

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

# PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

---

Fourth Session of the Forty-Seventh Parliament  
(1992)

---

Parliament, which adjourned on 8 May, was prorogued by proclamation dated 1 June. By proclamation dated 1 June, it was summoned to meet on Thursday 6 August, and the fourth session began on that date.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 6 August 1992

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. N.T. Peterson) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr G.D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.15 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the speech of Her Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.45 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

### SWEARING IN OF NEW MEMBERS

The Hon. Dean Brown and Mr Olsen, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the Clerk, took their seats in the House respectively as the member for the District of Alexandra and the member for the District of Kavel, in place of the Hon. Ted Chapman (resigned) and the Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy (resigned).

### HANSARD

The SPEAKER: I have to inform members that, as from tomorrow, the form in which members receive their daily *Hansard* proofs will change. As a result of new technology installed in the *Hansard* area, it will now be possible to provide members with a separate volume of each day's sitting, which will probably become known as the 'Daily *Hansard*', in addition to the current weekly volume. This daily *Hansard* is to be available by 9.30 a.m. on the day following a sitting and will replace the present proofs. It will be delivered in the same way as proofs were delivered and will be marked 'confidential and subject to revision'.

It is most important, if *Hansard* is to be produced efficiently, that members return to *Hansard* by 4 p.m. on the day following a sitting any corrections they may have

to the daily edition for inclusion in the weekly edition. Members are asked to be patient if any teething problems are experienced as the new technology is introduced.

[Sitting suspended from 12.50 to 2.15 p.m.]

### GAMING MACHINES BILL

The Governor, by message, conveyed to the House of Assembly that, after the presentation of the Gaming Machines Bill 1992 to Her Excellency by the Speaker, she had drawn to her attention an inconsistency between the Bill that had passed the Legislative Council and the amendment subsequently agreed to by the House of Assembly. The Governor requests the House of Assembly to reconsider the Bill.

### GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that the House has this day, in compliance with a summons from Her Excellency the Governor, attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where Her Excellency has been pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which speech I, as Speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT

A petition signed by 3 288 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to maintain and improve public transport services was presented by the Hon. Frank Blevins.

Petition received.

### PUBLICATION STANDARDS

A petition signed by 458 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to stop reduced standards being created by publishers of magazines and posters debasing women was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

### GAMING MACHINES

Petitions signed by 528 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to introduce gaming machines into hotels and clubs were presented by Messrs Eastick and Matthew.

Petitions received.

### JUVENILE OFFENDERS

A petition signed by 1 332 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase penalties for juvenile offenders was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

### SPECIAL EDUCATION

A petition signed by 177 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase special education assistance to schools was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

### SENATE VACANCY

The Speaker laid on the table the minutes of the joint sitting of the two Houses for the choosing of a Senator to hold the place rendered vacant by the resignation of Senator J.W. Olsen.

### GAMING MACHINES BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that, due to a clerical error in the schedule of amendments transmitted with the Bill returned in message No. 134 of 7 May 1992, it was necessary to forward to the House a copy of the annexed corrected schedule.

**The SPEAKER:** Members will undoubtedly be aware that the Gaming Machines Bill, which was passed by both Houses at the end of last session, was not assented to. I think it is appropriate at this time to inform members of the reasons for that and to make a ruling on the status of the Bill.

Members will recall that on the last day the Legislative Council returned the Bill to the House with a schedule of 77 amendments, which was agreed to in Committee. To all intents, the Bill had been agreed to by both Houses. Shortly after the House rose, the Clerk was advised that an incorrect schedule had been forwarded by the

Legislative Council. He informed the Chairman of Committees, who declined to sign the revised schedule as having been agreed to by the House. That left me as Speaker with no choice but to take the Bill to the Governor in the exact form agreed to by the House.

Having done that, I was subsequently informed by the Attorney-General that Executive Council had noticed inconsistencies between the Bill agreed to by the Council and the amendments subsequently agreed to by the House and returning the Bill to me. The Attorney-General also informed me that Her Excellency would formally advise the House today of that fact and request the House to reconsider the Bill. That message was the one I read a short time ago.

The message from the Legislative Council that I have just read indicates that Her Excellency's assessment is correct and that the House has not agreed to all the amendments made by the Legislative Council. It is my view that, in terms of Standing Order 312, the Gaming Machines Bill has not been 'finally disposed of', and I rule that it is capable of being restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934. If the Bill is restored, it will be at the stage of consideration of message No. 1 from the Legislative Council.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

Remuneration Tribunal—Reports Relating to—  
Members of Judiciary.  
Members of Parliament.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

State Government Insurance Commission Act 1992—  
SGIC Charter.  
Treasury Department—Response to the Report of the  
Economic and Finance Committee—Public Sector  
Asset Management Developments, 1988-91.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):

South Australian Health Commission—Response to the  
Report of the Economic and Finance Committee—  
Public Sector Asset Management Developments,  
1988-91.

Royal Adelaide Hospital—By-laws—Smoking in Hos-  
pital.

The Commissioners of Charitable Funds—Report,  
1990-91.

Regulations under the following Acts:

Chiropractors Act 1991—Regulations—  
Election of Board Members.  
Registration—Miscellaneous.

Controlled Substances Act 1984—Regulations—  
Declared Prohibited Substances.  
Ethylamphetamine.  
Pesticides.

Poisons—Monitor and Control.

Poisons Possession.

Optometrists Act 1920—Optometrists and Optical  
Dispensers.

Physiotherapists Act 1945—Regulations—Fees.

Psychological Practices Act 1973—Regula-  
tions—Registration Renewal Fee.

Public and Environmental Health Act 1987—Reg-  
ulations—Swimming and Spa Pools.

South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—  
Regulations—

Compensable and Non-Medicare Patient Fees.

Nursing Home-type Private Patient Fees.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold):

Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of 137th Meeting, 14 February 1992.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. Lynn Arnold):

Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—  
Finger Point Sewer Outfall.  
Gulf Waters Experimental Crab Fishery—Blue Crab.  
Abalone Fisheries—Licence Fees.  
Rock Lobster Fisheries—Licence and Pot Allocation.  
Fish Processors—Licence Fees.  
Licence Fees—General.  
Lakes and Coorong Fisheries—Licence Fees.  
Miscellaneous—Licence Fees.  
Prawn Fisheries—Licence Fees.  
River Fisheries—Licence Fees.  
Marine Scalefish Fisheries—Licence Transfer and Fees.  
Fish Processor Registration Fee.  
Buoys.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter):

Attorney-General's Directions to the Director of Public Prosecutions.  
Report of the Judges of the Supreme Court, 1991.  
Rules of Court—District Court—  
District Court Act 1991—General Rule.  
Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Interstate Witnesses.  
Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act 1935—  
Correction of Schedule Errors.  
Criminal Rules—General.  
Listings—Appeals.  
Uniformity Amendments.  
Magistrates Court—Magistrates Court Act 1991—  
General.  
Civil Jurisdiction.  
Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1966—  
Regulations—Fees.  
Builders Licensing Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.  
Classification of Publications Act 1974—  
Regulations—Jundah Aboriginal Corporation  
Exemption.  
Commercial and Private Agents Act 1986—  
Regulations—Fees.  
Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Regulations—Fees.  
Consumer Credit Act 1972—Regulations—Fees.  
Consumer Transactions Act 1972—Regulations—Fees.  
Cremation Act 1891—Regulations—Fees.  
District Court Act 1991—Regulations—Court and  
Transcript Fees.  
Education Act 1972—Regulations—Open Access  
College, Marden.  
Fees Regulation Act 1927—Regulations—Fees.  
Goods Securities Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.  
Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—  
Regulations—Fees.  
Landlord and Tenant Act 1936—Regulations—Fees.  
Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—  
Fees.  
Ceduna, Thevenard—Dry Areas.  
Magistrates Court Act 1991—Regulations—Court  
Transcript and Bailiff Fees.  
Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913—  
Regulations—Fees.  
Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983—  
Regulations—Fees.  
Sheriff's Act 1978—Court and Bailiff Fees.  
South Australian Office of Financial Supervision Act  
1992—Regulations—Financial Interests—  
Members and Employees.  
Members and Employees (Amendment).  
Summary Procedure Act 1921—Regulations—  
Industrial Offences.  
Witness Fees and Expenses.  
Supreme Court Act 1935—Regulations—  
Court and Transcript Fees.

Probate Fees.

Trade Measurements Act 1971—Regulations—Fees.  
Travel Agents Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins):  
Department of Road Transport—State Transport Authority—

Responses to the Report of the Economic and Finance Committee—Public Sector Asset Management Developments, 1988-91.  
Fees Regulation Act 1927—Regulations—Motor Registration, Licence, Sundries Fees.  
Moters Vehicles Act 1959—Regulations—  
Motor Registration and Licence Fees.  
National Demerit Points Scheme.  
Proof of Age Card Fees.  
Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—  
Blood Analysis—Lameroo District Hospital.  
Inspection Fees and Exemptions.  
Emergency Vehicles Giveaway—Revocation.  
Tyres and Rims.

Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulations—Traffic Infringement Notices—Expiration Fees.  
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Applications to Lease—8 April 1992.

By the Minister of Finance (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Lottery and Gaming Act 1936—Regulations—Expiry Extension.

By the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Urban Land Trust Act 1981—Regulations—Seaford Land.

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

Racing Act 1976—Rules of Harness Racing—Bi-Carbonate Testing.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan):

Department of Environment and Planning—Response to the Report of the Economic and Finance Committee—Public Sector Asset Management Developments, 1988-91.  
Beverage Container Act 1975—Regulations—Glass Container Exemptions.  
Botanic Gardens Act 1978—Regulations—Fees and Charges.  
Building Act 1971—Regulations—Building Code—Bushfire Prone Areas.  
City of Adelaide Development Control Act 1976—Regulations—Heritage Register Additions.  
Clean Air Act 1984—Regulations—CFC Phase Out—Exemption.  
Dog Control Act 1979—Regulations—Truro Dog District Number.  
National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Regulations—Para Wirra Park and Alligator Gorge.  
Permit Fees.  
Planning Act 1982—Regulations—  
Development Control West Lakes.  
Mount Lofty Ranges Water Protection Area.  
Waste Management Act 1987—Regulations—Fees.  
Wilderness Protection Act 1992—General Regulations.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. S.M. Lenehan):

Engineering and Water Supply Department—Response to the Report of the Economic and Finance Committee—Public Sector Asset Management Developments, 1988-91.  
Sewerage Act 1929—Regulations—Fees.  
Water Resources Act 1990—Regulations—Fees.  
Waterworks Act 1932—Regulations—  
Fees.  
Mount Lofty Ranges.

## By the Minister of Lands (Hon. S.M. Lenehan):

Department of Lands—Response to the Report of the Economic and Finance Committee—Public Sector Asset Management Developments, 1988-91.  
 Bills of Sale Act 1886—Regulations—Fees.  
 Crown Lands Act 1929—Regulations—Fees.  
 Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989—Regulations—Fees.  
 Real Property Act 1886—Regulations—Survey Exemptions.  
 Lodgment Fee.  
 Lodgment Fee (Amendment).  
 Fees.  
 Land Division Application Fees.  
 Transferable Title Rights.  
 Registration of Deeds Act 1935—Regulations—Fees.  
 Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991—Regulations—Fees.  
 Strata Titles Act 1988—Regulations—Fees.  
 Worker's Liens Act 1893—Regulations—Fees.

## By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder):

Firearms Act 1977—Regulations—Fees.  
 Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulations—Traffic Infringement Notices—Expiration Fees.

## By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder):

Electricity Trust of South Australia—Response to the Report of the Economic and Finance Committee—Public Sector Asset Management Developments, 1988-91.  
 Electricity Trust of South Australia Act 1946—Regulations—Unscreened Conductors—Vegetation Clearances.  
 Explosives Act 1936—Regulations—Fees.  
 Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920—Regulations—Fees.  
 Mining Act 1971—Regulations—Fees.

## By the Minister of Forests (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder):

Forestry Act Proclamations—Forest Reserves Declined—  
 Mount Gambier Forest District.  
 Murray Lands Forest District.  
 Southern Hills Forest District.

## By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory):

Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1968—Regulations—Fees.  
 Dangerous Substances Act 1979—Regulations—Fees.  
 Industrial Relations Act (SA) 1972—Regulations—Disabled Worker Awards.  
 Lifts and Cranes Act 1985—Regulations—Fees.  
 Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986—Regulations—  
 Ministers of Religion—Exclusions.  
 Tiling Subcontractors—Exclusions.  
 Agencies and Instrumentalities of the Crown.  
 Non-economic Loss Variation.

## By the Minister of Occupational Health and Safety (Hon. R.J. Gregory):

Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986—Regulations—  
 Asbestos Removal Licences.  
 Construction Safety—Fees.  
 Employer Registration Fee.

## By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory):

Boating Act 1974—Regulations—  
 Murray Bridge Bathing Zones.  
 Hire and Drive—Commencement.  
 Stansbury Zoning—Speed Limits.  
 Port Stanvac Zoning.  
 Harbors Act 1936—Regulations—Changes to Price Sensitive Trades.  
 Marine Act 1936—Regulations—  
 Floating Establishments.

Navigation and Fishing Inland Waters.  
 Commercial Vessels—Qualification and Crewing.  
 Fees.

West Lakes Development Act 1969—Regulations—Development Control Incorporation.

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

Local Government Act 1934—Regulations—  
 Auditors.

Appeal Application Fee.  
 Superannuation Contributions.

Recreation Grounds (Regulations) Act 1931—Regulations—Glenelg Oval.

Technical and Further Education Act 1975—General Regulations.

Corporation By-laws:

Brighton:

No. 1—Regulating Bathing and Controlling of Foreshore.

Glenelg—No. 6—Public Conveniences.

Henley and Grange—No. 14—Liquor Control.

Thebarton—No. 2—Streets and Public Places.

District Council By-laws:

Beachport—No. 6—Animals and Birds.

Kingscote—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties.

No. 2—Height of Fences Near Intersections.

No. 3—Garbage Removal.

No. 4—Inflammable Undergrowth.

No. 5—Camping Reserves.

No. 6—Bees.

Loxton—No. 39—Dogs.

Mount Remarkable—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties.

No. 2—Streets and Roads.

No. 3—Fire Prevention.

No. 5—Animals and Birds.

No. 6—Bees.

Port MacDonnell—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties.

No. 2—Council Land.

Tumby Bay—No. 24—Control of Dogs.

Victor Harbor—No. 33—Garbage Removal.

Yorketown—No. 8—Garbage Removal.

## STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Speaker, the House would be aware that the SGIC Act, which was proclaimed on 30 June, requires the Government, in consultation with the board of the commission, to prepare a charter which clearly defines the nature and scope of the activities to be undertaken. It is this charter which I have just tabled. The new Act and the accompanying charter for SGIC herald a new phase and new direction for this important South Australian financial institution. Now that the Act has been proclaimed and the charter for the commission agreed, the current Chairman of SGIC, Mr Vin Kean, has advised me that, once the accounts for 1991-92 have been finalised, he wishes to step down from the board.

Mr Speaker, I wish to advise the House that Mr John Lamble, one of Australia's leading insurance executives, has agreed to take the position of Chairman of SGIC. In addition, Mr Richard England, a prominent South Australian businessman, has agreed to act as a member of the board of the commission. The Government intends to

recommend these appointments to Her Excellency the Governor, effective from 1 September. Mr Lamble is currently the Chief Executive Officer of the NRMA, and the Managing Director of NRMA Insurance Limited.

Mr Lamble has almost 40 years experience in the insurance industry, commencing with Lumley's in the 1950s. He joined the NRMA in 1968 and has been Chief Executive Officer since 1987. He will be retiring from these positions in September. Mr Lamble has held a number of insurance industry posts, including President of the Insurance Institute of New South Wales, President of the Australian Insurance Institute and a member of the General Insurance Consultative Committee advising the Federal Treasurer from 1971-87. Mr Lamble has also been President of the Sydney Chamber of Commerce.

Mr Speaker, the new SGIC Act provides for the increase in the size of the board from five to seven members. The appointment of Mr Richard England will fill one of these vacancies. Mr England is a national Director of Ernst & Young. He has 20 years experience in insolvency and management advisory services, and specialises in capital and debt reconstruction for corporations.

I believe the wealth of experience that will be brought to SGIC by both Mr Lamble and Mr England will be an important contribution to the rebuilding of SGIC. After a long period of extremely successful operation the past couple of years have been difficult for SGIC. This has placed an enormous burden on the management and board of SGIC, and in concluding I would like to express my appreciation of the efforts made by the outgoing Chairman, Mr Vin Kean. Mr Kean has given great service to the commission since his first appointment in 1979 and has worked assiduously to try to resolve the problems currently facing SGIC.

#### FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Mr Speaker, in relation to the 1991-92 operations and results of the State's financial institutions, I wish to advise that the accounts of these various bodies are now being finalised subject to normal audit processes. I have been advised by the boards of these institutions that they are confident of meeting my request to have these accounts available to the Parliament with the budget on Thursday 27 August. While it is not appropriate to make available details of the 1991-92 results of these bodies prior to the release of their audited accounts, there are some matters relating to SAFA and the State Bank on which I wish to advise Parliament.

In relation to SAFA, the estimate of its surplus provided at budget time last year was \$400 million. I am advised that the actual surplus will be in excess of that estimate. Amongst the reasons for this is the favourable settlement of the Torrens Island Power Station (TIPS) transaction. I made a press release on this matter on 15 July 1992. I wish now to table a statement on the specifics of this matter which has been prepared for SAFA by its external auditor, Deloitte Ross Tohmatsu. I draw the House's attention, in particular, to the main conclusions reached in this statement, as follows:

- The TIPS transaction was entered into in a commercially responsible manner.
- South Australia has preserved approximately \$29 million of the original economic benefits which were derived in 1987 as a result of the TIPS financing arrangements.
- \$65 million of the \$100 million allocated to the provision for general contingencies in SAFA's accounts is no longer required and has been credited to the operating surplus in 1991-92.

The House will be aware that, with my approval, the Government Management Board has commissioned an independent review of SAFA. I have been advised that this review is well advanced.

In relation to the State Bank, some members will recall the statement I made to the House on 27 February 1992. As foreshadowed in that statement, further write-downs in the value of some of the bank's loan assets have been necessary. To a significant extent, these reflect the fact that the Myer Centre had now been in operation for a sufficient time for a more accurate valuation to be placed upon it. While a number of successful workouts have been concluded, other write-downs have been caused by the continued slump in property values and by the continuation of recessed economic conditions generally. The general contingency reserve amount of approximately \$100 million, set aside last August and referred to in my February statement, has been made available to the bank.

Much progress has been made by the bank in terms of achieving greater focus on its core activities. This has involved, amongst other things, the sale of a number of businesses including Myles Pearce, Day Cutten, Executor Trustee, Oceanic Capital Corporation Ltd and United Bank Limited in New Zealand.

In my statement of last February, I said that 'the Group Management Division has been established to maximise recoveries from problem loans and, at some future date, the division could form the basis of a separate entity'. The Government has received considerable advice about the desirability of some kind of 'split' of the bank between its profitable core activities and the funding and administration of its impaired loans and other assets. Important progress has been made on this matter and detailed decisions will be announced at budget time.

#### COMMONWEALTH GAMES BID

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** As all members are aware, the decision of the Commonwealth Games Federation taken on 21 July in Barcelona was to award the 1998 Commonwealth Games to Kuala Lumpur. I am sure that most South Australians share the deep disappointment felt by the members of our bid delegation that we did not win the right to host the Games, given the enormous contribution of so many South Australians to our bid and given the very obvious benefits of a successful bid for our State.

However, despite that very natural disappointment, I am sure all members will join with me in reiterating our congratulations and best wishes to Kuala Lumpur on its

success. The competition between our two cities, although often intense, was always conducted in a spirit of friendly rivalry and in the context of recognition of the importance of harmonious relations between our two countries. In keeping with that friendly spirit, we will certainly offer our support and appropriate assistance to Malaysia in its preparation for the Games.

I trust also that all members will be supportive of the opportunity for the Games to be hosted by an emerging Commonwealth nation. The Government has never been opposed to the need for that opportunity to be provided. What we have always maintained is that the quality of the Games as a sporting event should not be jeopardised and that the needs of sport should be paramount in the bid process.

In the final analysis, it seemed that the majority of delegates were persuaded that the political priority of awarding the Games to an emerging nation should be the prime consideration rather than that of sporting preparedness. While we readily accept that decision, we have expressed concern that those political priorities, held and actively promoted by senior members of the federation during the final stages of bidding, were not communicated to our bid team at a much earlier stage of the bid process.

There is no doubt that, if we are to contemplate bidding for the 2002 Commonwealth Games, we would need to receive absolute assurances from the Commonwealth Games federation in regard to the basis of the selection process and the federation's role in that process.

Despite our loss, there is no doubt that our involvement in this bid has generated many positive outcomes for South Australia and has created the potential for many benefits in the future.

Our highly professional and skillful bid team has brilliantly promoted to the international sporting community the many strengths that Adelaide offers for the conduct of major sporting events: our exceptional facilities, our proven organisational skills, our strong sporting culture, our attractive climate and, of course, the beauty and amenity of Adelaide itself.

We intend to ensure that opportunities arising from this international exposure are fully explored and realised. We will be establishing a capacity within the Department of Recreation and Sport to ensure that the skills and expertise built up in the bid process are fully utilised to attract major sporting events to South Australia.

Finally, I wish to convey my congratulations and thanks to all those involved in the bid effort and in particular to those who served on the bid committee. This has truly been a project involving the united and enthusiastic commitment of our whole community: the State Government, the Opposition, local government, the sporting community, the corporate and union sections, the media and the general public. I believe that all those who have contributed, in whatever capacity, to our bid can be proud of the way in which it was conducted and presented to the international community. In the final outcome, we lost the bid for the 1998 Games: it is my firm belief that in a very real sense, Adelaide will ultimately be a winner through what we have achieved.

## QUESTION TIME

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling for questions, I indicate that any questions for the Minister of Education will be taken by the Minister of Employment and Further Education, and any questions for the Attorney-General will be handled by the Deputy Premier.

### STATE BANK

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** Why is the Premier allowing the State Bank to carry out a fire sale of major properties when that fire sale will add tens of millions of dollars extra to the massive losses already incurred by the State Bank? I have a bank document which shows that the bank is selling four major hotels, now associated with non-performing loans, substantially below the value of the loans provided by the State Bank. The bank has been seeking a buyer for the Grand Hotel at Glenelg at a price of about \$45 million when the loan carried on the books of the State Bank is over \$70 million. The Ramada Hotel in Sydney has been sold for a price of \$14 million, when the asking price listed here is at least \$20 million. The St Moritz Hotel in Melbourne sold last week for \$21 million, when the loan on the books was \$35 million. That hotel was fully leased. In addition to these hotels, the bank has been seeking a buyer for the Myer-Remm building at about \$200 million, when the total exposure of the State Bank on that building is \$655 million.

Several property specialists have contacted me and expressed serious concern that the State Bank's practice of conducting a fire sale runs completely counter to the policies adopted by the other major banks of Australia. One of those specialists who has written to me has advised that, 'this is a stupid move and quite against the best interests of South Australia' and that the bank should hold properties until there is some improvement in the property market. It is interesting to note that the Premier, in his ministerial statement—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader is well aware of the Standing Orders: he is not a new boy in this House, and he knows that they do not provide for debate of the question: the explanation must be precise.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I point out to the House that the indemnity of the bank, given by the Government to the bank, requires the Premier to monitor the bank's practices and, in particular, to look after the interests of the South Australian taxpayers who have paid for the debt.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader is starting to debate the question and, as I say, he is well aware of the rules.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I do not intend to, Mr Speaker. All I ask is: why is the Premier not looking after the interests of the taxpayers?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** One has an extraordinary sense of *deja vu*. We read about it, but it is not until you actually get into the House, sit down and look across, that you realise we are caught in some sort of time warp of the late 1970s or early 1980s.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. We are starting a new session, and we have a new Leader. It will obviously be a very hard session, and we are all aware of the Standing Orders. When the Speaker is on his feet, members will not interject. Let us now set the pattern for the rest of the session. Questions will be precise, answers will not be debated and interjections will be dealt with. The honourable Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hanson will be quiet.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am sure the Leader will quickly get up to speed on his procedure and not debate and repeat questions, and so on.

I congratulate the honourable member on being in this place, this being the first opportunity I have had, and I may say how delighted I am to see him there as, to a greater or lesser extent, are probably a majority of his colleagues. I hope that he has a very long tenure in that seat on that side of the House.

Much speculation has taken place as to what the Opposition would be asking questions about. There are many matters of economic and other importance, and the Leader has been raising some of those matters outside this place. I do not know how the book went on the bets that were being taken, but it is extraordinary: one would have thought that the question should have been about the employment situation in this State.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** No, it will not, as the honourable member interjects, because the news today was good; there was, in fact, a 1 per cent reduction in unemployment in this State. There were 5 000 extra—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Goyder is out of order. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The question that was, no doubt, organised in the expectation of these figures being published today was hastily shredded or torn up, and something was substituted, I guess, down a similar line of predictability, because the Opposition is not interested in canvassing any positives in the current environment in South Australia—although we need it—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** 'And there are not any', interjects the honourable member. That is typical. He adds, 'It's all your fault.' We are in for a really classic session: they are off again. In relation to the bank—

**Mrs KOTZ:** On a point of order, Standing Order 127 talks about relevance. Could I direct the Speaker to direct the Premier about the relevance of his answer to the question?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Is the Chair right in understanding that the honourable member said 'direct the Chair to direct' the member?

**Mrs KOTZ:** Can I rephrase and, with respect, request the Speaker to ask the Premier to direct his answer to relevance?

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair was listening to the response, the first part of which was complimentary to the Leader and was certainly not germane to the question. However, on the Leader's first day, I thought it appropri-

ate. But I ask the Premier to be specific in response to the question.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I note the views of the honourable member who has just interjected on what is relevant. Apparently, unemployment and employment are not relevant. They are relevant to a whole series of interrelated matters, not the least of which is the question the Leader asks. As he is aware—and he is, because he has been briefed on the matter and will continue to be briefed as and when he wishes (and I think it important that he is)—the management of the impaired assets of the bank are handled through a Group Asset Management Division, in which a number of officers work.

The interests of the Treasurer, to which he refers, are protected through an officer who works in the bank and is specifically designated to that task but who reports through Treasury and Crown Law. In these areas, as the Leader would well know, matters of judgment must be exercised as to when and at what price it is appropriate to quit assets.

He is making the allegation that, in respect of some of the matters he has outlined, the timing is wrong or the price is too low. That will always be debatable: one has to make judgments about economic conditions, about what price the market will bear and about the valuation of those assets in their original state. As everyone knows, the problems of the State Bank and a number of other banks and many financial institutions in this country all revolve around the massive drop in property values. So, it is not surprising to find sales taking place at less than the original value. This is happening everywhere, and a number of institutions are quitting their assets.

The Leader is also right in saying—and this is amazingly complimentary, but I do not think it will last very long; I will have to be a bit careful, I think—that it is important to be able to time sales not just in the short term but over a considerable length of time, to have the mechanism of holding those assets as long as is reasonably appropriate to get maximum return from them. That is the precise issue that I referred to in my ministerial statement a moment ago: the issue that relates to having the ability to hold those assets without impairing the core operations and profitability of the bank.

That is something on which some extremely intensive work has taken place over the past few months. As I foreshadowed in my statement, when we deliver the budget and when the bank delivers its accounts certain statements will be made about that, which I believe will satisfy the Leader of the Opposition and the general public that the way in which the bank is handling its impaired assets is appropriate and that appropriate judgments will be made. There will still be arguments about individual institutions, but it is interesting to note that this attitude that is being raised by the Leader of the Opposition—that one should try to hold these assets in the long term because it is in their interests—certainly differs very sharply from that of his predecessor.

He was right into the fire sale. He was the one who wanted to dance up and down on current valuations. In defence of that, we said that you must look at the long-term value to an organisation or an institution, and when considering valuations you do not look only at 30 June in a particular year and say, 'That's the liability that we are

grappling with'. Instead, you deal with it long term in respect of what can be realised for these assets, and enormously different calculations are made. The previous leader of the Opposition wanted to jump in, get rid of them all and sell them off. He even advocated selling the bank in its impaired state.

So, it is all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to stand up and make these points about hanging on to assets and working them through for the best price but, if that is what he and his colleagues really believe, I hope he will ensure that both he and his colleagues actually support the policy of doing that and the mechanisms we have established so to do.

### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of the latest unemployment figures released today?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** We hear laughter from the other side. Many of my constituents have, and quite properly so, expressed concern at last month's high unemployment figures, both nationally and in South Australia where the unemployment figure reached 12.5 per cent. Many of my constituents have informed me that they are looking for bold initiatives in the forthcoming budget to address this very serious problem both nationally and, indeed, in South Australia: hence my genuine concern, not the mockery from the other side.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** We have responded to the employment situation in previous months and it is appropriate that we do so today. It is interesting that members on the opposite side have been looking rather depressed at any sign of improvement. That shows their contempt for the unemployed, which was demonstrated by Mr Hewson's comments the other day.

The labour force figures issued today show that South Australia's unemployment rate for July fell by one per cent from 12.5 to 11.5 per cent. Nationally, the unemployment rate fell by 0.1 per cent to 11 per cent; South Australia's youth unemployment rate fell by 1.6 per cent to 40.8 per cent.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Just wait for it. Total employment in South Australia grew by 5 000 jobs, and South Australia was the only State to record a fall in its unemployment rate.

However, I did hear members opposite calling out about youth unemployment—this tragic level of youth unemployment.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Just wait for it, because the new Leader of the Opposition needs a bit of education. In July about 11 per cent of our 15 to 19 year olds—not one in two as has been said—were seeking full-time work. That is tragically high, but this figure contrasts sharply with that of January 1981 when the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Industrial Affairs. At that time the number of 15 to 19 year olds seeking full-time work was 66 per cent higher than it is today. In other words, 18 500 young people were looking for work under the

Leader of the Opposition's administration compared with 11 000 in July 1992. We all remember the honourable member's role in that Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Yesterday's men! Take a look at them! Their proudest boast was that they were going backwards more slowly than the rest of the country.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mount Gambier is out of order. With all due respect to the member for Albert Park, I ask Ministers to give due consideration to the use of ministerial statements rather than using up Question Time.

### REMM-MYER

**Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Following the Treasurer's repeated promises on 10 October 1991, 31 October 1991, 13 November 1991, 26 February 1992 and 31 March 1992 to provide the answers, can he once and for all tell the House of the total exposure of the State Bank to the Remm project and the total cost of overruns and forgone interest borne by the State Bank? The Remm project's costs have blown out to at least \$655 million while the latest Valuer-General's valuation has dropped to \$150 million. The Remm Queensland-based developers have got out of the deal leaving a company debt of \$446 million behind them, of which the State Bank is the leading financier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The honourable member has given a series of dates on which this matter has been raised. I obviously canvassed the matter on those occasions. As recently as a few minutes ago, in a ministerial statement, I also mentioned specifically the impact of that transaction—the Myer Centre—in the State Bank's books. It will certainly be a very important factor in analysing the results of the bank this year. On 27 August—which is pretty early compared with the time taken by most institutions to prepare their accounts—in accordance with a request made to it, those figures will be available.

### NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PLAN

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I direct my question to the Minister of Employment and Further Education. How will South Australia fare under the funding initiatives announced in the Federal Government's National Employment and Training Plan for young Australians?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am sure members will agree that this is a very relevant question in light of the recent youth employment summit. Of course, the Deputy Premier led the South Australian delegation to this summit and put forward on behalf of the South Australian Government a very detailed plan to look directly at attacking the problem of youth unemployment, including a three-pronged proposal: a youth in education and training guarantee, a youth income guarantee and a national employment scheme.

The Federal Government's national employment and training plan for young Australians, which was announc-



ed last week, takes up many of the points made in the South Australian submission. It directly links training and employment strategies which will help achieve Australia's long-term objective of a skilled work force. It contrasts very strongly with attacking the victims of unemployment, which is the centrepiece of John Hewson's youth plan. He is on the record, just last Friday, calling our young unemployed Australians 'couch potatoes' because they object to being paid a youth slave wage of \$3 an hour.

We have yet to hear the Leader of the Opposition in this State dissociate himself from his Federal counterpart on this issue. In the Fraser days it was dole bludgers; now it is 'couch potatoes'. That is the contempt that they have for the unemployed and how phoney they are. That is the key difference: Labor wants to educate and train the work force and build up the skills of our young people so that they can become future leaders and take Australia into the 21st century.

It is very important that employers make full use of the incentives available from last week's initiative to employ and train our young people, and we are pleased that they have taken up South Australia's call. I want to acknowledge the support of the Opposition in this for a national version of South Australia's Youth Conservation Corps by establishing a land care and environment program. In 1992-93, 6 000 places will be funded at a cost of \$50 million. At least 600 of these projects should come to South Australia to add to our current successful projects. We wanted to pilot the scheme in a small way and have it taken up nationally, and that is what has happened.

For young people unemployed for 12 months or more, 35 000 places will be created. Full-time training for six months will be followed up with a guaranteed Jobstart card and we want to see 4 000 of these places in this State. An extra 9 300 short-course training places will be available for long-term unemployed teenagers and, together with places provided by the proposed special youth units in Skillshare, we want 1 500 places to be created in South Australia from this Federal initiative.

An additional 4 400 wage subsidies (approximately 400 in South Australia) under Jobstart will directly assist employers taking on young people. This will bring a total of 12 000 available nationally. As well, employers who take on additional apprentices will be entitled to a \$5 000 subsidy with a further \$1 000 incentive if they employ a disadvantaged young person. Employers of trainees, including those under the new career start traineeship system, will receive an increased incentive from \$1 000 to \$2 000, and a further \$1 000 for those who take on additional trainees. Using that special allowance for the disadvantaged would entitle an employer to a \$4 000 subsidy, which is even less cost than Dr Hewson's \$3 an hour; but the crucial difference is that the young people will get structured training, and that is the key to their future.

A number of members on both sides of the House have talked about the group training and apprenticeship schemes, and we are very pleased that we will get an additional incentive payment of \$3 000 for each first-year apprentice. I appeal to employers to take up these subsidies. We all have to respond to the challenge to create new jobs for South Australians through these schemes. We have to

make sure that we take advantage of the availability of these Federal dollars.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the Minister again that time is available for Ministers to make statements. Such answers intrude seriously into Question Time and the Minister might be better served by making a statement.

## STATE BANK

**Mr OLSEN (Kavel):** My question is directed to the Treasurer. What steps are being taken to overcome serious concerns expressed to State Bank senior management over the activities of the bank's vital group asset management division and its supervision of non-performing loans? Why are comprehensive analyses, completed on those non-performing loans during 1991, being discarded and then restarted while sales opportunities are deferred or forgone?

I have been informed that senior management has been told that many staff are resigning from the division and that considerable amounts of money are being spent unnecessarily on consultants and duplication. I have also been told that a division manager on approximately \$300 000 per annum for many months last year was living in New Zealand and flying weekly—regularly—at State Bank expense to Adelaide to supervise the sale of assets on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and part of Thursdays.

**The SPEAKER:** I assume that that question was directed to the Premier. The honourable member did not direct his question.

**Mr OLSEN:** Yes, I did direct my question to the Treasurer, but you, Mr Speaker, obviously did not hear over the hullabaloo from the Government benches.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest that the member for Kavel let the Chair worry about that. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Welcome back! The question that the honourable member asked is something that I will refer to the Chairman of the bank. Obviously, if these problems (and I am getting locked in the time warp, too) that the former Leader of the Opposition raises are of grave concern, one would hope that the board of the bank was cognisant of and attending to them.

I have not had reported to me material of the nature that the honourable member is talking about in any discussions I have had with the Chairman, but I am certainly prepared to refer the question to the bank. It must be understood that in this area there are intensive requirements of major dimension on all the personnel operating there. No doubt, from time to time there are disputes and disagreements, as there would be in any organisation, and whether these are spilling out in the form of the sort of complaint that the honourable member mentions, I do not know. Whether he has had particular knowledge to which he is privy in a direct sense or whether one or two people feel aggrieved by some process, it is impossible to judge. It seems fairly unreasonable that they should be raised in this way in this place and given all the status of parliamentary question significance, and, of course, the

resultant media publicity, before they have been explored more directly with the bank.

I would say to the honourable member who asked the question, to his Leader and, indeed, to other members that, bearing in mind the commercial operations of the bank and the economic climate in which we are proceeding, where they have matters of this kind, the Chairman has said that he is very willing indeed to discuss them and would like to do so before they are raised publicly in this way. At some point, it may be appropriate that they be raised publicly and, if and when that judgment is made—that point has come—fine. But at least that preliminary exercise ought to be undertaken if we are to ensure that the bank, as all South Australians must hope, becomes a viable trading enterprise. It is in all our interests. The fortunes of so many South Australians are tied up there.

On occasions, people question the concept of the indemnity and the way the Government has stepped in to support the bank. Of course, we had to step in to support the bank because, in doing that, we are supporting the interests of hundreds of thousands of South Australians, clients and customers of the bank, a housing sector that is dependent on the bank's operations and many other aspects that are separate from the particular problems with which we are dealing. That ought to be remembered when these questions are raised. If the Opposition, although it has an invitation to do so, feels coy about addressing them directly to the Chairman, I am happy to act as a conduit for that. But I would have thought—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** —that that was the first and responsible course to undertake.

#### BARTON TERRACE

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Will the Minister of Transport advise the House whether the Adelaide City Council's proposal to close Barton Terrace at North Adelaide permanently is part of a Department of Road Transport plan to regulate traffic flows or part of any traffic management plan whatsoever?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I was concerned to read a few weeks ago in the paper that the Adelaide City Council had been acting illegally in blocking Barton Terrace, had in fact just closed the road, had eaten into parklands to create traffic management devices without a skerrick of legal authority to do so—and did it knowingly and willingly. I believe that that is no way at all for any government to act. I understand that someone who lives in the western suburbs was apprehended by the police and fined for disobeying the traffic control devices. Of course, the courts threw out the charges and made clear to the Adelaide City Council that it had acted without any authority. As I said, I do not believe that that is any way for local government or any government to act.

In traffic management terms, there is absolutely no reason to close Barton Terrace. The closure of Barton Terrace does absolutely nothing to improve traffic management in that region. As I understand it, it is only for the alleged private comfort of a handful of wealthy, influential people in this State that all the western su-

burbs of Adelaide are deprived of this access. I find that unacceptable.

I understand that the member for Spence has led and is continuing to lead an effective public campaign to have Barton Terrace re-opened. I congratulate the member for Spence for that. I believe that he ought to have a great deal of support. I know that there are other members in this place who have constituents in the western suburbs or who expect—are attempting—to have constituents in the western suburbs. I think, for example, the member for Hanson may have an interest in this and may give the member for Spence some assistance to rectify this outrage. I understand that there is a preselected candidate for Colton who would have an interest in this and who said, at one stage, that Barton Terrace would be re-opened over his dead body. That is a very bold statement. I understand that a number of people in Henley Beach are considering that statement and seeing what they can do about it, because they do want Barton Terrace re-opened.

Complaints have been made about this closure by people who, unfortunately, have to use the Mary Potter Hospice and the Calvary Hospital. Apparently, those people from the western suburbs are not good enough to drive through Barton Terrace, which is more convenient. The Adelaide City Council does not want them soiling its streets, going through to the Mary Potter Hospice or to Calvary Hospital. I think that is appalling. The specific answer to the member for Spence is 'No'; there is absolutely no reason as regards traffic management why Barton Terrace ought to be closed.

#### STATE BANK

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** My question is directed to the Treasurer. Now that he has stated that the \$100 million contingency reserve has been made available and, thereby, confirmed that additional write-downs have been added to the \$2 200 million losses incurred by the State Bank, will he say what is the latest estimate for the State Bank losses?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Saved up for the king hit, obviously, Mr Speaker. They jump down. I have already made a statement about this. As the honourable member would understand, the question will be in the 1991-92 accounts of the State Bank, and I suggest that he have a little bit of patience for two or three more weeks, then he can have his say, his information and everything else he wants.

#### STREHLOW COLLECTION

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House of the present status of the collection of Aboriginal items that were offered for sale by Mr Carl Strehlow and then, in April, surrendered to the Government to allow research into their authenticity and ownership? As you would be aware, Mr Speaker, there are several Aboriginal groups in my electorate, and they are very concerned to know what is going to be the fate of that collection.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hayward is out of order. The Minister for Environment and Planning.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for her continuing interest in this matter. Notwithstanding the interjections, I will remind the honourable member that on 28 April this year I informed the House that I would order the surrender of these items for a period not exceeding three months while their authenticity and ownership were determined. That 90 day period has now expired for the first lot of items, but the items are still within the safe keeping of the Department of Environment and Planning as a result of a request from the Strehlow family, which was agreed to by both the Central Lands Council and the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

I understand that the Central Lands Council is currently negotiating with the Strehlow family for the purchase of these items within the collection, and both the Federal Government and the Northern Territory Government are being kept informed. I should like to point out that the research opportunity that was provided by South Australia under our Aboriginal Heritage Act confirmed the importance of this collection both to Aboriginal people within South Australia but, more appropriately, to people within the Northern Territory from whom the objects had come originally.

I believe it is important that these objects be returned to their traditional owners, and I hope that every member of this House would feel the same. It is important that we give the opportunity to the Central Lands Council to negotiate a fair price with the Strehlow family. That is the current status of the Strehlow collection.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Murray-Mallee was out of order for interjecting, and the Minister was out of order for responding. The member for Victoria.

#### NO. 1 ANZAC HIGHWAY

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** Will the Treasurer insist that the full stamp duty be paid on the \$20 million loan from SGIC to a company part owned by its Chairman, Mr Kean, to fund the building at No. 1 Anzac Highway? When was he made aware that only \$4.25 was to be paid in stamp duty? Is he satisfied that Mr Kean has acted properly at all times?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Stamp Duties Act contains specific provisions imposing duty on mortgages at particular rates, such as .25 per cent on the first \$10 000 and .35 per cent thereafter but, of course, as is well known, there are many ways of structuring transactions in order to minimise, within the law, the level of taxation that is paid. That is why it is people like those in business with large accounts and access to the best accounting advice and best legal advice who do it.

I have heard the honourable member who asked that question boasting about his having one of the best accountants in the place. What is the accountant doing? Obviously, he is attempting to minimise the business liabilities-

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Victoria has asked his question. If he wishes to ask another one, he must let us know. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Frequent amendments are brought in to our stamp duty legislation in order to try to ensure that loopholes are closed and that any of those unforeseen effects or structures that are introduced, if they are there in a way that is detrimental to the public interest, can be closed up. I hope that we will have the support of members opposite when we do that. Indeed, I announced some time ago a crackdown on tax avoidance and evasion. The Government is looking again at specific legislation to cover some of these cases.

In relation to the particular matter mentioned by the honourable member, an examination was made of the transaction and I understand that it has been the subject of discussion and examination by the parliamentary committee. So, I would have thought that it has been subjected to the sort of appropriate scrutiny that the honourable member is demanding. It was the Crown Solicitor's view that the duty had been correctly paid on the mortgage, but although the matter was not free from doubt, *ad valorem* mortgage duty could have been assessed on the deed. The problem was that if such an assessment had been made there were in fact ways in which parties to the deed could make certain statutory declarations that would obviate the need to make those payments.

I am certainly of the view that where possible we must ensure that our legislation is tight and that we must try to keep ahead of the very ingenious devices that are often used. However, how is it that an honourable member, who has been braying all the time he has been in here that financial institutions have to be as commercial as possible and that they must mix in the real world and pay their own way and meet their obligations, is now suggesting that they must in some way be precluded? I do not believe that there is an absolutist doctrine of that kind.

However, that is the way the honourable member has presented it. On the one hand he is telling those institutions to be commercial because they are letting down the taxpayers of this State if they are not and, on the other hand, he is demanding certain requirements of them within the law of which they have taken advantage. I repeat: this area is under constant examination. However, in the particular instance concerned, the Crown Solicitor's view - and that view was sought and was rigorously pursued - was that there was no ability to recover further stamp duty.

As I have said, it has been subjected to the parliamentary committee's scrutiny and, if the committee says anything further about it, that will be of interest as well. There really is a hypocrisy involved in the way in which the former Leader has addressed this question.

#### SPORTING OPPORTUNITIES

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** What specific sporting opportunities for South Australia does the Minister of Recreation and Sport see arising from both the international exposure gained by a Commonwealth Games bid team and the international success of our Olympic athletes in Barcelona?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** It is important that we look at the positive things that come out of such a bid, and I note that members opposite have said that that was something I addressed in my ministerial statement. There are certain important things about which the community is asking with regard to the bid and the benefits we can see flowing from it. There are additional factors that come out of this, given the success of our Olympians currently in Barcelona, and I am sure all members would join with me in congratulating them on their achievements. To some extent the criticisms levelled by the media against our athletes, particularly our swimming team, are unwarranted and unnecessary.

They certainly undermine the confidence of the young people involved in that team, as well as the coaches and managers. Apart from a couple of instances, most of those competitors have achieved a best performance result in Barcelona. Both the member for Hanson and I, who were privileged to be there, can appreciate the sort of environment they are experiencing, with temperatures, humidity and pollution at almost unbearable levels, yet they are expected to put in their best performance. Many of them have done that. In fact, many teams, including the Olyroos, have put in a magnificent performance to become the focus of not only our media but the international media in their efforts to achieve the best result.

I think we will still see some of those results as we approach the closing ceremony of the 25th Olympiad. I want to say some very positive things—and I am sure that the member for Hanson will agree in this respect—about our efforts and achievements. From our point of view, the significant thing is that we have achieved international exposure, not just with a mediocre attempt but with a very professional and successful presentation of the attributes of our city and the facilities that we offer, what we offer as a nation and the type of environment we can provide for an international sporting festival.

From every delegate and every person to whom I was introduced in my efforts to support our bid, along with the Premier, the Lord Mayor, the member for Hanson and everyone else involved, the comment came back that Adelaide's bid was the best they had ever seen; it was the most professional and the most comprehensive, and it would be very hard for any other city to equal it.

I think we can build on that bid very positively in terms of other international events. As I have mentioned in my ministerial statement, I will elaborate for a few moments on what we intend to do to build positively on that fact. We need to look at having an international events sector in the Department of Recreation and Sport so that we can identify and liaise with international sporting organisations and draw their attention to South Australia's obvious benefits.

As part of that bidding process, as a Government we have achieved the best range of international sporting facilities of any city in Australia. I do not think that the comprehensive package that we can offer can be equalled by any other city, including, at this stage, Sydney. So, I think it is fair to say that there is growing recognition of the level of achievement of our city, and I think it is important that we build on that and promote it.

One thing that we have to be aware of when talking about any future bid for this sort of event or for the

Commonwealth Games in the year 2006 is that we have a very even playing field and a fair and accountable system in this country, but on occasions we might be playing on a field that is not quite as even as we expect. We have to be clearly aware of that.

Following publication of *Lords of the Rings*, there are many current allegations about how people operate, but whether or not those allegations can be substantiated I am not sure. We have to be aware that other people within the international community may not operate at the same level of propriety, probity or accountability under which we operate in this country. So, I think we have to be very cautious and aware of that when we are bidding for these international events. It is our intention to develop this unit so that we can draw upon the benefits gained from the bid and, in fact, enhance our existing facilities and our opportunities to bring international sporting events and people to our city.

### STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** What capital injection will the Government need to make into SGIC to prevent it from becoming technically insolvent now that 333 Collins Street has been valued by the Melbourne City Council at \$216 million, which is \$179 million less than its valuation on SGIC's books?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** As the honourable member knows, the valuation depends on whether one is valuing in the long term. I refer to the discussion that we had earlier about the retention of assets in the current market valuation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** These things are different, and it depends on whether or not you have the mechanism to hold those assets appropriately. Obviously, that has been the subject of discussion. In the recent House of Assembly select committee on SGIC, that issue was canvassed quite extensively, and a discussion took place about the nature of capital support for SGIC, remembering that to date it has operated throughout its history without the provision of capital by Government. It has been in a unique position in that sense.

As I said in my statement, I think it was in April, certainly while a Government guarantee is an offset to the level of capitalisation that one would normally provide, nonetheless, it is inappropriate in this day and age for institutions such as a one operating commercially to operate without capital. Precisely how that will be addressed is under discussion at the moment and will be part of that package of announcements to which I referred on the 27th of this month.

### PRAWN FISHERY

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** Can the Minister of Fisheries advise whether an appointment has been made of a chairperson for the independent management committee of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery in line with the select committee's recommendations?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I advise that there were some problems with the establishment of this committee, which were identified previously, due to the problem of the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Boat Owners Association identifying its own candidate. It has since gone to the Australian Electoral Commission to conduct a ballot of its 10 members and that ballot nominated Florian Valcic as its representative. The next task was to find an independent Chair, as the select committee recommended, and I brought up the name of someone involved in the fishing industry in South Australia who was based in Port Lincoln. That person was not acceptable to the Prawn Boat Owners Association.

**Mr D.S. Baker:** He would not accept the money you offered.

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

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am not sure what the member for Victoria is on about. The fact is that it had nothing to do with the prospective person himself accepting it. It is an insult to that person and I hope that the former Leader was not making any reflections upon him. The person's name was unacceptable to the Prawn Boat Owners Association and it came back with a series of other names. Some of those names were credible in their own spheres of interest; I do not dispute that. However, in my view, they were not particularly knowledgeable in terms of the ongoing questions of management issues in the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery.

As a result, I had to look around for someone who would be truly independent and who would not be in the pocket or hand of either the prawn boat owners or the Department of Fisheries. I needed someone with the capacity to be free of bias for either side. Although I have great respect for both parties, and certainly for my own Department of Fisheries, it was important that the Chair be independent and have the capacity to pass a rigorous eye over the views expressed by both the industry and the department. I have to say that sometimes things fall into your lap because circumstances happen where people become available for nomination.

The person I had in mind was not capable of being nominated during the last session of Parliament because the present member for Alexandra, now Leader of the Opposition, was not in this place. The Hon. Ted Chapman was in this place and he is the person whom I have appointed to be Chair of this committee. I think that he is an excellent choice, if I do say so myself, and I look forward to his providing that kind of independent rigour in getting the Gulf St Vincent prawn industry managed in this phase of closure ready for a successful restart at the end of a further 18 months.

## WORKCOVER

**Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I direct my question to the Minister of Labour. Will the legislation being introduced this session to amend WorkCover honour the Premier's commitment first given in March last year to reduce South Australian levies to nationally competitive levels for the next financial year?

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I suggest that the Opposition be patient and wait until we introduce the Bill. When it is introduced, the honourable member can make his own assessment. The Government has given commitments to reduce the cost of WorkCover in this State and, if one cares to look at the recent announcement made by the Manager of WorkCover, one finds that it is one of the best managed funds in Australia and, consequently, has returned an enormous amount to WorkCover itself.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** Mr Speaker, there has been slightly more than a 31 per cent reduction in injuries over the past three financial years, and that is also reducing the cost. I would suggest that this is a culmination of a number of things. The bonus and penalty schemes of WorkCover have brought home to employers the true cost of injury and recently a number of companies have gone to their associations and asked for them to arrange occupational health and safety training. They want to do that because they can no longer pass on the high cost of work-caused injury to their customers. They are not allowed to do that. For the first time they have to do something about not injuring their employees. They can no longer pass on the cost.

**Mr D.S. Baker:** It is a scam.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** When he was Leader of the Opposition, the member for Victoria tried to put across to the public of South Australia that he cared. Today he is saying that, when workers are injured at work and can no longer work, it is a scam and a fraud on their part. When he was Leader, and before he became Leader, he always talked about the rorts in WorkCover. Not once did he come before the select committee with any of those rorts. As far as I know, he has never been to the fraud squad of WorkCover about the rorts that he reckons are happening in the workers compensation area. I can only say that the interjections that he has made in this House over the years are just a lot of hot air. He is a bag of wind.

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** As I was going to say before the member for Victoria rudely interrupted me, a number of factors have brought about this dramatic decrease in injuries. One of those has been the bonus and penalties scheme, which has been in effect for just over two years, and another has involved the application of the codes of practice and regulations that have been formulated by the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act. There is also the application of manual handling codes of practice and regulation, which will affect one of the more insidious injuries that people have, that is, back injury.

I know that members opposite will appreciate that, if we can progressively eliminate back injuries out of industry each year, we will see dramatic reductions in cost but more so a dramatic reduction in the number of people who suffer back injuries. Along with the training of safety people, on a *per capita* basis we will have more trained safety people in South Australia than in any other State. They have all come together to bring about a

reduction in the number of injuries in the workplace—a reduction greater than that which applies in Victoria and New South Wales. We are achieving that here with good management by a Government that actually cares about people—not one that ridicules people.

### CIVILIAN SPACE INDUSTRY

**Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth):** As the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology will be aware, the Australian Defence Industry's complex at Salisbury is to be closed over the course of the next 12 months. As the staff of the facility have developed substantial experience and expertise in the construction of rocket motors and guidance systems, what steps is the Government taking to ensure this expertise is not lost to the State and may instead be used to develop further this State's civilian space-related sunrise industries?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I certainly share the concern of the member for Elizabeth and congratulate him on his ongoing interest in this general area and also his reference to the fact that the skills here offer an opportunity for conversion in terms of the civilian space industry. However, the fact is that it is not possible for the State Government to do anything to retain this facility, which employs a group of people at the DSTO. What is really important is whether or not the people who are involved there, the human resources, can be kept in South Australia and what we are doing to try to help the broader development of the civilian space industry in South Australia. I will make some comments about that in a moment.

The ADI rocket motor facility at the DSTO was originally established in the late 1980s particularly for the Nulka project, the hovering rocket project. That project is currently at the full-scale engineering development stage and is still awaiting a decision as to whether or not it will proceed. If it does proceed, it will be some time before a production contract is awarded. So, there would be a major hiatus in terms of the actual need to use the people at that facility.

In addition, it was anticipated that the small solid fuel rocket motors being developed at that facility might have some other uses, in particular for some kind of missiles being used by the Australian forces. However, that use has declined to a minimum as, in the main, the missiles for which the motors were to be produced are no longer in service. In the absence of any other viable commercial markets, a decision was made to disband that facility.

The State Government has been working with both the Federal Government and industry in this State to examine the feasibility of establishing a business based in South Australia to launch light satellites on an indigenously designed vehicle. While the retention of the expertise in this solid fuel motor technology is relevant, it has to be acknowledged that it is not in any way critical for this development trend.

If it proceeds, the project would in the early stages involve the sourcing of rocket motors from overseas. Should it then proceed further, it would be some years before specific resources, such as may be available at ADI, would need to be applied to the project in South Australia. In any event, of course, the key issue is that

the decision has to be made by commercial partners, not by the State Government.

Another area that is of interest and relevance is that the State Government has been supportive of the establishment of the Space Engineering Centre of Australia within the Signal Processing Institute Building at the Levels campus of the University of South Australia. That is a significant facility that in many ways can be regarded as one of the first developments within the MFP concept. The Space Engineering Centre is funded under the Australian Space Office's Space Industry Development Centre program. It is intended to be a repository of expertise, design and engineering of satellites and related launch systems. Should the centre develop as it is expected to do, it would provide a natural home for the retention of some of the relevant expertise that exists at the Australian Defence Industries facility at DSTO—in other words, keeping it in this State.

### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege, and in doing so I draw your attention to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 9 May 1992 in relation to the gaming machines legislation. The article was headed 'How your MP voted on the Bill'. This article listed those who voted 'Yes' and 'No', and another misleading heading stated 'Absent, abstained, overseas or resigned'. That is a matter of privilege, because that article has portrayed members of Parliament to their constituents in a bad light when many of the members mentioned were properly paired or were on other business, and that situation would have had no effect on the vote.

I therefore raise this as a matter of privilege, because the vote concerned related only to amendments and was not the vote on the third reading. I draw to the attention of the House page 3742 of *Hansard* of 31 March. That is when the third reading debate took place and I, for one, was recorded as voting for the 'Noes'. Mr Speaker, I ask that you have this matter investigated, or that you at least take it up with the *Advertiser* to ensure that misleading and grossly inaccurate information is not conveyed to the public.

**The SPEAKER:** It would seem to the Chair at this stage that this is not a matter of privilege. However, I will look at it. To my knowledge, several letters to the Editor of the paper were written by members of Parliament. However, I will look at the issue and, if the honourable member is aggrieved in particular, I draw his attention to the opportunities he has to air that grievance during the grievance debate, the Address in Reply, or any of the other forums available in this Parliament.

### STANDING ORDERS

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

That for the remainder of the session, Standing Orders be so far suspended as to provide that:

- (a) At the conclusion of the period for questions without notice, the Speaker may propose the question 'That the House note grievances'. Up to six members may

speaking for a maximum of five minutes each before the Speaker puts the question.

- (b) The motion for adjournment of the House on Tuesdays and Wednesdays may be debated for up to 20 minutes, provided it is moved before 10 p.m.
- (c) The motion for adjournment of the House on Thursdays—
- (i) may be moved later than 5 p.m.;
  - (ii) may not be debated.

Motion carried.

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The **SPEAKER**: I pose the question that the House note grievances.

Mr **HAMILTON** (Albert Park): I have been in this place for approximately 13 years, and during that time it has been on a rare occasion that I have criticised the media. Like many other members of this House, I have made mistakes, and I have apologised when that has occurred. While sometimes I have been misleading, I have been prepared to admit that fact, as I believe all people should admit it when they make mistakes or mislead the electorate. A few moments ago, we heard the member for Eyre, who is well respected on both sides of the Parliament for his views about propriety in terms of reporting. I have taken note of your advice to me, Sir, in relation to articles that appeared in the *Advertiser*. An *Advertiser* article of 4 August 1992 headed 'Time to take a stand on pokies' urges the community at large not to vote for the poker machines legislation. It states:

Small 'l' liberals were deluded into thinking the freedom to have poker machines somehow outweighed the right to be free of them. Unionists were implored to think about jobs. Free marketeers were won over on the basis of the boost to the economy. The cynical were sold the lie of the gambling-led recovery from the State Bank disaster. All these issues of 'conscience' were advanced by 'experts' with long political pedigrees and/or connections.

One of my constituents who is well known to me and who lives in Keppel Grove on Delfin Island—and that is as far as I am prepared to go when mentioning this person who is, I suspect, well known to both sides of the House—asked me, 'Kevin, what's your memory like?' I said, 'Not bad.' He said, 'Go and get the editorial opinion in the *Advertiser* of 16 July 1990 headed, 'It's time for pokies'. The article states:

This only indicates how little the 'social issue' is the real concern. There may well be theological arguments that any gambling negates our free will to control our destinies, and there may still be some public concern about family pay cheques being gambled away out of avarice, desperation, addiction, drunkenness or sheer stupidity. But gambling has been accepted by the community as a way of life. So the Government has been a willingly addicted party to its expansion . . .

Mr Bannon's problem, having approved almost every form of gambling yet devised, has been baulking at pokies, as though they were significantly less mindless than most other forms of gambling, more addictive and more destructive . . . the time seems long past when the State Government should be objecting to poker machines.

Given the revenue issue, it is hypocritical for any member of the Government to try to capture a moral high ground with 'social issue' arguments against pokies on Commonwealth property . . . The wisest course would be to admit pokies, of his own judgment, to the Adelaide Casino and the State's clubs and pubs now and to leave their future in the hands of the people. What hypocrisy from the *Advertiser*! It is on a rare occasion that I have ever criticised that newspaper, but

this pillar of society is prepared to try to influence the community. It is trying to lead people like sheep. The reality is this: when the Casino legislation came before the Parliament, I did not support it, but on reflection and having been influenced by my constituents I voted for it. Later, I want to mention Alex Kennedy—who I think is well known to some members of the Opposition—and her views on the hypocrisy not only of members opposite but of some sections of the media in South Australia. What an outrageous somersault! The Opposition has the gall to stand up and attack members of this Parliament for using, in their terminology, 'conscience'. What hypocrisy!

The Hon. **DEAN BROWN** (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to raise two matters very briefly, simply to correct the record as far as the Minister of Employment and Further Education is concerned in giving unemployment figures. I would like to give the actual numbers of people unemployed. When the Liberal Government went out of office in 1982, the figure was 51,200 people unemployed in South Australia, representing 8.5 per cent of the work force.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. **DEAN BROWN**: Wait for it—it is now 83 100, representing 11.5 per cent of the work force. The Minister has the hide to stand in this place this afternoon and try to paint a picture that unemployment was worse under the Liberal Government than under this Government. What hypocrisy! It represents an increase of 60 per cent compared with the unemployment that existed in South Australia under the former Liberal Government.

I wish to take up a point that I raised with the Premier in Question Time today, because there is a general assumption within the community that, when the disasters of the State Bank were announced in February 1991 and the then managing director, Mr Tim Marcus Clark, was forced to resign, that is when the problems of the bank stopped and since then there has been very sound management of the bank.

The clear evidence—and we have produced some evidence today, but I would like to take it up further—is that in fact the problems of the State Bank have continued due to the lack of astute management and supervision by the Premier and Treasurer of this State. The clear evidence is that there has been a massive fire sale of the assets now held by the State Bank as non-performing loans, and that fire sale has attracted a great deal of international attention. A property specialist in a letter to me stated:

Chinese entrepreneurs and others are in town picking up bargains from present management of the State Bank interested, apparently, in dumping all the bad news on the past Marcus Clark regime and looking good themselves in the future. In the present climate this is a stupid move and quite against the best interests of South Australia, I believe. A prudent businessman in a very large ongoing organisation surely would hold the properties on his books at cost and wait for some market improvement and some positive rent reviews.

That same view has been conveyed to me by a number of property specialists in Australia; yet the Premier today in his ministerial statement has tried to convey the impression—and I will use his words—that 'a number of successful workouts have been concluded'. Successful in what way? They have been successful in dumping the properties on the market at approximately half their true long-term value so that the taxpayers of South Australia

are having to pick up extra tens of millions of dollars to pay for the difference.

*Members interjecting:*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Although he is the Minister responsible for ensuring, on behalf of the South Australian taxpayers, the prudent management that that worked through, the Premier has apparently ignored his responsibilities yet again. As a consequence of that, we have found that the bad debts and the support provided for the State Bank have blown out further. Today we have heard of another \$100 million having to be given to the State Bank. Originally it was \$970 million and in the second bail out it went to \$2.2 billion.

Today we have an extra \$100 million put in, and yet members opposite are willing to allow Cabinet, which has permitted this financial disaster which will cripple the State for at least 10 years, to perpetuate this further mismanagement by the present Premier. It is absolutely abhorrent, because I hear that, case after case, the Premier is not prepared even today to confront people who wish to put further information to him about the mismanagement within the State Bank. The Premier has cocooned himself and as a result there is, across the whole State, a paralysis of decision-making by the State Government and the bank.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I would like to carry on from some of the remarks made by the member for Albert Park, who raised a very important issue here this afternoon about the hypocrisy surrounding the current gaming machines legislation in South Australia. The reality of this matter is well summed up, I think, in an *Advertiser* editorial of about two years ago, as follows:

Since it is such an uncomfortable notion that governments should be trying to save people from themselves, and from developing their own senses of responsibility, the time seems long past when the State Government should be objecting to poker machines.

That article makes another telling point. Members opposite do not like this, and the humbug and hypocrisy they have displayed here over the past two and a half years is amazing. Members opposite are the deregulators when they get outside this place. They go around saying that they do not believe in compulsory trade unionism, they do not like regulation, they want the Government to get out of the economy.

They are the ones who constantly argue about Saturday afternoon shop trading and pokies legislation. They will quite happily tell us how to live our lives, and they will tell everyone else how to live their lives but one thing is certain: what they say out there is different from what they say in here. That article goes on to state:

The wisest course would be to admit pokies . . . to the Adelaide Casino and the State's clubs and pubs now and to leave their future in the hands of the people.

I emphasise that last remark. I notice members of the Opposition are not enjoying this and are leaving the Chamber. It is quite clear that they cannot handle being told that they go out there and tell everybody, 'No, no: we are into *laissez-faire*; we are into freedom of expression; we are small 'l' liberals; we are into individualism' but they come in here and say something different alto-

gether. Another article that I find particularly good on this issue is by Alex Kennedy in the *Messenger Press*, as follows:

It is always fascinating to watch when Liberals, who belong to a Party which makes much of non-interventionist Government, who believe workers don't need unions but can negotiate pay deals and conditions direct with their employers, then turn around and argue those same workers don't have the sense to decide what to spend their money on. That it should be decided for them e.g. they can throw it away at the trots, the dogs, the horses or hanging around newsagents scrubbing off instant money tickets like an obsessive compulsive [gambler], but not pokies. It defies Liberal ideology. And come the bottom line, that is, in Government aiming to reduce the State's debt and unemployment, the Liberals as much as Labor desperately need and want those machines and the revenue they provide. The theatre is not to look as if you need or want them.

I emphasise the last sentence in that article. The reality here is that members of the Liberal Party make much of it out in their electorates but come in here and act very differently altogether. They are hypocritical in every sense of the word. This issue exposes it. The reality is that it is not a *laissez-faire* Party. It is happy to tell the whole community how that community should spend its money, how it should live its life. The reality is that the people of South Australia will not accept that.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I wish to address today a matter about which I have had incredible feedback in the space of less than 24 hours, and it is a matter which ought to make every member of this Parliament anxious. I refer to the fact that the health services budget in 1992-93 is to be cut by 1.4 per cent in real terms. That is distressing news, especially for the more than 8 900 people who are on waiting lists. As we know, these people are often older and sicker and are unable to afford any other type of health care.

They are not just statistics: they are people who have lived for many years, supporting Australia and its goals and bringing up a family in the best way they can. Their lives are often ruined by their ill health. I hear frequently of people who wait 18 months to have a knee operation so that at least they can be mobile. Someone rang me recently to say that they had been told that they would have to wait seven years for their operation. That pensioner sold her television set to have the operation immediately because of the effect her illness was having on her life.

Federally the ALP has recognised the fact that the Medicare system is an abject failure. It has had several goes at changing it. The much-vaunted co-payment, which everyone was reasonably amazed about, we soon learnt was nothing more than a shot in the Keating armoury to become Prime Minister. Most recently we have heard about the leaked Cabinet submission about increasing the Medicare levy. That is a clear admission that this much-vaunted, all-singing, all-dancing, all-whistling system has failed.

Yesterday's media release from the Minister of Health glosses over the human tragedy. It says, 'The essential role of health services has been recognised in the 1992-93 health budget.' What twaddle! It also says, 'All of the figures show just how far we have come.' They certainly do. In his media release yesterday, the Deputy Premier and Minister of Health also indicated, 'Health units will need to find savings of about \$20 million to absorb the



award and national wage increases and a proportion of inflation.'

I would like to quote some figures from the Flinders Medical Centre. Those members who have bothered to take some interest in this matter would know that the announced budget cut that the Minister of Health indicated was a mere \$2.3 million is compounded by an award restructuring carryover from the previous year of \$943 000, award increases carryover from the year before of \$330 000 and a penalty for having over expended its budget because of increased usage of \$148 000, which means that the total cuts for the Flinders Medical Centre are not \$2.3 million but \$3 721 000. That is the cuts they know about.

Then there are cuts that the Minister so blithely glossed over yesterday. These include things like an inflation shortfall of \$450 000, the national wage case cost of \$550 000, the visiting medical officers award cost of \$170 000, a cost for enrolled nurses of \$220 000, hospital scientists at \$420 000 and junior medical staff at \$1.6 million, which is a total added on of \$3 410 000. Yet the Minister said it is a cut of \$2.3 million. It is in fact a \$3.1 million cut. The Minister invited me previously to ask about the effect on the Flinders Medical Centre and other hospitals, and I did. I quote from a letter dated 2 April in which a hospital administrator stated, 'Each \$1 million taken from our budget is the equivalent of closing a 28-bed general ward for one year.' The Minister of Health is happy to have \$7.1 million taken from the Flinders Medical Centre budget. That is only one hospital. I draw the attention of the member for Napier to the changes at Lyell McEwin.

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

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I would like to address a matter which, to use the word of the member for Adelaide, is distressing, or could be very distressing, to the women of Australia. I refer to an article in the *Alternative Law Journal* by Marion Sawer, a teacher of politics at the University of Canberra. The article, entitled 'Do women need small government?' refers to the Opposition's Fightback! package, which the author is saying will ensure that Australia stays as two nations: men and second-class women. The article states:

The aggressive title Fightback! alerts us to the masculine character of this manifesto.

She goes on to say:

Is this manifesto, then, of any relevance to women? The answer is clearly 'Yes', not least because the incentives for male work are largely to be provided at the expense of women, through the cutting back of the public sector.

Hence the heading 'Do women need small government?' As probably everyone agrees, women perform the bulk of the non-market work that constitutes the basis of the social economy, and that was recognised by the Federal Labor Government when it started a whole series of negotiations to set up the Office of the Status of Women.

I was privileged to be part of some of those negotiations and overwhelmingly the people of South Australia, the women of South Australia, agreed that there was a need for specialist services for women, particularly for those in outback areas who needed the special support that could be given. The Office of the Status of Women has had a large degree of success in providing services

that would not have been provided if it had not been for those negotiations and the setting up of that office within the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

The office was specifically set up within that department so that it would be able to liaise with other Ministries in order to point out to them which areas they needed to cover to ensure that services for women were provided in rural/country areas as well as city and metropolitan areas. Marion Sawer goes on to say that the Fightback! package says that 'rationalisation will occur to eliminate functions that can be reduced or absorbed into other departments'.

That is one of the planks of the Fightback! package and it is one of the ways that the Federal Liberal Opposition says it will get the money with which to run the programs. The Office of the Status of Women does not duplicate such work: rather, it provides a central coordination between the Commonwealth departments and between levels of Government, as well as being the major channel through which Australia reports and contributes to the international bodies responsible for promoting the status of women. I might say that this office has international recognition because it was one of the first offices set up specifically to look at the problems that affect women.

As I said before, I am proud to have been part of the negotiations for the setting up of the office. The Fightback! package suggests that the Office of the Status of Women should be disbanded and that its functions should be taken into other Ministries. That did not work before and it will not work again. I would think that the Federal Liberal Opposition would have learnt some lessons from that.

If one were to look at some Governments who have already experimented with that, one would see that from 1977 the Commonwealth experimented and found that it did not work. In New South Wales, the Greiner Government also experimented. In both cases, the effects were proven to be highly deleterious to women. In New South Wales, the women's coordination unit lost automatic access to Cabinet decisions as a result of being moved out of the Premier's Department. So, already it has been pushed out of the prime area where decision making occurs and put into minor areas. As I said, the Opposition's Fightback package will ensure that Australia stays as two nations.

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): Recently, two reports were released that are a sad indictment on this Government and this Administration. They demonstrate 10 years of inaction, 10 years of allowing the economic base of South Australia to erode. The two reports, which were commissioned by this Government, clearly identify the Government's lack of decision making, lack of action and its lack of support for industry, the economy and jobs. That is why we have such a high level of unemployment in South Australia. The 2020 Vision document clearly indicates that many of our procedures that we have adopted in this Parliament over the past 10 years have inhibited, restricted and retarded development in South Australia, with the consequent difficulty related to jobs and job opportunities for young South Australians of the future.

The Arthur D. Little report clearly indicates where action is required of Government. It is a sad case that 10 years ago the Industry Development Council of South Australia recommended action in the month just prior to the Bannon Government being elected in South Australia. Ten years ago a report described the action that ought to be taken by the Government. That document can be obtained from the Parliamentary Library. It clearly indicates what was required. There has been 10 years of no action; 10 years of collecting dust. Ten years later, the Arthur D. Little report almost mirrors the report presented to this Parliament and to South Australians in 1981-82. What did the Government do with the report? It shelved it. It collected dust, and it dismissed the council. When John Bannon came to power in 1982, we were promised economic advancement. At the last election he promised light and flare.

**Mr Lewis:** Flare and light.

**Mr OLSEN:** Well, we got neither, which ever way you put it. What have we? All we have ever had from this Government is economic stagnation and a paralysis of Government—constipated decision making, I suppose you would almost call it. Of course, it was beautifully concealed. The packaging was in true style of the 1980s: all gloss, all hype, all headlines, but no substance at the end of the day. We may have a Grand Prix, but many of our country roads are death traps, and our public transport system is abysmal. We may have a submarine project, but our industrial relations restructuring has been ignored. Our manufacturing sector is adrift, rather than being on course for the 1990s and for global competition.

**Mr Brindal:** And our people are unemployed.

**Mr OLSEN:** And our people are unemployed as a consequence of our not getting on with it over the course of the past 10 years. We chased the Commonwealth Games. I have no argument with that. But our budgetary constraints mean that many of our junior schools have no physical education teachers and no exercise program for our students. We have talked about an MFP, yet we have been prepared to take millions from the Better Cities program, from needy suburbs, to plant trees and to start the Gillman site. Some social justice! Despite the many MFP speeches about being the high technology State, this Government hardly raised a whimper when some 600 job losses were announced as one of our most advanced, successful and prestigious, high technology units at DSTO Salisbury was moved to Victoria. What did this Government do about it?

**Mr S.G. Evans:** Shut up and said nothing.

**Mr OLSEN:** Exactly. Got a problem—close the door and wait for the problem to go away. That has been the hallmark of this Government, and look what it is costing South Australians now. This Government certainly had plenty of visions, but unfortunately they have become something of a nightmare for South Australia. This was helped by advertising. We all remember the advertisement on the State Bank, 'The only bank with its heart in South Australia,' while it was in fact losing an arm and a leg interstate and overseas on global markets.

**Mr LEWIS:** And most of its viscera, too.

**Mr OLSEN:** Yes. The Bannon Government's time in office has seen this State's debt grow at a million dollars a day, for every day. We well remember the ad in 1985, referring to a vote for the Liberal Party, and there was a chap standing in front of a sign of the State Bank and the sleeve being ripped off his shirt.

**Mr Ferguson:** It was a good ad.

**Mr OLSEN:** The honourable member says that it was a good ad: well, I remind the House that that was talking about sleeves but it was this Administration that took not only the sleeves but the bloody shirt off the back of South Australians.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the member tries to call over the Speaker, I am afraid I will have to take action.

Motion carried.

#### STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

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

That a Standing Orders Committee of seven members be appointed, consisting of the Speaker, Messrs Blacker, Brindal, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gunn and the Hon. J.P. Trainer.

Motion carried.

#### PRINTING COMMITTEE

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

That a Printing Committee of six members be appointed, consisting of Messrs Atkinson and M.J. Evans, Mrs Hutchison, Messrs Lewis, McKee and Matthew.

Motion carried.

#### ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

**The SPEAKER:** I have to advise the House that I have received a letter of resignation from the Economic and Finance Committee from Mr Ingerson.

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

That Mr Brindal be appointed to the Economic and Finance Committee in place of Mr Ingerson, resigned.

Motion carried.

#### SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**The SPEAKER:** I have to advise the House that I have received a letter of resignation from the Social Development Committee from Mr Oswald.

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

That Mrs Kotz be appointed to the Social Development Committee in place of Mr Oswald, resigned.

Motion carried.

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE LAW AND PRACTICE RELATING TO DEATH AND DYING

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

That the Select Committee on the Law and Practice Relating to Death and Dying appointed by this House on 13 December 1990 have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up its report be extended until Thursday 29 October 1992.

Motion carried.

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I move:

That the Select Committee on the Juvenile Justice System appointed by this House on 28 August 1991 have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up its report be extended until Thursday 29 October 1992.

Motion carried.

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON RURAL FINANCE

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): On behalf of my colleague the member for Henley Beach, I move:

That the Select Committee on Rural Finance appointed by this House on 14 November 1991 have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Thursday 29 October 1992.

Motion carried.

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON BUSHFIRE PROTECTION AND SUPPRESSION MEASURES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That the Select Committee on Bushfire Protection and Suppression measures appointed by this House on 28 November 1991 have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Thursday 29 October 1992.

Motion carried.

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): On behalf of my colleague the Minister of Education, I move:

That the Select Committee on Primary and Secondary Education appointed by this House on 19 February 1992 have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Thursday 29 October 1992.

Motion carried.

### JOINT COMMITTEE ON WORKCOVER

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

That the members of this House appointed to the Joint Committee on WorkCover have power to continue their considerations during this session.

Motion carried.

### JOINT COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

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

That the members of this House appointed to the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege have power to continue their considerations during this session.

Motion carried.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

That the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Amendment Bill 1992 be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill pursuant to the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I nominate the member for Napier to move an Address in Reply to Her Excellency's opening speech.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That the following Address in Reply to Her Excellency's opening speech be adopted:

May it please Your Excellency—

1. We the members of the House of Assembly express our thanks for the speech with which your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

I pledge my undying loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. It was a great honour to be chosen by my peers in this House to move the Address in Reply. It is an honour that is usually given to new members when they come into the Parliament but, as I was given to understand by the Whip, when he rang me and I eagerly accepted the role of the mover of the Address in Reply, it is also given to those members at the chosen end of their political career.

Bearing in mind the main thrust of my speech, may I say that, unless I change my mind in the remaining 18 months, once I leave the Parliament, unlike the Leader and the members for Kavel and Hanson, I will not ever darken your doorstep again, Sir. The Whip has assured me that one of the main criteria for choosing me to lead the Address in Reply was that it has been years since the Address in Reply started at great height, that it was usually after I came in, about three-quarters down the line, that it started to pick up some momentum and was in a position where Her Excellency was able to get some enjoyment from reading it.

The Whip's view, Sir, and I understand that of Cabinet, was to let us start from the highest point at the be-

ginning and drag the rest of them up with us. Sir, I am pleased to attempt to do that.

I will say a few words about two members who have retired, the Hon. Ted Chapman and the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy. Ted Chapman was a great friend of mine—a political adversary but a great friend of mine—and I am very pleased that the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries has chosen Ted to chair the management committee of the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery Committee. I understand that Ted Chapman was told that if he decided to come back into the Parliament at any given time he would have to resign the position as chairman of that committee, and I understand that he has promised to do so. With regard to Roger Goldsworthy, I will miss his many speeches about Roxby Downs. In fact, I wrote to Roger and said that if at any time he feels that I am depressed he could send me either copy number one, two, four, eight or 15 of his speeches to revive me, because as you well know, Sir, all his speeches were the same.

Also, commiserations to Roger for what I understand was one of the first decisions the Leader made after his elevation to that position—that Roger Goldsworthy was not going to get the promised job of Chairman of the ETSA board. Mr Speaker, you will be aware that one of the prime persuasive offers that the Liberal Party made to Roger Goldsworthy to vacate the seat of Kavel at a very early stage (and it ultimately cost the taxpayers of this State something like \$70 000) was that if a Liberal Government was formed in 1993 or early 1994 he would be given the chair of the ETSA board. That was the kind of—dare I put it crudely, Sir—bribe. Roger eagerly took that promise, but I understand that one of the first things the Leader of the Opposition did after being elected Leader was to cross Roger—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I think you would agree that under Standing Orders the member for Napier has impugned the reputation of a former member and a current member of this Chamber, both from this side, by the remarks he has just made about offering and accepting bribes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member may have been noticing that at the time I was looking through Standing Orders. I must say that I thought the comments about members being offered bribes reflected on this Chamber and on all members. Even though I cannot put my hand on the specific Standing Order at the moment, I would ask the member to withdraw that.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I gladly withdraw that. The point I was making was that it was common knowledge that the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy would be Chairman of the ETSA board. I believe it is now common knowledge that he will not be. That is what I was trying to get across. If I offended members of the House or you, Sir, I do withdraw.

I would also like to congratulate you, Sir, on your continuing wisdom and commonsense in your approach to the position of Speaker. I have often been accused of trying to get your favour by saying very kind things about you. However, everything I have said about you has been the truth and I make no apology for saying that in your position as Speaker you have shown wisdom far beyond that shown by many others in the past and, perhaps, that which will be shown in the future.

That wisdom was very evident in your response to the call by the Leader of the Opposition that the Government be brought down. You responded in your traditional down to earth way and it gives me great pleasure to read your response to the House. You said:

The only policy the Liberals have is to try to pressure the Independents to throw out the Government and force an election.

The electors of Semaphore should be very proud of you because you have continually said that whilst you are Speaker you will maintain order in the House and you will give both the Government and the Opposition a fair go. As I said, there have been very few who can live up to that reputation two years down the track and I congratulate you.

It is quite proper for you to say that those on the other side have no other policies in these recessionary times than to put pressure on you and the members for Elizabeth, Hartley, and even the member for Gilles, to ensure that this Government is defeated.

It should be noted that the Leader made that request of you and the other Independents to pull the pin—to use a colloquialism you are fond of using in your down to earth way—before coming into this Parliament, being tested as an alternative Premier and before putting policies to the people of South Australia. He is using you and your position and the other members I have mentioned in effect to create a situation where those opposite can walk in and take over the reins of Government. Your sense of fair play, Sir, will always ensure that that never happens. In addition, it is a sad reflection on the Leader's ability to do all the things mentioned earlier.

The Hon. Ted Chapman did a sterling job in not only getting the Leader of the Opposition elected to the seat of Alexandra but he did it against the might of the current front bench—or the front bench as it was then, with the exception of the current Deputy Leader—and despite the Party office, the *Advertiser* and the Murdoch press. He singlehandedly managed to get the Hon. Dean Brown elected not only to Parliament but also as Leader. The Hon. Ted Chapman would be very disappointed to hear his protegee utter those kinds of words.

Having said that, I would like to welcome the member for Alexandra and the member for Kavel. They are old colleagues and adversaries of mine. I will not call them 'has beens' and 'failures'—although that is what they are—but they are living examples of recycling, because they have done their turn. They were given positions of power and responsibility, but what did they do with them? They threw them away completely. As I will say further into my speech, certain people were conned into bringing them both back. We all know what they went through to achieve that, and I will have great pleasure in outlining that again to the House.

Already today we have had the pleasure of hearing both the Leader and the member for Kavel speak, albeit briefly for only five minutes. The Leader stumbled and moved around; he did not really know what he was on about. I should imagine that, apart from the most stalwart supporters that the Leader has, there was a little uncomfortable feeling of 'did we back the wrong horse?' On the other hand, the member for Kavel gave quite a polished performance: he was very suave, I even noticed that he actually had a docket. They give them those things in the Senate, and he must have brought a few with him. With

some degree of trepidation I think of what the member for Kavel might be able to achieve during the next 18 months, not against this Government but against members of his own Party who knifed him in the back during the leadership battle.

It is of interest to bring to the attention of the House comments that have been made in the past by both the Leader and the member for Kavel in relation to their future careers. I learned many years ago that if you say something you had better mean it because, if you do not mean it, it will come back to haunt you. As long as I heap praise on you, Sir, I know that I could never be in trouble for doing that. In an *Advertiser* article of 14 March 1992 in an interview with Peter Hackett, Dean Brown told everyone that, when he was dumped as the sitting member six years ago, his political career was finished, that he was quitting politics and he would never return. The article states:

'My political career has come to an end,' said the man who, at 35, had been the youngest minister in the Tonkin Liberal Government. 'It's time for something new.' In the wake of his defeat as the member for Davenport—a seat he held for 12 years—Mr Brown confided that in 1979 he had the numbers to oust David Tonkin as Liberal leader. But he turned down the opportunity because he was getting married.

One can understand that getting married is a sight better than being Leader of the Opposition or even Premier. That is all I could find on what the Leader of the Opposition said, but when the member for Kavel quit he told not only the world but everyone in the universe in article after article that he was quitting South Australian politics to go to the Senate and would never come back. An article in the *Advertiser* of 29 December 1989 states:

The Opposition Leader, Mr Olsen, said yesterday his decision to run for the Senate was the toughest of his political career. In the end he had no choice, if he wanted to remain in politics.

After the 25 November election Mr Olsen virtually lost control of the Liberal Party, which reelected him leader for a third term.

At that point he never really regained control, and the way in which the Opposition knifed him in the back in the leadership ballot shows that he lost the leadership, and he has never regained it. The article continues:

Mr Olsen wanted the member for Mitcham, Mr Stephen Baker, as his deputy and got the member for Victoria, Mr Dale Baker. He wanted Mr Martin Cameron as Opposition Leader in the Legislative Council and got Mr Robert Lucas. He wanted the member for Morphett, Mr John Oswald, as Whip and got the member for Davenport, Mr Stan Evans.

Mr Olsen said three weeks ago, after being reelected, that he intended holding the job until the next election in four years.

In his heart he knew that was impossible. The Liberal Party hates losers.

In announcing his decision to run for the Senate, Mr Olsen as much as admits he would have been toppled from the leadership in a year or so.

That is pretty dreadful. He was not toppled two years down the track as the Leader of the current Opposition; he had to go to the Senate and come back before he was again toppled as the Leader. 'The political reality is that it is rare indeed for one person to serve up to 11 years as Leader of the Opposition,' he said. 'It is inevitable—'

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: It is a sure sign when I am getting through to the members of the Liberal Party opposite that they do their utmost to try to sit me down,

so I know I am on track, I am going well, and I will continue for a further 43 minutes. The article goes on:

It is in the interests of the Party that this speculation be dealt with as soon as possible before the next election. What could be plainer? By running for the Senate Mr Olsen leaves a refreshed and expanded Liberal Parliamentary Party under a new leadership untainted by past defeats and divisions. He leaves a hero. By staying he risked ending his political career on the backbench and eventually retiring, a political handicap, to his car sales business in Kadina.

I will not go on. As I say, the member for Kavel made perfectly clear that he would not be coming back. I now pose the question to you, Sir, and to the House: what made those two gentlemen change their minds? First, the Leader had his mind changed by Ted Chapman. Ted Chapman is a very persuasive person. Also, along with Ted Chapman, there was a very able group of grass roots Liberal Party members who wanted to have the honourable Leader of the Opposition there to replace Ted Chapman when he resigned. That is it, pure and simple. They wanted the Hon. Dean Brown back into this Parliament to replace Ted Chapman, and that is fair enough. As all of us retire we would all like to see certain persons succeed us, and there is nothing wrong with that whatsoever.

But why was the member for Kavel's mind changed? I would venture to say (and I have this on very good authority) that the member for Kavel was instructed by the *Advertiser* to do what he was told. Why did the *Advertiser* do this? For years, it has had a clear bias towards the Liberal Party, and I have no problem with that at all. At least, I always console myself that just once in its history—in 1985—it backed the Labor Party, and who knows? One day it may do so again, but I will not hold my breath in that regard.

The *Advertiser* is indulging in a far wider agenda than just giving editorial bias to the Liberal Party. The *Advertiser*, as a part of the Murdoch press, along with the *Herald and Weekly Times* in Victoria, has set out to hijack the Liberal Party. There may be some people in the Liberal Party who say in the short term that there is nothing wrong with that, because they will get all the editorials and bias they want, to ensure that in the lead-up to the next election they will have everything going their own way. But, once they have a tiger on their back it will be very hard to dislodge it.

I have heard speech after speech in this Chamber about how the Labor Party is controlled by the trade union movement. The trade union movement is affiliated to the Labor Party—no bones about that. In fact, anyone can go to our State Council and State convention conferences to see what is going on. Everyone knows that there are people on this side of politics who were elected through the trade union movement. My colleague the member for Henley Beach is one; my colleagues the members for Albert Park and Peake are others.

I might as well go right through the list. In fact, I was sponsored by my own union to be a candidate and ultimately to be a member of this Party. That may cause members opposite some concern, but at least it is out in the open. By going down the path of letting the *Advertiser* hijack the Liberal Party—because it did—the *Advertiser* instructed the member for Victoria to vacate the leadership and it instructed the member for Kavel to vacate the Parliament too soon. It told the present mem-

ber for Kavel to leave the Senate and stand for Leader because that is the way it wanted to get control. By getting control of the leadership, you get control of policy. If members opposite think that is okay, I warn them that, one day, they may well rue that decision.

The only member opposite who is present in the Chamber, the Deputy Leader, was not party to any of that conniving, to his credit. He made his decision perfectly clear. He did not want the member for Kavel as Leader: he wanted the member for Alexandra as Leader. He did that not just to get the deputy leadership because he knew that was always a very tenuous position to get, but he made his position perfectly clear. I do not include him. I think that the Deputy Leader will be well aware of the problems that I am highlighting in the Liberal Party.

It may well be that because the *Advertiser* was thwarted by Ted Chapman and his merry band of helpers, we may well have averted that. However, I very much doubt it. If betting were allowed in this Chamber, and I know it is not, I would be willing to bet that, after the Victorian election, Piers Akerman will be back here, directing the current Leader of the Opposition exactly how to deal tactically with the day-to-day affairs of this Parliament and in the lead up to the election.

For many years I had a profound respect for the *Advertiser*. I read its editorials with interest and sometimes they helped me form my opinion on complex and controversial issues. Twice today we have heard reference from two of my colleagues about the situation with regard to poker machines. Approximately two years ago the *Advertiser* told us all—not just on this side of politics—not to be wimps and to start backing poker machines.

It helped influence my decision when we went through that debate. I am sure that other people were influenced likewise. What is the reason for the 180 degree turn that has now been taken by the *Advertiser*? If it was right then, why is it wrong now? It fits into the *Advertiser's* current attitude. It detected among the churches and some social groups that there was an unease about pokies. So its writers have been instructed to promote anti-poker machine letters and articles; yet it knew that we would be dealing with only technical amendments when the Bill came back to this House.

In fact it was a typing error. They knew that and played a cruel hoax on literally thousands of genuine people who have been besieging all of us with letters about reconsidering our vote on poker machines. That just shows how callous the *Advertiser* can be, and I offer that as a word of warning to the Deputy Leader sitting opposite.

I know his views on poker machines and I respect him for them, but it just goes to show what a newspaper controlled by the Murdoch press will do to achieve its ends. It has done it on pokies and it did it with Senator John Olsen. It gave him his marching orders, and we know what it did to him after that. We know that the *Advertiser* is moving down into the tabloid press. The new plant at Mile End has been geared for tabloid production. The demise of the *News* may influence lesser lights at the *Advertiser* to take the tabloid route, and I know that the *Advertiser's* market research has convinced some of its executives that it must continue to go down-market and find a happy medium between a *News* format and the *Advertiser's* former middle brow image.

My plea to the *Advertiser* (not that it would take any notice of me) is not to do it. We have already seen the tabloid mentality creep into the *Advertiser*, and its disgusting attacks on the royal family are one aspect of its down-market trend. I used to buy the *Advertiser* until it started to attack the royal family, and then I stopped buying that newspaper. One cannot pledge loyalty to the Queen and then read the rubbish that a newspaper publishes about our dear and revered royal family without taking such action.

As to the question of political bias, I do not have to remind the House of the strong campaign in Victoria against the bias of the *Herald and Weekly Times*. I have seen public meetings on television where queer bedfellows have stood up at public meetings. Conservatives (I do not mean conservatives belonging to a conservative Party), Liberals, socialists, communists and others including sports people and stars from all walks of life have all been willing to say publicly that they are uneasy about the antics of the *Herald and Weekly Times* in Melbourne under Piers Akerman. It is not just the Labor Party in Victoria or trade union people saying that: that is what many people are saying. Every newspaper has the right to give strong opinion through editorials, opinion pieces and cartoons, but the *Sun Herald* has sunk to a new low and has even overtaken the *Sun* newspaper in the United Kingdom, another flagship of the Murdoch press, in the way in which it has denigrated a political Party.

Again, there may be those members in the Liberal Party who feel that that is worth it, but once they do that and they give over their own policy and decision making to an unknown board or to someone who will dictate by the stroke of a pen which way the Liberal Party will go, they will have lost control of their own Party. Unfortunately, under Peter Wiley the *Advertiser* is going down the same path. This is not an attack on my friend Rex Jory. It is irrelevant to me that Rex Jory was a political adviser, an election strategist, to former Liberal Premier, David Tonkin. It is also irrelevant to me that he was a political and media adviser to former Opposition Leader John Olsen. Rex has a job to do, and he does it well.

However, it does concern me that Mr Wiley's role as Editor of the *News* during the 1979 State election campaign is legendary. Not only do we all know that but also Mr Wiley is not the least bit concerned about everyone around Adelaide knowing exactly what the matter is all about. At meetings with other media executives, at business luncheons and at functions at which the Commonwealth Games bid was being promoted, he openly boasted that his job was to get rid of John Bannon and oust the Bannon Government. If the Bannon Government has made sufficient mistakes to be ousted by the electorate, whilst I would be sad about that, I have no problems with it. If the media reports things as they happen, I have no problem with that—none whatsoever. However, when a real bias is being injected into that reporting and when it is being taken away from the leadership of the Party—albeit successors to this Government, it is a different matter.

It is a good time for the member for Victoria to come in, because and he was told to make the ultimate sacrifice, and he did so. I have put on record the regard I have for the member for Victoria. He was a larrikin, and

he was a refreshing change. In my opinion, he is the only one in the Liberal Party who I would say is a man's man (and I know that the member for Victoria knows what I mean by that). When he was told to do so, he gave up.

Despite all that, with regard to the leadership, the *Advertiser* got it all wrong. Ted Chapman had sufficient sway to be able to change all that. The *Advertiser* got it all wrong. It went through a real campaign. Prior to that, a softening up process occurred. The member for Victoria was the only Liberal Leader whom the *Advertiser* signalled to its readers as being the only thing that was stopping the Liberal Party from getting government at the next election. The *Advertiser* actually went out and said that. No-one in this House can deny it; it said that. When the member for Victoria was making speeches or putting policy changes on behalf of the Liberal Party (and I might not have agreed with them—and I will not say that I did; nor did anyone else on this side of the House), the *Advertiser* went out and said that it was a lack lustre performance by the member for Victoria; that it was not any good; and that, unless the Liberal Party changed its leader, it would lose the next election.

The *Advertiser* promoted every bit of tittle tattle that went through the Liberal Party room or through the Liberal Party corridors that in any way denigrated the member for Victoria. Its whole attitude was to soften up the backbench for the change of leadership. Despite what I have said, I admire the member for Victoria because, when he was told to go, he went. After that, what did the *Advertiser* do to the member for Kavel? It led him up the garden path. The *Advertiser* told him that many articles said that he would be the next Phoenix risen, that he would be the one who would lead the Liberal Party to victory at the next election. The *Advertiser* told him, 'John, leave the Senate, come back and we will make sure that you are the next Leader.'

But what did they do after they got it all wrong? They just walked away from the debacle, without a second thought. They had not a second thought, not a moment of compassion, for the man they had suckered. They had suckered him as well and truly as anyone who goes through the Suez Canal and falls for the old three-card trick or the old three-pea trick. They led him down the garden path, and once they realised that they had done something wrong they left him out. Two days after the blood letting in the Liberal Party room, senior executives of the *Advertiser* were having lunch with the member for Alexandra, the current Leader, in a trendy restaurant, which I will not name, because overnight it will become famous, and they told him that all was forgiven, that they did not really mean what they had said about his attempts to get back into Parliament, that they had backed the wrong horse, that all was forgiven, that 'as long as you do what we tell you, Dean, we will continue to give that strong political bias for the Liberal Party against the Labor Party'.

I do not know what terms were agreed, but I do know that now the *Advertiser* has swung behind the current Leader of the Opposition. No wonder the member for Kavel was bitter. In the *City Messenger Press*, which appeared shortly after the bloody coup in the Liberal Party room, I read one of the most heart-rending stories that I have ever read about a political colleague, whether on my side of politics or on the Liberal Party's side of

politics. The article, headed 'how they crucified John Olsen', it stated:

John Olsen: they invited him back as saviour and crucified him.

This was written by Alex Kennedy, who used to work for John Olsen. She continued:

I know the names, and faces and now the characters of those SA Liberal MPs who sat across from Olsen in his office and welcomed the prospect of his return as Opposition Leader. They said things like 'Thank God you're back, you have my total support, and you're the only one who can do it.' Sixteen said it. He believed fourteen of them. He trusted twelve. In the end, only eight delivered.

There are members opposite—and I will not name them—who have always preferred the Hon. Dean Brown as Leader. They wanted him to come back into the Party and to be there. They were not in the category referred to in the article; but I will not name them because I am not here to create mischief in this speech. The article continued:

In the end, only eight delivered, and one can't help wondering how secure Dean Brown feels today as those six MPs whom Olsen believed now sit across from Brown pledging the same total support and undying loyalty. They asked Olsen to return. They told him they needed him, and then they assassinated him. Olsen made two colossal errors which in any other area of life would be attributes. He refused to do deals (in the sense that he offered no ticket for deputy and no commitment to ministries or committee positions)—

and I know that is true—

and he trusted people. At least two of the six who betrayed him were old friends, mates for years.

I wonder whether they are friends or mates now. The article continued:

Another, who almost shed tears of joy at his proposed return, had created enormous problems for Olsen when Leader but he had always supported them. At least two others who betrayed him phoned him as late as 12 hours before the ballot to confirm yet again their support. So what went wrong? If the stunned silence in the Party room when the vote was announced is any indication, everything. At 6 p.m. on Sunday 10 May Olsen's votes were secure. Three who swapped sides in the final hours claim they were persuaded by Brown supporters to make the vote close in case Olsen didn't work out and a close vote would allow Brown to challenge at a later date.

Anyone who believes that believes in fairies. At least, in our Party room, when we make a decision, whether it is right or wrong, we stand by it. We do not make excuses afterwards. The article continues:

Another has told colleagues he was promised a 'position' when he retires, which Olsen wouldn't deliver and should have.

That makes me then think: is that the reason why the member for Hanson is back? The member for Hanson was quite gullible in telling us that he was going to be given a position when the Liberals got back into Government. Obviously, the honourable member—who could well be the one being quoted—was told that he is not going to get that position, so now he is going to challenge my colleague the member for Peake. I could tell him now, 'Don't waste your money.' The article continues:

Two claim Dale Baker told them on Sunday evening, at odds with Olsen's public comments, that John was supporting him for deputy, and they didn't want that.

The poor old member for Victoria, who had made the ultimate sacrifice, on the instructions of the *Advertiser*, is now getting the blame for two others. The member for Eyre, who is, I understand, the Party Chairman, must know which part of that article is right and which part is

wrong. I would say that roughly 90 per cent of this article is spot on. I look forward to the contribution of the member for Eyre in which he will say either that he agrees with it or that there is a different story to be told to the House. The article goes on:

But given the lies they've told in the past week, how can anyone believe anything they say? Olsen is likely to accept a position in Dean Brown's Cabinet. He will undoubtedly express total commitment and loyalty to the Leader and to the Party. The difference between him and those who claim to be his loyal supporters is that he will deliver.

The interesting thing about that article is that when it came out it was eagerly seized upon by members on this side of politics, and that is obvious, from the way in which I have used it in this speech. The word went out from the *Advertiser*, which owns the Messenger network, that no more articles such as this would be tolerated. The Messenger Press, our local, favourite, suburban newspaper, is now being dictated to by Big Brother down at Mile End.

I understand that Alex Kennedy is still writing, and Alex Kennedy has the courage to tell the *Advertiser* to go and do what it should be doing, but we all know that in the newspaper business there is sub-editing and things can get spiked. The message went out: 'You do not write anything more about the leadership problems in the Liberal Party.' The Alex Kennedy article did not actually name names, but let us try to guess who those people would be who let down the *Advertiser's* heir apparent.

Sir, luckily enough I know them. I know every one of them. I have a very good source in the Liberal Party room, but I do not want that source to dry up. Not in a million years would I stand up and name those who did not deliver. But, I will give a few hints, and those more discerning members of the House may be able to establish who those people are.

Let us take the member for Hayward. I am not accusing the member for Hayward of doing anything, but I am putting to the House that the member for Hayward was trying desperately to get preselection for a seat. He tried to get preselection for the seat of Hartley: in fact, he went out of his way to be friends with the current member for Hartley in an attempt to try to get up some support in that electorate. But, he did not get there. Shortly after the leadership battle he was given the seat of Unley which, on current polling, must make it an attractive seat for the Liberal Party. However, I understand that he is yet to move into Unley.

Today we also found out that there was another reward: he was put on the Economic and Finance Committee. I would not dare to say that there was any form of inducement there, but I put to the House that he was a pro Senator Olsen supporter prior to Senator Olsen returning to his present seat. Suddenly the numbers are not there, you are trying to get preselection and cannot get it, and you are given the plum seat of Unley and put on the Economic and Finance Committee.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will have to be very careful as to how he refers to these matters.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Right, Sir. I understand that the member for Bright was seen nursing a very swollen arm a couple of days afterwards, and there could have been any reason for that. Sir, I am assured that as well as his arm being better his campaign funds are well

shored. Again, I deal with the member for Hanson. After telling the world that he was quitting politics he is now trying the resurrection act. I can only ask the House: 'What job in his afterlife failed to materialise? Did the way he voted in the coup in any way reflect on this matter?'

I congratulate the members for Murray-Mallee and Newland for standing firm; they paid the ultimate price. However, I notice that the member for Newland has picked up a minor guernsey and has been put on the Social Development Committee. Perhaps that is because the member for Newland caved in quickly without a fight, and she did not have to get a swollen arm. But enough of the Liberal Party's problems for a moment: I will deal with that at a later date.

Despite the tirade we get from members opposite and despite the *Advertiser* saying that this Government is tired, lacklustre and has lost all direction, with the Premier completely befuddled by the State Bank Royal Commission, it is encouraging to see that Her Excellency the Governor gave one of the most exciting speeches as to what will happen during the budget session that I have heard for a long time. I am sure that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, listened with interest, as I did, and that you would agree with what I have said. I am talking about the establishment of the Economic Development Board, matters relating to the planning review and further work on the establishment of the MFP. Those programs all interlock and are designed to address key issues regarding the future growth of this State.

Vision 2020 has been a long time coming to fruition. However, I have yet to hear one politician of any political persuasion actually actively criticise Vision 2020. We had the Patawalonga kid—the member for Morphett—say that he did not like Vision 2020 because it would not provide jobs in the south. Mr Speaker, you and I have been saying that there should always be growth on a uniform basis in this State. When the north has lost out you or I have never stood up and cried about it.

As I said, we have the planning review, which has actually picked up a lot of out dated legislation and brought it altogether to ensure that developers can develop and that there are sound planning processes. I have heard a fair bit of criticism about the Planning Appeal Tribunal decision in regard to the Marina at Cape Jervis.

**Mr Ingerson:** So you ought to.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The Deputy Leader says that I should. I have heard a lot of concerns about that and I share those concerns. However, I say to members opposite that the planning review, Vision 2020, will overcome those problems.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** If the member for Eyre and the Deputy Leader were to listen to me they would find that I am repeating a lot of the things that they have been saying for a long time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Napier will resume his seat. The member for Eyre is out of order in interjecting in the first place, and he is out of his seat. That makes him out of order on two counts. The Minister is interjecting and arguing across the Chamber and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is also interjecting across the Chamber and is out of order. I draw members'



attention to the Standing Orders on these matters and call on the member for Napier.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** As I said, if members had listened they would have heard that the planning review, Vision 2020, will overcome those problems so that those developers who have a good development that is in the interests of not only the local community but the State generally will be able to go ahead with that development. Those members who can remember when the Premier launched Vision 2020 two years ago will recall that he said exactly that. That is what this Government will be doing in the budget session.

The State Government has been fighting for about 18 months to achieve the historic agreement between the Commonwealth Government and the State Government to establish a national TAFE training system. Our Minister went across and told the Hon. Mr Dawkins that the only way to go about it was to pick up the South Australian model. Ultimately the Federal Government has picked up the South Australian model and we now have a national training scheme that, in line with the One Nation statement, will do something tangible to give young unem-ployed people a chance in life. It will give them a training opportunity. Those training programs that are started in South Australia will be recognised throughout the country and *vice versa*.

Yet, how did the Liberal Leader today refer to that? He said it was a Mickey Mouse program of tree planting. If that is his attitude, what chance does the rest of the Liberal Party have to understand what youth unemployment is all about? I was also pleased to note that in the agriculture sector the outlook for prices in 1992-93 is mixed. It has been predicted that the price of wool will rise by 9 per cent over last year's price. The new wool tax rate, which is 3.5 per cent lower than previously, will obviously give a welcome boost to those South Australians who are dependent in the rural community. It may be an opportune time to inform the House that I have changed my lifestyle to one with a rural bent. This also encourages me to continue to make statements on agriculture in this House, because all too often we hear nothing from members opposite regarding rural affairs.

**Mr Venning:** Rubbish!

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The member for Custance says 'Rubbish!' I must admit that the member for Custance could be classed as an exception to the rule, but all too often lately he has been getting involved in the affairs of the State Bank and SGIC, matters that really should not concern him. He should be spending more time on issues such as the sealing of the road from Burra and encouraging more of his colleagues to support the improvement of railway transport in this State.

What was the big decision that came out of the recent UF&S conference? What was the thing that really took up time at that conference? It was not the plight of farmers or the role of the Federal Government in the current GATT talks—there was nothing about that. A third of the time was spent slating the Labor Party and another third was spent slating the Liberal Party. Having read what was said, I would have spent the whole time slating the Liberal Party, but that is really by the by. The rest of the time was spent on arguing a change of name.

Every time there is talk by any organisation or corporation of leaving South Australia and transferring the head office to Victoria or New South Wales, the UF&S has screamed. But what has it done? It has actually closed its head office and made it a branch office, and it has changed its name from the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia to the South Australian Farmers Federation. All it is now is an adjunct to McLachlan's Australian Farmers Federation. Now that it has changed its name, it will not have a chance of getting its hands on that billion dollar fighting fund to which the farmers have contributed. That money will be used to promote eastern State politics, which is nothing to do with South Australia, and the UF&S has calmly allowed itself to be led down that path. It no longer exists as a viable South Australian organisation. I was going to join the UF&S but, having heard what it has done, I will not.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 11 August at 2 p.m.