves a lot to be desired. If it continues, some action will be taken. The Minister of Mines and Energy.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** The honourable member wants to know about certain demand management techniques which have been useful in this State and which are being used here. I have said on a number of occasions, in terms of the putting out of various plans and so on, that there are a number of these: we can start at one end—

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** If the honourable member will be patient for a moment, we will get to the answer in due course. The honourable member tends to yap away in the middle of an answer, but we will accept that for the moment. A number of things can be done. They can start at the fairly easy end, such as the energy labelling of appliances. The honourable member might not have been to a number of the launches regarding energy labelling of various appliances, but I assure her that I have done this on a number of occasions and I can probably list, without looking at my notes or anything like that, a number of things we have dealt with. We have put in energy labelling for such things as washing machines, refrigerators, air-conditioners and so on.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** If the honourable member will again be patient, we will get to the others in a moment. We can do a number of other things.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** For Goodness sake, don't be so stupid!

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** Had the honourable member visited the Electricity Trust of South Australia, she would have seen on the ground floor various signs indicating that the trust is cooperating with Philips in the production of its new light bulbs. The honourable member may not be aware that the new light bulbs are supposed to save a great deal of electricity and that in fact they do not save quite as much electricity as people think they do, but ETSA, because there is no choke on those globes and they are a form of globe that requires a choke for the full amount of electricity to be registered, in fact uses an amount of energy but charges only for .7 of that amount of energy. I think an *Electronics Australia* magazine last year—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I will show the honourable member my notes later: there is nothing about that in my notes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** Consequently ETSA is, at some cost to itself—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I hate to tell the Opposition this, but none of this information is in my briefing notes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I am enjoying this speech, and I will go on as long as necessary.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Question Time is a time for serious answers and questions on matters of concern to the people of this State. This conversation across the Chamber is ensuring that this Question Time is degenerating into a rabble, and it will not be countenanced. The Minister will direct all his remarks through the Chair.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I have no intention of doing otherwise and, if I have been a bit betrayed by my eagerness to answer interjections, I apologise for that. Other ways of achieving savings would be to have hot water services that are solar operated most of the time. I have one in my house, and I would like to know whether others have them in their places. Other ways of—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I really think that members are not all that keen to hear what they have asked for. Clearly, the thermal insulation of houses is another area where demand management is an effective way of cutting down on the supply of electricity or other fuels. The shift to LPG from petrol, and so on, is another. By now, there have been so many interjections that I have become convinced that the Opposition does not want to know the answer that it has been seeking, and I will sit down.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is up to members if they do not want a Question Time.

#### COOPER CREEK SYSTEM

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Will the Minister of Fisheries advise whether a decision has yet been made concern-

ing the commercial taking of fish from the Cooper Creek system?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** This is a very important and topical question. A decision has been made with respect to the very limited taking of fish for commercial purposes from the broad Cooper Creek system. The limited decision is that I have approved the granting of a licence under an exemption under section 59 of the Fisheries Act to enable one leaseholder in that area to take fish from what are referred to as ephemeral waters contained entirely within that person's leasehold.

However, a number of conditions apply to that: first, that the waters which are to be so commercially fished have dried sufficiently to separate them from the rest of the Cooper Creek system (in other words, there is no chance that the fish within the water could have gone into those other waters); secondly, that those waters have themselves deteriorated in quality to the point where the fish in them would most likely perish within the following 12 months; thirdly, where nets and other equipment used to take the fish have not been used in other river systems or waters (and this, quite specifically, is to avoid the risk of the spread of red fin virus); fourthly, that recreational fishing of such waters is not directly or indirectly discouraged; fifthly, that the fish taken are properly handled to maintain hygiene and proper product quality standards; sixthly, that prior approval is obtained from the Pastoral Board; and, seventhly, that access arrangements would be subject to review and variation at any time.

I understand that the Pastoral Board has approved this limited access on the basis that it will be a one off, pending much more detailed research that needs to be done. I will acknowledge that a degree of concern has been expressed to me about this matter by the conservation movement in South Australia and, broadly speaking, I concur with its concerns with respect to general commercial access to the Cooper Creek system. However, I believe that this exemption well and truly fits within reasonable management of that resource.

It is certainly true that, in the broad Cooper Creek system, we need to make sure that there is a breeding stock of fish that is able to survive and repopulate the creek at later times when floods come. It is also important that the bird life of the area does have sufficient fish stock upon which to feed, and that is why we still do not have enough data about the broad Cooper Creek system. However, that is quite different from the ephemeral waters, as they are referred to—the now much separated waterholes that are contained within this one particular leasehold, where the only option for those fish is to die and rot when the water dries away. It seems quite reasonable that, in the prospect of the two options—are those fish to be a totally wasted resource or are they to have some possible commercial use for the leaseholder—that latter course of action is taken with respect to that leaseholder's property.

There has been criticism that I have acted against the advice of the department on this matter. Certainly, it is true that the department drew my attention to the concerns of many groups in the community about broad access to Cooper Creek—remembering that that has not been approved. It needs to be noted that both SAFIC and SARFAC, under conditions, approve a broader access than I have already indicated. However, the Department of Fisheries has advised me that the application was received before the present legislation was in place, in any event.

We changed the legislation last year. It was proclaimed on 19 December, and that legislation would have given rights to limit commercial access to waters contained entirely

within the leasehold. The situation prior to that, under the then legislation, was that the leaseholder did not require approval under the Fisheries Act to take fish from waters wholly surrounded by his lease. That situation has now changed. In any event, I have indicated that we will not be giving any more such exemptions until a proper study of the whole broader system has been undertaken.

What choice, finally, was to be made: to let the fish die and rot as the isolated waters were separated from the main Cooper Creek system or, at least, to allow some benefit to be taken from those fish without detriment to the fish resource of the Cooper Creek system?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I appreciate the interjections of the members for Eyre, Morphett and Whyalla, and look forward to seeing what further studies will reveal in this very interesting and important matter.

### GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** My question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy.

*The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:*

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

**Mr LEWIS:** I think he wants some tablets.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr LEWIS:** Will the Government legislate to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 20 per cent of their 1988 level by the year 2005, and will the Minister explain how lower energy use and lower greenhouse gas emissions will attract industry to our State and create employment opportunities, as claimed in the Government's recent action plan for managing energy demand?

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** It is interesting that the member for Murray-Mallee is saying that there are some real dangers that if we reduce all these things we will not be able to attract industry, yet the member for Coles is saying that we have to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions or we will have problems of another kind. One of the difficulties is that the Government must balance those things, and one way of doing that is to try to deal with it more intelligently than most.

We in South Australia are in the position of having abundant supplies of natural gas that other people do not have, and that is one of the major points that will be of very great importance to us. Indeed, we are already some 20 per cent below the carbon dioxide emissions for electricity supply proportionately to other States such as Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland, because we have natural gas and use it to burn for electricity purposes and, therefore, have a head start because of that fuel.

We will need to do some very intelligent thinking, and the demand management measures on which the member for Coles is so very keen are part and parcel of the need to try to reduce gas emissions by that time. The legislation will come after we have exhausted all the non-legislative possibilities, because some hard decisions will have to be made in the future if Governments are serious about continuing with this—and I have no doubt that they are.

I do not believe that it is appropriate for the next few years to take those hard decisions while we can take all the energy demand measures that are possible and while it is possible to take some of the alternative energy measures a little further than we are.

### MINERAL EXPLORATION

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether, in view of reports of a nationwide slow-down in mineral exploration, there is a slow-down in that exploration in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I am pleased that the honourable member has asked this question, because we have a very good story to tell in South Australia in that regard. There has been a downturn in Australia generally as the exploration dollar has become tighter, and it is very pleasing to be able to report to the House that the situation in South Australia is in direct contrast to that. Members will probably recall that during 1990 mineral exploration totalled some \$13 million in South Australia, and that was a 34 per cent improvement on the previous year. I am glad to say that that improvement has continued and that it is estimated that during the 1991 calendar year there was a 30 per cent improvement on the previous year. The figures are still being compiled, but it is reasonable to say—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** The honourable member is going a little off the track. However, there has been a 30 per cent increase over the previous year. In fact, in the first nine months of the past calendar year an equivalent amount of money was reported as having been spent on exploration compared with that spent over the entire previous year, and that is therefore a very pleasing improvement.

Exploration for base metals has shown a significant upsurge, particularly on Eyre Peninsula, where members may be aware we did some geomagnetic surveys, which have resulted in a very high uptake of the packages that were put out there. The \$500 000 which was spent there on the surveys was very well spent. This financial year that \$500 000 has been upgraded to \$1 million for geomagnetic surveys. Special drilling programs in the Kingoonya/Tarcoola/Tallaringa area have greatly enhanced its prospectivity, and company exploration in the area is expected to grow markedly when data packages are made available in the near future.

### HEALTH COMMISSION BUDGET

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** Will the Minister of Health confirm that the Government intends to continue to cover up deficiencies and problems with the Health Commission budget by negotiating with the Urban Land Trust to purchase Hillcrest Hospital and Hampstead Centre for nearly \$8 million?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** First, in relation to the budget, let the honourable member remember that in terms of recurrent expenditure—which is what is used to pay the doctors and nurses and all the other people in the system—the Health Commission has in money terms had something close to a 3 per cent increase in its budget for this year. The honourable member keeps wanting to change the ground rules. Let us get back to it. Before we talk about deficiencies in the health budget, let us remember that. That component of the budget that keeps the show going—the doctors and nurses and all the people working in the hospitals and health centres—had close to a 3 per cent increase in this budget. So much for deficiencies in the budget this year!

Let us get to the sensible and serious part of the honourable member's question. The honourable member is aware that 120 beds are being shifted out of Hillcrest Hospital.

Certain facilities will have to remain—the security aspect of the psychiatric hospital will have to remain, as will a number of other things. However, Hillcrest in its present form will go. That will leave some considerable property available upon which we will almost certainly realise one way or another. Whether the purchaser will be the Urban Land Trust, private industry, the Housing Trust or some other body, I do not as yet know. It is in fact jumping the gun to speculate on that at this stage, because a number of those beds, as the honourable member knows, will remain there for some time. We are not willy-nilly pulling beds out of there until such time as the facilities are available in other hospitals for this to happen.

As to the amount to be paid, if it is paid by a Government instrumentality, it will clearly be in line with a valuation that is brought down by the appropriate part of government which is under the general purview of the Minister of Lands. If it is purchased by a private purchaser, it will be the very most that we can get in the interests of the taxpayer at the time of the sale.

### CHRYSANTHEMUM WHITE RUST

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Will the Minister of Agriculture advise the House as to whether there has been any outbreak of *Puccinia horiana* in South Australia and, if so, what measures are being contemplated to protect this State's horticultural base? I have been approached by a constituent, a member of the South Australian Cut Flower Growers Association, who is concerned that a repeat of the outbreak of *Puccinia horiana*, which occurred in Aldinga in 1989, could, if not dealt with promptly, have disastrous consequences.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** No, the Leader of the Opposition did not laugh, and quite rightly so, because it is an important matter. It is true that the South Australian Cut Flower Growers Association and the Nursery and Landscape Industry Association fully and strongly support the eradication of chrysanthemum white rust, which is the more common name for the condition referred to by the member for Napier. Therefore, they support the actions that we have taken in this regard. The first identified outbreak in South Australia occurred in late 1986 and, by successful management, was eradicated within the year. The most recent outbreak, until the one I am about to talk about, was in May 1989 at Aldinga, and that was eradicated within a year.

I am advised that there has been another outbreak, this time in the Lenswood area. Yesterday I approved an instruction that declared the land defined within that area—which is a relatively small area of a quarter hectare—to be so affected by chrysanthemum white rust and therefore to be a quarantine area that then requires five sets of activities to take place to see the elimination of that condition as soon as possible. I believe that that will again be effected within the year. I know that all members who are concerned about the health of the floriculture industry in South Australia will support the action that I have taken.

### HILLCREST HOSPITAL

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** My question is directed to the Minister of Correctional Services. Is it true that the Department of Correctional Services intends to have traffic offenders and fine defaulters locked up at Hillcrest Hospital

while it is still being used as an institution for the mentally ill?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** No, that is not the case. I am sorry to disappoint the member for Newland. The Department of Correctional Services has been looking throughout the metropolitan and near country areas at suitable accommodation for fine defaulters.

*Mr Such interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Not Angaston; we have not looked at Angaston. I thank the member for Fisher for that suggestion. A number of buildings owned by the public sector have been looked at. There is one building at Hillcrest, the name of which escapes me, but which is alongside or very close to James Nash House, and it is possible that, rather than level that site, that building at some time in the future, because it is being used at the moment by Hillcrest Hospital, may be useful if it is excised from the site and made part of the Northfield prison complex for a correctional institution. It is a very fine building.

**Mrs Kotz:** Is that a categorical assurance?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Oh, shut up and listen, for goodness sake woman.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Really, it was a rather offensively phrased question. I am trying to treat the House with some dignity, more than the question actually warranted, by giving the information that is available. I think that it is rather interesting and useful information. Mr Speaker, I am particularly directing these comments to the Chair. We get the member for Newland prattling on, niggling away, and it really is quite tiresome. However, I am a very patient person. There is a very fine building there which I think is worthy of further investigation. I am certainly not interested in that building while it is being used as a hospital. However, when the Hillcrest Hospital vacates the building, it may be possible to carve up the area and not devalue the land too much.

Without going into the details, the building is very close to the oval and, because of the site location, it may well seriously diminish the value of the rest of the land. I think it would be a great pity if that building was not used when another correctional facility is required. It would be ideal. It may even be that, with further investigation, it will be a better prospect for a women's prison than the present women's prison at the Northfield Prison Complex.

I invite the member for Newland to have a look at the building. If the member for Newland is going to have an interest in the area, I will be only too pleased to accommodate her interest. However, I think that these kinds of questions about whether we will put fine defaulters in a hospital that is presently used for people with mental illnesses contributes nothing at all to a sensible debate about the correctional services or the Hillcrest Hospital.

#### ABORIGINAL DEATHS IN CUSTODY

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs inform the House when the responses to the final Royal Commission into Black Deaths in Custody report will be available? I note reports in today's press calling for a uniform approach from the States with regard to the final 339 recommendations.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I certainly agree with the *Advertiser's* editorial about the need for a uniform and coordinated approach amongst the States and Territories and the Federal Government in relation to this very important Royal Commission into Black Deaths in Custody. At the outset I

want to say that there have been two royal commissions. The interim royal commission was known as the Muirhead royal commission. It produced what was essentially a nuts and bolts document, and one to which the South Australian Government gave the fastest and strongest response of any State in this country. It spent nearly \$10 million in implementing the recommendations of the Muirhead report. It was very interesting that last year when we were supposed to be discussing at the national level the response to the final report of the royal commission—the Elliott Johnston report—other States were still talking about how they were handling the Muirhead report. We had been there and done that.

The Muirhead report was important, but so was the Elliott Johnston report, because it does not deal with just the 100 cases involving the tragic deaths of Aboriginal people in custody; it also deals with the underlying causes of discrimination and problems affecting Aboriginal people. It looked at racism, ignorance, cultural breakdown, employment, education, health issues, Aboriginal justice issues and land rights. We want to ensure that there is a comprehensive response to this document of about 5 000 pages and 339 recommendations.

It is interesting that again South Australia has been leading the charge, and I can certainly pledge to the House that South Australia will have the most effective response to the royal commission. Indeed, already in South Australia 303 of the 339 recommendations have been immediately supported before we even go to the summit meeting. The other 36 recommendations still require some follow-up and consultation. Indeed, there has been extensive consultation with the Aboriginal community. Preliminary responses have been sent to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission regional councils, and they were discussed at the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission zone meeting in January and at the Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee conference organised by my office and State Aboriginal Affairs on 10 February.

Again, it is worth noting that we were the first State to set up this Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee which was endorsed by Commissioner Elliott Johnston as being the model for the rest of the nation, as is our Aboriginal Visitors Scheme and our mobile assistance patrol.

However, it is certainly true that we intend to finalise responses to the report in the next few weeks, and we expect to have a national summit meeting of Ministers at the end of March. Of course, some issues do not directly relate to Governments. I am sure members of the media would be interested to know that a number of recommendations relate to the media. They were the ones that were not reported after the royal commission brought down its recommendations, namely, Nos 205 and 208. They dealt with the training and employment programs in place for Aboriginal employees in the media, the fact that all media organisations should be encouraged to develop codes and policies relating to the presentation of Aboriginal issues, consideration of the establishment of a media award for excellence in Aboriginal affairs reporting, and other issues. I would certainly like to pay tribute to the Australian Broadcasting Corporation—

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Sir—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** This is Question Time, and the question was, 'When will a report become available?' We have had every other answer but that one.

**The SPEAKER:** What is the point of order?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The Minister is wasting the time of this House.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The Minister has been a while answering, and I ask him to bring his response to a close.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I want to emphasise that the deaths of Aboriginal people is a very important issue that should be of concern to every member of this House. In conclusion, there will be reporting at the end of March. I have written to the AJA, and I am writing to industry members, to see whether we can get media awards for excellence in reporting Aboriginal issues.

#### CHILDREN'S COURT

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** Will the Minister of Family and Community Services explain to the House what measures he has put in place to prevent a repeat of the gross abuse of power by an officer of the Department for Family and Community Services who used emergency powers under section 19 (3) of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act to forcibly take a 2½ year old child into custody last Friday and who was overruled yesterday in the Children's Court when the child was returned to its mother by the Senior Judge?

I have been informed that FACS chose to use the emergency powers under section 19 to avoid having to go to court and first argue the case for an order before taking the child. The child has now been returned to the mother on the grounds that the court believes that the abuse of the emergency powers was inappropriate and that there was no risk to the child from its mother. The court is also of the belief that it was extremely unethical of FACS to forcibly take the child simply because a lawyer wished to be present during interrogation of the mother.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** In view of the report I have in front of me, I will have no change whatsoever in procedures. I assume that the honourable member and I are talking about the same case. I do not want to use names in this matter, because I do not want to unnecessarily embarrass people in any way. I also confirm that at no stage has the Department for Family and Community Services ever felt that this child was at risk from the mother.

I will share the following information with the House. The 10-week old baby was notified to FACS as a child protection matter on 29 January 1992. The baby had been admitted to the Adelaide Children's Hospital on the previous day with a fractured leg. A later skeletal survey found a broken rib that was some weeks old. This broken rib was in an unusual site for an accident. The father was charged some days later by the police on a serious criminal charge in relation to this matter. No satisfactory explanation has been given for the damage to the rib. The doctor in charge of the Child Protection Unit of the Adelaide Children's Hospital believes that two fractures on a tiny baby, one of which is unexplained, is a very serious matter, and he believes further that the child was at risk of injury or death. Medical and child protection literature supports this.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** He was talking about a 2½ year old child—are you on the same wavelength?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** My understanding is that we are. There may be some difference as to the age of the child, but that is my understanding. Perhaps in view of the uncertainty of this matter, I should give the rest of the details to the honourable member rather than the House and allow him to draw his own conclusions. This is the only matter of this type that has come forward in the press

in very recent days, and I am pretty certain we are talking about the same matter. However, I will not go further with individual details. What I will certainly do is simply say to the honourable member that the department was by no means satisfied that, in the circumstances that entailed at the time, the father might not, under certain circumstances, have had continuing access to that child. If the court rules and finds in other directions, that is for the court. However, that was the judgment of my officers, and I think, with the facts that were then present before them, they had no other recourse than the action that they took.

I do feel distinctly uncomfortable about talking about individual details of these cases in public—even in this place—and I have gone as far as I have only because I believe I had to defend the actions that my officers took in this case. I am certainly happy to give further details to the honourable member. In the light of that, if the honourable member is sincere in a conclusion that he should not have used the words he used in asking the question—I believe the words were 'gross abuse'—he will be happy to recall publicly.

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

**The SPEAKER:** The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** I call on the House to condemn the Minister of Correctional Services for the revelations that were admitted in the ministerial statement made in this House with regard to the escape from Yatala of a very dangerous criminal, Marcel Spiero. Before I refer to the Minister's statement, I point out that, in answer to a question asked of the Minister, the Minister assured me of his accommodation of my interest in this area of correctional services. I thank the Minister for that accommodation, but I suggest that the Minister would find it far better to accommodate his own responsibilities in this area.

On page 2 of his ministerial statement, the Minister states that the facts are that the management at Yatala Labour Prison became aware on 27 December 1991 that four prisoners had prepared a plan to escape from within a secured section of Yatala Labour Prison. One of those four prisoners who the management at that prison had declared had a plan of escape was, in fact, one of those taken on 11 February. I ask the Minister why no measures were taken to ensure that, after having identified that Marcel Spiero was one who was involved in a plot to escape from the prison on 27 December, security procedures were not enforced on the day Marcel Spiero was taken from Yatala Labour Prison to his court appearance.

The Minister goes on to say that information obtained at that time did not include details of a likely escape from an escort vehicle. I would hardly imagine that the plans for escape would include such detail as exactly how the prisoners intended to escape or the date of that escape, which apparently the Minister seems to believe would have occurred.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mrs KOTZ:** The Minister is telling me at the moment that that was included, 'chapter and verse'—that is his comment. If chapter and verse was the information that the Minister had at the time, why was it possible for Marcel Spiero to escape on 11 February? In an earlier answer to a very similar question as to why this occurred, the Minister

made it appear that many high security vehicles leave from Yatala prison. On the day in question, 11 February, only one high security vehicle left that prison. On the understanding that there were plans for escape by four people, one of whom was Spiero, and Spiero happened to be leaving the prison on 11 February in the only high security vehicle to have left that prison, will the Minister tell this House why the fullest security arrangements were not made? Why was the Dog Squad, which was part of the security arrangements, not there? Why did that vehicle leave half an hour prior to the stated arrangements to take care of security? Why did the Dog Squad arrive a quarter of an hour afterwards?

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

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

**Mrs KOTZ:** The Minister's statement says that the Dog Squad arrived at 8.45; the high security vehicle left at 8.30, but the vehicle was not due to leave until 9 o'clock. Why did that vehicle leave half an hour earlier? I also find very interesting a later statement, wherein on page 6 the Minister, in regard to the security provisions, states that the driver of the escort vehicle did vary his route.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before calling the next member—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hayward is out of order. I draw the attention of all contributors to this debate to the fact that remarks must be directed through the Chair. The honourable member for Mitchell.

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** Fifty years ago today, Darwin was bombed, and I believe it appropriate that this House should remember those many hundreds of people who were killed in that and subsequent air raids on Darwin. I believe it is also appropriate that we should consider the lessons we should all learn from that tragic event. I recall as a child visiting the Adelaide River war cemetery in the Northern Territory and being absolutely stunned by the rows of gravestones of those who were killed in that battle. Having heard of those raids as a child, I was not aware, and I believe that very few Australians are aware, of the number who were killed at that time.

I should like to read a small extract from the unpublished memoirs of a great South Australian, Norman Makin, who was the Minister for Munitions and a member of the War Cabinet at that time and, as such, was in a unique position to observe the significance of those events. Those memoirs read as follows:

*The 19th February 1942 will ever be remembered as the first occasion that an enemy force engaged in a bombing raid on the Australian mainland. An attack was made on Darwin, and serious damage and loss of life was occasioned. Almost the entire business centre was either destroyed or damaged beyond repair. Very few Australians seemed to realise the extent of these attacks by the enemy air force, but there were about 50 of these raids.*

*One of the most astounding things that will never possibly be fully understood nor explained is why the Japanese forces, flushed with victory, should have stopped short of actually invading the Australian mainland, for there was no effective defence power available to those holding Darwin with which to have stemmed the onrush if it had actually occurred. It was well known that the northern waters had been carefully surveyed in earlier years by Japanese luggers, ostensibly there for pearlshell fishing, and much espionage was undertaken for Japan by those who frequented these waters. With their complete knowledge of the coastline, the overwhelming nature of their sea power and air cover gave them an easy opportunity of walking right in by the front door.*

*A full inquiry was made into the raid on Darwin, and definite indications of Japanese fifth column activity were disclosed. Meteorological balloons were found in the vicinity of the Darwin aerodrome, the purpose being to indicate air currents in order to guide the pilot in the operation of his bomb release.*

The discovery of the balloons led to observations which showed that messages in Japanese morse were detected both outwardly and, after a lapse of 40 minutes, inwardly towards a point in the direction of Daly Waters. These facts, coupled with the disappearance from Darwin on the outbreak of war of Japanese then residing there, who had not since been traced, furnished at least a suspicion that there was activity in the neighbourhood of Darwin which might have been connected with the raids. Similar balloons had been noted at Port Moresby concurrently with a raid there.

The civil authorities found themselves insufficiently equipped to meet this situation, and a tragic feature of that morning was that warning of the enemy was not received in time. Although the AWA coastal radio station at Darwin received a report at 9.35 a.m. of a large number of aircraft passing southward over Bathurst Island, no general alarm was given in Darwin until just before 10 a.m. Failure of RAAF Operations to communicate with ARP Headquarters was inexplicable. The reason given for the delay was that a number of American planes had set out for Koe pang, and there was some discussion whether the planes reported were the American planes returning because of bad weather, or enemy planes.

Foremost in the mind of those who quietly and gravely studied the ever-increasing menace, was the possibility that with the taking of Darwin there would have been a concentration of air power down through the centre of Australia, making a place like Alice Springs the principal base, and from that centre fanning out to the various capital cities with the most devastating raids, which no power that we possessed could have effectively withstood. It would have been sheer massacre, and the Australian people should at least be conscious of the great deliverance they received through being spared by a remarkable providential intervention—for no material power at this time was sufficient to have safeguarded our lives and security. It is no wonder that the Prime Minister, Mr Curtin, at a subsequent meeting of the War Cabinet, expressed himself in the following words:

*The people of this country of Australia may well go down on their bended knees and offer for the rest of their lives prayers and thanksgiving for their deliverance.*

We can learn a lot of lessons from that, and I think that of defence preparedness is particularly important. I rather regret having read in today's newspaper an announcement that a cut of some 550 in the number of defence scientists is to occur at DSTO. I believe that we should be well aware of the lessons of the bombing of Darwin. Certainly, the memoirs of Norman Makin were interesting reading. One gets an indelible impression of the great pressure on those who led this country at the time, being aware of the total unpreparedness of this country and the great peril facing Australians of the day.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** Late last year the Minister of Agriculture introduced legislation to provide for three-State indicative wine grape pricing, which is currently in force throughout the three States of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales. At the time of its introduction the Opposition and I supported that legislation, because over recent years the Government had not made use of the pricing powers it had in South Australia to set minimum wine grape prices, and also because minimum wine grape pricing legislation did not exist in the other two States.

However, members of the Riverland Growers Unity Association, with whom I met on Sunday night, believe that, unless substantial modifications are made to the new system prior to the 1993 vintage, a large number of the relatively small family-based growers will suffer further considerable hardship. This will occur for a number of reasons. The objective of tri-State indicative wine grape pricing was, first, to have the three States coordinated in an endeavour to bring the industry together on a national basis; secondly, it would provide market intelligence to both the wine grape growers and the wine making industry; thirdly, it would increase the bargaining power for growers; fourthly, it would lead to close winery adherence to the indicative prices because the winemakers were very much involved in the negotiations; and, fifthly, it was to reflect the free market forces

so that both the winemakers and the wine grape growers would be aware of all the relevant information.

I believe it is necessary at this stage because, with the many bulk wine grape varieties, it would appear that growers are not being paid what was agreed as the indicative price. I believe it is necessary for the Minister of Agriculture to discuss the issue with his counterparts in Victoria and New South Wales to see what alterations can be made prior to the next vintage and to ensure that the indicative prices are adhered to. This is also supported to some extent by the UF&S in a statement in the *Advertiser* on 25 January urging growers not to sell below the indicative prices. Further, in the *Farmer and Stockowner* of 5 February, the UF&S stated:

Winemakers have consistently argued that wine grape prices should be determined by market forces, but if they continued to abuse market power it would be difficult to ignore continued calls for legislated minimum wine grape prices.

Australia has an enormous potential export market for wine because of its ability to produce very high quality wine at very competitive prices for the world market. This is partly because of the conditions in Australia. We have the potential to machine prune and machine harvest and produce high quality wine grapes at the same time. However, unless the growers get a viable return for their product, they will not be able to upgrade their plantings of the varieties which are demanded by the world market. Consequently, the potential for this important industry in Australia will not be taken full advantage of and more and more growers will go to the wall.

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** I should like to speak about a project which, whilst I applaud its initiative, is going to cause some problems for my electorate, particularly the Port Augusta section of it. That project is called Gulf Link, about which I asked a question of the Minister in this House yesterday. The project involves a ferry crossing Spencer Gulf. I am sure that you, Mr Speaker, would be aware, as would most members, that that project has been around for some time. The service is mooted as making considerable savings in distance and time on the Adelaide to Western Australia and Eyre Peninsula service. Whilst I applaud the initiative of the developers of the project, it causes me some concern with regard to the traffic which will no longer be going through Port Augusta.

It is suggested that Wallaroo is the obvious port on the Yorke Peninsula side for this to occur, and on the other side I believe it will be at a place called Port Gibbon. It is a 42-nautical mile sea crossing, and it is estimated that it would save trucks 370 kilometres one way—that is Adelaide to Port Lincoln—and shave 253 kilometres off the journey from Western Australia via the Eyre Highway. Obviously that would have many attractions, particularly to truck traffic. There are other reasons why it would have attractions for truck traffic as well, and I shall enumerate those later. One of the other reasons is that it would mean a substantial reduction in wear and tear on running gear, to say nothing of the savings in fuel costs. The promoters say:

Assuming the Kyancutta-Port Gibbon road will be approved for road trains, savings would be made by breaking the trains in Port Gibbon, putting them aboard a ferry using 'mules', then sending them to Adelaide as conventional trailers from Wallaroo via Kadina, as opposed to the much longer haul down the highway from Port Augusta.

Currently, the traffic that goes through Port Augusta, particularly the truck traffic, uses all the services and facilities in Port Augusta. If the traffic were no longer going that way, all of that would be lost to the community. Of course, the other side of that is whether the ordinary vehicle traffic would use this ferry and, there again, it would have enor-

mous ramifications for the Port Augusta community in that a lot more trade would be lost for those who live there, particularly in the business areas.

The most major potential users contacted have expressed strong interest in using the ferry, but they have stipulated that the service must be sufficiently frequent so that long waits at terminals at either end are avoided, and that freight rates are acceptable. With those considerations in mind, a gentleman called Steve Neale has formed Gulf Link, a company now completing preliminary studies into the viability of the project and the building of the first ferry. Mike Murdock, Gulf Link's Operations Manager, recently showed interested parties plans of a 68 metre conventional catamaran designed by the Victorian firm Australian Ship Design and Management, plus proposed harbor developments at Wallaroo and Port Gibbon.

Obviously, for these areas there would be an increased amount of traffic and the potential for the area to develop would be enhanced. Mr Murdock apparently said that plans were well under way towards buying and developing sites that would include a caravan park at Port Gibbon and a motel at Wallaroo. Fuel and other amenities would be available at both ends, and a cafeteria, wash and rest facilities would be available on board the ferry. That would have some very obvious benefits for the truck drivers in terms of the rest periods which they must have during their driving time on the road, and it would obviate the necessity for them to stop on the national highways to comply with that national Government regulation. Mr Murdock also revealed that plans are already under way to seal the new road required to Port Gibbon and to upgrade the necessary sections of highway to be affected. It is foreseen that this project will have many advantages. I agree with that, and I would be the last person to step in the way of development.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I want to take this time to draw attention to a problem that I believe every member of the House would have with increasing frequency. Over the years every member would have been called upon to adjudicate, make comment upon or try to resolve the difficulty of loud music or noisy occurrences at night, vandalism in parks, and the congregation of young people on street corners, etc. What was an occasional event in every member's activity has, unfortunately, become an epidemic. The frequency with which members are called upon to find an answer to these matters causes me, and I believe others, a great deal of concern.

The particular concern that I have is that many people find themselves on a treadmill and run between the council, the police and the Department of Environment and Planning, in the case of noise, and they cannot get an answer. Nobody wants to know about it. They will always refer somebody to another department or person, but rarely will the matter be followed through. If this is a criticism of individuals in the Police Force, the department or the councils, I am sorry; it must be a criticism, but not in the sense that somebody is derelict in their duty, albeit that that inference may be drawn. It is a problem that they do not know about or they do not know how to find out about it, or they themselves have been rebuffed in trying to find out through the system how to provide answers to the community.

On more and more occasions one receives advice about the problems of noise emanating not only in but around disco sites. One recognises that there is an element of concern or responsibility so far as the Licensing Court is con-

cerned, but it is also on a treadmill. If people start making inquiries there, they cannot always get the answer, and nor can they get any backup from the other organisations that ought to be able to provide clear evidence of the events which have been complained about. Therefore, the people in the middle—the community—find themselves going around and around, and unfortunately they finish up in the hands of the local member.

The local members not infrequently find themselves in an almost similar circumstance of inquiries being made, only to be told, 'Well, it happens fairly frequently, and we did not log that one,' or 'Yes, somebody did attend, but there was something more important to do. There was a car accident, so we had to leave that disturbance and go to another one.' Or they may say, 'Yes, unfortunately we got a request to come out and take a decibel reading, but on that particular night the operator had reported in sick and was not available,' or '... it was too far distant from the headquarters to get out there. It would have all been over by the time we got there,' etc.

If what I am saying appears to be a series of excuses, that is what the public is getting—a series of excuses as to why it cannot be done or has not been done or perhaps it will be done next time. The public naturally becomes quite concerned and the matter finishes up with the local member. It should not be necessary (and I have always held this view) for a member of the public to get service from a Government department by having to go through their local member. There are occasions when the local member must come in to help sort out things in serious circumstances, but too frequently people are fobbed off to the local member as though the local member has a wand and can correct things in five seconds flat, whereas the people who passed on the information should have done it first and foremost.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** The matter I raise is one we hear about so often. I will read into *Hansard* a letter given to me during a visit from a constituent this morning. It will be obvious why she is distressed. The constituent states:

On 20 December 1990 I attended a public auction—the name and address of the auctioneers is then given—the intent of buying a car. I saw a 1983 Ford Laser which suited my needs, checked the compliance plates with the registration, rang vehicles security register which assured me verbally that it was unencumbered and rang previous owner, who assured me it was a family car no longer needed... next day I successfully(?) bid for this vehicle. To my horror on 9 February 1992—15 months later—I was visited by the police who seized and impounded the car as a stolen vehicle. I am told by the police my only recourse is that the insurance company that owns the car may sell it back to me after the police have finished with it... Why, when a car is written off, aren't compliance plates destroyed and if someone does buy a vehicle that is written-off, why are they issued with new ones? Why, 18 months after this car is stolen, isn't it on the vehicle security register? Why, when phoning this register, aren't you told this doesn't cover being stolen?

I have quoted selectively from the letter because of the limited time available to me today. In raising the matter with the Minister's office, shortly after I faxed information to his office, and in part because of time constraints I have been advised of the following. The question was posed:

Is there any provision under the Goods Securities Act 1986 for compensation claims to be paid where a vehicle is found to be stolen and subsequently recovered from a purchaser?

I refer to the recent cases which were highlighted by the news media whereby a certificate was purchased from the Vehicles Securities Register which indicated that there was no financial interest on the vehicle. The purchaser had assumed that since the register contained stolen vehicle information, the certificate also provided protection if the vehicle was stolen.

The answer I received states, in part:

There is no provision under the Goods Securities Act for payment of compensation to consumers who purchase vehicles that are later found to have been stolen. However, if the vehicle is purchased from a licensed motor dealer, the injured party may seek compensation from the dealer or, failing that, apply to the Commercial Tribunal for an order for compensation payable in accordance with the provisions contained in the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983.

I am grateful for the assistance that the Minister and his staff have provided to me. The reply goes on to state:

The Government is actively considering the introduction of legislation... requiring insurance companies to compulsorily advise the registration authority of all insurance claims where the vehicle is deemed to be a total loss.

Further advice provided to me indicates:

Advice I would give to the prospective motor vehicle purchaser is to obtain a certificate from the Vehicle Securities Register and always insist on the Certificate of Registration from the seller and ensure that the vehicle identifiers match those on the certificate.

I understand that this may not cover those people involved in auctions. It is my intention to pursue this matter in other grievance debates and, indeed, if it is possible, to raise questions in this House on this very important issue on behalf of my constituent.

---

#### BOTANIC GARDENS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Botanic Gardens Act 1978. 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

Regulations made under the Botanic Gardens Act 1978 are due to expire on 1 January 1992 under the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978 regulation review program. It became apparent to the board in the course of reviewing the regulations in conjunction with the Office of Regulation Review that certain amendments to the Act have become desirable.

The Botanic Gardens Act was enacted in 1978 and has not been amended to date. The legislation establishes the Botanic Gardens Board and the position of Director, sets out the functions of the board and creates a general offence of damaging property of the board. The amendments proposed address a number of miscellaneous issues raised in the course of the regulation review.

The State Herbarium is an integral and important part of the Botanic Gardens operation and it is appropriate that it be given prominent recognition in the legislation governing those operations. The herbarium was re-established in 1955 and has grown in stature since that date. It houses a significant and well respected collection of specimens and is used extensively in the identification of species and in the course of many research projects.

It is proposed to alter the short and long titles of the Act to include reference to the State Herbarium. The functions of the board are also adjusted to give prominence and recognition to the function of establishing and managing a herbarium. The Bill specifically requires original specimens to be retained in the collection, although, as is the case with the museum legislation in this State, the board is not required to accept, accumulate or retain material if it does not consider collection or retention justified. In addition, it is proposed to alter the name of the board and the title of the Director to include references to the State Herbarium.

The functions of the board are altered in three further respects. First, references to zoological functions are removed since the

board does not exercise such functions and it is not intended that it should do so.

Secondly, the board is expressly given functions relating to nature conservation. This aspect of the functions of bodies that oversee botanic gardens has gained increasing recognition in recent years both in Australia and elsewhere. The board has an important role to play in conserving plant species and this Bill reflects that role.

Thirdly, the participation of the board in commercial activities is recognised. The board acquires extensive knowledge and expertise in the course of its conduct of research. Hybrids of plants are cultivated or occur naturally in botanic gardens. The Bill promotes the use by the board of that knowledge and expertise in a commercial sense. It enables the board to provide consultancy services and to propagate and sell hybrids or cultivated varieties of plants, including by way of joint venture or partnership with a nursery business.

The board's ability to charge fees for entrance to various parts of the gardens and for other services and to waive or reduce those fees where appropriate are clarified.

The Bill brings the reporting obligations of the board into line with that of other agencies under the Government Management and Employment Act 1985. It also brings the employment provisions relating to the Director and other staff into line with the requirements of that Act.

The regulation-making powers under the Act are clarified and expanded to support the regulations proposed as part of the review program. New regulation-making powers make it clear that powers to enforce the regulations may be given to Botanic Gardens employees and that fees may be imposed for permits for activities usually prohibited. The regulation-making power and sections of the Act relating to the regulation of parking of vehicles on land vested in or under the control of the board are replaced with powers that allow for a code of parking to be included in the regulations along the lines of the local government parking scheme. This will enable appropriate regulations to be made concerning the provision and enforcement of parking controls on behalf of the board.

The divisional penalty scheme is adopted. The maximum penalties for contravention of disclosure of interest provisions by a member of the board and for damaging the board's property are increased with a view to retaining them as effective deterrents. The maximum penalty that may be imposed under the regulations is also increased.

A schedule of amendments updating the language of the Act to modern standards is also included.

I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Clause 1 is formal.

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

Clause 3 substitutes the long title of the Act. The new long title makes it clear that the Act provides for the establishment and management of herbaria as well as public botanic gardens. The reference to the repeal of the earlier Act is removed as part of a statute law revision exercise.

Clause 4 substitutes the short title of the Act. The new short title is the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act 1978.

Clause 5 amends section 5, the interpretation provision, by altering the definitions of 'the board' and 'the Director'. The board is to be known as the Board of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium and the Director as the Director of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium.

Clause 6 amends section 6 which establishes the board. The amendment provides for the establishment of the board under the name referred to above. Clause 13 is a transitional provision relating to this change.

Clause 7 amends section 13. Subsection (1) which sets out the functions of the board is substituted. The new subsection emphasises the board's functions in relation to the State Herbarium, includes within the ambit of the board's functions matters related to the conservation of the natural environment and gives the board commercial functions as follows:

- to undertake the commercial exploitation of knowledge acquired by the board in the course of conducting research;
- to propagate and sell hybrids or cultivated varieties of plants developed in the course of conducting research or occurring spontaneously in its gardens, including by way of joint venture or partnership with the owner or operator of a nursery business;
- to provide consultant services.

A new subsection (1a) is inserted. It provides that the board is only required to collect and classify material where that is, in its opinion, justified under the Act.

Subsection (2) is amended to make it clear that the board has the power to lease out facilities for the provision of refreshment facilities.

Clause 8 amends section 20 to bring the title of the Director up to date as referred to above (see clause 3) and to bring the provision into line with the Government Management and Employment Act 1985. It sets out that the staff employed in connection with the administration of the Act may be public servants, persons appointed by the Minister (for example, daily paid gardeners) or persons appointed by the board with the approval of the Minister on terms and conditions from time to time approved by the Commissioner for Public Employment.

Clause 9 amends the penalty provided in section 21 (1) for contravention of the disclosure of interest provisions by a member of the board. The penalty is increased from \$500 to a division 7 fine (\$2 000). It also updates subsection (3) in line with the amendments to section 20—a member of the board who is a member of staff is not by reason of that fact to be taken to have a direct or indirect interest in any matter relating to the staff. Consequently, the member is not excluded from the board's deliberations on matters relating to the staff.

Clause 10 substitutes section 23. The new clause provides that the board's annual report is to be presented to the Minister on or before 30 September in each year and that the Minister must cause copies of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 12 sitting days.

Clause 11 amends the penalty provided in section 24 (1) for damage to property of the board. The penalty is increased from \$1 000 or six months imprisonment to a division 6 fine (\$4 000) or division 6 imprisonment (one year).

Clause 12 amends section 27, the regulation-making power. The following express powers are included:

- (a) the regulations may confer powers on the Director and other members of staff for the purposes of the enforcement of the regulations;
- (b) the regulations may provide for the waiving or reduction of charges by the board or Director;
- (c) the regulations may confer powers on the board or the Director to approve (on payment of a fee, if any, determined by the board) any act or activity that would otherwise be prohibited by the regulations.

In addition, the regulation-making powers with respect to the control of driving and parking vehicles on land vested in, or under the control of, the board are expanded and allow for regulations of a similar nature to those that govern local government parking controls. The evidentiary and expiation provisions currently found in section 27 are removed with a view to them being included in the regulations.

The penalty that may be imposed by the regulations is increased from \$500 to a division 7 fine (\$2 000).

Clause 13 is a transitional provision relating to the change of name of the board. It ensures that the board and its activities are not otherwise altered.

The schedule contains various amendments of a statute law revision nature.

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

#### **MOTOR VEHICLES (LICENCES AND DEMERIT POINTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### **CROWN PROCEEDINGS BILL**

Second reading.

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

This Bill replaces the Crown Proceedings Act 1972. The Bill is the South Australian version of a model Crown Proceedings Bill

prepared by the Special Committee of Solicitors-General and approved by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General.

The need for the Bill arose out of proposals by the Commonwealth to amend section 64 of the Judiciary Act 1903 in the light of High Court decisions on the ambit of that section.

Section 64 of the Judiciary Act provides—

'In any suit to which the Commonwealth or State is a party, the rights of the parties shall as nearly as possible be the same, and judgment may be given and costs awarded on either side, as in a suit between subject and subject.'

The effect of the decision in *The Commonwealth v Evans Deakin Industries Ltd* (1986) 161 CLR 254 appears to be that the Commonwealth, and in some circumstances the States, could be exposed to liabilities even under legislation that is expressed not to bind the Crown in any right. These implications were unacceptable to the Commonwealth which indicated its intention to legislate to make clear the extent to which the Commonwealth is to be subject to State and Territory law.

The proposed changes to section 64 in its application to the Commonwealth have been the subject of correspondence between Attorneys-General.

The original proposal by the Commonwealth would have left section 64 in its original form applicable to the States. The attitude of the State Solicitors-General was that this was unsatisfactory. Furthermore, it was considered that the Commonwealth should not determine when State statutes would bind a State in proceedings brought by or against the State in federal jurisdiction and that this should be determined by State law. The Commonwealth power to determine when a State was bound was disputed by State Solicitors-General, but the view was taken that, whether the Commonwealth had power or not, as long as State laws relating to the applicability of statutes to the State were reasonable, the Commonwealth should leave it to State law to determine applicability.

The Solicitors-General proposed that the Commonwealth should amend section 64 so that it did not purport to make statutes apply to the State Crown. Section 64 should leave it to State law to decide if the Crown or State was bound. The Solicitors-General agreed to recommend to their respective Attorneys-General that if the Commonwealth agreed to implement this change each State would review its Crown Proceedings Act and in particular would consider clarifying the applicability of its Crown Proceedings Act to interstate Crowns or States.

The purpose of each State agreeing to review its local legislation was to produce, as far as possible, uniform, comprehensive and reasonable legislation on the topic.

The end result of correspondence and deliberations over three years is that the Commonwealth has agreed to amend section 64 of the Judiciary Act in the manner in which the States have requested. The proposed amendments to section 64 of the Judiciary Act are expected to go before the Federal Parliament later this year. The Commonwealth has indicated that the amendment to section 64 will not come into operation until each State has provided, in its equivalent to the Crown Proceedings Act, for two basic measures.

The first is that proceedings by or against the Crown are to be brought in the same way as proceedings between subjects. That is, that by and large the same procedural rules are to apply.

The second is that the immunity (if any) of the Crown in actions in contract and tort be terminated. Each State may decide to what extent it is to be made liable, under statute or the common law. But there is not to be a complete immunity.

Each of these provisions is to be made applicable to the Crown in right of the enacting State and to the Crown of another State. This will remove existing difficulties in suing in State A the Crown in right of State B.

The model Crown Proceedings Bill on which this Bill is based contains the provisions required by the Commonwealth. From the South Australian standpoint provisions relating to Crown Proceedings were already relatively modern following the enactment of legislation in 1972. The principal changes made by this Bill are the following:

- the Bill makes provision for proceedings against the local Crown and also the Crown in right of another State, the Commonwealth and a Territory. Present Crown Proceeding Acts in force in this and other States make no provision for the Crown to be sued outside its own State.
- the Bill makes it clear that the Crown is generally in the same position as the subject in legal proceedings. The Bill makes it clear that subject to the terms of the Bill and any other Act the same procedural and substantive law will apply to proceedings by and against the Crown as is the law in proceedings between subjects.
- the Bill gives the Crown by the Attorney-General liberal rights to intervene in proceedings.

- the Bill generally modernises a number of machinery and detail provisions.

The Bill does not deal with the rules relating to when the Crown is bound by statute. These rules will be dealt with in an amendment to the Acts Interpretation Act 1915.

Clause 1 is formal.

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

Clause 3 repeals the Crown Proceedings Act 1972.

Clause 4 is an interpretation provision.

Subclause (1) defines terms used in the measure.

- 'corresponding law' is defined to mean a law of another State relating to proceedings against the Crown declared by the regulations to be a corresponding law to the measure;

- 'Crown' is defined to include a Minister, instrumentality or agency of the Crown and any body or person declared by the regulations to be an instrumentality or agency of the Crown for the purposes of the measure;

- 'judgment' is defined to mean any judgment or order of a court;

- 'proceedings' is defined to mean civil proceedings;

- 'State' is defined to include a Territory of the Commonwealth;

- 'State Crown' is defined to mean the Crown in right of this State.

Subclause (2) provides that the measure extends not only the Crown in right of the State but also (as far as the legislative power of the State allows) to the Crown in any other capacity but does not extend to the Crown in right of the Commonwealth except where specific provision is made for its application to the Crown in right of the Commonwealth.

Clause 5 deals with proceedings by and against the Crown generally.

Subclause (1) provides that subject to the measure and any other Act of the State, the Judiciary Act 1903 of the Commonwealth and any relevant rules of court, proceedings may be brought and conducted by or against the Crown in the same way as proceedings between subjects and the same substantive law is to be applied in proceedings by or against the Crown as in the case of proceedings between subjects.

Subclause (2) provides that, subject to the regulations, proceedings by or against the Crown may be brought—

- in the case of proceedings against the State Crown—under the name 'The State of South Australia';

- in any other case—under the name in which the Crown could sue or be sued in the courts of its own jurisdiction.

Clause 6 provides that the measure does not affect any immunity from, or limitation on, liability that the Crown enjoys by statute.

Clause 7 allows injunctive relief (other than a mandatory injunction) to be granted against the Crown.

Clause 8 provides that the measure does not affect any rule of law under which the Crown or an officer or employee of the Crown may refuse to discover or produce documents, or to answer an interrogatory or other question, on the ground that to do so would be prejudicial to the public interest.

Clause 9 deals with the right of the Attorney-General to appear in proceedings.

Subclause (1) empowers the Attorney-General to represent the Crown in any civil or criminal action, proceeding or matter in which the Crown is a party.

Subclause (2) empowers the Attorney-General to intervene on behalf of the Crown in any proceedings—

- in which the interpretation or validity of a law of the State or the Commonwealth is in question;

- in which the legislative or executive powers of the State or Commonwealth, or of an instrumentality or agency of the State or Commonwealth are in question;

- in which judicial powers of a court or tribunal established under the law of the State or Commonwealth are in question, or

- in which the Court grants leave to intervene on the ground that the proceedings raise issues of public importance,

for the purpose of submitting argument on issues of public importance.

Subclause (3) gives the Attorney-General the same right of appeal in proceedings in which he or she intervenes under subclause (2) as a party to those proceedings.

Subclause (4) provides that where the Attorney-General intervenes in proceedings under the clause, and there are in the opinion of the court special reasons for making an order under this subclause, the court may make an order for costs against the Crown to reimburse the parties to the proceedings for costs occasioned by the intervention.

Subclause (5) provides that references in the clause to the Attorney-General extend not only to the Attorney-General for

this State but also to the Attorney-General for any other State or the Commonwealth and that references to the Crown have a correspondingly extended meaning.

Clause 10 deals with the enforcement of judgments against the Crown.

Subclause (1) prohibits the issue out of any court of a writ, warrant or similar process to enforce a judgment against the Crown.

Subclause (2) requires a court that gives a final judgment against the Crown in right of this State or any other State to transmit a copy of the order to the Governor of the relevant State.

Subclause (3) requires the Governor of this State, where he or she receives a copy of such a judgment, to give directions as to the manner in which the judgment is to be satisfied.

Subclause (4) authorises and requires a Minister, agency or instrumentality of the Crown to which such a direction is given to carry out the direction.

Subclause (5) provides that a direction under the clause is sufficient authority for the appropriation of money from the General Revenue of the State or from funds of any agency or instrumentality of the Crown.

Subclause (6) defines 'Governor' as including—

- in relation to the Australian Capital Territory—the Chief Minister;
  - in relation to the Northern Territory—the Administrator.
- Clause 11 provides, subject to the measure and any relevant rules of court, for a judgment recovered by the Crown to be enforced in the same manner as a judgment in proceedings between subjects, and not in any other way.

Clause 12 provides that the State Crown is, in relation to its activities in another State, bound by a corresponding law of that other State to the same extent as the Crown in right of that other State.

Clause 13 deals with the service of process and other documents in proceedings by or against the Crown.

Subclause (1) requires a statement that contains the prescribed information to be endorsed on, or annexed to, the process by which any proceedings brought against the State Crown are commenced.

Subclause (2) provides that a failure to comply with subclause (1) does not render the proceedings void unless the court is of the opinion that the State Crown has been prejudiced by that failure.

Subclause (3) requires service on the State Crown of any process or document relating to proceedings to be effected by service on the Crown Solicitor except—

- if special provision relevant to service of the process or document is made by or under the measure, in which case service must be effected in accordance with that special provision;
- if the party by or on whose behalf the process or document is to be served has notice that some solicitor other than the Crown Solicitor is acting for the Crown in relation to the proceedings, in which case service must be effected on that other solicitor.

Clause 14 deals with the service of subpoenas and other process on Ministers.

Subclause (1) prohibits, without the leave of the court, tribunal or other authority, the issuing by the court, tribunal or other authority of a subpoena or other process requiring a Minister to appear in his or her official capacity to give evidence or produce documents.

Subclause (2) provides that leave pursuant to subclause (1) may only be granted only after the Crown Solicitor has been given reasonable notice in writing of the application for the subpoena or other process and a reasonable opportunity to be heard on the application.

Subclause (3) requires a court, tribunal or other authority that grants leave pursuant to subclause (1) to give, at the same time, directions as to the manner in which service on the Minister is to be effected.

Clause 15 deals with costs.

Subclause (1) exempts the State Crown from the obligation to pay any fee or charge for commencing, or taking any step in, proceedings or for obtaining a transcript of any proceedings or evidence in any proceedings to which it is a party.

Subclause (2) provides that any costs to which the State Crown is entitled will be calculated as if the State Crown were liable to pay, and had in fact paid, fees and charges from which it is exempt under subclause (1).

Clause 16 deals with judicial notice of the Attorney-General's appointment.

Subclause (1) provides that in any legal proceedings, a document apparently signed by the Attorney-General will be presumed, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to have been duly signed by the Attorney-General.

Subclause (2) requires the Attorney-General's commission of appointment as Attorney-General to be noted in the records of the Supreme Court on production to the Court.

Subclause (3) provides that no action, proceeding or matter (whether civil or criminal) by or against the Attorney-General is suspended, terminated or affected by any change of office holder.

Clause 17 deals with cases where the right of the Crown to legal representation is restricted.

Subclause (1) permits, where an Act removes or restricts the right of a party to be represented in proceedings by a legal practitioner, the State Crown or the Attorney-General, if a party to the proceedings, to be represented by an officer or servant of the Crown (not being a legal practitioner, an articulated law clerk or person who holds legal qualifications under the law of this State or of any other place) authorised to conduct the proceedings on behalf of the Crown or the Attorney-General.

Subclause (2) provides that in such proceedings, a document apparently signed by a Minister of the State Crown or the Chief Executive Officer of an agency, instrumentality, department or administrative unit of the State Crown that appears to be an authorisation of the kind contemplated by subclause (1) will, in the absence of proof to the contrary, be accepted as such an authorisation.

Clause 18 deals with the Crown Solicitor.

Subclause (1) provides that the Crown Solicitor is a corporation sole which may act through the instrumentality of the person for the time being holding the office of Crown Solicitor or any other person to whom that person delegates his or her functions.

Subclause (2) requires the Crown Solicitor to act as such either under the name of the office holder for the time being or under the name 'The Crown Solicitor for the State of South Australia'.

Clause 19 provides that the measure does not affect—

- any proceedings for the recovery or enforcement of a fine, penalty or forfeiture (including the estreatment of a recognizance) imposed in criminal proceedings;
- any law, custom or procedure under which the Attorney-General is entitled to sue, or be sued, or to intervene in proceedings, on behalf of the Crown, on the relation of, or on behalf of, any other person or persons or in any other capacity or for any other purposes.

Clause 20 empowers the Governor to make regulations.

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

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 February. Page 2907.)

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I support the Bill. It is a traditional finance Bill that enables the Public Service to be paid until such time as the budget has been dealt with. I note with interest that the Government has contained the figure to \$860 million, which is just \$10 million more than last year and, whilst that may seem to be good on the surface, we should be questioning how that money is being spent to ascertain whether taxpayers' money has been spent appropriately. I can readily recall that in the very first Supply Bill debate in which I participated many years ago greater detail was provided about how much was being used at various levels of the Public Service.

However, in more recent years it has become just a generalised figure and, therefore, the importance of the debate has been lessened as a result. One can only hazard a guess as to what moneys and how the moneys have been spent. This Bill gives us the opportunity to be able to make some comment on our present economic position and to establish whether we should change our direction and, if so, in which way.

We are in the middle of a considerable recession—some would call it a depression—but we should carefully assess how and why that is the case. We all know that much of the problem has been brought about because of the deregulation of the banking industry some eight or nine years ago and the consequences of that, more particularly the way

in which the banks at the time set out on a lending spree to inhibit any one of the 17 new banks coming into the area. I refer specifically to primary producers and, more particularly, to my own area, the District of Flinders.

The willingness of the banks to advance money to anyone who cared to ask for it created a false sense of expectation and an artificial raising of land values, because money was so freely available and farmers were encouraged to borrow, buy and extend their holdings. This was ably assisted and abetted by Governments of the day—State and Federal—who were saying that farmers should get big or get out, and all the economic advice at the time encouraged everyone to do just that—get big or get out. Get big they have, and get out they may well be forced to do and, unfortunately, that is the problem. Following on from that, we have seen an increase in interest rates, and that, in itself, has taken a tremendous toll. If that factor is compounded with the lowering of commodity prices as a result of trade wars with America and Europe, we have a recipe for a disaster.

We should really assess the situation more than on a peripheral level and ascertain the impact; we should look at the thousands of jobs that have been lost in the rural community and the manufacturing and service providing sectors as a result of that scenario. We can try to assess the impact by looking at the financial position of the State. We can debate whether the \$6.6 billion, the State's indebtedness at this time, is a workable amount and whether it can be handled by the State. I will try to put that in some form of perspective, because the figure of \$6.6 billion passes over the top of most people's head, and it is hard to comprehend.

We would need more than just the average pocket calculator, because very few pocket calculators can deal with figures such as 6 billion, most of them having an eight digit ability; one would need at least a 10-digit calculator to be able to do the sort of assessment I am talking about. If we entered \$6.6 billion into that calculator, in order to get a feeling for such a sum, and if we divided that figure by the total number of rural enterprises in South Australia (that is, 14 386), we would get a figure of about \$458 000 each. I venture to say that sum is considerably in excess of the value of each property.

What I am really saying is that the State indebtedness is equivalent to more than the value of all rural enterprises outside the cities. It is hard to assess or even comprehend what we are talking about when we use figures of that kind. While \$6.6 billion may not appear to be all that great at an international or national level, at a State level, with our limited population, it is a great deal of money.

The effects of the recession are compounded in so many other ways. The quarterly economic report of the State Bank, which has been released in the past few days, contains a series of tables which provides information about what has been happening. From an individual point of view, I know that the number of unemployed in the period December 1990 to December 1991 increased from 61 300 in December 1990 to 79 500 just 12 months later. That sort of massive unemployment growth would have to be a considerable problem to this State, to every member of this State and to every member of this Parliament, because we just cannot tolerate that sort of unemployment problem.

Having said that, where do we go from there? What do we do to try to turn around the parlous state we are in? We do know that some slight improvements have occurred in the rural sector. We know that some of the banks are not backing off, and we know that some of them intend to pursue their efforts to try to force some property owners to sell up. For example, one farmer, who had a relatively large farm by most standards, late last year was given carry-on

finance to plant his crop. He sought carry-on finance of \$125 000 and, as it turned out, he required only \$82 000 because of the favourable seasonal conditions: it was not necessary to work the land as many times, and that resulted in considerable cost savings, and he did not have to use as many chemicals as he would normally use, hence the great saving.

That farmer had a good year, much to the delight of probably everyone on the Eyre Peninsula. As a result, he has been able to pay all his debts, except for his long-term loan. He finished up with a \$57 000 surplus, and now the bank is saying that it will not advance \$80 000 carry-on finance for next year unless he puts his property on the market.

**Mr Such:** That is blackmail!

**Mr BLACKER:** As the member for Fisher says, 'It's blackmail'. His position is infinitely better. In general terms, he is at least \$100 000 better off this year than he was just 12 months ago. That sort of attitude, which is adopted by certain banks, needs to be questioned. It is for that reason that I am pleased that a select committee on rural finance has been set up because, no doubt, that sort of question will be asked. Many other issues could be raised in relation to the banks changing their attitudes depending on circumstances. Banks seem to have an attitude at this time of the year when farmers want advances for carry-on finance to plant next year's crop that is different from their attitude in December: whether it is a good or a bad crop then depends on the attitude of the banks at that time.

We all know that banks were set up initially, in terms of rural finance, for long-term investments. We are finding that banks are acting on very short-term situations—sometimes only a month at a time and, at the very longest, 12 months at a time. I have sufficient confidence in the rural industries of this State to believe that those industries do need and should get the support from the banks, which have been ably serviced and supported by their clients over a long period. It is a joint venture that the banks must enter into with those primary producers to make sure that the land is looked after.

The Government must maintain a close watch on this situation, because all the environmental considerations that have been presented to this Parliament and all the legislation that has been passed would not mean a cracker when it comes to a bank budget. Bank managers rule a line through when farmers want to budget for maintenance, weed control, and pest, plant and vermin control; the farmer has no option. That is another area where Governments can step in and say, 'Look, there is Government legislation. If bankers are to become farmers, they can comply with the legislation operating in this State.'

So, we have many areas where it is necessary to step in. A further consequence of the effects on the primary producing sector has been the cost of labour, of parts, etc. Every cost input to a farmer has increased dramatically far above the commodity price increase there has been in some industries and that, in itself, is of concern. I take it one step further, because I want to broaden it to more than just the rural sector, to take into account the effect on the rural area.

I refer to an article in today's *Advertiser*, in which Horwood Bagshaw is indicating some hope for the future. Some 12 or so months ago I raised in this House the fact that my greatest concern was that the manufacturing sector, particularly that relating to harvesting equipment, would be in chaos in a very short time. Twelve months after I made that statement, we have an indication along very similar lines expressed by Horwood Bagshaw in the 'On the Land'

section at page 24 of today's *Advertiser*. However, that there are signs of hope, and I quote the article as follows:

Already, its January sales of cultivators have equalled all of 1991s sales.

So, there is hope. Jobs are attached to a statement such as that. If we know that that section is on the move, that is good. More particularly, the article continues:

The company says that in 1980, 2 174 self-propelled and PTO harvesters were sold to Australian farmers. In 1990 only 480 were sold, and last year only 220 were sold.

The consequences of that are that we now have harvesting equipment across this State which is old and worn out and for which there is no means of replacement. No manufacturer in Australia can replace that, with the exception of Horwood Bagshaw, which operates only at the smaller end of the market. We will need to import equipment from overseas, and some of that equipment costs \$250 000 or more. We even have the importation of second-hand harvesting equipment. I do not believe that people understand the gravity of what has been happening over the past six or eight years in the rural sector, with the downturn in finances.

Everyone was quite happy to push that to one side, but the real consequences for the wider community are now starting to emerge. When Governments recognise this and get out and support the rural sector a little more, because it is the principal market for those manufactured products, I am sure that a wider benefit can be obtained for the whole community. I noted before that there are some indicators that the rural community is on the upturn. I see from today's paper that the price for 24 micron wool is double what it was at the same time last year. It is still way below what it was three years ago, but there is a very marked increase, a move in the right direction.

The trend is up, as my honourable colleague said. Furthermore, at this time last year I was arguing in a debate in this place for a guaranteed minimum price for wheat when the anticipated price was about \$105 per tonne. The House did not decide on a price to support, but we were looking at \$150 per tonne. I am pleased to say that we are now looking at \$165 to \$170 per tonne, so there is a marked improvement and a ray of hope if the opportunity is allowed.

I qualify those comments by saying 'if the opportunity is allowed', because the banks will have a fair say in all of that. The effect of the recession has been the loss of rural jobs and the ageing of the farming community, because the young marrieds who have the ability to obtain jobs elsewhere are the ones who have left the farm. It is the mums and dads who remain on the farm. Eventually, nature will take its course and those people will not be able to continue; therefore, we will have an unqualified farming community coming into an area that requires more and more expertise.

The brain drain that has occurred as a result of the rural recession has not been addressed. There has been some talk about TAFE colleges having rural schools. That is fine, but it does not address the real problem of how young people who want to go farming can acquire land. At the present time it is humanly and physically impossible. As I stated, we have the ageing of equipment, which has meant a loss of manufacturing and service industry jobs. There has been a loss of cash flow into the rural community, and this has its effect on sporting teams. How many times have we seen football teams, netball teams and even church parishes amalgamate because there just have not been the numbers of people in the community? Effectively, they have been taken out because of economic circumstances. That, in turn, has an effect on health and education facilities, and makes it more difficult for those who remain in the community to be able to stay. On top of that, the wider community misses out because of the loss of export earnings.

It is time to boost the rural sector. This would result in additional jobs in the rural sector, in the manufacturing sector and in the service industries and would mean an improvement in the capital asset of the primary producer and everyone else who becomes involved. It is time that we started to look at an even broader spectrum than that. We need to look at such issues as whether there should be a further specialised bank in relation to the rural finance market.

I am thinking more particularly along the lines of a cooperative bank to involve and serve the cooperative, household, small industry and rural sector. I will outline at a later time some details as to how I believe such a system should work. I believe that the banks have been ripping off the farming community, because in relative terms the farming community is a very small part of the banking industry.

In recent times we have seen an amalgamation of the various banks in their terms so that they can compete in the broader field of banking on a national and international level and, having done that, in their quest to get big—and I guess we could use the phrase, 'Get big or get out'—they have ignored the very people who have been the foundation of South Australia, that is, the primary producers, the small business people and the general householder in the family unit structure. As I stated before, I will be putting forward such issues at a later time.

I make one last comment, totally separate from what has been said, by making reference to what the member for Stuart said about Gulf Link. The member for Stuart was a little out of date in the comments she made to this House. She referred to a Mr Murdoch, who has not been with the company for some considerable time. She referred to Gulf Link landing at Port Gibbon, but I believe that that proposal was dropped about 12 months ago. I do not believe that the project would have the effect on Port Augusta suggested by the member for Stuart.

If the Gulf Link ferry could attract 1.3 per cent of interstate haulage, it would not be able to handle the loadings, because there is just so much. At the most, fully loaded at all times, without any tourist component, the most it could take away would be 1.3 per cent of interstate transport that would otherwise go through Port Augusta. I do not believe that the fears of the member for Stuart are well founded.

**Mr SUCH (Fisher):** In speaking on the Supply Bill, one is tempted to think that supply is dry. By that, I do not mean that it is running out—at least, I hope it is not—but that the very name of the Bill does not sound very exciting. However, it is important for us, when talking about money measures in this House, to examine the impact on people because, ultimately, that is what they should be about. We are talking about the impact not only on public servants in terms of their pay but on the wider community, whether in country or city areas, in large or small families or be they young or old people. When we focus on something like the Supply Bill, it is important that we focus on what it is ultimately about, that is, to be directed to the benefit of the people of South Australia.

Supply ultimately depends on two things: first, the economic strength of the State; secondly—and obviously related—the economic management of the State. South Australia has many natural advantages. We have a climate that is generally accommodating; we have resources, including land, which are not available in many other countries; and we have people who are talented and skilled. Yet, we have a State, particularly under this Government, which is not performing, despite those natural advantages.

We have adult unemployment at about 11 per cent and youth unemployment exceeding 37 per cent. We know that those figures are at the bottom end of the scale, because many thousands of people have given up the search for work; many people are working part time; and many people are under-employed in full-time positions. There are also many women who would like to be in the work force, but due to the lack of affordable child-care they are unable to participate. These unemployment figures are an understatement of the real situation that confronts us. The word 'tragedy' has been used before and it should continue to be used, because it is a real tragedy.

The Labor Party, which purports to govern this State, should look at its name, because to call itself a Labor Party when it is presiding over an adult unemployment rate of 11 per cent and 37 per cent for young people is quite inappropriate. I believe the tragedy is that we are looking at the possibility of a lost generation—lost because of economic mismanagement and denied opportunities to demonstrate talents and largely because of the policies of both the Federal Government and the State Labor Government.

Years ago—but not all that many years ago; within the last decade or so—it was trendy for people to knock work and the work ethic, as if work were somehow an undesirable activity. However, we—and I say that collectively—as members of Parliament appreciate that work gives purpose to living. It gives order, structure, a sense of achievement and an inbuilt discipline, and it is something that is a natural aspiration for all of our citizens. To vary the words of a former politician: life was not meant to be spent unemployed.

A lot of what confronts us in our society can be attributed to high unemployment. I believe it is an issue that must be more seriously and vigorously addressed by this Government, as well as by the Federal Government. When we debate Supply we might well talk about the need for a supply of jobs. How can the Government create jobs? First, it is essential that the State Government create the climate that will enable industry to employ people. It is critical that it create a climate of confidence. Too many people underestimate the significance of confidence in economic matters.

People talk about micro-economic reform, level playing fields, J curves and all sorts of interesting devices: they are all significant in their place. However, in a market or semi-market economy one of the most critical aspects is confidence. Unless there is that degree of confidence where people are prepared to spend and invest, one does not have the jobs, the development and the economic activity that is necessary for a State and country like ours. One certainly does not get the investment unless investors have confidence in the Government and the management of the State. To that end, investors look for predictability, stability and the freedom and ability to be innovative, to create and to employ. At the moment, with this Government, those factors are largely missing. There is little incentive to invest and to employ people in South Australia. If one just takes the case of WorkCover, those in small business and large business will say that there is not much point in employing people, because the return on that employment is just not there. There are so many impediments, whether it be WorkCover or Government red tape generally, that there is a disincentive to invest and to employ.

Confidence is a critical factor. We need to break the cycle, and one of the ways that cycle of lack of confidence can be broken is for this Government to resign. It should not have to be asked to resign; it should not need to face a motion of no confidence in this House. This Government should crawl out the back door with its tail between its legs in utter

shame. The reason why a change would be good is that I believe people see the Liberal Party as an alternative that would generate confidence. As we have seen at the Federal level, the Liberal Party offers a package of reforms which can be complemented and supplemented at the State level and which will help create that climate of confidence that offers a positive and constructive incentive to people who want to invest. There will be less red tape and more certainty for industry.

If we look at the economic position of the State—and this point has been repeated endlessly in this debate—we will see, and we are well aware of, the increase in the debt level in South Australia in the past few years under this Government. The increase is something in excess of \$2 billion. As the member for Flinders indicated earlier, that sort of figure rolls off the tongue, but it means a lack of jobs and a lack of confidence. We have an interest bill in the order of \$700 million per annum. I ask you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and all members whether that is the sort of figure that would inspire confidence in you or anyone else to invest in this State? Is it the sort of figure that would lead to the creation of opportunities and jobs for our young people and other people who are unemployed? The answer is 'No'.

In looking further at the economic management of this Government one sees that it is a record-breaking Government, but it is not the sort of record of which it could be proud. The State Bank, SGIC, SATCO and other organisations have been mentioned previously. Do those sagas—which have not ended—inspire confidence and investment? Once again, the answer is a resounding 'No'.

Mr Deputy Speaker, we have had a Premier presiding over this State since 1982 who we know has a record as an actor. To a large extent that has been the problem: we have had an acting Premier since 1982. It is time that we had a real Premier and a real Government that tackled real issues rather than the 10 second television grab. Even though the Premier flaunts his acting skills, I am sure we would all agree that he would not qualify for an Oscar or a Logie in respect of economic management. If we look at some of the economic aspects of South Australia we will see the wonderful organisation of SAFA. I have had the fortune to be involved in economics for quite a while. The thing that comes to mind with SAFA is that it just does not add up.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I rise on a point of order Mr Speaker. It has been a very interesting debate, but SAFA has nothing whatever to do with Supply.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Supply relates to the State's finances and money used in the management of the State, and it is a free-ranging debate. As a matter of fact, the Chair does recall that that particular organisation has been referred to on both sides of the House during this debate and I think it is acceptable.

**Mr SUCH:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The member for Henley Beach has highlighted one of the reasons why the Government that he supports has got us into a mess. Somehow, he believes that SAFA is—

**Mr FERGUSON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that the honourable member is reflecting on me in particular, and that is against Standing Orders, as you know. I ask you—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! A personal reflection is definitely out of order. I am not quite sure of the wording—whether it is specifically reflecting on the member for Henley Beach or not. However, I will give the member for Fisher the benefit of the doubt. I did not pick it up, but I ask him to

be very careful in his references to any member in this place.

**Mr SUCH:** Mr Speaker, I thank you for your protection from members who may wish to undermine the content of my speech. I was talking about SAFA. It is a bit of a golden goose that is just too good to be true, and I do not believe it adds up if one looks at the figures involved. I believe that in time it will be demonstrated that SAFA is not quite what it has been cracked up to be. I do not want to be accused of being negative, but, on the evidence that I have seen, it is too good to be true.

Looking at this Government's performance in economic management terms, we see that it has sold or leased off nearly every public asset in South Australia. We have had the biggest fire sale in the history of State Governments in Australia. We have seen power stations, forests, Noarlunga Hospital and STA vehicles flogged off. There has been more flogging than was experienced even during the convict days. We are not sure of the extent of this fire sale. Time will reveal that part of the financial mismanagement of this State has involved quiet, secretive, so-called lease-back deals, or what I would call flogging off the assets of the State.

Looking at the budget, we see that there has been a cut in real terms in capital spending. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out yesterday, this comes as a surprise from a Government which is trying to tempt the Federal Government to spend more on capital items in South Australia and elsewhere. They cannot have it both ways. At State level we have seen a real cut in capital spending, yet we have seen our Premier acting on the stage of Australia trying to obtain greater capital spending in this State. We have seen the impact of these cuts on schools, school maintenance and hospitals, not to mention the neglect of our hidden assets, such as water and sewerage mains which are largely being left to deteriorate over time so that future generations will have to pick up the tab for a huge maintenance cost to replace some of those pipes and other hidden assets.

This Government was illegitimate from the start. It was assisted in by forceps delivery with a bit of a bribe on housing interest. It has survived only by mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. First, it survived as a result of a double bypass; now it has had a triple bypass; and, depending on what the member for Gilles decides, we could end up with a record quadruple bypass. The Government has survived on a very fragile basis, but its days are coming to an end.

In my few remaining minutes I should like to focus on a couple of human aspects of the Supply Bill. Some time ago I raised in the House the matter of Mrs Yvonne Parker, a constituent of mine, who is seeking surgery for a knee joint operation at Flinders Medical Centre. It is no fault of the staff at Flinders Medical Centre; they are fine, dedicated people. However, here is someone at a comparatively young age, in her early 60s, who is having to endure agony because this Government cannot accommodate her for surgery. She has not been out of her house for three to four months. People like Mrs Yvonne Parker are paying the price for the financial mismanagement that has been exhibited by this Government.

Public servants are not sure of their future under this Government. We all support a more efficient and effective Public Service, but the way that this Government has been managing its finances has put a cloud over the heads of many of our public servants. Consider what has happened to the State Bank and its employees as a result of financial mismanagement. Once again, we have a dedicated staff who, each day, have hanging over their heads doubt about their future under this Government. Looking at another

specific issue, the provision of public housing, we find that this social justice Government has created a six-year waiting list for people in the southern suburbs.

**Mr Brindal:** It's seven years in some places.

**Mr SUCH:** The member for Hayward has just—

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, public housing has no connection with the Supply Bill, because any money coming in from—

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

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** There is no reference to public housing in the Supply Bill.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not uphold the point of order.

**Mr SUCH:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Supply Bill pays the wages of people in the Housing Trust and, as we know, the Housing Trust is responsible for public housing. This social justice Government has created a six or, as the member for Hayward pointed out, seven-year waiting list for people in the southern area. The consequence of this economic mismanagement is that ordinary working people suffer. Other examples that I have mentioned before relate to employment and the Government's failure to create new opportunities.

I come now to public transport. We used to have six o'clock closing. Now we have 10 o'clock closing—'Time's up; off the buses.' That is a consequence down the track of a Government that has fiddled around and mucked up the finances of this State. There used to be a British comedy show, 'On the buses'. That has been replicated by the Government's economic mismanagement.

I believe that quite a few positive things can be done. I applaud attempts to obtain money for infrastructure projects. Whilst I deplore the hypocrisy of the Government and the way that it goes about it, the seeking of those projects with Federal assistance is worth while. I mentioned publicly quite recently the need to electrify the metropolitan rail network with the assistance of funding from the Federal Government. At the moment South Australia is the only mainland State that does not have a program to electrify its metropolitan rail lines.

Finally, supply is fundamental. We must put people back into this equation. I call on all Independents in this House to show that they are truly independent by putting pressure on this Government to lift its performance or else to kick it out. This Government is a tired, worn out show and it is time that it was put out to graze in a paddock where it can no longer harm the people of South Australia.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I note your return to the Chamber, Mr Speaker. I hope that it is to hear my speech. This is a vital time for South Australia. It is the beginning of another year—1992. It can be the year when South Australia gets out of the mess or it can be the year when we sink further into the mire. I am not in the least confident that the Government has the will, the courage or the ability to do what needs to be done. The management of this State's finances has never been worse, as all members on the Government side know. That is why every speaker on this side of the House brings up this one question of the State's finances.

I hate to be a member who continually harps on this subject, but what do the people of South Australia expect us, as members of the Opposition, to talk about, because it is the key, most important issue? It is the most parlous position in which this State has ever been. No member opposite is interjecting, so they must agree. The debt has increased to \$2 300 million, and the interest bill alone on our debt is \$700 million a year. That is money going after

money. It is 50c in every cash dollar that we earn. For every dollar that we get from our cash-strapped taxpayers, half is given immediately to pay for the Government's silly business tradings. We give away half of each dollar. As a businessman, that tells me that, if we are not bankrupt, I do not know what we are.

We have choices, and we heard some of the options mentioned so capably yesterday by my Leader. We have no choice but to sell off Government assets, which they should not have been in the first place, particularly the State Bank. I know it is not the ideal time to sell, but what is the upshot of all this? If it was a farm, you would sell off the paddocks that are further away to try to survive, but the way we are going there will not be a survivor, because we are paying interest on interest. When you are paying 50c in every dollar, a basic businessman will tell you that things are not too flash. In fact, we are technically bankrupt. Any business in this position would be in receivership—all members know that. The directors—the Ministers—ought to be sacked, and the outfit ought to be sold up, just as many private people have been sacked in the past few months. All Government members know that. Many private people have been sacked. In fact, when one looks at the statistics, they reveal that 15 private people have been put on the unemployment list compared to one person in the public sector, and that is a statistic in itself.

The Government is failing in so many ways. The Opposition has told this Government for many years the folly of its ways. The *Hansard* record shows quite clearly what the Opposition thought about the Government getting into banking, insurance, business and workers compensation. It is all there for anybody to read. Scorn and derision then came from the Government. Members opposite ought to read the record again and think of the folly of their ways because, without a doubt, time proves many things, and we can now see the results on the board, and we can all read!

Still we question the Premier. We find that, when pressed on questions in this House such as the other day in the no—confidence motion in the Government, the Premier did not address those questions. He chooses not to do so, because he knows that he cannot. He just plays cheap games and makes personal attacks on individual members of the Opposition. This is the height of arrogance. The Opposition did not get us in this mess. If one checked the business acumen of members on this side of the House and compared it with the other side, one would realise why, this Government has not only got itself in a mess, but also is totally incapable of coming up with any ideas to get itself out of that mess. Every day that goes by, all the Government does is defend, power punch and pick on Opposition members individually and personally. We are the Opposition, and our job is to highlight the problem. I am sure that, through my Leader, the Opposition will take a bipartisan approach if the Government wishes to bite the bullet and do the things that must be done.

I turn now to the more specific area of roads in the State. Fuel franchise has been collected by the State Government since 1979-80, when the Tonkin Government was in power. One hundred per cent of that went directly to the Highways Fund. Of course, that was under a Liberal Party Government. In 1983-84, under the then new Bannon Government, only 66 per cent of the fuel franchise receipts were credited to the Highways Fund; the rest of it disappeared into Consolidated Revenue, never to be seen again. That portion of revenue which was raised and directed back into the Highways Fund has dwindled rapidly and sharply to the extent that it was only 36 per cent in 1990-91.

The frightening statistic is that the estimated revenue for 1991-92 is about \$86 million, which implies a further reduction in the percentage going into the Highways Fund. This year only 30 per cent will go back into our roads. There is only one way to describe that: 'highway robbery'. The Government is taxing motorists, particularly those in the country, to try to get itself out of the mess it is in. The facts are there quite clearly and explicitly. Less than one-third of the moneys raised from motorists is spent back on the roads. The rest of it is spent in helping the Bannon Government pay its interest bill. This Government adds 5.5c to the cost of every litre of petrol. A litre of petrol costs 65c. Treasurer Bannon takes 5.5c per litre, 1.65c goes back into our roads, and 3.85c goes into paying Mr Bannon's interest bill.

According to Financial Paper No. 1, this Government hopes to rake in an extra \$15.8 million in fuel franchise. Not one red cent is earmarked for spending on our roads. Does the average South Australian realise how they are being milked? One can see the condition of our roads: they are absolutely crumbling around our ears. The statistics clearly show that we are being milked. Liberal Party policy is to increase immediately the proportion of fuel excise going into the Highways Fund to 50 per cent. However, I believe that it ought to be 100 per cent, because that is the only honest thing to do. Mr Speaker, I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* the figures which are purely statistical.

**The SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member assure the House that they are purely statistical?

**Mr VENNING:** I assure you that that is the case, Sir. Leave granted.

Year	Fuel Franchise Collections \$ Million	Fuel Franchise Credited to Highways Fund \$ Million	Per Cent to Highways Fund
1979-80	14.209	14.158	Effectively 100
1980-81	20.230	20.167	Effectively 100
1981-82	23.794	23.737	Effectively 100
1982-83	25.792	25.726	Effectively 100
1983-84	38.569	25.726	66.7
1984-85	48.487	25.726	53.0
1985-86	46.448	25.726	55.4
1986-87	47.285	25.726	54.4
1987-88	67.470	25.726	38.1
1988-89	76.200	25.726	33.8
1989-90	77.880	25.726	33.0
1990-91	70.133	25.726	36.7
1991-92 (est.)	85.900	25.726	29.95

Source: Auditor-General's Reports

**Mr VENNING:** I ask members to note these figures. They are in actual dollar terms, and they are not adjusted for inflation. They show that, since 1983-84 when the Labor Party came to Government, only \$25.726 million each year has gone to the Highways Fund from fuel franchise takings. That is the same figure every year, and it is not adjusted for inflation. So, proportionately less is provided for roads expenditure every year. The way things are, it ought to be the other way. The figure is fixed by legislation by this Government. I signal my personal intent to rectify the matter through a private member's Bill. It is disgusting and shameful neglect, and a dereliction of duty and responsibility by this Government.

I turn now to wheat. Probably the most important product in this State at the moment is its wheat crop. About \$86 million worth of wheat sales were lost to South Australia last year because the Government did not choose to place a guaranteed minimum price on a tonne of wheat. I am sure that, privately, the Minister of Agriculture agrees with me. The Western Australian Premier, Carmen Lawrence,

chose to place a guarantee, but our Premier did not. Privately both he and the Minister agreed that it was the only thing they could do, but they could not convince Cabinet as it was so short-sighted and hoodwinked. It has no confidence in the rural community to get the State out of its mess. The \$86 million would have gone a long way to getting us out of our problems and would have generated a lot more money in the community, especially in country areas, where it is badly needed.

The \$86 million was lost, because the Bannon Government could not give two hoots about farmers, and would not back farmers in planting a crop last year. The Government's own statement was that the estimated gross value of agricultural production would be down 24 per cent last year. This is not the way to get ourselves out of the mess. Gross production should be up 24 per cent rather than down 24 per cent, and that occurred not only because the crop was not sown but also because production is less per acre. As the member for Flinders said earlier, our means of production and tools of trade are wearing out. Where do we replace them? Horwood Bagshaw is a great company, and I hope that it can forge ahead and fill the gap left by the imported machinery in the market place.

The estimated value of our wheat production is down 50 per cent. A significant contribution to that was a 20 per cent reduction in the wheat produced in this State in 1991. One would think that the Government would do all it could to encourage growers to plant a crop. They have the same problem this year. A farmer may go to the bank and request \$25 000 to \$30 000, that is, the average requirement for fertiliser for a farm. The bank would ask what the product would be worth at the end of the year. Neither the grower nor the Minister could tell the bank.

The ABARE figure is \$166, but why cannot the Minister or the Premier and Treasurer guarantee that? The banks could increase borrowings by 25 per cent, because they are assured of the grower having a chance to repay it. It is disgraceful, because the average man knows that primary industry, agriculture and mining can and will get us out of this mess, but the Government does not seem to be able to realise that. All money raised goes directly towards jobs—to creating not short-term but rather long-term jobs. We have heard of all these crazy Government schemes to create jobs. They only last as long as it takes to write them or to pay people: they do not go on. They finish as quickly as they start.

We want long-term jobs for people to produce things that matter for the long-term good of the State. Shearers, one manufacturer of prime agricultural equipment, is down to 25 staff. I made reference to this matter not only last year but also in my maiden speech. There are now only 25 staff with one of the major agricultural machinery producers in the world. If that figure goes any lower, they will have to shut the shop. They have no representatives around the country and no salesmen. It is a parlous situation. It is pleasing to hear about Horwood Bagshaw. I wish that company well and will visit the factory at Mannum to give those people all the encouragement that I can. Farmers' plant is decaying and wearing out, and production subsequently falls. This has a multiplying effect. Normally, the multiplying effect goes up but, it is now multiplying downwards. The cost of production goes up and production goes down.

Incentives are needed for the Federal Government to encourage farmers with money to re-tool and upgrade. The scenario out there this minute is that up to 100 South Australian farmers could be refused bank finance. Most are negotiating to buy fertiliser. We have had farmers growing

crops without fertiliser for the past couple of years, and that is ridiculous. This year fertiliser will be more expensive per unit because the Australian dollar increased. Farmers are out there repairing totally worn out machinery; years ago it would have been on the scrap heap or sold for parts. They are trying to patch it up to get another year out of it. Where will it end? The cost of new machinery is now beyond their wildest dreams. I do not see how many farmers will be able to afford new headers. Their only hope is to buy reasonable second-hand ones.

Most farmers are not carrying fuel on hand. They watch the sky and, if it looks like rain, they telephone the fuel agent and expect the fuel to be delivered within minutes. That cannot happen, because the infrastructure is not there. All the small agents are gone and the big agents cannot provide that service at short notice. There are two major manufacturers of cultivator points and shears, Anders and McKays, both of which are out of business.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will relate his remarks to the Supply Bill.

**Mr VENNING:** In terms of appropriation, we need to be able to create jobs; we must spend money on incentives in these areas. These tools are vital to our production, and this is the way we will get the State going again. We were importing shears, but they were coming in from Brazil, so they were banned, because they were deemed to have been dumped in this country. It is a very serious situation.

It was good to hear that the Adelaide to Melbourne line will be brought up to scratch. That will mean much money to South Australia. It will also mean a standard gauge line all the way from Brisbane to Perth. Obviously, South Australia will benefit in the construction and operational phases. I hope that we will capitalise fully on these jobs and that they will be jobs that will last. I also hope that we will create industries alongside this project so that, when the project is finished, we will have something to go on with. Does it not then make sense to complete the link right across the centre of Australia from Alice Springs to Darwin? It is coincidental that 50 years ago today Darwin was bombed. Anyone would think that, for strategic reasons alone, we ought to finish the Darwin to Alice Springs rail link. There would be benefits to this State: that is quite obvious. It is a \$1 billion project ready to go.

The Northern Territory Government has put up over \$100 million and it is asking the Federal Government for the same amount and private investors for the rest. Why does the South Australian Government not put something towards it, say, \$100 million? One only has to look at the benefits to us. We will obtain the most benefit from the rail link by far. That project would return \$1 billion worth of work for Australia, 60 per cent of that for South Australia, particularly in steel and cement. A sum of \$600 000 would generate so many jobs, so much work and so much revenue in taxes and charges.

In summary, the financial management of this Bannon Government, and the Cabinet in particular, is absolutely terrible. If they were in the private sector, they would be out of a job; they would be unemployable. So, I wonder how low a Government can go before someone pulls the plug. How long before the three Independents in this House decide that this Government really has been put to the test and has failed? I hate to harp on this subject. I did not come into this House to debate the same subject every day, because there is so much else to talk about. Unless we can arrest this problem, unless we hit the nail right on the head and turn the State around now, the situation can and will be worse.

We are not due for an election for another two years and, if the next two years are anywhere near as bad as the past two, where will we be? If one draws an imaginary graph, one sees where we will be. What happens when the State is completely bankrupt? I do not know. I do not know who will take us over or what will happen, but the Government needs to bite the bullet now. It needs to do the things that matter, not to waste its money. The Government needs to liquidate some of its problems. I was very cross at the criticism that has been levelled at my Leader. He made a good speech in this House last week; it was full of facts and figures and proposed positive solutions. However, the Government just chose to deride the whole thing, as did the media. I am quite confident that my Leader, Dale Baker, will be the next Premier. He has the guts and the ability to know what running a State is all about.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** A couple of matters are of grave concern to me with respect to the way this State Government has been performing its duties on behalf of the people of South Australia. Those matters compel me to express my concern about the way in which money is being spent, but without good effect. One of the most glaring examples in recent times of the incompetence of this Premier to identify and to take up opportunities was the way in which the Torrens Island animal quarantine station and other facilities there have been allowed to slip. Indeed, ultimately in the short term, they will be closed, and the funds from public revenue that have been invested there by both the State and the Commonwealth over the years, (the province, of course, goes back earlier than federation) will be lost—wasted. That is no small sum, as the information I have put before the House will demonstrate.

The other disturbing aspect of it is that this State in particular, and Australia in general, derives so many benefits from its animal industries both in not having to import those protein rich foodstuffs and, indeed, from the export of them. The low cost regime of our rural enterprises over the past 150 to 200 years in this State, and the nation of which it is a part, because of the low cost of disease control and the absence of any communicable disease in the animal industries, has meant that the State's and nation's economies have been able to grow very rapidly. We have been able to find overseas markets in many countries for those animal products because we in Australia have freedom from disease.

If we allow, as indeed seems apparent, the quarantine restrictions to lapse or to be improperly enforced, we will lose not only our cheap, locally produced animal protein and other animal products for our own consumption (whether that be in the form of fibre or hide) but more importantly the export income we presently derive from the sale of those products. Mr Speaker, did you know that in 1988-89 those products were worth \$43 billion, that last year they were worth over \$49 billion and that for the year just ended (1990-91) they were worth about \$52.5 billion? That is only for exports, and many of those exports are processed animal products; and they are at risk.

Here locally, direct from the farm gate, those products, which we will put at risk in some part at least if we allow the State Government to continue to sit on its hands and do absolutely nothing about them, during 1985-86 were worth just over \$8 billion; in 1986-87 they were worth \$9.5 billion; in 1987-88 the figure was \$12.3 billion; in 1988-89 it was \$13.1 billion; and in 1989-90 it was \$13.7 billion. We are not talking about small fry.

I know that this is a subject of which you, Mr Speaker, must at least in part be aware, because it is within your

electorate. All members of this place should recognise that over the years the province itself, prior to federation, and the State subsequent to federation, undertook in contract with the Federal Government to operate that quarantine station for the benefit of the State and nation. We now face the prospect of losing all the jobs at the quarantine station and, in the process of doing so, of allowing the high standards set for the importation of living animals and animal tissue to be laxly considered—indeed, to lapse in many instances. That is of grave concern to me.

To appropriate \$800 million to this Government, without drawing its attention to the risk to which it is exposing the animal industries by failing in its obligation to the people of this State is, to my mind, a dereliction of duty, especially since I have been able to obtain the information necessary to alert other members of the House, and indeed other members of the Government in this Chamber, to what is happening because of this indifferent attitude.

I have said that we are an extremely fortunate country in that we are isolated from the rest of the world and always have been through natural barriers that have protected us from the spread of disease by insects, by direct importation of those diseases in the living animals and by wind or other vectors such as wildlife. We enjoy that status and it has given us great wealth from our agricultural animal production. It still has an enormous financial potential benefit for Australia.

In many protocols around the world, Australia is the only country through which imports can be bought. Following the discovery of diseased animals imported from New Zealand, Canada, for instance, allows the importation of deer from Australia only, to the exclusion of all others. We put that, for example, at risk. Our predecessors in this place and in Canberra, and at the behest of the entire community, were successful in protecting those industries for our benefit and future generations.

They did it through very stringent regulations regarding anything of the kind that might bring disease into Australia. Millions of dollars has been spent in the past to eradicate diseases such as TB, and this investment has created a disease free status for Australia, which must be protected. Natural barriers were sufficient in the past. However, with the advent of modern transport, our front line of defence has been eliminated in that respect, so our defence now against the importation of diseases lies in the hands of customs officers and in special quarantine.

At a time when stricter quarantine and customs controls are being implemented elsewhere in the world we are allowing ours to be relaxed, and the Government has made drastic cutbacks in the area, putting those industries at great risk. It is my judgment that such funding should not be cut. As I have said, the disintegration of our system of customs and quarantine has already begun, and the Premier has been silent about it, as has the Minister of Agriculture.

It means not only the loss of jobs, but means in prospect the loss of the value of our animal industries that provide us with a revenue, enabling us to appropriate part of that revenue for other public purposes. I believe that it is impossible anywhere else in Australia to find a facility nearly as adequate as the Torrens Island Animal Quarantine Station. There is one on Cocos, although that is way off shore, not part of this State and is not part of any debate we could have about this matter at present. It is far more expensive to operate, which is why I am talking about the Torrens Island facility being an essential part of the future shield we use to protect our animal industries. At present, Torrens Island has the foundation for the provision of the quality of service necessary. However, it has been debased by cor-

rupting influences, and I believe that we need to address that problem, and to do so quickly.

The sort of thing which the Government has allowed to be run down or closed—or with the Government's full knowledge will become run down and closed—includes a cattle facility that was built in the 1970s, which has a separate manure processing plant for the production of methane, but which never became operational. The sheds are completely air-conditioned with offices in each, while the perimeter incorporates a front office; shower-in and shower-out access; a modern, fully equipped surgery; a modern shed for storage and mixing of feeds; and handling yards. Replacing all of that will cost over \$2 million.

All the costs I will give the House are net of any land costs, that is, not taking into consideration the value of land. The horse facility was built in the mid-1980s, at the time of the Gawler Three Day Event. There are two stables with 18 boxes in each, outside exercise yards and lunging rings, as well as a full sized training track, which has been used for only four quarantines. On no occasion was it full. It is a state of the art outfit and to replace it would cost in excess of \$250 000.

There is the hospital area, comprising three sheds which were built to be used as a lambing and kidding area as well as an office and surgery with the necessary toilet and cleaning facilities; that would cost over \$500 000 to replace. There is an outside area of 44 paddocks, which was established at the time of the scrapie program. Scrapie is a virus which causes animals' bones to degenerate in later life. To replace that area, including the buildings with a modified surgery, post-mortem room and so on, would cost over \$1 million. There is the dog and cat area. Those facilities were renovated only two years ago to link to the manure treatment plant, and the outside area of that facility was then roofed. It has always made money, because the people who have used it have had to cover the cost of its operations, regardless of what the charges have been there, and I am not sure that they have always been reasonable. Notwithstanding that, it would cost over \$1 million to replace.

As you would know, Mr Speaker, by chance there is a human quarantine area in that facility as well, which has been there since well before the turn of the century. It happens to include facilities such as an autoclave, which I believe is the largest in the southern hemisphere, with a huge boiler to run it, a private wharf and entrance to facilitate isolated transport, dormitories, chalets, hospital area, disinfecting block, shower block, amenities building, fire station, carpentry building and offices. The area is already on its own bore water supply so that it could be completely isolated from the mainland if necessary. This area also has great historical and cultural value to this State, and many of the original records about the epidemics that have been held in check there as well as implements are kept in storage on site in a museum. I do not know what it would cost to replace some of that, and I do not know how it could be valued, but it is of the order of millions.

There is staff housing there which, conservatively estimated, would take more than \$1.5 million to replace. There is an avian facility which is a state of the art facility and which was completed only in late 1990, a year after the scheduled deadline. It has fully computerised operations, shower facilities for entry and exit, internal temperatures, alarms, airflow, humidity, water treatment and back-up generator. All the air entering and leaving the aviary is fully treated—sterilised. All liquid waste is stored underground and then treated. It seems stupid to me that the Government has allowed a planned discontinuation of the use of that facility, even before the official opening. It has been involved

in only four batch quarantines. That is despite the fact that tremendous interest has been shown by private companies, both in this country and overseas, to take over the cost of running it, in particular, the emu and ostrich farmers who at one stage were willing to build their own facility in order to be able to import and export eggs. That is worth millions of dollars. Western Australia has already proven that through their emu farming.

The conservative estimate of replacing that facility, as far as I have been able to determine from experts, is over \$5 million and now it is to be closed down. Of course, there is the security of the area to be considered; it is on the isolated island and it is connected by only one bridge. A 24 hour a day surveillance and guardpost at the entrance to the island has been provided by ETSA, which patrols the island. A front office has been built at the facility at the second security gate which houses modern offices containing computer equipment, PABX, Telecom and fire panels and a red phone to a nerve centre in Canberra.

The quarantine area is surrounded by two 10ft security fences, including barbed wire. One cannot get into the place unless one has a keycard. To replace that much would cost more than \$2 million. The other plant and equipment that is there, which admittedly is mobilised to the point where it can be taken off and then brought back again in some part, includes things like trailers, feed machines, forklifts and motor bikes and other items that are fixtures like bores and the watering system that provide potable water to the people and the animals that are there. The large hay shed is not yet four years old and the manure treatment plant that is connected to all facilities would cost \$3 million to replace.

All in all, at the most conservative estimate, \$16.5 million of facilities is involved and the Government has said nothing to the people about its intended acceptance of the closure of the place and the loss to South Australia of the jobs and the income. The State Government has done nothing about the Federal Government—this current cowboy outfit that we have in Canberra—as to the way it has run down quarantine for animals and the animal industries in this country. It is about time we conducted a high level inquiry into exactly what has happened there and why the Government is intending to close the facility. We should investigate the large number of serious allegations made about mismanagement and misconduct of the use of those facilities and, more particularly, about the consequences for the animal industries throughout the rest of the State.

Before I sit down, let me further illustrate what I consider and what I have demonstrated to be the Government's lack of concern and commitment to integrity of information by referring to the State Bank and the way in which it has cost this State so much money. The Premier is on record, for instance, as having said:

... it is neither my job nor my duty to intervene in the proper commercial proceedings of any organisation.

That is in spite of the fact that, following the first admission of massive State Bank losses in February 1991, the Premier made repeated claims that he had not intervened or otherwise interfered in the commercial operations. On 21 March last year the Premier stated:

It is a fact that the State Bank has written into it certain protections and has, indeed, been given by statute both a commercial brief and a protection from political interference and direction.

Those claims, as an attempt to evade any responsibility for the bank's financial position, need to be measured against the discussions between the bank and the Government in the lead-up to the 1985 and 1989 South Australian election campaigns about the issue of the bank's home loan interest

rates. It was scandalous. The way in which the State Government deliberately bought the bank off with a \$2 million gift, grant or bribe, so that it could win the last State election and hang on by the skin of its teeth, a mere thread, to my mind, beats anything in terms of political corruption that has ever occurred in this State previously.

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

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** The Supply Bill provides for the allocation of about \$860 million towards the current account and to allow those people employed by the State of South Australia to remain in employment, a happy situation indeed in view of the high unemployment rates that pertain in this State, particularly in respect of younger people of whom some 30 to 35 per cent are unemployed. In some areas—and this will be particularly grievous to members on the Government benches because it is in their electorates that the worst unemployment is to be found—as many as 50 per cent of our young people are unemployed.

The Leader and other members on this side have given a run down of the State's finances. It is an even bigger shame that 'run-down' is all too adequate a description of the state of those finances. They are run down. I suppose that while some surprise has been expressed over the past two years at the rapid rate of acceleration—it really has been a rapid rate; it has almost been as if we have been running headlong into the depression—the signs have been there since 1982-83, when the present Government assumed office.

Let me just point out why I say that. The Auditor-General himself has given us the key figures year after year in his annual report. For example, from 1983 to 1985 the Premier showed that he already had a massive penchant for borrowing. In two and a half years he borrowed \$1 billion. However, that was not the end of it. By 1985 he had borrowed \$2 billion; by 1991 that \$2 billion had been doubled to a little over \$4 billion. Those statistics may be incredible, but they are true. From 1979, when the annual interest rate was only \$98 million, to 1982 the interest rate rose to \$145 million, under a Liberal Government, but from 1982 to 1991 the interest rate increased from \$145 million to \$780 million a year.

Reflecting on that rapid increase in annual interest payments from the State's coffers, it makes the huge loss of jobs in the past two years all the more regrettable. My sympathy and deep sorrow lies not only with the youth and unemployed but also with the staff from age-old institutions that have long served South Australia honourably, such as the State Bank—amalgamated with the former Savings Bank of South Australia—who are no longer on the payroll.

To follow this Government into office will be no happy task, although, as the Leader has said, we on this side of the House are perfectly ready for that. But it will be like the Herculean task of cleansing the Augean stables when ultimately government does change hands. Even the Premier himself has admitted the parlous state of finances in South Australia.

Of course, there was a hiatus between 1985 and 1989, when the Premier and his Cabinet acknowledged that they were racing too heavily and too quickly into debt with the massive borrowings and they tried to slow them down. In fact, on two occasions the indebtedness of South Australia actually retreated; but all too little because by 1988 the signs of financial decay were evident and the Premier's attempts to reduce borrowings were an admission of his acknowledgment. However, State instrumentalities such as the State

Bank, SGIC, Beneficial Finance and, to a lesser extent, SASFIT—and a host of subsidiaries that are listed in the annual reports, and too numerous to count let alone to control, I suggest—had already gone well down the path of high risk investments, like Shakespeare's mischievous character Autolycus, the thief snapping up here and there ill-considered trifles, a few million dollars here and a few hundred million dollars there by way of loan investments, but loans considered best left alone—in fact, no loan at all—by the senior banks in Australia.

By 1990-91, the alarm bells were ringing throughout the Treasury, but 'Too late, too late,' the cry went out. The Premier with the bent for borrowing was caught with his assets exposed to the cold winds of commercial depression. Only the tip of the iceberg appeared to be showing when \$100 million was paid to partly bail out Beneficial Finance Corporation. That soon accumulated to \$1 billion and, subsequently, \$2.3 billion of taxpayers' funds were needed to keep the State Bank afloat. There was no joy from the nearby lifeboat, the SGIC, whose bail-out funds were still to be assessed and which are currently standing at about \$350 million.

I want to say a little more about State Bank, SGIC and Beneficial Finance correspondence, which members on this side of the House received from senior executives of those institutions assuring us that things were well with those institutions, saying that for us to make any reference publicly to a parlous situation might further disadvantage them in the trading circles of the world, saying that everything was really all right but, at the same time, telling us that we would have to tread a very delicate path if we were not to make things extremely difficult for them, and that we were exercising our right to speak and to question in the House of Assembly purely for political reasons.

How spurious were those allegations from the executives of South Australia's senior institutions is now self-evident when we look at the possible \$3.5 billion to \$3.8 billion of non-performing investments which the State Bank currently has on its books and of which some \$2.2 billion has already been backed by the State Government which is, of course, ultimately, the State taxpayer who is now faced with a personal debt of \$4 500 per head of population plus an additional interest rate of over \$200 million a year out of the \$750 million a year that is now outstanding.

I think it was an exercise in very bad taste for senior executives to malign and caution the Opposition and, even worse, for the Premier to smile at the fact that letters were sent to members of the Opposition to try to put them off the scent and to stop them questioning. That is not the way to run a State. The best approach would have been to acknowledge the problem—not to pretend that they had not heard of the problem when the Opposition had been asking questions for 18 months to two years beforehand; not to put one's head in the sand like an ostrich, but to come out and acknowledge the problem and to start dealing with it on a cooperative basis. But that did not happen. We appear to have lost our financial edge over other States. We are not competing. Borrowings continued over 1990, 1991 and 1992 and, furthermore, the State's assets appear to be mortgaged to the very hilt.

The South Australian Government Financing Authority together with the State Bank when they were amalgamated in 1982-83 appeared, at that stage, to have tremendous potential for good in the development of South Australia, but poor management and poor investment over the past few years has thrown the State into a worse position instead of a better one. It is the age old catchcry of commercial confidentiality, which the Premier has used repeatedly in

responding or not responding to questions from this side of the House. That has enabled SAFA and the Government to put out a cloud of obfuscation—certainly more cloud than clear—preventing members on either side of the House from learning the true state of South Australia's financial affairs.

We do not know the extent to which the State's assets are mortgaged. I was very apprehensive when I learned that 18 months to two years ago SAFA assumed control of 100 per cent of South Australia's woods and forests operations—not only the timber, but the mills, too. That was at a time when really all SAFA needed was an interest of about 16 per cent to cover its lendings to the South Australian Timber Corporation, to Scrimber, in which it invested in company with SGIC, and for the Greymouth mill, New Zealand, fiasco. That would have been about \$80 million in all. It needed only a 16 per cent interest to be transferred.

I asked at that time why the Government had allowed SAFA to take a 100 per cent interest. I feared that it was because SAFA was going to use that 100 per cent interest as an asset against which to borrow. There was no news from the Government that that was going to happen or that it had happened. Instead, the whole of this Parliament had to learn indirectly, by perusal of the Australian Gas Light Corporation's annual report, that it had invested \$407 million in South Australia's woods and forests operations. Added to that is the fact that we have power stations in hock—mortgaged. A school which was recently vacated was almost instantly mortgaged. Many other properties have either been sold or borrowed against. One wonders just how much will be left, by the time the Liberal Party assumes office, to sell or to borrow against. I strongly suspect that it will be almost zero.

This Government, which has been telling everyone how good it is at financial administration, has really done everything that it can to run the State down. The Premier, in response to a question only a couple of weeks ago, said, 'Ah, yes, woods and forests operations can still be sold.' If one had a house that was 100 per cent mortgaged, one would have to pay the debt out if one sold it and there would be nothing left in one's pocket. Therefore, to suggest that it can be sold and that South Australia would benefit from the sale is an admission of financial ineptitude.

If members do not think that \$407 million to AGL was a 100 per cent mortgage, all they have to do is to look at SAFA's own valuation of the woods and forests operation. That was valued down from \$346 million to \$343 million in the last financial report, so \$407 million would be over 100 per cent mortgage. I assume that AGL had some tax benefits by investing to that extent in a down-valued forestry operation. That is only one aspect.

Electricity Trust charges in this State are the second highest in Australia. The Premier won the worst budgets award for the past two years—a cynical award. Some 80 000 unemployed people in South Australia are looking at others who have contributed to record bankruptcies. There were 2 000 bankruptcies in 1990-91 in this State, and more budget deficits are predicted.

The Remm investment in South Australia has been quoted as creating a great burden for our major Government financial institutions. That is only one Remm project. There is a Remm project in Queensland, too, where our institutions have a \$240 million investment. That project was valued at well over \$400 million when it was first invested in. Now it has gone down by half, just as the 333 Collins Street investment has been devalued tremendously since SGIC became financially involved in it.

I do not want to keep repeating these things *ad nauseum*, but I do not think the Remm Queensland investment has been quoted by anyone. It simply adds to an already huge volume of poor investments made by South Australian Government institutions. At the moment, the Government appears to have no solutions. Since it came to office, it has been riding on the back of successful ventures either initiated or put forward by the Liberal Party in its brief three year period in office. One has only to look at Stony Point Petrochemicals, Roxby Downs—the biggest mine in the world with another mine of huge potential adjacent—and the O-Bahn project, which was decried. The Government has ridden on those for years with very little initiative of its own.

The only solutions appear to be either a taxation-led recovery or, with certain Bills currently before the House, a gambling-led recovery—hardly a recipe for success. The taxpayer of South Australia is so highly taxed that I believe the next budget papers will be published in paperback edition entitled, 'The South Australian budget: a pickpocket edition' and the worst may be yet to come. There is, I suggest, an atmosphere of fear and decay exuding from the Government benches. As I said, the Premier has broken borrowing records for South Australia. In just nine years he has tripled the state of indebtedness, from \$2 billion to \$6.2 billion. However, that may be substantially greater because other poorly performing accounts are still to be brought in. Losses large and small abound in this State's financial records under Labor. Everywhere there is evidence of careless, sloppy, inept management. There is little evidence of creative initiative. Even SGIC had a credit in its compulsory third party fund when this ALP Government took over in 1982. It is not in credit now. It has been borrowing from the life fund in order to invest in high risk ventures, not only in South Australia but mainly interstate. Those years of poor investment have been the undoing of South Australia and, I suggest, this Government.

The Premier did not accede to the Opposition's requests to take action a year or more earlier on the problems that were besetting Government agencies. As I said at the commencement of these remarks, he seemed pleased when the State Bank and SGIC executives were attacking members of the Opposition for trying to bring these problems to the public's attention. It simply shows that this is not a Government which is in charge. It is a Government which has tried to conceal. At best the Premier is trying to make out that he was unaware but, if that is true, and he was unaware after seven or eight years in office, how much worse is the real situation when he and his Cabinet are the group in charge of South Australia. They were ignorant.

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** The Supply Bill before the House this afternoon really is a cheque being drawn against the taxpayers of South Australia by the Premier on an account which is already heavily overdrawn. In fact, since the Premier came into office, South Australia's debt has increased by two-thirds. We now have a situation where every man, woman and child in this State carries a debt of the magnitude and in excess of \$4 500. The member for Mount Gambier earlier referred to the fact that that is a massive increase in the State's debt of two-thirds of what it was when the Premier came into office. When one considers how long it has taken South Australia to accumulate the debt it had prior to the Premier coming into office, it is absolutely nothing whatsoever to be proud of.

The figures in relation to the position of the State Treasury have been clearly outlined by numerous speakers on behalf of the Opposition. I do not intend to reiterate all the figures that have recently been referred to, but we must look at where we will go from here, and at what is the answer to the problem that has been created by the Premier and Treasurer of this State in that we have gone so far into debt in such a short time. Where has the Government gone wrong, and what can be done to turn the situation around? We now see that South Australia has at least 80 000 unemployed people and, if you look at youth unemployed, the figure is in the area of 37.5 per cent, so somewhere along the line we must get productivity moving again in this State as well as in the rest of the nation. The priorities of Government expenditure should go into the areas of increasing productivity and worthwhile jobs. We must be able to generate genuine productivity, whether in the manufacturing or primary producing areas because, ultimately, everyone will be employed as a result of a spin-off from the actual production in primary and secondary industries.

I have said it on numerous occasions, and I will continue to say it because of the poor deal that country people receive from the Government: the reality is still that 50 per cent of the State's economy comes from the country areas. In fact, fewer than 30 per cent of the State's people live in country areas, yet they generate about 50 per cent of the State's economy. The resources ought to be poured back into areas that will generate more wealth for the State. Unfortunately, at times like this we see massive amounts of taxpayers' money being poured into facilities such as the Entertainment Centre, which is a great facility if we can afford it. But there is little indication that the Entertainment Centre will run at a profit or generate any real wealth for the State. Until we can get our farms, horticultural properties and manufacturing industry in a much healthier state, to continue spending on luxury items such as the Entertainment Centre will not solve our economic problems.

When one considers that 50 per cent of the economy is generated in country areas and that, in reality, only some 10 per cent of the resources available to the Government are actually spent in the country areas, the sheer logic is absurd, because the money ought to be spent where the Government can generate more productivity and wealth, and that is very much out in the country areas. Besides the injustice of that small expenditure when 30 per cent of the population lives in the country, it makes sheer economic sense that a fair proportion of the resources available to the State Government from the taxpayers ought to be spent in the country, where it can generate more wealth for this State. Let us look at the horticultural industries, for example, the irrigation industry. The Government has procrastinated for years over the rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas.

The rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas would significantly increase the productivity of horticultural crops in this State and be to the great economic benefit of all concerned. Earlier today I referred to the potential of the wine industry in this State. It has the potential to be a significant export earner for this State but, unless the Government provides the resources to enable efficient productivity of wine grapes in particular, the industry will stagnate and stall. We have the ability in this country, if the resources are put back into it, to be a leading figure in the international wine industry. We have the climate, the land and the water to produce high quality grapes but, unfortunately, we are not able to produce the high quality grapes that the industry requires to make the quality of wine that the export industry in the northern hemisphere is demanding. Unless

we can produce the right varieties, the industry will not progress at the speed at which it should progress.

The priorities of the Government are completely wrong in that it is spending on such things as the Entertainment Centre when it ought to be spending on industries that create and generate wealth for the State. If the Government was to allocate greater resources to primary industries (and I use the wine and wine grape growing industries as an example), the returns would be great indeed. Many wineries in this country have indicated that by far the best return to them in the past year or two has been from the export market, and that is of great benefit to the balance of trade in Australia, in South Australia in particular. However, that is not happening, partly because the Government is more interested in spending the available resources, principally in the metropolitan area, for the purpose of buying votes rather than worrying about the economy. Until the Government gets past that shallow thinking, there is little chance that unemployment figures will improve or that the economy of the State will pick up.

It is not that we do not have the potential in this country but rather that resources are going in the wrong direction. Unless the Government is prepared to face up to that, we will have a situation that has occurred throughout history: one can go back to Roman days when Rome reached the point where all that its citizens were interested in was entertainment and high living. In the end, the whole economy and civilisation collapsed, and it had to start all over again. I do not expect that to happen to the same extent here in Australia, but it has happened to a somewhat lesser degree and the situation is continuing to deteriorate, because the priorities of the Government are completely wrong. They revolve around giving the people what they want in the way of entertainment in order to keep them happy rather than around solving the financial problems and the balance of trade deficit in this country.

There is little point in my reiterating the figures that have been quoted on numerous occasions over the past two days by members on this side of the House. Suffice to say that, unless the Government mends its ways, changes its priorities and gets back to the fundamental philosophy that the economy is based on productivity and heads the resources of this State in that direction, there will be no improvement in the overall financial position of this State or in the figure of 80 000 people unemployed.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in the debate on this Bill, whereby the Parliament is asked to approve the expenditure of some \$860 million of taxpayers' funds for the general administration of the State. It is the role of the Opposition and the Parliament to scrutinise properly how the Government proposes to spend that very large amount of taxpayers' money, to make constructive criticism, to put forward suggestions and to make observations about how the Government is administering the general affairs of this State. That is the proper role of the Parliament.

It is unfortunate that Governments have a policy of rarely taking notice of Oppositions and adopt defensive stances instead of taking heed of some of the suggestions that are put forward. This Parliament and other State Parliaments throughout Australia are basically the providers of services to the community, whether that be electricity, water, health, roads or law and order. All those sorts of things are the province of State Governments and State Parliaments. Therefore, we have to analyse very carefully how those services are being provided in this State and why there is such a discrepancy between what is spent within 30 to 40

kilometres of the GPO and what is spent in the rest of the State.

As members know, the area I represent is more than 800 000 square kilometres of South Australia, and after the next election that electorate will be slightly smaller, although it will still cover a large portion of South Australia. This area has great potential for development and the ability to generate a huge income that will be to the long-term benefit of all the citizens of this State. What this Parliament and the Federal Parliament have to do is to create some incentive and give encouragement to industry so that we can move the economy forward and create employment and permanent jobs for the benefit of all citizens.

If we allow the situation to continue where in excess of 30 per cent of our young people are unemployed, we will have long-term social problems in this State and nation. Nowhere in the world has a situation been allowed to continue for any length of time whereby nearly 37 per cent of young people are unemployed. It is just not acceptable. Those young people believe that the system has bypassed them and that they no longer have a role to play. When that happens, there are great social problems such as the breakdown of law and order, vandalism and general delinquency, and the rest of the community become angered when these people, who feel that society has bypassed them, react quite violently to their problems.

It is important that we create the economic circumstances in this State and nation to encourage people to produce and place on the world markets products that are of the highest quality and at a reasonable cost so that we can improve our balance of trade. Unless we can export an increasing volume of our productivity, the nation has no future—none whatsoever. With a population of 17 million people, we have to make sure that we do those things we do well better than anyone else, and that we put our products on the market in good condition.

This country has been successful, because it has had very good mining, fishing and rural industries. From the 1950s to the 1980s the farming and mining industries could invest, because we had a sensible taxation system that gave increased depreciation allowances and special investment allowances; we protected our industries so that they could establish; we created jobs; and we had a high standard of living. We could create more jobs if we expend some of this \$860 million we have here on real products, real industries—not figments of people's imagination and not trying to buy votes in urban marginal seats, trying to entertain the public. We should employ them, not attempt to entertain them; but that is what we are doing.

A great amount of money is being spent within a short distance of this building on projects that, in my view, have limited value to the community and the nation as a whole. We are not creating any real, permanent jobs; we are creating entertainment through such things as the Entertainment Centre and the Performing Arts Centre, all of which are very nice. However, the only way in which you can afford those sorts of projects is by having a strong, expanding, developing economy bringing in income. You cannot have those projects when the economy is depressed, when people are losing their jobs, when firms are going out of business and the nation is on a downhill slide.

My electorate has great potential for mining, for agricultural and pastoral development, for tourism and for many associated industries. Many people are losing their jobs and must shift out of those areas into an already overcrowded metropolitan area. The need for redevelopment and urban consolidation is a high priority, in my judgment, because

we are expanding the facilities of the capital city at a rate at which we cannot sustain the services and infrastructure.

We are gobbling up vast amounts of the most productive land available to us, and that policy is doomed to cause further problems unless it is reversed. It appears to me nonsensical to see hundreds of people losing their jobs at Whyalla, Port Augusta and other parts of the State, and to see those people coming to Adelaide, as that merely extends the problem. The services that they require start to contract and we have all the nonsense that we have seen over recent times.

What the House should be aware of, particularly in relation to the rural industry, is that 37 per cent of the income from broad acre farms is now taken in debt service commitments, compared with only 10 per cent 10 years ago. What should also be understood is that an Australian company has to be 20 per cent more profitable pre-tax than the OECD average for an investor to obtain the same net return after corporate and personal taxes.

Taxation in this country is too high. We must change it and put back incentives. Our agricultural industries have been successful because we have been able to guarantee to the potential purchaser of our products that we can deliver and that we can guarantee quality because we have a central system of orderly marketing. In recent times, when all those services have been removed, there has been a lack of development in port facilities. I believe that it would be in the greater interest of the people of this State if money were spent in upgrading our port facilities instead of spending it on an arts centre down at the old D&J Fowler building.

It is absolutely ridiculous to spend \$7 million or \$8 million here on North Terrace when the port system is in urgent need of upgrading in order to make it more attractive for people to come and purchase our products. Unfortunately, Governments do not seem to understand that. The idea that we need to run these organisations on a commercial basis is fraught with danger, because all these other arms of Government taking up millions of dollars of taxpayers' money are non-productive.

The service industries, for some unknown reason, need to show a profit, and I believe it is the role of Government to provide those basic facilities to assist industry and commerce to export, so that they can employ people and give them a standard of living. In my electorate, I have recently had to argue with Government to try to save .4 of a school teacher at a little school such as Carrieton, or a percentage of a teacher's salary at Tarcoola.

We have seen the State Bank exercise lose thousands of millions of dollars and we understand that there will have to be a huge capital injection into SGIC. If the State Government has to do that it should dismiss the people involved in running the SGIC, because they have failed the people of this State. I do not personally have any problem with a Government's being involved in insurance or banking. I think there is some role for Government to play in those industries, but I have great difficulty when those enterprises are run poorly and when people are making commercial gains with taxpayers' money because, at the end of the day, people in isolated areas such as that which I represent will miss out.

Why are there so few kilometres of bitumen road and why is so little spent on roads? Why is it difficult to get an air-conditioned bus to run between Andamooka and Roxby Downs? Heaven help us; we could give free transport here in Adelaide for a while but not provide a basic necessity at a place with one of the harshest climates in the State. Because there was an unfortunate fire, the senior secondary students have to go to Roxby Downs, which has one of the

best schools in the State. However, the fights, arguments and representations that have to be made just to get that school bus are amazing and, when one thinks that taxpayers' money has been squandered in another hair-brained escapade, it is amazing.

I want briefly to read some of the letters that I have received from my constituents. The first is from the Gladstone kindergarden. This copy, which was sent to me by the Federal Minister, states:

I am writing in the hope that you may be able to assist the parents and friends of the Gladstone kindergarden in a matter of extreme importance to our children. According to the Children's Services Office, four year old children are entitled to attend four three-hour kindergarden sessions per week. Due to a very minor, and also temporary, drop in our numbers, this office is now threatening to cut our sessions back two per week. We feel that our children are being treated very unjustly and being placed at a distinct disadvantage.

With today's educational policies leaning strongly toward equal opportunities and social justice, we feel our children are being disadvantaged simply because they live in a rural area. The South Australian Social Justice Strategy states that 'The quality of education either opens doors or limits opportunities, and this makes it very powerful in creating a fairer and more equal society.' We are inclined to believe that our children are being bypassed from this strategy.

As parents we would like you to consider the following points:

(1) Our current and projected enrolments for 1992 are: Term 1—16 children (14 four year olds, two pre-entry); Term 2—19 children (14 four year olds, three pre-entry); Term 3—19 children (18 four year olds, four pre-entry); Term 4—21 children (18 four year olds, three pre-entry).

The Children's Services Office maintains that to keep our present staffing of 0.4 we need 15 four year old children per daily session. The children attending in Terms I and II are therefore being penalised due to the lack of one or two more pre-schoolers in the community and those attending in Terms III and IV are facing the loss of sessions despite having the required number of children enrolled.

(2) Should our kindy sessions be cut back to two per week, children wishing to attend their designated four weekly sessions would then be forced to travel to Laura, 10 kilometres north. Unfortunately, this is not a viable alternative because:

(a) Of the 16 children currently enrolled in term 1, two are already travelling 40 km per day to Gladstone and back to attend and a further five are travelling 30 km per day—adding up to some 160 and 120 kilometres respectively per week. Should these children travel to Laura their total travelling times would be 200 and 160 kilometres each per week.

The letter further states:

It is our hope, as parents and members of the Gladstone, Georgetown and Gulnare districts, that you may be able to help us in our fight to retain our four weekly kindy sessions and thus save our children from the disadvantage that their loss would create.

I think that is a most reasonable request. That is the sort of problem that has been created by the mismanagement of public enterprises.

We all know that there has been great concern in rural areas about the loss of hospital facilities.

People have been told that in little places like Blinman they have no hope of getting water extended to their properties, yet the Government claims it wants to improve tourism. A Blinman constituent has written to me today pointing out that he cannot get his property connected to the local water supply because the E&WS Department is unable to assist him.

If it is possible to extend water supplies and all sorts of other works in other parts of the State, surely a basic necessity of life like water connection should be provided to assist people in isolated areas of the State. Further, we have had the spectacle of schools being given special assistance for Aboriginal children, including two schools at Port Augusta and one at Port Lincoln, but schools at Coober Pedy and Ceduna missed out.

Such escapades are unacceptable because in a decent society, if we cannot educate people, they do not have a great deal of hope. I have been inundated with correspondence from constituents in such areas and it has been interesting to read what departmental officers have said when one makes representations to them concerning these matters. Departmental officers point to a lack of finance being the main difficulty. We know where the money has gone and why it has gone. The unfortunate thing is that insufficient action has been taken to rectify these problems.

Another matter of concern to me is that Governments tend to take too much notice of their advisers and too little notice of their local communities. Regularly we have seen Governments decide to act but, when it comes to a matter involving people in the local communities who will be affected by such action, unfortunately this Government in particular follows the advice of its public servants and not the needs of local communities. Not only is that unfortunate but it is also unnecessary and unwise because the advice of people who have lived in areas for generations is lost.

A classic example is the problem in national parks where the Government has failed to accept local advice and undertake appropriate burning off operations. I have received a copy of a letter from the District Council of Mount Remarkable indicating an urgent need for effective fuel reduction programs. I sincerely hope the Government takes notice of the evidence that will be provided by the select committee because I am confident that, if it accepts the commonsense advice that will be received, it will save a great deal of time and effort of communities, national parks and the Country Fire Service, as well as saving taxpayers a large amount of money. In conclusion, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* two tables of a purely statistical nature indicating the value of agriculture and fisheries to this State and nation.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member assure the Chair that these are of a purely statistical nature?

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

**BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**  
Gross value of Australian farm and fisheries production

	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91 <sup>p</sup>	1991-92 <sup>f</sup>
	\$ m	\$ m	\$ m	\$ m	\$ m	\$ m
<b>Crops—Grains and oilseeds</b>						
Wheat	2 462	2 016	2 976	2 775	1 961	1 550
Barley	435 <sup>r</sup>	460 <sup>r</sup>	557 <sup>r</sup>	708 <sup>r</sup>	546	562
Oats	162	189 <sup>r</sup>	233 <sup>r</sup>	178	157	180
Triticalc	26	27	28 <sup>r</sup>	25	21	12
Maize	30	32	35 <sup>r</sup>	39 <sup>r</sup>	32	28
Sorghum	161	208	188	136 <sup>r</sup>	126	174
Rice	86	151	124	130	124	135
Lupins	136	151	182	150	156	193
Field peas	96	125	114	90	72	104
Peanuts (in shell)	42	33	28	17 <sup>r</sup>	40	32
Sunflowerseed	34	66	53	25 <sup>r</sup>	53	33

	1986-87 \$ m	1987-88 \$ m	1988-89 \$ m	1989-90 \$ m	1990-91 <sub>p</sub> \$ m	1991-92 <sub>f</sub> \$ m
Soybeans .....	27	27 <sub>r</sub>	51 <sub>r</sub>	28 <sub>r</sub>	23	25
Cottonseed <i>a</i> .....	31	57	56	59	93	103
Other oilseeds <i>b</i> .....	25	29	35	31	40	46
Total .....	3 751 <sub>r</sub>	3 571	4 661 <sub>r</sub>	4 390 <sub>r</sub>	3 442	3 174
<b>Industrial crops</b>						
Cotton lint <i>a</i> .....	330	392	441	587	880	675
Sugar cane (cut for crushing) .....	586	618	744 <sub>r</sub>	874 <sub>r</sub>	756	561
Tobacco (green weight) <i>s</i> .....	71	75	71	81	83	84
Total .....	987	1 085	1 256 <sub>r</sub>	1 542 <sub>r</sub>	1 719	1 320
<b>Fruit</b>						
Apples .....	205	187 <sub>r</sub>	239 <sub>r</sub>	219 <sub>r</sub>	212	226
Pears .....	77	79 <sub>r</sub>	66	75	51	55
Peaches .....	41	47	45	48	51	58
Apricots .....	26	30	31	28	30	33
Citrus .....	175	203	241	235	213	251
Bananas .....	127	126	144	195	218	204
Pineapples .....	42	40	44	42	44	46
Dried vine fruit <i>s</i> .....	120	133	110	120 <sub>r</sub>	158	154
Wine grapes <i>s</i> .....	122	178	280	211	155	200
Table grapes <i>s</i> .....	52	69	51	58	64	69
Total .....	987	1 092 <sub>r</sub>	1 251 <sub>r</sub>	1 231 <sub>r</sub>	1 196	1 295
<b>Other crops</b>						
Potatoes .....	272	270	326	343	283	254
Other vegetables (human consumption) .....	613	665	878 <sub>r</sub>	966 <sub>r</sub>	905	962
Other crops n.e.i. <i>c</i> .....	959 <sub>r</sub>	1 127 <sub>r</sub>	1 323 <sub>r</sub>	1 405 <sub>r</sub>	1 476	1 506
Total .....	1 844 <sub>r</sub>	2 062 <sub>r</sub>	2 527 <sub>r</sub>	2 714 <sub>r</sub>	2 664	2 722
Total crops .....	7 569 <sub>r</sub>	7 810 <sub>r</sub>	9 696 <sub>r</sub>	9 877 <sub>r</sub>	9 021	8 512

RECEIVALS SUMMARY: COOPERATIVE  
BULK HANDLING

Season	Wheat Tonnes	Barley Tonnes	Oats Tonnes	Other Tonnes	Total Tonnes
1955-56 ..	154 360	—	—	—	154 360
1956-57 ..	218 252	8 834	—	—	227 086
1957-58 ..	151 952	48	—	—	152 000
1958-59 ..	386 836	72 739	—	—	459 575
1959-60 ..	154 509	—	—	—	154 509
1960-61 ..	910 979	71 743	—	—	982 722
1961-62 ..	691 334	71 915	—	—	763 240
1962-63 ..	853 864	76 614	8 697	—	939 175
1963-64 ..	1 329 362	252 008	19 137	—	1 600 507
1964-65 ..	1 299 165	333 230	18 366	—	1 650 761
1965-66 ..	961 050	211 519	8 865	—	1 181 434
1966-67 ..	1 346 949	313 980	34 215	—	1 695 144
1967-68 ..	595 408	141 738	206	—	737 352
1968-69 ..	2 076 448	403 713	28 048	—	2 508 209
1969-70 ..	1 516 048	463 494	9 576	—	1 989 119
1970-71 ..	680 776	580 316	22 180	—	1 283 272
1971-72 ..	1 307 012	850 424	19 380	—	2 177 266
1972-73 ..	711 157	374 780	2 040	—	1 087 977
1973-74 ..	1 671 348	676 112	30 712	—	2 378 172
1974-75 ..	1 377 418	1 070 630	37 840	—	2 485 888
1975-76 ..	1 042 101	1 004 810	26 663	—	2 073 574
1976-77 ..	724 948	811 789	13 692	—	1 550 429
1977-78 ..	416 924	484 051	1 857	—	902 832
1978-79 ..	1 974 273	1 340 324	42 039	—	3 356 636
1979-80 ..	2 231 215	1 456 519	46 337	—	3 734 071
1980-81 ..	1 532 364	1 029 813	16 142	12 420	2 600 739
1981-82 ..	1 580 780	1 120 208	11 485	11 272	2 723 745
1982-83 ..	587 280	494 183	6 736	2 000	1 090 199
1983-84 ..	2 712 214	1 772 010	64 695	3 908	4 552 827
1984-85 ..	1 921 265	1 810 566	39 639	1 766	3 773 236
1985-86 ..	1 769 996	1 634 714	16 256	24 430	3 445 396
1986-87 ..	2 380 000	1 510 000	36 069	63 615	3 989 684
1987-88 ..	1 822 426	1 118 293	47 077	113 818	3 101 614
1988-89 ..	1 318 677	870 679	48 425	162 498	2 400 279
1989-90 ..	2 703 290	1 674 620	107 844	173 090	4 658 844
1990-91 ..	1 975 100	1 344 503	29 286	144 793	3 493 682
Total ..	43 111 980	24 116 416	764 668	568 817	68 561 881

Mr GUNN: Anyone reading *Hansard* will be able to see the value of grain production and agriculture in general to this State and nation. Unless we give incentives to producers, we will have a bleak future. I sincerely hope that, when it comes time for us to consider the next budget, action will be taken. If it is not taken, the decline in rural areas will continue.

The Government has failed to understand that it has to give business the opportunity to develop. It is no good allowing irrational environmentalists and others to get in the way of mining development, because the time has come to take the shackles off the mining industry and to get out of the way of agriculture and let them get on and employ people. If we do not allow that, more people will be unemployed at Port Augusta, Whyalla, Leigh Creek and Coober Pedy and more people will be on unemployment and social security, because the Government has hogtied business and commerce, particularly small business. I know first hand the effect it is having.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

COUNTRY FIRES (NATIONAL PARKS)  
AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 12 February. Page 2700.)

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I refer, first, to the fire danger season. It has been suggested that the amendment is contrary to the intent of the Act. The Country Fires Act provides the power to create bushfire prevention committees at State, regional and district level to ensure that proper

fire prevention measures are planned and implemented. Part of the bushfire prevention strategy is the setting of fire danger seasons. Consequently, the consultative process with local authorities is achieved through the regional bushfire prevention committee. The effect of the honourable member's amendment is to have one consultative committee process for the fixing of a fire danger season through the regional committee and also another consultative process with councils if there is a need to extend the fire danger season. That would be contrary to the Act.

In addition, whilst under section 35 (1) and (2) the board has power to fix the fire danger season, the actual power to extend such a season is then taken from the board and effectively placed in the hands of local councils. To suggest that such an extension could be implemented only by the board if all affected councils agreed would almost certainly mean that, even if a real danger existed in, say, six out of seven council areas in a fire ban district, then, if just one objected, the board would not be able to extend the season to cover the very real fire prevention needs of an area. That causes a problem already in that only one objection needs to be made and the whole thing could be knocked out. The consultation must remain with the regional bushfire prevention committee and the ultimate decision on the extension is then left with the board, acting on the best advice available at that time.

The second matter I wish to raise relates to Crown land. The overall effect of the suggested amendment is to empower the CFS Board—a statutory board created by Government—to issue orders, in effect, to Government departments. As there is no suggestion in the amendment as to how such an order would be enforced, there seems little point in enabling the board to issue a notice because it could not be enforced in any case. The board can and does now make representations to Government departments and instrumentalities to ensure, as far as possible, that reasonable steps are taken to prevent fires and the spread of fires on Government land, and we are speaking specifically about Government lands. The South Australian Bushfire Prevention Committee is one forum for that. The effectiveness of the suggested amendment, without some punitive measure to ensure compliance with a notice, would have no effect.

It should also be noted that the major Government land-owners are the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Woods and Forests Department, which operate under Acts of Parliament that charge them with fire protection, so it is part of their role and responsibilities, which are in accordance with the use for which the land is intended. The Bushfire Prevention Committee at both regional and district levels provides for representatives of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Woods and Forests Department to be involved in the planning of bushfire prevention and to monitor and implement programs in areas of Crown land.

The next section with which I would like to deal concerns the actual powers of a CFS officer. Quite clearly, it would appear that the intent of this amendment is to remove any command power on Government reserves from officers charged with the management of such lands. The amendment applies equally to both the National Parks and Wildlife Service and Woods and Forests lands. The suggestion that CFS officers, who are excellent officers in their own areas but who are probably volunteers, should have control of fires in major pine forest plantations cannot be supported. Woods and Forests fire crews and their leaders are specially trained and have specialist equipment to deal with fires in such plantations. So, they would have to be much more efficient in the controlling of those fires. Whilst such

a commercially compelling argument does not exist in relation to the National Parks and Wildlife Service reserves, these lands have other values in terms of conservation.

While they may not be as tangible as pine forests, they are equally as important to reserves. I am sure that members on the other side of the House agree that it is imperative that we retain these areas and not have them susceptible to bush fires. Wildfire within National Parks and Wildlife Service native forest reserves is invariably a highly complex matter. All sorts of things, Mr Speaker, which I am sure you would know about, such as topography, vegetation associations, fuel loads and so on, create a very difficult fire management position within reserves. They do not necessarily occur outside reserves in given localities throughout the State, so they really are quite specific.

I believe that in dealing with this matter there is a need for some sort of balance to be struck between maintaining conservation assets and upholding the requirements of the National Parks and Wildlife Service Act so that we can consider the protection of adjoining lands or assets. If fire breaks out in National Parks and Wildlife Service reserves other land is at risk also. The suggestion that volunteers be placed in a situation where effectively they take on a statutory responsibility for Government policy implementation and potential subsequent accountability, which is a very important aspect, is I believe unreasonable and not acceptable. The firefighting resources of both the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Woods and Forests Department are now wholly integrated into the CFS group system, and personnel are trained in incident management. The Minister touched on that matter in answer to questions in the House recently.

The current legislation provides for CFS officers to be given the ultimate control of fires on any land in CFS areas of jurisdiction, and this should be sufficient to ensure combined effective fire control, provided of course that all firefighting authorities agree on the principles to be adopted through pre-arranged operational procedures and the use of incident management systems for forests. Over and above everything we have to make sure that we have effective and well trained people to manage firefighting in specific areas, particularly on Crown land. For that reason I cannot support the amendment.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### CONSTITUTION (PARLIAMENTARY TERMS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 12 February. Page 2700.)

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I commend the member for Elizabeth on bringing this measure before the House. I believe that from time to time the House should indulge in the exercise of looking at the term of office of any Government, and the exercise of bringing it before this Chamber is definitely worth while. When Governments come to office they generally put down their policies, although some Governments come to office without putting down their policies. Depending on economic circumstances and arising out of the fiscal situation at the particular time, Governments need a full four years to bring their policies to fruition.

A logical reason for four-year terms is to give incoming Governments every opportunity to meet the promises that

have been made and to implement the policies that they have determined. You would know, Sir, from your experience in this place that Governments are often formed in difficult circumstances. When the Bannon Labor Government was elected and came into this place the Treasury benches were empty and we were heading towards bankruptcy.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** I accept the correction that has been made by the Minister. I mean the Treasury itself, not the Treasury benches. There was not much money available. A Government, especially a Labor Government, coming into power with a social justice policy, that would want to transfer as much money as possible from those who have money to those who have not, needs to look at what might happen over a four-year rather than a three-year term. Not only that, the constituency expects that when somebody has been elected for four years they will see out those four years. It is very unpopular for a Government to go for only a short term and then go back to the people. We on this side of the House know only too well what happened in 1979 when the decision was taken to go back to the people after a very short time in office. People resented it. Therefore, there is a lot going for a four-year term.

On the other hand, there are problems with four-year terms. Look at the American experience. American Federal elections are based on a fixed four-year term. Some of the American States vary. Not all the American States have a fixed four-year term. Some of the American States have used their constitutional rights and decided to have a different system, but by and large the American experience is to have fixed four-year terms. The problem is that electioneering starts 12 months before the end of the four-year term, so the whole country is paralysed. Important decisions for the country and the community are held in abeyance while the Americans go through an election period of more than 12 months. If one were to calculate the amount of money involved, it would run into millions, if not billions, of dollars. One could put forward an argument to say that, instead of that money going into electioneering, it should actually go towards the welfare of the people of America.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** It would be much less fun!

**Mr FERGUSON:** Indeed, it would be much less fun, but it would be a better Christian attitude, with that money going to the public rather than being spent on politicians and electioneering. We do have that problem of what might happen if this legislation is passed and we have a fixed four-year term. Electioneering would begin 12 months before the actual election day, with huge amounts of money inevitably going into that sort of campaign. These days, a campaign in a marginal State seat costs anything in the order of \$100 000. It is not unusual for candidates in State seats to spend \$100 000. If we go into a fixed four-year term, it is quite possible that that amount would be exceeded.

With the current time limits for private members' debates, there is not much of an opportunity to develop an argument. However, let me say that the fixing of a four-year term would prevent a Premier and a Cabinet from calling an election on a matter of principle. I believe that we should not give up easily that freedom. From time to time there would be issues of such major importance that the Premier, Cabinet and the Government would need to go to the public to obtain its view as to who should govern on these matters of principle. For example, if we had a change of Government federally—and heaven forbid that that should occur—and the incoming Federal Liberal Government was to do what it says it will do (and I certainly hope that it does not because there will be a lot of poverty and misery if that

actually happens) and introduces a goods and services tax, and knowing that the Liberal Opposition in this State supports a goods and services tax, it may well be that the Premier and Cabinet would want to go back to the people on a matter of principle to discuss this very important issue which will change the lives of everyone in this State.

Make no mistake: not one person will escape the effects of the introduction of a goods and services tax, resulting in the certain spread of misery. That is a matter of principle which we must allow the Government an opportunity to take up. Nonetheless, I find the notion of a fixed four-year term to be extremely attractive. I am having difficulty in making up my mind on this issue. I look forward to the debate that follows me, and I will listen intently to members on both sides because I believe I could be convinced either way by that debate as to the way I should vote.

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

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings (Napier):** I was quite surprised that no-one from the Opposition wanted to follow my colleague the member for Henley Beach, whom I thought gave a very balanced view on the pros and cons of a fixed four-year term. I was quite surprised on 12 February when the member for Davenport, who is well known for being able to speak at length on any subject—in fact one could say that he could speak *ad nauseam* on any subject—took precisely a minute and a half to put his opposition on the record regarding this Bill, which has been introduced by the member for Elizabeth.

As a person in his last term of office, I could perhaps be criticised were I to support a fixed four-year term on the ground that I am only interested in my superannuation because, if we went on until March 1994, I would maximise the return that I could get on my superannuation. But you know me, Sir; I am not a cynic, and I would not speak in that way. However, as the member for Henley Beach said, there are points for and against, and I think that, in his introduction to this debate, the member for Elizabeth actually outlined some very valid points. To be honest, I must acknowledge that in the past Labor Governments tended to disregard the traditional three-year term, and the situation culminated in 1979 when we were dismissed by the electorate. I am sure that one of the contributing factors to that was that we had called an election when it was not really necessary. I know I can say that, because the Minister on the front bench was, like myself, a fairly new member of the Labor Caucus, and whatever we said at that time would have been ignored anyway.

I find the Opposition rather hypocritical. Granted, we have heard only one Opposition member put forward for about a minute and 45 seconds what I consider would be the official Liberal Party line, saying that the proposition is wrong because Governments can manipulate the situation. One of the charges members opposite continually lay against Labor Governments is that we try to go to an election when things look right for us, and they want us to go to our maximum term. The member for Elizabeth is providing them with the opportunity to ensure that that happens. I would have thought that they would grab the chance. After all, the Opposition has only to support the Bill and it will get through. However, if members opposite support it, they know that they are locked into a four-year term for ever and a day, and they know as well as I that, if they ever sit on this side of the House, they will rue the day they became locked into a four-year term, because members opposite will manipulate the Constitution in every way possible to ensure that they are kept in Government.

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order, Sir, the member for Napier has just imputed to me quite improper actions as being something I would take in prospect by saying that I, amongst others, would manipulate the Constitution in any way possible. I take exception to that and ask that you direct that it be withdrawn.

**The SPEAKER:** I did not quite hear it. I do not think the member implied it individually to the honourable member.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** No, I meant it collectively, Sir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I am looking at the member for Goyder. I do not uphold the point of order. I do not believe there was a direct imputation on the honourable member.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** It sounds very attractive to me. I would like to be sitting here under your guidance, Sir, until March 1994, but I am also a realist and, whilst the proposition has many good points going for it, there are also some very dangerous aspects. History has shown that the Labor Party has never been generally the favoured political Party as far as the media is concerned. We have seen time and again that that is the case and I give an example. Members opposite scoff. It is the view of the *Advertiser* that the current Leader of the Opposition, Jim Baker, should not be the Leader of the Liberal Party. It is the current policy of the *Advertiser* that the present leadership should not be sitting there, and that includes the Leader and the Deputy Leader. There have been numerous editorials and telephone polls pushed by the *Advertiser* that show that it is not happy with the current leadership. The *Advertiser* wants the member for Coles—

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** On a point of order, Sir, the Bill before the House relates to parliamentary terms and has nothing to do with what the newspapers have to say about Leaders, Deputy Leaders, Premiers or Deputy Premiers.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I uphold the point of order. In these debates the comments must be relevant to the subject of the debate. I draw the attention of the member for Napier to that point.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I bow to your ruling, Sir. I was trying to enlarge my argument that one of the dangers of a four-year fixed term is that, if the media decides that it does not want the current Government, right the way through (particularly at a certain time, with an election in March) it can create a certain scenario that could be detrimental to the current Government. There was scoffing from members opposite that this does not go on. I was giving an example of where the *Advertiser* stands regarding the current leadership of Jim Baker and his deputy. It now wants Dean Brown to come into the Parliament and take over the leadership, backed by the member for Coles.

I was enlarging that argument, which is very valid and which would be supported by those members on this side of the House. The media plays far too prominent a role in determining what it thinks should be the leadership of this Government. If we have a fixed term, the *Advertiser* with its scant regard for the truth can manipulate people's viewpoints. That is one of the dangers. At the moment that may sound attractive to members opposite, but we all know that the *Advertiser* can be very fickle. I recall in 1985 that we had an editorial that came out in praise of the Labor Government. It came out at an opportune time: the Saturday morning of the election, and we came in with one of the biggest majorities that we have ever had. But, generally, it supports the Liberal Opposition.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to relevancy.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thought that I was doing very well. I have an open mind and I will listen closely to what members opposite say but, judging by their interjections, they will be against this proposition. I wonder why! They know that all they have to do is support the member for Elizabeth and we are here for four-year fixed terms. I may be tempted in my last term to support the member for Elizabeth. My Party cannot touch me, so I may be tempted to support him.

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

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Given the quite disgusting performance of the member for Napier, I do not know whether we are discussing four-year fixed terms or, more pertinently and appropriately, a six-month fixed term in Yatala for that honourable member. I find his contribution quite despicable and out of character with what I expect in this Parliament. However, the member for Napier is quite correct in one matter: he well knows that Liberal Party policy is not to have fixed terms. Indeed, what we have before us today in this State and Parliament lends great weight to the principle that the exact term should not be specified in any shape, way or form.

We know that under the Constitution there is a three-year minimum and a four-year maximum, and under the current rules the Premier of the State, unless he fails to maintain the confidence of the House in the meantime, can extend the election date until March 1994. There is no way in the world that the majority of the people of South Australia would wish this Government to go one day further, let alone until March 1994. It is absolutely unconscionable that in this Bill we should be giving this Government more time, and we would naturally expect this Government to go its four years and go to the polls some time in November or December 1993. I do not believe that the people of South Australia should have to put up with this Government one minute more, let alone for another two years. This is an excellent example of why we should not have four-year fixed terms.

I take the point of the member for Henley Beach when he talked about the American situation of fixed terms. As he quite rightly pointed out, the problem with fixed terms is that everybody knows they are coming and prepares accordingly, and we find that the last six or 12 months of government is concentrated purely on the process of politics rather than on the process of governing the State or country properly. America is currently paralysed by the primaries, and that is a very good example why we should not fix the date of any election.

There are other reasons why we should not do so, and one happens to be a good Westminster tradition. We know that over a long time in the British Parliament it would be difficult to find two consecutive elections where the full term has been run, certainly since the Second World War.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Five years.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** As the Minister of Correctional Services has quite rightly pointed out, the term is five years. I notice that a lady of great substance, a great leader of that great nation, was prone to serve four years, and that is quite appropriate. The issue we should be addressing today is how we can get rid of Governments which are incompetent and which are leading the State into economic ruin. That is the issue we should be discussing, not the cementing of terms and ensuring that Governments remain in power long after their support has disappeared and their level of competence has reached such a low ebb that they simply cannot perform.

Fixed terms only mean we have lame duck Governments—and this Government, which could not even get 50 per cent of the vote, is a lame duck Government—in power longer than they deserve. I note the time. There are other issues before the House in private members' time, and I do not intend to take up the time of the House in the same way as members opposite. I simply point out that the Liberal Opposition, to a person, is opposed to the concept of fixed terms.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ACTS INTERPRETATION (COMMENCEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 12 February. Page 2702.)

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** The amendment proposed in the Bill has an infinite amount of wisdom. I am assured that it will cause some complications, but perhaps our legislators and the people who are drafting the legislation should take account of the new provision, if it becomes law. I personally believe it has much merit.

**Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth):** I should like to thank members for their contributions to this debate and for their indications of support. I agree that the measure is capable of further amendment and improvement in Committee, and I am sure that the House will give it full consideration. It is a vital rule of law in this country and our democracy in this State that legislation passed in this Parliament should either be brought into effect as law of South Australia or be abandoned as such and the Parliament invited either to appeal or to reconsider the legislation. This provision will bring about that certainty. In the event that it is adopted, I believe that it will provide a much better atmosphere for the administration of our laws.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement of Acts.'

**Mr ATKINSON:** I move:

Page 1—

Line 19—Leave out 'first' and insert 'second'.

Line 20—Leave out 'first' and insert 'second'.

Under the restored Stuarts in Great Britain, in the case of *Godden v Hales*, all but two of the judges of the King's Bench joined in holding that the Kings of England were absolute sovereigns, that the laws were the King's laws, that the King had the power to dispense with any of the laws of Government as he saw necessary for it, that he was the sole judge of that necessity, and that no Act of Parliament should take away that power.

The principle before us is designed to get away from the modern Stuarts in the Executive. However, desirable though the principle is, I think that the amendment will allow our modern Stuarts in the Executive to adjust to this new and desirable principle, which enhances the rule of law. This is because, first, it introduces more certainty into our act of legislating and it encourages a desirable separation of powers between the Executive and the Legislature. It is for Parliament to make the law, not for the Executive arbitrarily to suspend the law. Therefore, I commend this amendment to the House.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brindal:

That a select committee be established to inquire into the report on the provision of primary and secondary education by the Education Department.

(Continued from 13 February. Page 2749.)

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

Leave out 'by the Education Department' and insert 'in South Australia and in particular:

- a. pre-service and in-service teacher training;
- b. the development of curriculum;
- c. the assessment of student achievement; and
- d. the management and organisation of schools'.

I am grateful for the indulgence of the House in allowing this matter to be debated this evening. I have circulated this amendment to members and I wish to speak briefly this evening in support of it. It seeks to bring the motion into focus, and I refer to the four points that I recommend that the select committee consider in its deliberations.

Of course, it will be open for the select committee to consider other matters if it so desires and it can seek the concurrence of the House to do that in due course. The four matters that came out of the brief speeches that were made by a number of members last week on the motion highlight the need for there to be a review of pre-service and in-service teacher training in South Australia. The member for Coles and the member for Davenport both raised this as a key issue.

As to the development of curriculum, a number of members spoke on the processes that result in the provision of curriculum for our schools and the important moves that are abroad in this country with respect to the national frameworks for curriculum, and the great cooperation that is now abroad in the development of curriculum across this country, as well as the many other aspects of curriculum that are of interest not only to those within education in this State but also to those in the broader community.

Thirdly, I refer to the assessment of student achievement, which is an issue of considerable debate and importance in our community, particularly the debate surrounding some of the more pernicious and simplified approaches to the testing of student achievement as compared with the more complex, detailed and qualitative approaches that have been taken, for example, in this State.

Fourthly, there is the management and organisation of schools, and here I think we touch on issues of the day with respect to local management of schools, but also on the many other varied issues that members have raised in the debate in this House. So, I would recommend that the work of the select committee be focused in those four areas. I would like to comment briefly on some of my concerns about the process that has evolved with respect to this motion.

First, I want to say that there have been many reviews of education in South Australia. Members referred to the Karmel reports and there was some mention of the Keeves report, but there have been many reports since those two major reports into primary and secondary education in this State. Members may not be aware of some of those reports, but the select committee will become very much accustomed to them.

Members might not be aware, for example, of the Cox report, released in 1987. Professor Ian Cox reviewed the role of superintendents in the Education Department. The report saw an essential part of the role of superintendents being the evaluation of schools, providing public accountability and quality assurance for education programs. That report laid the foundations for the present Education Review Unit. My colleague the member for Price currently has a motion before the House which relates to the Education Review Unit, and I refer members to his remarks in that debate during private members' time on Thursday 13 February.

The Education Review Unit provides an ongoing review mechanism for schools and education programs. As the member for Price pointed out, school reviews started in 1990, when 127 schools were reviewed. Another 104 were reviewed in the first half of 1991. Public reports of between 25 and 40 pages have been prepared for each school reviewed.

The Education Review Unit is expressly set up to ensure that each school is providing the core curriculum and the essential skills and understandings which is intended and which, indeed, is the right of every student in our schools in this State. So effective has this unit been that a group of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools is coming here from the United Kingdom to learn more about our methods of quality assurance and public accountability and incorporate those ideas into the restructuring of the British inspectorial system.

Another extensive and rigorous review into various aspects of Education in South Australia was the Primary Education Review, conducted in the early part of the 1980s and reporting in the mid 1980s. That has had a profound effect on primary education in this State and placed us in good stead. I believe that we have the best primary schools across this nation and that report has helped us to establish that reputation.

We have had the report of the committee chaired by Kevin Gilding which has led to legislation being passed in this House to create the South Australian Certificate of Education and, indeed, to provide a broad review of years 11 and 12 in our secondary schools. A junior secondary review is currently being conducted under the Chairmanship of Dr Vivian Evers, and we have had a reading and writing assessment project and the analysis of that very important work in our schools.

The Government Agencies Review Group is currently considering recommendations and we are periodically implementing them. That very important review is much more than a simple GARG exercise; it is a report about the future directions of the management and organisation of the Education Department. The Public Accounts Committee has also conducted reviews specifically into management related matters in the Education Department. Attainment levels have been introduced and trialled in our schools and are being implemented right across our school system this year.

School restructuring reviews are also being carried out. For example, the Joel Committee in the Elizabeth/Munno Para area, the South-West corner review of our schools, the western suburbs secondary review, the western suburbs primary review and the north-eastern suburbs secondary review are all valuable inquiries into restructuring of our schools in those areas to meet the needs and challenges of the future.

In view of these major reviews that have been carried out and the ongoing work of the Education Review Unit, I must express concerns about the possible duplication of effort that may occur as a result of this committee. Indeed, like the members for Napier and Henley Beach, I have

some reservations about the whole mechanism being proposed for this inquiry. I think we must be vigilant to ensure that it is constructive and positive and that it does not have a negative and destabilising influence on our schools and the community.

I am very much concerned that this Parliament has just gone through the process of setting up a brand new committee structure to look at a whole range of Government activities, particularly in the human services area. These are very powerful committees with authority to delve into many issues. The Social Development Committee has the task of examining education. Almost before the ink is dry on the documents that have been approved by this place creating those committees, members opposite are calling for yet another committee to do some of the work that the standing committee was created to do.

The areas proposed for this select committee are vast. If it is to look at all the areas mentioned so far by members in this debate—and that is why I have suggested some focusing of it in my amendment—we are talking not about months but about years if the committee is to do its job properly, seriously and honestly. Select committees are meant to exist for short periods of time to examine a specific issue or sets of issues, to report and to disband. A select committee of the nature proposed by members opposite runs the risk of becoming a *de facto* standing committee subverting the structures that have been put in place so recently, and, indeed, it could cut across the traditional role of parliamentary review of the Executive.

The resource implications are also significant and cannot be overlooked. On top of the usual expenses, I imagine this will involve a substantial expense in research and in providing other support for this committee, in addition to all the time and work that will be asked of public servants and others in our community. Many people are under great stress and pressure now to deliver important services in our community. I think that we must be careful about the nature and role that this committee plays in order that it can do justice to the standing of the parliamentary committees and, indeed, to the traditional role of this Parliament.

Not only will there have to be extra salaries but also the energies of salaried departmental officers will be diverted from education if they are required to appear before the committee in a detailed manner, as I anticipate will be necessary. Several hours of each senior officer's time will thus be used for an activity other than providing services to schools and students, and it is beholden on us to justify that diversion of resources and time. These unproductive salary costs, if the committee misuses its powers, will mount up significantly during the life of such a select committee. In effect, it will divert tens or maybe hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of officers' time away from education. As I said, it is incumbent on each member of the committee to accept the traditional role that this place has played. I assure members that I will do my best, in chairing this committee, to ensure that it meets the fundamental aims of the House.

**THE SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister's time has expired. The honourable member for Hayward.

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** The Opposition supports the amendment. In doing so, I thank the Minister for his wisdom in putting forward the four areas for the select committee to examine. I thank all members who have contributed to the debate. The Minister's comments in proposing the amendment show that he has studied the debate carefully and that the directions in which the committee will look

are the result of the contribution of members. In that sense, the House owes them a debt of gratitude.

I, and I am sure all members of this House, are conscious of two things: first, our responsibility to the people of South Australia; and, secondly, the prudent use of this State's resources. I feel sure that whoever serves on this select committee will do their very best not only for the electors of South Australia but more importantly for the children of South Australia. Whatever questions the select committee asks, whatever time it takes or whatever direction it takes, every member of the select committee will act at all times in the best interests of both this Parliament and the children of South Australia. I support the amendment.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The House appointed a select committee consisting of Messrs Atkinson and Brindal, Ms Cashmore and Messrs Crafter and M.J. Evans; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 9 April.

### FISHERIES

Adjourned debate on motions of Mr Meier:

- (a) That the regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Abalone Fishery—Scheme of Management made on 27 June and laid on the table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.
- (b) That the regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Prawn Fishery—Scheme of Management made on 27 June and laid on the table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.
- (c) That the regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Rock Lobster Fishery—Scheme of Management made on 27 June and laid on the table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.
- (d) That the regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to General Fishery—Definitions, Sizes and Licences, made on 27 June and laid on the table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.
- (e) That the regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Scheme of Management made on 27 June and laid on the table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.
- (f) That the regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Marine Scalefish Fishery—Scheme of Management made on 27 June and laid on the table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.
- (g) That the regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to River Fishery—Scheme of Management made on 27 June and laid on the table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.
- (h) That the regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Experimental Crab Fishery—Licences made on 27 June and laid on the table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.

(Continued from 31 October. Page 1657.)

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** I oppose the motion. During the 1991 parliamentary spring session, the then shadow Minister of Fisheries (the member for Goyder) and the Hon. Peter Dunn in the Legislative Council introduced motions of disallowance on this package. On 31 October 1991, the member for Goyder withdrew the motions relating to the miscellaneous fishery and exotic fish; the motions relating to other fisheries are still active. The remarks of the member for Goyder on 31 October 1991 centred on his concern that the amendments to regulations pre-empted the outcomes from two select committees sitting at that time. This was not correct.

All recommendations of the select committees that were released in late 1991 have been or are being addressed and implemented. The amended regulations resulted from an ongoing review of the subordinate fisheries legislation which

identified a large number of matters requiring amendment, revocation or inclusion in the regulations. In addition, due to the number and extent of amendments, the Government took the opportunity of addressing the requirements under the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978. This resulted principally in a very significant reduction in the amount of subordinate legislation by amalgamating the schemes of management of a number of fisheries—for example, the three separate abalone schemes—into one single scheme.

This resulted in the number of schemes of management being reduced from 19 to 13. It is considered that all the matters raised by the member for Goyder have been addressed, particularly with the passage of the Fisheries Act Amendment Bill in December 1991. The major area of contention at the time was the proposed amendments to section 37 of the Fisheries Act dealing with the ability of the Minister and the Director of Fisheries to amend access arrangements under fisheries licences. This was fully debated during consideration of the Fisheries Act Amendment Bill and was satisfactorily resolved with the incorporation of industry-requested amendments.

Debate adjourned.

*At 8.30 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

### SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).  
(Continued from page 2952.)

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** This is a Bill that one cannot oppose. The Government needs the money to carry on the business of the State. However, I believe that one would be justified, if the numbers were available, in forcing the Government to take a more responsible approach or to get out. There is no doubt that this Government has brought the State to its knees. It has asked in this case for \$860 million to be appropriated to the consolidated account for the Public Service, and the Public Service administers every facet of State Government operations. There is no facet of the operation that one could not talk about in this debate. My colleagues have gone through many of the areas of concern not only to members within this Parliament but to the vast majority of the public, and the opinion polls show that the vast majority of the public do not want the present Government.

I suppose that the greatest group that can create employment is small business. I believe that this Government ignores small business. It has had the opportunity of governing as a Party with a socialist philosophy for most of the past 25 years and it has failed. It has gradually ground the State to a halt. All of us have young and old people coming into our offices saying, 'Do you know how we can get a job?' They then say, 'If we cannot get a job, we want further education; and where do we get further education because there are no places available?' I read a letter into *Hansard* recently on that subject from one very concerned family, but that is only one of many. Three or four years ago, to help the employment situation or the Government's position in that area, we said that we wanted young people to continue at school in order to get a better education. Suddenly, they are all coming into the work force or they want to go on to tertiary education and there are no places. There is no opportunity for them. They cannot get a job and they cannot further their education. What is the Government doing about it? The Minister with responsibility for youth affairs and employment has failed in those areas.

In order to demonstrate the frustration of small business under this Government's administration, I want to read

into *Hansard* a long letter involving a situation that could be found to exist many times over in the State. It describes the sheer frustration of small business and how it has been let down. I refer to a young family who have taken a punt. They explain very well in their language how this Government has failed in administering the State and in giving opportunities for business to prosper, or at least get a reasonable return, and at the same time employ people. The Government has departments which should be looking at this problem and those departments are paid for out of this budget. The letter states:

Dear Sir,

I thank you for a moment of your time. I was going to write to the Department of Labour but decided this course of action was probably better directed.

We operate two small retail businesses in this State, and, like 99 per cent of them, times are tough as we juggle our accounts deciding who can wait for payment and so on. In spite of this country being in this terrible economic plight we continue with ridiculous situations such as 17.5 per cent leave loading, employers paying 3 per cent superannuation above wages (a responsibility laid on our shoulders, no doubt so that the Government will actually receive the money) and rises in pay over the last twelve months when trading is so low.

With these grievances in mind I want to elaborate on one. If we are one business in this position how many more are out there? We employed a 19-year-old last October. We had been working seven days and Thursday evenings with four children, five years and under, and decided they needed more time with their parents, so we hired someone. Due to his inexperience he works from Monday to Friday and not Saturday as that day requires staff with experience. Firstly, because of the way the award is structured we have to pay our staff at a higher rate because we open seven days (or 6 as the award states) regardless of the fact that none of the staff worked outside of Monday to Friday hours.

That is the point that hurts. The letter continues:

The reason that we have to abide by this regardless is that it 'is too open to abuse' otherwise. So, we pay a higher rate—and more super, more workers compensation, more leave loading, etc. etc. Personally we are fed up with the John Martins and Myers of the world controlling what happens in the retail industry. Its fine for them—they trade staff on Saturdays. We need Sunday staff but won't put on staff because of the penalty rates—mind you that'll be fixed when Myers and Johnnies decide to trade Sundays! Now, since we hired this lad, who had been unemployed for over 12 months, a pay rise in the award occurred before his first pay period, followed by a birthday (another rise) and followed by a recent rise from 1 February. He hasn't even been here six months and there's been three rises! Our takings over the last eight months have dropped in excess of \$50 000!

So, what do you think is going to happen? We are going to have to put him back on the dole queue. Great incentive isn't it? We retail products that require a lot of labour and maintenance (being primarily plants). We could do with an additional 4 or 5 more people working for us, but this Government has been allowing rises to occur when many employers are making losses and lucky to take home a full wage themselves weekly. Where is the logic? Are these decision makers living somewhere else? Do they get so out of touch with reality? My 94-year-old grandmother told me that in depression years where labourers were unable to work because of rain etc. they didn't get paid on those days—bosses couldn't afford to pay for a 'no productivity' day. That's a harsh line to take when mortgages still have to be paid but a pinch of this way of thinking would not go astray.

As employers we try to do the right thing, we economise when times are tough, we don't gamble on products that may or may not sell and take each day carefully. But, somewhere up there in this 'unreal' world decisions get made—the phone costs more, the power costs more, the water costs more and the staff cost more. We work our long hard hours sacrificing a lot of family life and nights when sleep doesn't come through worrying—and we ask for what?

Where has reality gone—times are bad and going to get much worse as those of us who are hanging on by the skin of our teeth will just have to let go.

I worked for the Government for eight years before going it alone and in all that time I never learned, as others did, to get used to the waste, to the red tape, or to how the minds of some of the senior public servants worked. I always felt that they all needed time spent doing a real job for a real boss whose whole life depends on how they operate and how hard they work. From

directors to department heads and Ministers, there were probably only one or two of them who would ever have succeeded in private enterprise!

Does each person who sends a letter voicing their objections make an impact? I'd still like to think so.

Hoping my 'drop of water in the bucket' just fills it that little bit more.

Small business is in big trouble, and some big businesses are also in trouble, of course. The situation is serious: you can drive along streets anywhere in Adelaide, in any suburb, rich or poor, and shops and offices there are empty. And walking along the street in front of them are people who are unemployed. Recently I was in a shop at Edwardstown, and a well-dressed young man walked in and said, 'Is there any work?' He was walking from shop to shop. I give him credit for that. He was walking from business to business, and he would have done anything. What does he do when he goes home? I spoke to him, and he said that he wanted to undertake further education, but he could not get in. He cannot get a job, and so he walks looking for one. He is a young man, aged 24, with a wife but no children, and both of them are in the same boat.

I say to the Government and to you, Sir, as an Independent, as well as to others that it is unfair. Things can be done to help if we want to. Some of the moneys we spend on getting advice from consultants and so-called experts—people who call themselves economists—is of no benefit in creating jobs. We would be better off to get away from all the consultants, which cost so much money, the hundreds and thousands and millions of dollars. Let private enterprise employ them if they want to, but we should start building things, whether they be roads, bridges or pipelines to pump the effluent out of catchment areas—or whatever.

The Bannon Government has failed. It has squandered our money and has tonight asked for another \$860 million through this Bill. It has failed because it did not supervise those whom it should have been supervising. They were warned, but they did not have the courage to say, 'What is really going on?' The Premier is a Mr Nice Guy. He does not like the rough and tough decisions; he does not like having to front up to people and say, 'I want to know what is going on. I want you to show me what is going on.' He does not have the courage to do that, because it is not in his makeup. The Premier is a man for smooth waters and easy decisions. What has happened? Those around him ignored the warnings also.

Sir, as each and every one on your side of politics walks out into the streets, I ask them to think about the number of people who have lost their homes, which have been taken over by the banks. The banks have taken everything the people have, because those people's opportunities were taken away. In saying that, later in the grievance debate I will read a letter in relation to Westpac Bank and how ruthless it has been. However, the State Bank should never have been allowed to get into that position. I would not have minded, nor would a lot of South Australians have minded, if the money had been spent here, but the confounded stuff was lost overseas and interstate.

If the money was lost somewhere in South Australia, somebody would have it and might be spending it to create job opportunities, but it was not lost here: it was lost outside the boundaries of the State. I do not think any genuine, traditional, old-time Labor person who believed in the working man and in helping the under-classes—which was its stated philosophy—would accept what happened. This Government, with its Federal colleagues, shook hands with the rich, those who wanted to go and spend big, the so-called top businessmen. But they were not: they were racketeers and paper money players. That is what they were, and the Government was caught out.

Therefore, of course I support the Bill. The money is needed, but I am hurt whenever I think about how it has been squandered, and I do not think there is a member of Parliament on the other side of the House whose constituents would not be disgusted at the way our State has been allowed to collapse. I think that any sensible group on the side opposite that had any sense of morality towards seeing the State prosper would step aside and say, 'Have a go fellas, and see if you can do any better,' because I am sure that nobody could do any worse than what has happened to our State.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Correctional Services):** I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** Being first on my feet in this grievance debate, I have the opportunity to express the opinion that the Premier seems to be treating the House with more than his usual contempt in failing to respond to debate on the Supply Bill. If there is a precedent for that, I will be surprised and, if indeed there is, it is not a proper way to acknowledge the contribution of the Opposition or members of the Government to a debate that is important. We are talking about the expenditure of some \$860 million. The Premier apparently cannot be bothered being present in the House when these matters are discussed. I would have thought that the proposals and the analysis put forward by the Opposition deserved at least a response. The fact that the Premier is not prepared to respond to them is yet more evidence of his total arrogance in the way in which he treats the financial affairs of this State and the role of the Parliament in analysing such financial affairs.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** There was reference on the other side to hatred. In response to that, I and all South Australians cannot come to terms with an attitude of arrogance that is so complete that the Parliament is treated with almost total disregard when it comes to analysis of financial matters.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** On a point of order, Sir, the member for Coles is reflecting on another member, the Premier, who is not present because he is paired with her Leader at a business function.

**The SPEAKER:** The statement that one is treating the Parliament with contempt is an opinion and not a reflection on the member in the direct sense. The member for Coles.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I repeat that the Parliament is the place where the Premier has a responsibility when it comes to his role as Treasurer in responding to a Supply Bill. If he cannot be present, the Minister at the table—the Minister for Finance—could, at the very least, have responded. The substantial part of this debate is already on the *Hansard* record. If the Minister was not able to be in the House to hear the debate, he certainly had the opportunity to analyse the record and respond on that basis. The fact that he has chosen not to do so simply illustrates—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I heard what the Government Whip said, and I am responding to that, namely, that, if the Premier cannot be present (and all of us accept that there are responsibilities), the first responsibility is to the Parliament and there is a duty on behalf of the Minister representing the Premier to act in lieu of the Premier in

responding to the Opposition. The fact this has not been done simply underlines the fact that the Government is treating the Parliament with contempt. That statement cannot be refuted.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Both sides will come to order. The member for Coles.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** If there is time to progress to matters relating to finance, I will deal with the manner in which the Minister of Mines and Energy handled himself at Question Time today. I find it extraordinary that a Minister, who is supposed to be leading the State in policy development as far as demand management goes, is unable to answer what would normally be regarded by any Minister as a Dorothy Dix question.

In December last year the Government released a very interesting and worthwhile policy document entitled Energy Demand Management. One is tempted to ask whether the Minister of Mines and Energy read the document. We have ample evidence that the Minister rarely reads documents; he is certainly unable to recall what he has read if indeed he does read them.

There are 25 major initiatives outlined in the Energy Demand Management report. I asked the Minister, in what I thought was a rather kindly fashion, whether he could nominate perhaps five (out of 25) of the most important initiatives. The Minister disappeared into a fog of words, overlaid with much umming, ahing and sarcasm, and in the space of five minutes with extreme difficulty was able to come up with three—and only three—initiatives.

**Mr Such:** It was hardly a 10 second grab.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** It was hardly a 10 second grab, and it was hardly an impressive performance from a Minister who purports—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** —to be in charge of the Mines and Energy portfolio. I think that any member who is interested in this subject, as many of us are, would have been able to identify one of the most important initiatives as being the establishment of additional cogeneration plants in South Australia which have the potential to save up to 30 per cent of energy use. That in itself should have been the first thing that sprang to the Minister's mind. He was unable to grasp it from the briefing that he presumably had about three months ago, and if indeed he had such a briefing he obviously did not retain very much of what he was told.

I would rate second in importance—and it may not be second but I would rate it as such—the establishment of energy audits which enable industrial and commercial users to identify waste and losses through waste of energy, and to improve the energy efficiency of their plants and their energy use. That very useful service which is provided by Government instrumentalities—an energy audit for industry and commerce—is also proposed to be provided for private consumers, and I would regard that as probably the third most important initiative.

Energy bill information will in future be provided to consumers. This will enable us to monitor the energy we use in our own homes, identify the greediest appliances, identify in which areas we can make the most substantial savings and how we can cut our electricity bills by reducing peak loads. Generally, the service that will be provided to consumers is worthwhile. I would have thought that the Minister might have identified that.

The first item that the Minister was able to drag out of the recesses of his memory was the proposal for appliance

labelling to identify energy-efficient appliances. That indeed is a valuable step and one which I think has been insufficiently promoted. Many of us have stuck with the appliances we purchased years ago and will retain for many years because they are such expensive items. Nevertheless, when new ones are purchased the opportunity to save energy through the benefit of appliance labelling will be very worth while, particularly for young people establishing homes and operating on very small budgets.

Another initiative is the promotion of energy-efficient housing, particularly the promotion of the five star energy rating system for the construction industry, and I would have thought that that would have come readily to mind. The Minister did mention new technologies, and the promotion of those new technologies particularly in respect of light bulbs for domestic and commercial use is something that can have a profound effect on energy bills.

Financial incentive schemes for consumers are dealt with in a very general way in the report. They have not yet been established or implemented, yet they probably represent one of the most powerful motivating forces for consumers in saving energy. What disappoints me is that the Minister, who should be out in the market place promoting this and giving every personal and political support to these work initiatives, cannot even in the House of Assembly identify to the Parliament the initiatives that have been proposed by his own departments and authorities. I regard that as a serious indictment of the Minister, and would urge his colleagues to do their best to try to encourage him, at least, to read and absorb the information provided.

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

**Mr SUCH (Fisher):** The first issue I should like to address relates to the introduction of the transit link from Aberfoyle Park. I was pleased to travel on it last Monday with the Minister, and we arrived safely in town although, perhaps, not as early as we might have done. Nevertheless, it is something that I welcome. However, there is one aspect that concerns me, and that is the introduction of so-called bus lanes on Goodwood Road, which is part of the route traversed by the transit link.

What is of concern about the introduction of the bus lanes, to which I have no objection in principle, is the fact that we now have signs that say 'Bus Lane 7 to 9.30 a.m.' on the in track, yet the introduction of these signs has not been publicised. Motorists travelling in those lanes, other than those turning left, will incur a \$77 on-the-spot fine, yet this innovation has been sprung on the public without adequate education or awareness programs being conducted.

It is even more interesting when we reflect that on 25 September last year, during the Estimates Committee, the General Manager of the STA, in response to a question I directed to the Minister about the transit link said:

However, that will not require bus-only lanes or high occupancy vehicle lanes along Goodwood Road. We can achieve the same thing by an adjustment to traffic signals at the critical bottlenecks and by allowing the buses to what we call queue jump at signals.

What we have is in direct contrast to that. As I say, I have no problem with the concept, but what we have had since last September is a complete change. We now have the introduction of bus-only lanes, but the signs do not indicate that. They do not say 'bus only', nor do they coincide with the clearway times. What is a welcome development in my electorate, in terms of offering a faster service to the city, has one aspect of concern, that is, the introduction of the bus lanes without adequate warning being given to local residents or to the general public. We will have a situation in which motorists will find themselves incurring \$77 on-

the-spot fines for an infringement that has not been publicised.

The second issue to which I should like to refer concerns a young businessman in my electorate by the name of Keith Kwong, who established a restaurant called the Jade Restaurant in Sheidow Park some months ago. In the past four weeks that restaurant has had \$17 000 worth of window damage. The first incident was considered possibly to have had some racial basis but, after another attack this week, which was twice as bad as the attack four weeks ago, it appears that it is the work of hoodlums who are doing this not only to businesses such as the Jade but, I am told, to quite a few other premises.

I will not name those, as I have not spoken to the owners, but I am told on good authority that a car dealer on South Road had 10 heavy plate windows smashed the other night, and restaurants and other premises are similarly being attacked. The consequence for someone such as Keith and his family is that, if this continues, it will put them out of business, because the insurance companies are saying that they will cease insuring unless a proprietor such as Keith installs \$15 000 worth of shades or shutters around his windows. So, here we have someone who has established a business and is working hard, yet confronted with this ongoing problem of people throwing rocks through the windows of his premises. It happened to the premises next door to him as well. The question he posed to me this morning—which is legitimate—is, 'What is our society coming to that we have a situation where hoodlums can go around and literally destroy the businesses that are being established by young people?' I trust that the police will pursue that matter very vigorously and bring to justice the mindless idiots who are doing this, not only in my electorate but also elsewhere.

The next matter I would like to address relates to concessions for war widows. I have a recent letter from a constituent in Aberfoyle Park. Whilst I realise that the war widows' pension itself is a Federal matter, my constituent has pointed out that as a war widow she gets certain concessions but that council and E&WS rates do not offer her concessions. She argues that there is an element of discrimination there, because other pensioners get those concessions but war widows do not. I intend to follow up that matter. I received that letter only today, but here is a woman who has raised four children following the death of her husband at an early age, and she is basically asking for equitable treatment in respect of concessions.

I have had several letters recently regarding the SGIC's using section 124ab (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, by which it is able to recover from the driver of a vehicle an amount up to \$200 in the event of an accident. I am not aware that that provision has been enforced in the past, but I am conscious of the fact that the SGIC is enforcing it vigorously at the moment, because several people have approached me. I question the extent to which the public realise that third party bodily injury insurance does not cover the driver of a vehicle totally and that drivers are liable to incur a financial cost of up to \$200 in the event of an accident. I think that drivers and the public should be made more aware of this, because it appears that SGIC is seeking vigorously to recover that money, as it can do legally under the Act. The next matter I wish to raise is potentially a good news story.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr SUCH:** Yes; they are confusing fractions with factions. The good news story relates potentially to the Marino Golf Club at Reynella, which is seeking to use stormwater

run-off to irrigate its greens and fairways. A preliminary assessment by the Department of Agriculture suggests that it is more than feasible to do that. It has carried out a preliminary on-site analysis that suggests that a club such as the Marino Golf Club could more than save its current water bill cost by utilising stormwater run-off in the vicinity of that area. I have written to the Minister of Water Resources and I am sure that, given her publicly stated commitment to the better use of stormwater, her department will respond positively to what I believe is a very positive and worthwhile initiative by the Marino Golf Club.

Of course, it is in the club's financial interest to do this, but it is also in the interests of all of us, environmentally, to make better and more productive use of our stormwater run-off. I look forward to the Minister responding in a positive way, as indeed the Department of Agriculture has responded, in terms of trying to better utilise what is currently seen as waste water for the purposes of irrigating not only the greens but also the fairways at Marino Golf Club. I trust that that concept can be extended.

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

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** The Labor Government introduced Medicare to provide a universal and equitable system of health insurance for all Australians. It is a health scheme in which all people are able to gain access to medical and hospital treatment. The Government has accepted the responsibility to provide a mechanism that ensures access to health services on the basis of need rather than capacity to pay.

Under Labor, health care is a right and not a privilege, but I am horrified that the Hewson Liberal Party is planning to dismantle Medicare and to introduce a privately run health care system, should it be elected. Under the Liberals, payment to the States for health services will be scrapped. Public hospitals will be privatised, and people will be forced to take out expensive private health insurance.

Once again, the poor and disadvantaged will be forced to rely on Government hand-outs in the form of vouchers so that they can purchase basic health cover from private insurers. Health care will become the responsibility of private entrepreneurs whose aims will be to make profits at the cost of people's health. We live in a capitalist economy supported by a democratic political system.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair assumes that the honourable member is not reading his speech.

**Mr FERGUSON:** No, Sir, I have copious notes.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** As long as the honourable member assures the Chair that that is the case.

**Mr FERGUSON:** They are absolutely copious notes, Sir. This system has many advantages, perhaps the most important being the freedom to fight equity and social justice. Medicare is the most dramatic example of success in the struggle to create a more just and fairer Australia. Let it be said that equity and social justice will be abandoned under a Liberal Government and that we will lapse into barbarism in the name of market forces. One needs only to look at the American health system to realise that privatisation has been disastrous—

**Mr SUCH:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It sounds to me as if the honourable member is reading his speech.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has asked for an assurance that the member for Henley Beach is not reading his speech.

**Mr FERGUSON:** No, Sir, I have copious notes.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member is not permitted by custom and practice to read his speech, and I remind him of that.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I hope that applies equally to everyone, Sir.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The rules of the House are enforced by the Chair equally.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I am very pleased to hear that, Sir. One only needs to look at the American health system to realise that privatisation has been disastrous for the people of that country. Extracts from the January 1988 *Washington Post* support my statement; it reveals that 35 million to 37 million Americans do not have any kind of health cover at all and that most of these people are employed. They do not earn enough to pay for expensive health insurance, but they earn too much to be eligible for Government assistance.

Moreover, the Government assistance that is available covers only 65 per cent of medical costs for the elderly. MEDICAID, the supposed safety net for poorer people below retirement age, provides cover for only 40 per cent of the population in poverty. It is also estimated that another 20 million Americans cannot afford to buy adequate health insurance that will cover the cost of hospitalisation or treatment for long-term illness. They are appalling statistics for a health system that is controlled by private interests where the creation of wealth is more important than the provision of quality health care for all. Such a system should not even be considered, but the Liberal Party has announced that this is the future for health care in Australia if it becomes the Government.

It wants our hospitals to compete for patients, doctors to compete for clients and private insurers to compete for subscriptions. This will supposedly reduce cost and improve the quality of health care in Australia. But internationally comparisons show that public health systems are cheaper, more efficient and provide a better quality of health care than private ones. America, with a private system, spends a much higher proportion of its gross domestic product on health care than any other country. For example, the United States spends 11.1 per cent of its GDP on health care while the United Kingdom and Australia, with public systems, spend only 6.2 per cent and 8 per cent of their GDP on health programs. The administrative costs of private health insurers are also considerably greater than the administrative expenses of Medicare. Before the introduction of our universal insurance scheme, the management expenses of private funds cost 14.8 per cent on average. The corresponding expenses for Medicare in its first year of operation were only 4.7 per cent.

Infant mortality in America is also considerably greater than in Australia, Canada or the United Kingdom, which countries have supposedly socialist health policies. America is supposed to be the most advanced country in the world, yet millions of Americans do not have access to health care and it has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the developed world. The trouble with the Liberal Party is that it is more concerned about rhetoric than reality. It believes that the free market and competition will lead to efficiency and freedom. But what about the millions of Americans who do not have health cover? For them, private health care means no health care.

The use of such high level principles to dress up their proposal is merely a fantasy invoked by the Liberals to justify a policy that will reinforce the inequalities between those who can and cannot pay. Of all the goods and services provided by our economic system, health services are the least suitable to be left to the competitive market. Health

care markets are not the same as commodity markets. The demand for medical care is irregular and unpredictable. Many people are often unaware of their need for medical services. Illness may occur suddenly, and one may not be in a position to choose between the range of health services available, and the cost of treatment cannot be predicted in advance. The basic weakness with any market analogy in health is that seeking medical services is not like going shopping. It is essential to maintain the presence of the public sector in the area of health in Australia. If we do not, the profit motive will become more important than the provision of a quality service; available to all.

A study conducted on health expenditures in the United States, which was published in the winter 1989 edition of the *New Doctor* journal, came to the following conclusion:

So far . . . market forces have been less successful in containing the growth of health care expenditures than were the regulatory efforts of the 1970s.

Further information supplied by Peter Abelson in his study on privatisation revealed that for profit hospitals in America provided more costly care than public hospitals. They charged, on average, 10 per cent more than non-profit hospitals. But Abelson did conclude that 'U.S. private hospitals did achieve their main objective, namely, to increase profits'. The high proportion of gross domestic product used on health care in America is driven not by a desire to provide a high quality service, but to reap an ever increasing profit.

In a private system, there will be no controls on health providers increasing charges or cutting services to maximise profits. Health care will become a business, and patients will be only a commercial proposition for their doctors. Economic considerations will, therefore, become more prominent in the doctor's relationship with the patient. When a doctor suggests further treatment, it might have more to do with the doctor's financial condition than the patient's medical condition. The rich will get treatment that they do not need, and the poor will lose out with under-treatment.

**Mr SUCH:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The reading of this speech is tending to put me to sleep and I believe it is contrary to Standing Orders.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Chair understands that the member for Henley Beach is not reading the speech but referring to copious notes; the Chair accepts his assurance. Let us hope that he has given a copy of his copious notes to *Hansard*. The member for Henley Beach.

**Mr FERGUSON:** Thank you, Sir. Under a private system, hospitals and doctors will be allowed to advertise their services to attract the health dollar. This will only reduce the medical profession to a buy-one get-one-free mentality. Privatisation will result in the degradation of the medical profession with catastrophic consequences for the public. It is only through the continuation of Medicare that the provision of health care in Australia will continue to be accessible to all. The Liberal Party has shown its true colours yet again. Its threat to dismantle a health care system, which ensures the delivery of quality health services to rich and poor alike in favour of a private health system accessible only to those who have the means to pay, makes a mockery of its pretensions to equity and justice. Any political Party which proposes a policy that will see the end of Medicare can only be treated with suspicion and contempt.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Henley Beach should avoid displays in the House.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** I think that every member of the House who listened to the member for Henley Beach will congratulate him on a wonderful

lesson in speed reading; I think it is the first time I have heard a 20-minute speech compressed into 10 minutes. Well done!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I did not understand the latter half of it because it was a little too fast, as members on this side of the House are saying. I refer to the comments that I was making earlier this afternoon on the Supply Bill. Time expired when I was in mid-sentence. I was saying that the Government and the Premier claimed to be ignorant of the financial ills besetting major financial institutions in South Australia. I simply say that if that were true—and I am not saying that it is—it highlights even more this Government's inability and unfitness to continue governing, because the Government should have known of those problems, having been made aware of them by the Opposition for such a long time. Certainly, members on this side of the House were concerned if the Government was not.

I want also to resume the comments I was making in relation to honesty in time of crisis. If the Government and the major institutions had been more honest both before and after the major calamities besetting the State Bank and other institutions were announced, an even greater degree of public confidence might have been instilled. However, documents that were circulated—for example, by the Beneficial Finance Corporation—did not do anything for me. That company expected the public to ask 25 questions to which it supplied 25 answers. Question 2 is as follows:

Is Beneficial about to go broke?

The answer is:

Definitely not. In line with other banks, finance companies and other financial intermediaries, the State Bank Group (including Beneficial) has suffered particularly badly from the economic recession and the near depression conditions in the property market.

That answer has nothing to do with the types of investment which were made and which it is patently obvious were bad investments. The answer continues:

We are indeed fortunate that our ultimate owner, the State of South Australia, has provided outstanding support by way of an indemnity agreement which effectively compensates us for any losses which might result from loans on our books. All loans on our books at 7 February 1991 are covered. These represent the great bulk of assets today.

I like that word 'assets' because they have certainly become liabilities. As all members know, \$1 billion worth of liability has been transferred to the State Bank and to the taxpayers of South Australia for them to cover. Question 3 is as follows:

What is going to happen to Beneficial? Will the company be absorbed by State Bank in the short run?

The answer is:

There is no question that Beneficial will be much closer to the bank in future.

That is an understatement. The answer continues:

We already share some support services, have a common Treasury and very similar boards of directors. Although it is a separate legal entity, Beneficial acts a little bit like a division of the bank. It even sources some business which is written directly on to the bank's balance sheet. These trends are likely to continue and strengthen. Several key Beneficial executives are senior executives of the bank.

I should say that our major competitors (which have also reported disappointing performances) are all moving much closer to their parent banks. It would not surprise me if some were fully absorbed in the future. This is not likely to happen to Beneficial for some time at least.

Again, that is an understatement. Beneficial has more than been absorbed. I am simply commenting on those, because these are the types of statements that were being made by major organisations.

The bank also sent me a copy of its questions and answers for the State Bank staff. I shall not go through all 28, but one struck me particularly. Question 17 is as follows:

Will the bank repay the State Government for its indemnity?

That indemnity, of course, is \$2.2 billion; say, 10 per cent interest, \$220 million per annum. The answer is:

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

I have some comment to make on that. The bank itself would have been well aware that its total profit for the past five years has been nowhere near sufficient to cover one year's interest on that massive loan which the taxpayers of South Australia, through the Treasurer, have made to the bank. At least it is a guarantee; it is the taxpayers' or the State's guarantee. Why does the bank put in a specious statement like that when obviously it will be almost impossible of realisation?

Of course, there are other questions. Why do State Bank executives get paid so much; why are there so many? I was asking this question of senior bank executives two years before. When I asked why they did not publish the salary bands, they said, 'We do not have to.' However, public companies did have to publish them. It is one law for one group and a different law for another group. A number of senior bankers in South Australia have been surveying the financial scene, as they do intermittently every two or three months, analysing how one bank is operating compared with another.

Another matter of concern seems to be emerging in this State. At least some senior bankers have contacted me to express their concern at the way that the State Bank is operating even now. We had understood that the major institutions in South Australia belonging to or controlled by the Government had been lending inadvisedly—unwisely. The comment that was made to me only yesterday by a banker was that they had been looking at the State Bank which is offering 8 per cent to investors when the average around the State is about 7.25 per cent. There is a difference of .75 per cent in what the State Bank will offer. The State Bank is also offering borrowers about 2 per cent below what other banks are offering borrowers. Housing mortgages issued by the State Bank are among the lowest to be found anywhere.

The simple comment that was made to me, which is almost incontrovertible, is that the bank appears not to have learnt from its previous exercises over the past few years. It is still buying dear and selling cheap. There does not appear to be a road to profit in that. The major concern for the South Australian taxpayer is that the bank can still say that it is guaranteed by the State—by the taxpayer—so that other banks in South Australia feel that their clients, as taxpayers, are to some extent subsidising the clients of the State Bank while at the same time they are disadvantaged because their banks are trading more realistically.

I wonder whether the State Bank is in such a position that it feels it has to keep on buying business or whether it will come up with the argument that we are now looking after South Australians and offering South Australians the best terms. On the surface, okay, but will the bank survive buying dear and selling cheap? It has never been an acceptable business practice, and I ask the Premier, his Cabinet and the executives of the State Bank to consider what they are doing, the types of arguments they were promulgating amongst the Opposition, and the almost veiled threats they were making to the Opposition when we were making inquiries about the bank's activities. At least I took some

of the letters that I received as a member of Parliament with a duty to inquire as covert threats.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Albert Park.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Earlier today in the grievance debate, I raised the matter of the anger of a constituent from Woodville West who related to me in writing how a car that she had purchased at auction was subsequently repossessed by the police on 9 January last. In expressing my concern to the appropriate Minister, I sought a response from him in relation to the assistance that would be provided by the Government to address this very important problem. It must be particularly galling for any person to purchase a car for approximately \$6 000, especially at an auction, only to find that some 15 months later the police knock on her door and repossess the car. I faxed to the Minister the particulars of this case and, for the record, received the following response which I shall read into *Hansard*. The Minister's advice stated:

1. An attempt to address the practice by thieves of taking the compliance plate and identifiers from a wrecked or written off vehicle was made in January 1991.

2. This is an agreement that insurance companies would advise the Registrar of Motor Vehicles when a vehicle was wrecked or considered an economic loss.

3. Where the Registrar of Motor Vehicles is advised a vehicle was wrecked or written off, then that information is recorded against the record of that vehicle. If that vehicle is subsequently re-presented for registration, the vehicle is physically inspected to confirm both the identity of the unit and the structural integrity and roadworthiness.

4. Unfortunately, not all insurers have complied with the agreement.

5. It appears to many that a solution is to simply remove or deface the compliance plates when a vehicle is wrecked or written off. However, should the vehicle be legitimately rebuilt and re-presented for registration, then there are no identifiers to establish the history of the vehicle.

To introduce a practice of allowing vehicles without compliance plates to be introduced to the registration system is not desirable.

6. The preferred approach is for the compliance plate to remain with the vehicle for the life of the vehicle and to introduce procedures that prevent stolen vehicles from being registered under identities taken from wrecked and stolen vehicles.

7. The Government is considering legislation that would require insurers and owners to advise the Registrar of Motor Vehicles when a vehicle is wrecked or written off. These vehicles would then be physically inspected before being approved for registration.

I appreciate the correspondence from the Minister. However, I am concerned that, where a constituent has taken what she believes in this case is every reasonable action to protect herself and her investment—particularly through auctioneers—she has found that her purchase was illegal. That raises in my mind very important issues. My constituent's problems, which she related to me—and which I do not want to record in *Hansard*—have been compounded by the considerable distress caused by other illegal actions involving herself and other members of her family.

Going back many years, I can remember raising in the Estimates Committees—if my memory serves me correctly, it was with the then Minister of Labour, the Hon. Jack Wright—the issue of a national registration scheme for motor vehicles, but such a scheme has not been implemented. Information I have received today from my constituents, particularly from the Motor Trade Association, indicates their very strong criticism of the State Government in not providing such a scheme. I believe that any constituent who purchases a motor vehicle should have that particular protection. The MTA states:

MTA strongly argues that car auctions must be licensed as car dealers. Government does not agree, insisting that auctions offer cheaper cars on a 'buyer beware' basis.

Whilst I do not disagree that people such as ourselves would be aware of what 'buyer beware' means, in my opinion the average Joe Bloggs in the community has very little, if any, understanding of what 'buyer beware' means in legal terms. Whilst it may well be that they should know or understand what 'buyer beware' means, unfortunately, time and time again we see repeatedly—particularly through our electorate offices—instances of people complaining that they have been conned or trapped into investing their money, only to find that they have lost money they can ill afford—indeed, their life savings in many cases.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** It may be well for my colleagues to jest about this, but it is not something that I jest about, because it is a very serious matter, with people, particularly this person who is a sole parent, losing a lot of money. We purport to represent the average person in the community, and it is important we ensure protection for these people.

A national stolen car register is very important and, as I illustrated in my earlier contribution, it is something that has not been agreed to by the States. I think that is most unfortunate because, in my view, the criminal element is exploiting these particular situations. Over the years allegations have been made to me—and one case readily springs to mind, although I could not get any proof—that stolen cars were being transported interstate, and that the people who drove those vehicles interstate, between Melbourne and Adelaide, made a lot of money out of that rort. I could never prove that and, of course, it is unfortunate that so many rorts have occurred.

My constituent further alleges in discussion that something like \$800 000 worth of motor cars have been stolen in the past four months. That is very sobering. This gives an extraordinary dimension to the problems confronting South Australians. The Minister has advised me that the Government is considering legislation. I appreciate that, and I hope that the Government hastens to solve the problem. If it were you or I, Sir, we would squeal like stuck pigs, but the average person in the electorate has had to put up with this problem.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** This afternoon I made a speech criticising the Government for its performance in this State. I do not get any joy from coming into this place and reminding members and the people of South Australia of what the Government has done. Tonight I wish to take a different tack and read to the Parliament a poem which indicates very well what the people of this State feel. The poem was sent to me by my accountant, and was written by Mr Derek Sutcliffe, from Mount Crawford. It is an adaption of A.A. Milne's *Christopher Robin* and is adapted to South Australia's current circumstances. It goes like this:

Little man kneels at the foot of the bed  
His cares and his problems cause pain in his head,  
Hush, Hush, please don't despair,  
Christopher Bannon is saying a prayer.  
God Bless SAFA and State Bank too  
Please keep secret, all that they do,  
Although there is brewing one hell of a row  
Don't let it happen—at least not right now.  
I can see there's a dressing-down heading my way  
Please will you send it far far away?  
Forget about Scrimber, WorkCover and Crime  
(I haven't been naughty for quite a long time).  
Make Voter's memories terribly short  
If I do wrong I don't want to get caught  
Now, what was the other—not SGIC . . .  
Oh, now I remember, God Bless MFP  
Little man tires, enough has been said,  
Blows out the candle and jumps into bed.  
Hush, Hush, whisper who dares,  
Christopher's dreaming of life without cares.

As simple as it may sound, that poem says a lot. The people of South Australia have now become accustomed to a Government that is not performing and that worries me greatly. In today's paper we see the forecast that the next election will deliver only 11 members of the present Government back to Opposition. That is not good for any prospective Government in this State. I really mean that; it does not make for good government and many colleagues opposite, many for whom I have great respect, will not be here. They stand in this place at the moment and put on a very brave face. I wonder why they do not do something about it in order to try to cling—and build up their numbers from 11 to at least 15 or 16 seats. Mr Sutcliffe, for example, took a lot of trouble to write that poem. The people of South Australia are obviously thinking deeply about these matters.

I refer now to a problem that has become prominent in my district, namely the shacks at Fisherman Bay. Many members have been to Fisherman Bay. It is the epitome of a beach shack area—the working man's holiday area. The owners of the shacks are very angry at the letters they have been receiving from the Minister's office. I have received more than 50 letters, and I presented a petition to Parliament last week on this matter.

Some of these people are being slugged with an increase of over 400 per cent, and when you add that to the huge increase in council rates, which they never paid before, it is just not fair. Most of these shacks have power, but little else. There is no road to a lot of them and they drive through the paddocks to get to them. These shacks are not transferable or resaleable, yet the Minister whacks on a 400 per cent increase in dues.

Most of these people are Labor voters. I have known them all my life, and they are great people. The shacks have been in their families for many generations. When I went down there on New Year's Eve to enjoy myself, as I always do, I ran slap-bang into a political meeting: they had got together to speak to me when I got there. Apart from subduing my New Year's Eve, I was quite struck with the emotion. I told them what our policy was, and I have to say that they were very happy about that.

If there are to be increases, I ask the Minister to at least make those increases reasonable. One hundred per cent would have been bad enough, but not 400 per cent. I know that most members have been to Fisherman Bay. These are just little tin shacks, they are very simple things and for many people this is the only holiday they can afford. The Government is extracting the maximum from people who cannot afford it just to pay Mr Bannon's bills. These people have been told that the shacks have been revalued. I ask every member: how can you value something that is not transferable and cannot be sold? Although the shacks have been there for generations, they are of a very basic standard.

I am doing all I can, but I am being continually frustrated. I cannot do much apart from standing in this House and telling members opposite that this is the situation. When members opposite next go to Fisherman Bay they should talk to their colleagues about it and tell them what they think. I know the member for Stuart would know what I am talking about. It is a lovely little spot. I think it is most unfair that the community at Fisherman Bay should be singled out for this heavy-handed treatment, just to get a few dollars to prop up the Government's ailing coffers. I am very offended by it, and will do all I can, but there is not much I can do. I remind members that these are ordinary, every-day South Australians, who are being fleeced to pay the Government's debts. Many of them are the constituents of members opposite. They come from all over South Australia, many from the Elizabeth area.

I did appreciate the speech tonight from the member for Davenport when he spoke about small business. On Monday I ventured into Tanunda, and I was honoured to be shown around the premises of E. H. Hage of Tanunda—a wellknown, long-established General Motors franchise in this State. I was visibly moved to see the way in which some people will tackle the problems that we have. Mr Malcolm Hage has spent a fortune upgrading his showroom and his entire enterprise, to keep the dollars coming in and his employees happy, and he has over 30 of them. He has employed a new accountant to make sure his business is as slick as it can be.

However, when we talked quietly and confidentially in his office I found out that his figures are not lining up. He said, 'What do I do with my 32 employees in a town like Tanunda?' I give credit to Mr Hage for doing what he has done in these times, and many companies are in the same position. As the member for Davenport said earlier, the companies are doing the right thing—they are out there fighting. I ask the Government to give them a chance, to get off their backs and to get the WorkCover levy back to a reasonable level. I am sure that Mr Hage will nearly break himself to keep those people in employment, as he is a major employer in Tanunda. I plead with the Government to give this man, who has been doing the right thing by his employees and the community, a fair go.

As I said this afternoon, there are many companies like that, such as Shearers in Kilkenny and Horwood in Manum. So many companies are in trouble, particularly with the State Bank. I will put a little bit of history to this Parliament. Early this century farmers and businessmen in this State got together to create a bank to provide an avenue for people in this State to invest in their State, and they called it the State Bank.

The prime mover in that instance was one W.J. Venning—my great-grandfather. That was a very successful venture in providing the people of South Australia with money to invest in their own State. When you compare that to the record today, you realise that 60 per cent of the non-performing debts of the State Bank today are out of the State and only three per cent are rural in this State. Let us look at the history books. Those people had the right idea: encourage South Australians to invest in the State; get people moving again and bite the bullet. We have deep problems and, if the Government wished to take that difficult decision, I am sure that I and all members of the Opposition would offer to take a bipartisan approach, because we are all hurting. To suggest that we are point scoring for the sake of it is really a shallow victory.

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

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

Motion carried.

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** For the past two days we have had a totally negative debate from members opposite on this Supply Bill. We have heard again all the old clichés and all the whingeing of the past 12 months. Of course, we have not heard anything at all positive from members opposite. The other feature of this debate that we have endured—and that is what it is for members on this side of the House who have had to listen to the cracked record of the totally negative whingeing of members of the Opposition—is the hypocrisy of members opposite, on the one hand calling for more expenditure on their favourite topics, with every shadow Minister calling for more expenditure or criticising

any Government cutbacks in their particular area yet, on the other, these hypocrites had the gall to stand up and say that we should be cutting the State debt and should be doing more to cut back on services.

I should like to say something about what the Opposition really believes in terms of services. We have had a lot of these bleeding heart comments from members opposite about health, welfare and so on, and they have accused this Government of making cutbacks in those areas. But this is what the Federal Opposition, in its much-touted fight-back package, had to say on welfare. Under the subheading 'Why Labor's policy has failed—welfare', it states:

The fact that about one Australian in three receives some form of Government benefit points not to the generosity of the system but to the fact that too many people receive welfare.

That is the view of members opposite. The document continues in the same chapter:

The latest Auditor-General's Report claims, for instance, that Department of Social Security and Commonwealth Employment Service staff have not achieved planned savings by enforcing the work test for unemployment beneficiaries. It is this kind of failure which helps to breed the culture of dependence which is so hard to break and so socially divisive.

They are saying to unemployment beneficiaries that those poor people who are now unemployed are not being persecuted enough by public servants. The document then goes on to say:

The minimum award wage is a little over \$300 a week. Yet an unemployed person, married with two secondary school age children, receives \$329 a week in benefits. Higher wages for unskilled jobs would send even more of our companies broke and price more of our work force out of work.

In other words, members opposite are saying that we should be paying people less and cutting welfare. That is their solution to the problems we have at the moment, yet at the same time these people can stand up in this House and criticise this Government when it makes cuts to services. What hypocrites they are!

The other thing I should like to address in this debate is the question of debt, about which we have heard much from members opposite. I should like to remind them of some figures that were pointed out in the budget. These figures are the percentage of gross State product in debt. Even allowing for the debt of the State Bank, which has been absorbed into the budget, as a percentage of gross State product it is 23.3 per cent. And what was it previously? It was 61.2 per cent under the Playford Government, and it is now down to 23.3 per cent. What was it in 1982, the last year of the Tonkin Liberal Government? It was 23.5 per cent. Even with the State Bank, the State debt as a percentage of gross State product is less now than it was under the Tonkin Liberal Government.

However, we never hear facts like that from members opposite. All they can do is concoct some of the nonsense that they have done. They also fail to point out that our net debt per capita is lower than in Western Australia, Tasmania and Victoria among other States yet, to listen to these members opposite, one would think that the State's debts were catastrophic. I think one of the sickest things is that members opposite are actually taking delight in this recession. One can almost see in their faces how they enjoy talking about how bad things are. Yet they have the gall to talk about confidence and say that what we need is more confidence. I suggest that nothing could be more calculated to remove confidence than the sort of negative criticism we have heard from members opposite.

I would like to quote from an article in the *Adelaide Advertiser* of Monday 6 January by Austin Donnelly. It is about time this House heard some of the positive things

that can be said about Australia's place in the world economy. The article reads:

Many politicians and others have persuaded the public that the Australian economy is approaching disaster. They have done this by repeating untrue statements for so long that many of them tend to become accepted as true.

How true that is of the statements of members opposite. The article continues:

At the very time when so many people were telling us that the long-term picture was so black that we needed the GST and associated packages to get it right again, a leading United States magazine was publishing completely different views.

In a survey, the magazine *Money* ranked Australia second to the United States among 16 of the better developed countries with at least five million residents. Japan was 7th, West Germany 8th, Switzerland 10th and Britain 15th. So much for the so-called economic miracle of the Thatcher years.

Of course, that is the policy that members opposite are advocating. The article further states:

There is also good news in the way in which Australian exports of manufactured goods and services have increased in the past five years, even after allowing for a dip due to the recession.

In this important area, Australia is near the top of the OECD countries. From a long-term point of view this is most encouraging because it means we will be a lot less affected by movements in volatile world commodity markets than in earlier years.

**Mr Brindal:** When was that written?

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** Earlier this year, for the benefit of the member for Hayward. Later, the article states:

Within the past two months, stevedoring companies have reported gains of about 60 per cent in productivity on the waterfront. That is an improvement few would have thought possible.

That was brought about under this Government. Those problems on the waterfront go back at least 60 years. The Federal Liberal Governments did nothing, even though they were in office for most of that period. The article continues:

In many other industries, there have been substantial improvements in work practices, including the elimination of demarcation disputes.

I could read a lot more from this article, but perhaps I will just finish with this last quote from it:

Eight years ago, with inflation of 11 per cent and unemployment of more than 10 per cent, the discomfort index was at 21 per cent.

That, of course, was at the time of the Tonkin Liberal Government in South Australia and the Federal Fraser Government. The article continues:

Today, with unemployment of about 10.5 per cent and inflation of about 3.4 per cent—

and it is actually lower now than when this article was written—

the total is under 14 per cent. Despite our problems, which are similar in many other countries, we have a lot to be confident about...

So, I think members opposite fail to realise—perhaps it would be true to say that they do not want to realise—that the recession is a worldwide phenomenon. It is certainly not unique to this country, as we can see when we look at the problems of banks, for example. Throughout this country there is \$30 billion in bank bad debts, yet one would think if one listened to members opposite that only the State Bank had problems. Indeed, in the United States there is over one trillion dollars lost from savings and loans in that country, which is far more massive than any problems in this country.

It has been a worldwide problem because of the opening up of the world financial markets, yet members opposite are quite ignorant of this, and the danger is that, if these members are so ignorant of what is really occurring and what has caused these problems, it therefore follows that they must be quite incapable of addressing the problems. The fact is that members opposite really do not have any

answers at all. The only thing I heard in the two days of negative debate from the members opposite was that we should sell off the State Bank.

What has happened in New South Wales? I refer to an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of Wednesday 8 January. It states:

Mr Greiner has suggested that the bank [the State Bank of New South Wales] is unlikely to be sold or floated for up to two years. This is due to the depressed price the Government would be likely to receive in the current market.

Mr Greiner is smart enough to realise that it would be absolute folly to try to sell off State assets in the current market. In spite of that members opposite, and the Leader of the Opposition in particular, find that that is their only answer, in spite of the fact that it would be quite a stupid policy for them to adopt.

The Opposition has no answers. It is certainly easy, at a time when we are at the bottom of the world recession, for those members to criticise this Government, but the fact is that they have no alternative plan at all. It is unfortunate that I do not have enough time left to go through some of the positive measures suggested by the State Government in its submission to the Commonwealth Government before the economic statement to be delivered next week.

If members opposite were to read that, they would see much detail and perhaps they would get some positive ideas to address the difficult economic situation in which we find ourselves. But certainly the negative statements that we have heard over the past two days do absolutely nothing at all to help this State.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Bright.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** After the disgraceful speech just given by the member for Mitchell in this place, it is fitting to remind him that speeches given in this House are recorded in *Hansard* and, regrettably for the member for Mitchell, speeches of that nature may well come back to haunt him. In relation to things that may come back to haunt, it is interesting at this juncture to reflect on the press release issued by the Premier on 5 August 1990. That press release was headed '\$1.8 billion Liberal spending spree does not add up, says Premier.' The press release issued by the Premier implied that Liberal members dream up vague wish lists of expenditure items that the Government should meet, but nothing could be further from the truth.

At the time I challenged the Premier's outrageous claims in this Parliament on 9 August 1990 and dismissed them one by one with supporting evidence. His press release accused Opposition members of irresponsibly requesting a total of \$1 821 064 000 since the first eight months of 1990. If we exclude \$1 419 billion that was outrageously attributed to my colleague the member for Bragg for urging investigation into the feasibility of building dual highways between major cities, we are left with a more realistic balance of \$402.64 million attributed to both my colleagues and I for a total of 31 expenditure items.

Interestingly, of that remaining figure the member for Fisher and I were collectively attributed with 13 items totalling \$294.5 million, in other words 73 per cent. And with justification because, prior to our being elected to Parliament, under Labor members our electorates were neglected. Those Labor members, along with three others, were quite rightfully unceremoniously dumped from their seats in the 1989 State election.

It is interesting to look at the items that were attributed to me and see what progress has been made on those expenditure requests despite the Premier's outrageous statements. I will address them one by one. One request was for the building of a new school in the Karrara subdivision at

Hallett Cove. It became known as the Hallett Cove East Primary School and the Premier claimed that I was requesting a school to the value of \$3.3 million to be built.

The Minister of Education, who is sitting here on the front bench tonight, is well aware that, despite the Premier's criticism of my requesting that expenditure, the school has now been built. With the use of this forum to air public desire to have the school built, and to highlight the need and justify it, coupled with community pressure, then despite the Premier's opposition that school has now been built.

It is interesting to look at another item that I requested associated with the same school. I was accused of asking for \$150 000 for pick up and set down facilities.

That sort of facility was against Education Department policy, and the department was absolutely adamant, after it had finally been forced to build the school, that there was no way in the world that it would provide pick up and set down facilities. Again, with the use of this Parliament, the grievances aired by my constituents and public pressure that pick up and set down facility has been provided. I am pleased to see that the member for Napier is smiling. In all fairness, I give the honourable member, in his role as Chairman of the Public Works Committee, credit for ensuring that justice was done and assisting the community in its endeavours to get that pick up and set down facility.

It is also interesting to look at the third item on the list. I was accused of requesting expenditure of some \$120 000 to provide a bus to transport students from Hallett Cove to Seaview High. Once again, in spite of the Premier's opposition, and again as a result of community grievances being aired, that bus has been provided. However, it does not stop there. I was also accused of asking for the provision of education to year 12 at the Hallett Cove school. The Minister of Education sitting here tonight is fully aware of the thousands of signatures that were presented to this Parliament. Again, with the use of community pressure and the forum of this Chamber, that aim has been achieved: that school will have classes to year 12, in spite of the Premier's criticism.

Regrettably, there are still some items left on my list. I am happy to stand up and be counted and to continue to request those items. One of the items I was accused of requesting was the bringing forward of the construction schedule for the third arterial road. That request involved the expenditure of \$90 million. I have already presented one motion to this Parliament shortly after my election and there is another one on the Notice Paper. I stand by my request for that expenditure, because something has to be done about the burden on the existing arterial roads so as to enable southern residents to access easily metropolitan Adelaide and our city centre.

Another request attributed to me was for the expenditure of \$500 000 for a pedestrian underpass beneath Lonsdale Road. Lonsdale Road is featured in many subsequent requests I have made in this Parliament, including the erection of traffic lights, the reduction of speed limits and pedestrian underpasses. I am pleased to say that, once again, despite the Premier's opposition, this week I received correspondence from the Minister of Transport advising me that the speed limit on that road will be reduced from 100 km/h to 90 km/h. Indeed, that is a compromise and I would like to see more done. However, it is a good start and I am pleased to acknowledge that the Minister of Transport, in finally coming to that decision, is at last making some step forward. Once again, the community is to be commended for its persistence which has assisted me in airing grievances to this Chamber to ensure that these things happen.

There is one other item attributed to me. Whilst I would like to claim credit for it, I did not actually request it. The Premier attributed to me a request for the spending of \$80 000 for lights at the junction of Neath Avenue and Seacombe Road. Again, those lights have now been installed, despite the Premier's criticism. So, perhaps there is an interesting lesson in that for the member for Mitchell. I was slammed for making seven expenditure requests. Five of those requests have now been met; one has now been partially met; and I could claim that the one remaining has been partially met because the Minister of Transport has announced the construction of the third arterial road. However, in fairness, I have claimed in this Chamber that what he has announced is not really a third arterial road, it is more a Mickey Mouse perimeter proposal.

Much can be achieved from opposition in this Chamber and much can certainly be achieved when Labor members are removed from their electorates—Labor members who were too gutless to ask for decisions to be made or to stand up on behalf of their constituents and ask for progress. One classic example can be seen in the education portfolio. I refer to Seaview High School, a cobbled together proposal combining the Seacombe campus in the pre-1989 marginal seat of Bright with the Dover campus in the pre-1989 marginal seat of Hayward. Neither of those members advocated that one of those schools should go.

One of the first things that I did upon election to my position as a representative of the people was to talk to the Principal of that school. We set about formulating a program to get rid of one of those campuses and to build one decent school on one site. I commend the Minister of Education for listening to reason and for announcing formally last week that once again Seaview High will become a single school campus and that a substantial building program will take place on that site. Had my predecessor had the courage to stand up for his electorate and to do something about the problem, he could have achieved that.

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

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Quite a few words have been said in this place over the past two weeks about preselections, mainly by way of attacks on the problems that the Labor Party has been experiencing in its preselection process. I want to bring to the attention of the House some of the more devious tricks that have been undertaken by certain members. I am not referring to members in this House but to members of the opposite political persuasion. I refer to the new seat of Colton. In 1979, Bob Randall won the seat from my colleague the member for Henley Beach.

**Mr Ferguson:** It was a fair fight, too.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** It was a fair fight. Bob Randall conducted his campaign quite fairly. It was unfortunate that some of the more devious members of the Liberal Party attacked my colleague the member for Henley Beach, who lost his seat. However, he worked hard to get it back in a subsequent election in 1982. Bob Randall, who lost that election, did not quit in a fit of pique: he worked hard and honestly to try to get preselection for the seat of Henley Beach. He was the sitting member for three years. I did not like his politics then and I still do not like his politics. It would be hypocritical of me if I were to say that Bob Randall was a friend of mine. He was a colleague in this House but he was not a friend. Afterwards, Bob Randall went into local government. Whilst I have lost contact with a lot of my local government friends, I understand that he has carried out his duties as the Mayor of Henley and Grange diligently. He was seeking preselection for the for-

mer seat of Henley Beach. If that seat were to keep its current boundaries, with some slight deviation, in all probability my colleague the member for Henley Beach would retain it for the Labor Party, but the redistribution created what is known now as a very safe Liberal seat.

So, all the work that Bob Randall did—and it was all fair and above board, with no branch stacking, just working at the grass roots of Liberal support in that area—was given the flick, because there was another man who suddenly decided that he wanted to enter politics. I have my doubts about whether, if a similar situation occurred on our side of politics, Lord Mayor Condous would have done the same thing to us. Lord Mayor Condous is a very fickle man. In fact, many a time he has told me that his true allegiance lies with the Labor Party, but he was so desperate to get into this Parliament that he was prepared to ride roughshod over Bob Randall.

**Mr Ferguson:** True blue Bob Randall.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** My colleague the member for Henley Beach says, 'True blue Bob Randall.' I would not go as far as to say that, but I would say that he is a man of integrity, a man of honesty and a man who put his principles fair and square before the electorate of Colton and said, 'I deserve to be your member. Please preselect me for this seat.' But what happened?

**Mr Quirke:** He did not have the numbers.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The member for Playford says that he did not have the numbers. What happened then? As soon as the redistribution came about—

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule on the situation where a member of this House is addressing the gallery.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. The honourable member was not directing his remarks through the Chair. I would ask him to do so.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I do apologise, Sir. I was directing my remarks through the Chair, but my sympathy was going out there into the broader community because of the way in which Bob Randall has been treated. What did Lord Mayor Condous do? He engaged in the old time-worn Tamany Hall contest of branch stacking. He has had all his family there. There are more Greeks now in the Colton Liberal electoral college than anywhere else.

**Mr Ferguson:** More than in Athens.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** My friend the member for Henley Beach said, 'More than there are in Athens.' They were coming from miles away. Some of them, from 150 kilometres away, suddenly turned up and signed up for the Colton Liberal electoral college.

**Mr Quirke:** All paid for by the one cheque.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I understand they were all paid for by one cheque, Sir, and I will give you two guesses as to who signed the cheque. It certainly was not Bob Randall and it was not my colleague the member for Henley Beach. I will give you a clue: the surname begins with 'C' and the person owns a Mercedes. That might give you a clue, Sir. Perhaps I sound a bit flippant, but I do not care who gets preselected on the other side and I do not care who represents Liberal Party philosophy as long as it is done fair and square.

If Steve Condous were to win preselection for Colton in a fair ballot, I would have no problem whatsoever, but he did not. All the work that Bob Randall has done over the past six or seven years has been totally disregarded. Despite the fact that Nick Minchin has suddenly realised that he has real trouble on his hands and is trying to juggle the dates and to determine who will get a vote if they join before a certain time and who will not get a vote, and all

those other things to make it look good, my gut feeling is that decency and honesty will count for nought in this preselection ballot. It seems that the Liberal Party, yet again, will fall foul to the lure of money—big dollars—which will come from a certain section of the community if it gets its man up, regardless of whether that person lives there or has done any work there. That counts for nothing.

I am sure that most members opposite will agree with me that the member for Davenport went through a similar kind of situation when he came up for preselection. He carried it off. I believe that he was not only very clever in the way he did it but also (I think he will agree) very lucky, because he had a certain amount of sympathy from the media. I say that most sincerely. However, I do not think that Bob Randall will have the benefit of a sympathetic media. The media want big Stevie in this place. As I said, we have copped a fair amount of flak in regard to the member for Hartley and his attempt to represent people in the northern suburbs. However, I think that eventually the Party will come to terms with that and the people of Napier will eventually—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr SUCH:** On a point of order, the honourable member is not addressing his remarks through you, Sir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Bright is out of order. The member for Heysen is out of order. I uphold the point of order. The member for Napier has been cautioned on two occasions about directing his remarks through the Chair. The next occasion could necessitate some other action.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** It is fairly obvious with the way certain members are trying to stifle my contribution that Bob Randall does not have much support from those Opposition members who are in the Chamber. They will succumb to big Steve's money; they will succumb to big Steve's brandishments and he will give them a ride in his Mercedes car. I do not know—all I can say is that there are some members on this side who do recognise decency and honesty, and who sincerely hope that Bob Randall does win the preselection battle for the new seat of Colton.

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** That was another load of tripe from the member for Napier. What else would we expect in this place? As the member for Napier has referred to Mr Bob Randall, I would just like to make a few comments about the said gentleman. I believe that, without any doubt at all, Mr Bob Randall has been the most effective member for Henley Beach that this Parliament has ever seen and is ever likely to see, particularly while we have ning-nongs like that on the other side of the House.

**Mr FERGUSON:** On a point of order, Sir, I am cut to the quick. There has been an absolute reflection on me, and I object to the words used by the honourable member. I am really deeply hurt.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The words used were not unparliamentary. The term was not applied specifically to any particular member. However, I remind the member for Heysen that we do have a requirement for decorum and upholding the standards of the House, and I ask him to be careful in his application of descriptions of members.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member alongside me did not call a point of order that the words were unparliamentary. He said that he objected to the words used against him.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not believe that they were directed to the member for Henley Beach.

**Mr Brindal:** Call them 'honourable ning-nongs'!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** My colleague suggests that we call them 'honourable ning-nongs'.

**The SPEAKER:** If the member for Bright interjects once more, he might find himself in serious trouble.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I do not want to go on in that vein, other than to suggest that the main reason why I wanted to refer to the Mayor of Henley and Grange was to say that I share his concern and that of his council, and that of many other people in his electorate on that side of town, in regard to the way in which the Patawalonga is being ignored by the Bannon Government. It is an absolute disgrace that the three major waterways in the metropolitan area are in their present condition. Of course, I refer to the Patawalonga, particularly the Torrens, and the Onkaparinga. I am pleased that at last political and community pressure has finally embarrassed the Bannon Government into a commitment at least to clean up the Torrens River. I will say more about that a little later.

The Government continues to ignore the condition of the Patawalonga. There is no doubt that the Bannon Government continues to shirk its responsibilities by trying to leave the problems of the Patawalonga to the Glenelg council. As far as I can see, nothing in the plan for the proposed foreshore in the Patawalonga basin redevelopment at Glenelg promises any improvement in that situation.

I am sure that many of us have received representations from the Chairman of the Friends of the Patawalonga, Mr Don Read, and I would commend that gentleman and the members of his committee for the excellent work that they are doing in bringing to the notice of the people in this State the deplorable condition of that waterway. Mr Read has said very clearly that he believes that those who live close to the Patawalonga are being treated as second-rate citizens by the State Government. There is no doubt at all about that. This group has every right to be fed up to the back teeth with Labor Government inaction over the Patawalonga. Its members saw \$800 000 quickly provided by the Federal Government to help reduce pollution in the Onkaparinga River when the member for Kingston, Gordon Bilney, tried to fend off the Democrats' Janine Haines.

But all that the people of Glenelg have got out of the Minister for Water Resources, Minister Lenehan, are promises to do something about the Patawalonga, such as that it would be 'cleaned up by Christmas'. The Minister made that statement three years ago, and not a thing has happened. The Friends of the Patawalonga claim that the Patawalonga River is more polluted than either the River Torrens or the Onkaparinga River, with Sturt Creek and its tributaries passing through 13 council areas before finally draining into the Patawalonga at Glenelg North.

The discharge of polluted waters and debris from the Patawalonga into the sea twice a week does nothing for the beaches, let alone the swimmers at our most popular coastal resort. It is interesting that Minister Lenehan, who is the Minister responsible, chooses to live at Glenelg, but she obviously holds her nose and closes her eyes whenever she goes near the Patawalonga; otherwise she would have acted well before now. It is a disgrace, and I share the concern of the Mayors of Glenelg and Henley and Grange and the other members of the community who live in the vicinity of the Patawalonga.

I referred briefly to the River Torrens, which is probably the biggest disgrace of all. On a number of occasions I have suggested that the Government should come clean on what is really happening with the River Torrens. It must really

come clean with detailed information relating to the pollution of that river. We now have to pay the price for the Government's inactivity in dealing with the pollution of that waterway. We are told that the Government authorities have been taking samples along the River Torrens for a considerable length of time. If that is so, they should know exactly what is coming from each outlet into the river. It is only natural that they should be able to determine the main sources of pollution entering the River Torrens. With that knowledge, they should be able to determine where most of the bacterial contamination is coming from and take corrective measures. Once again, there has been a lot of rhetoric but no action.

The Health Commission has admitted that the River Torrens water is not safe for swimming and should not be swallowed, and there is considerable pressure on those who use the River Torrens for recreational purposes. I believe that the Minister must answer questions relating to pollution entering the River Torrens from the zoo and the Royal Adelaide Hospital, for example. The Bannon Government does not need to embark on further studies into the River Torrens. If it knows where the problem areas are, they can be remedied, and a start should be made immediately on implementing stormwater management proposals, which is, again, a subject about which we have heard a lot of talk but about which we have seen very little action. It is up to Minister Lenehan to disclose just how much the Government will spend on River Torrens improvement works for the remainder of this financial year. We have heard estimates of what may be spent over an extended period of time, but the matter is urgent.

We want to know what will be spent now and what will be spent for the rest of this financial year to improve the disastrous situation on the Torrens. I fear that if there is an end to all recreational use of the Torrens the Government will use it as an excuse to do nothing because, if nobody is using the Torrens for recreational purposes, much of the pressure currently on the Government will be removed and the situation will continue to deteriorate. The matter of the Torrens and the Patawalonga is of considerable concern to the majority of people in South Australia. While I recognise that pressure is being felt concerning the Mount Lofty Ranges and that emphasis is being placed by the Government on the need to clean up the water catchment in that area, the Government also has a responsibility to the people of Adelaide and South Australia to ensure that it gets on and does something about cleaning out the waterways in this State instead of continuing on with the rhetoric of which we are sick and tired.

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** I remind the House and all members here this evening that every member in this place is elected by an electoral district to represent those electors. The reminder is timely because some members opposite seem obviously to have forgotten that. For the purposes of Government, it is a convenience and tradition in the Westminster system that we should group ourselves ideologically and philosophically into loose groupings that have come to be known as political Parties and that grouping which retains the majority number in the House forms the Government. From the Government is elected the Executive, the Premier and his Ministers, but the Premier and his Ministers are but, as the book by Jeffrey Archer was titled, the first among equals. Often in this place the Premier and these Ministers forget that they are special representatives of this place entrusted with special duties.

I was totally appalled last week when, in answer to a legitimate question that I asked about whether the Premier

had sought to elevate the Independent member for Elizabeth to any special position within his Government, the Premier rose to his feet and gave one of the finest answers that he has given in the past two years. He was very good. He united a rather perturbed and troubled looking Government. By the time he had finished he had them in stitches, and he did it very cleverly: by lampooning the Opposition, talking about the political organisation of the Liberal Party, about the preselection processes of our Party and about everything else except the matter for which he is responsible to this Parliament, namely, the allocation of ministries to people within the Parliament. It was fine: a great performance, applauded by the media—John Bannon, the clown prince of South Australia! However, he did not answer the question. That happens repeatedly in this place.

This place is treated like a circus and a sham for Ministers and for a Premier who comes in here and treats the Parliament with disdain and who—because the Standing Orders in this place are unfortunately very loose when it comes to the responsibility of Ministers to answer questions—thinks that, rather than answer such questions, he can give a prime performance. I wish the media had more time, were less burdened with deadlines and could come into this place to see just what a carnival corner the Government benches opposite have become. We have Popeye who daily has a dose of spinach, flexes his muscles and does a performance for the few cameras remaining in this place, for the print media and for radio. He does a good job.

Further down the bench we have perhaps Olive Oyle, I think soon to become Snow White, surrounded by her political dwarfs—Sleepy, Grumpy, Dopey, Frumpy, Sleazy and Bashful. On the back benches we have Heckle and Jeckle, who daily regale this House with their wit, incisive wisdom and free advice. The member for Napier gives so much free advice, that if this Government were to survive—and God willing it will not—he would become a consultant and make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year from his consultancy services when he leaves this place. The problem is quite easily defined—that this Government has lost control, it lacks vision and has denigrated this House and itself by sinking to the lowest form of political taunt, gibe and innuendo.

I know of no member on these benches who has commented on the political processes of the Government Party. There may have been things said about the stance and choice of Independent members, but in this House at least no member has stood up and commented on the factional deals, backroom boys and a number of other interesting facets of the Government Party—and interesting they must be, because I note that the *Advertiser* is publishing a regular column called 'The Power Brokers'. I have read it with interest and thought that it would last one or two days but it appears to go on and on. It appears to me to threaten to have a cast that looms as big as Cecil B. de Mille's 'Ten Commandments'. I am fascinated by these power brokers of the Labor Party.

It is not Opposition members who are standing up here and doing some sort of cheap exposé, trying to drive wedges between friends, compatriots and people of like political mind. It is not Opposition members who have to stoop to those tricks. We have not lost \$2.2 billion in the State Bank; we have not blown out WorkCover; we were not in charge of the Scrimber debacle; we have not sold off half this State's assets and leased them back, and then asked, by some divine miracle, that we not be found out until the next election. Rather, we have sat here patiently and questioned, probed and asked and, with the help of a few members who unfortunately are Independent Labor but

who nevertheless occasionally exercise the spirit of independence, have hopefully achieved something in this Parliament that was not achieved in the last Parliament—and that is a measure of good government.

I note that the Government is now increasingly taking up the Opposition's thoughts and options. I believe that what is behind the member for Henley Beach's churlish, incessant interjection, 'What is your policy?'—if you gave him 1c for every time he said it he would already have retired a wealthy man—is a desperate attempt for him, on behalf of the Premier, to get the flare and light that the Premier is looking for. They desperately want our policies so that they can implement them and claim them for their own. They have done it before and they will do it again.

The Government is so stupid that it does not know that we have clearly enunciated policies—policies which were enunciated at the last election and which stand as Liberal policy until in the fullness of time we reconsider them, put our stamp on them for the next Parliament and for the next period of three or four years, and modify them so that they become our policies for the next election. I promise that we will not be doing that precipitately, or at a time when the member for Napier or the member for Henley Beach can go rushing to the Minister and getting them drawn up as Bills and introduced into this House. Unfortunately for them, we are not quite so silly.

I conclude as I started, by reminding members that they are not here by the grace of their factional bosses or because of their allegiance to any political Party but because of one allegiance that they owe, that is, allegiance to the electors who put them here. Whether they voted Labor or Liberal, the electors of their Assembly districts are the people to whom they are responsible—and they would do well to remember it.

I say that because I particularly note—and with great disappointment—that when the member for Gilles makes his almost daily announcement that it is about time his Party found him a safe seat, the one thing he never mentions is that it might be up to the electors to decide whether or not he has a safe seat, wherever he stands, and the one great disappointment to me is that not once in any statement I have read from the member for Gilles has he mentioned his electors, the good of his electorate or anyone who put him into this place.

He seems to think that a place in this Parliament is a gift from Labor Party factional bosses, which can be bartered, bought and sold at no-one's consideration except that of the factional bosses of that Labor Party. I hope that, wherever the member for Gilles may be found a safe seat, the people take note.

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

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I wish to bring forward an issue relating to the purchase of a fishing licence by someone who moved into that industry for the first time last year. The gentleman concerned is a Mr Peter Germein of Corny Point. Before spending a considerable amount of money, which I am given to understand was of the order of \$20 000, for a marine scale licence, he decided to check out what he could or could not have in the way of endorsements for that licence.

To do so, he contacted the Department of Fisheries—a very good move, one would think. The officer to whom he spoke advised him, in Mr Germein's words, that 'No endorsements would be considered until the release of the green paper report,' or, as we know it, the supplementary green paper that came out at the end of last year. Mr

Germein got the distinct impression that, once that green paper came out, it would be highly likely that he could receive endorsement for a dab net and for a longline.

So, he proceeded to buy his fishing licence. One can imagine his shock when, after the green paper was released, he applied for the appropriate endorsements. In his letter to the Director of Fisheries, Mr Rob Lewis, he said amongst other things:

I hereby apply for a minimum endorsement of one only hand dab net for garfish and one only longline of 100 hooks or 50 hooks for mackerel as I will find it extremely difficult to meet my commitments without it.

The answer he got from the Director stated, amongst other things:

I wish to advise that your application has not been approved as this would be inconsistent with the Director's principal objectives to ensure proper management measures, so that fish resources of this State are not endangered or over-exploited. The decision to refuse the registration of devices is subject to review once the future management arrangements for the fishery have been established following the finalising of the supplementary marine scalefish fishery review green paper.

It was at that stage that Mr Germein contacted me and asked what was going on with the Department of Fisheries when, before spending a very large amount of money to go into an occupation that he felt would provide a satisfactory income, he was given information that turns out to be incorrect, in his opinion. I took it up with the Minister of Fisheries and pointed out the areas that Mr Germein felt were inconsistent, seeking an appropriate answer.

I wrote on 8 October 1991 and received an answer dated 24 January 1992 in which the Minister stated the following:

Perusal of Mr Germein's file has revealed that he had a telephone discussion with an officer of the Department of Fisheries on 14 August 1991, concerning the endorsement of additional devices. This conversation was summarised in a memo dated 14 August 1991, and states that Mr Germein was advised that 'current policy was not to endorse new gear but this may alter after the review of the fishery as outlined in the supplementary green paper'.

So, the Minister acknowledges that the possibility of additional endorsements was conveyed to Mr Germein. The false hope was given to Mr Germein. When the green paper came out, we found that his false hope proved to be hopeless. You, Mr Speaker, would appreciate, being involved in the fishing industry by way of some of your constituents, and, as former shadow Minister of Fisheries, I also understand that that sort of false hope was clearly wrong and should never have been conveyed to Mr Germein or anybody else because, as the first green paper indicated, the decision there was to cut back marine scale fishers, and this latest green paper and subsequent events indicate the same.

I feel very much for Mr Germein. I feel as though it is a case where the Minister should intervene personally, because of the advice given to Mr Germein, and allow endorsements, seeing that Mr Germein went ahead with the purchase of his licence and did the right thing by contacting the Department of Fisheries; but the advice he received was false. At the very least, the department must clean up its act and give correct information to people so as not to cause them financial embarrassment.

The second matter I wish to raise in this debate concerns the absolutely pitiful water supply being provided to a constituent of mine at Two Wells, Mr Dean Smith, who has a property in section 400, in the hundred of Port Gawler. Mr Smith's problems go back many years but, specifically while I have been involved, back to 1987 when he contacted me,

and I visited his property. Amongst the matters I raised with the then Minister of Water Resources were the following: that, during the hot weather periods, pressure for much of the day at Mr Smith's property is such that water will not flow and, in a recent hot spell (in 1987), the water only began to trickle at midnight. The Smiths have some 500 acres and run 700 head of cattle, plus some sheep. To gauge the size of this industry, Mr Smith kills an average of 50 cattle a week; it is an industry that South Australia should do everything to keep.

Mr Smith had brought the problems he was facing with water supply to the attention of the E&WS Department on many occasions and they indicated that his pressure would be much better if he replaced a water line on his property from the water meter to his house, and he undertook this in 1987 at a cost of approximately \$2 000. But, to his bitter disappointment, the new line made no difference at all to the water supply. He then constructed a holding tank of some 1 500 gallons, in addition to 4 000 to 5 000 gallons storage provisions he already had for the house. Following the E&WS recommendations for him to replace or change other items on his property, that department then admitted that the fault lay in the mains pipeline.

Obviously, Mr Smith's cattle drink a large quantity of water and you, Mr Speaker, and all members would appreciate the absolutely untenable situation a feedlot owner such as Mr Smith is in if there is not an adequate water supply during hot periods. I took up this problem with the then Minister of Water Resources and, in an answer to me, the Minister acknowledged that there was a problem and he also indicated that something would be done.

In fact, I wrote to the Minister on 24 December and received a reply on 4 March 1988. The Minister indicated that there had been an upgrading program, that new mains had been laid in the Dublin and Windsor area north of Mr Smith's property and that, further, to improve water pressure approval had been given to install a booster pump on the main supplying Two Wells and that that was to be installed toward the end of 1988 and that, when this was operational, the pressure to Mr Smith's property should be substantially improved.

The Minister also referred to proposals to upgrade the water supply to Angle Vale, Virginia and Two Wells. Members will imagine my surprise when nearly two years later Mr Smith contacted me again saying that things were not any better. I took it up with the Minister and received an unsatisfactory answer. Then at the end of last year, on 23 November, in desperation Mr Smith contacted me and said, 'We still have no water. Surely this problem can be solved.' I took up the matter with the Minister and received an answer in which, amongst other things, the Minister said:

The existing water mains in this area were originally designed for rural broad acre farming use and were never intended for intensive farming use, such as feedlots. Provision of on-site storage is strongly recommended where customer's requirements exceed the capacity of the system.

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

**Mr S.G. EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 20 February at 10.30 a.m.