

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 19 August 1992

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

## PETITIONS

## CITIZEN INITIATED REFERENDA

Petitions signed by 645 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to hold a referendum to implement all aspects of citizen initiated referenda were presented by Messrs Atkinson and M.J. Evans.

Petitions received.

## PUBLICATION STANDARDS

A petition signed by 51 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to stop reduced standards being created by publishers of certain magazines and posters debasing women was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** I have been sitting here waiting for that point of order. All the noise is coming from members themselves. Week after week there are complaints about not hearing petitions, when the background noise is from the Chamber. I draw members' attention to the fact that the Clerk has to read these petitions. If members wish to listen to them, under Standing Orders they should remain quiet.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Mr Speaker, my point of order is that it is not only the fact that there is background noise. The amplification system in this House is atrocious and we need more volume than we are getting at the moment.

**The SPEAKER:** I will undertake to have that investigated. If need be, we will replace the system.

## RURAL CARE WORKER

A petition signed by 381 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reinstate the position of rural care worker on Eyre Peninsula was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

A petition signed by 178 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase special education assistance to schools was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Acting Premier (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Department of the Premier and Cabinet—Response to the Report of the Economic and Finance Committee—Public Sector Asset Management Developments, 1988-91.

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

Education Department of South Australia—Response to the Report of the Economic and Finance Committee—Public Sector Asset Management Developments, 1988-91.

## QUESTION TIME

## ASER

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Has the Government known since the completion of the ASER project that it cost \$340 million to build and, if so, why was this information concealed from taxpayers, given the very clear public interest in this matter? The Government's involvement in the project requires it to meet rental obligations to the ASER Property Trust. The Premier's original estimate of the full year cost of these obligations was a maximum of \$2.65 million. However, the actual cost to the end of June has been just over \$40 million. On an annual basis, taxpayers are now paying about \$9 million a year into the ASER project—more than three times the Premier's original estimate because these rentals are based on the capitalised cost of the project which blew out by \$200 million. These obligations do not include any budget allocation to meet superannuation payments made necessary because of SASFIT's reduced returns from its investments.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The questions asked yesterday by the Leader and the member for Mitcham are being examined and responses are being prepared. Having had a look at the preliminary responses, I like them very much and regret that I do not have them with me at the moment to make the ministerial statement that I was expected to make. However, that ministerial statement will be made tomorrow at the latest, and perhaps even before the end of Question Time today.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** What the honourable Leader, the rest of the House and the public of South Australia will find is that SASFIT has made very profitable investments in this area. The return to SASFIT has been in the order of 20 per cent—higher than if the funds had been invested in equities. I am not quite sure why the honourable Leader finds a return of 20 per cent amusing. I would also point out that there is a select committee at the moment inquiring into all the finances of SASFIT—they are before the Parliament.

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** They aren't.

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am sure that those members of Parliament who are on the select committee are perfectly capable of asking any question they wish and they will get the correct response.

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** Will they get the answer?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Of course they will get the answer. Are you suggesting, Sir, that—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair is not suggesting anything. I would ask the Minister to direct his remarks through the Chair.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Certainly, Sir. The clear implication from the Leader of the Opposition is that people are appearing before a parliamentary select committee and telling lies. Again, I invite the Leader of the Opposition to go outside and say that, but I know that that will not occur. The select committee is capable of examining anything it wishes from SASFIT and is doing so. I can assure the House that the ministerial statement will be very full, very comprehensive. All the details requested will be there. Again, as I stated, it has achieved a 20 per cent return, higher than if the money had been invested in equities. That is a very good return.

I also remember one of the PSA representatives making some comments on this issue when it was raised a few months ago. A member of the PSA, who has an intimate knowledge of these things, assured public servants in South Australia that there is absolutely no problem with this investment and that in fact it had been a very good investment. I wish that all people handling investments in this State had handled them as well as SASFIT. It has been outstanding and has exceeded the industry standard and certainly exceeded many of the investment funds in this State and, indeed, in Australia, although that would not be hard.

#### STATE BANK

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I direct my question to you, Sir. Are you satisfied with the findings of the Ombudsman's report into allegations that the State Bank held secret dossiers into the lives of prominent South Australian citizens, including members of Parliament, and do you believe that there now needs to be further inquiries, given that the Ombudsman's report has revealed that a senior *Advertiser* political journalist played a key role in compiling the dossiers for the State Bank?

All members would be aware that the *Advertiser*, through its reporters David Hellaby and Rex Jory, has revealed the existence of the State Bank secret files on MPs, including you, Sir, the member for Elizabeth and the member for Victoria. It has been put to me that the *Advertiser* is now aware that the journalist referred to in the Ombudsman's report as assisting the State Bank in compiling personal information on prominent citizens was Mr Rex Jory. In its article this morning on the Ombudsman's report, co-written by Mr Rex Jory, the *Advertiser* censured his involvement in the secret dossiers. That is an extraordinary display of hypocrisy and dishonesty.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The report has been received and tabled, and all members have access to it. If they read it they will see that the Ombudsman has not closed the investigation. He actually stated in the report that there would be ongoing investigations. Even this morning I received communication by fax from the Ombudsman indicating further investigations. So, until the

Ombudsman has finished his investigation of the matter, I think it is not a matter about which any of us could be satisfied.

#### BUDGET

**Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Acting Premier confirm that total Commonwealth net payments to South Australia will increase by 11.2 per cent to \$2 857 million this financial year, as stated on page 10 of Budget Paper No. 4, and will he now rule out any further tax increases in the State budget?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The Government was aware of pretty well everything that has been factored into the State budget prior to the bringing down of the Federal budget last night. It seems to me that last night's budget was very good for South Australians, but by no means reassures us as to the way in which the States will necessarily be treated in the next couple of years. All I can say to the honourable member—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** —is that the forthcoming budget will be responsible and fiscally conservative.

#### STATE BANK

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** Has the Acting Premier read the section of the Ombudsman's report referring to the sources of the dossiers kept by the State Bank, how much State Bank money was involved in paying those sources and was one of those sources the same person whose by-line appeared above the article in today's *Advertiser* on the Ombudsman's report into the earlier *Advertiser* report on those dossiers?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Yes, I have read the report. I have it in front of me and perhaps the specific paragraph should be read into the record because it is very interesting. It states:

I was of the opinion that the most convenient source of information would be supplied outside of the bank by people with a special knowledge of politics. Accordingly, I approached a reporter from the *Advertiser* to ask whether he could supply me with some background biographical detail on the three politicians. At the same time, I approached a political lobbyist employed by a public relations company and asked for a commentary on the same persons.

I believe that in the House last evening an honourable member indicated who he thought these two people were. The member for Napier indicated that he understood that the reporter from the *Advertiser* was a Mr Rex Jory and that the political lobbyist employed by a public relations company was a Mrs Joan Hall.

I can neither confirm nor deny that, and I guess there is an opportunity for those people to deny if they feel that is appropriate. Nor can I indicate whether there was any payment—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** —made for these services rendered.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Nor would members, I think, expect that I would know whether there had been any payment for the services. No doubt it was very modest in view of the modest nature of the services provided.

All I want to say in relation to this particular matter—and I make no comment on Mrs Hall's involvement at all—is that she was approached to provide a service, and that was provided. In a sense, that is what Mr Jory did, if indeed he is the political reporter involved. I think what took our breath away was the initial article in the *Advertiser*—the suggestion that this was some sort of extraordinary exposure that it had run across, that there was some extraordinary cover-up going on in the State Bank when, of course, all the *Advertiser* had to do, on the information that has been given to me, was to talk to Mr Jory. Someone could have walked into another office and asked, 'Rex, what's the score here? Do you know anything about this? What light can you throw on these matters?' I then assume that all would have been revealed. As someone obviously did not take that step into the next office to ask Mr Jory, that is the only construction I can put on these events. The people of South Australia have been led into unnecessary alarm about a matter which really should have been put to rest some time ago.

#### BETTER CITIES PROGRAM

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** I direct my question to the Acting Premier. Why is only \$15.3 million being allocated this year in the Federal budget for the Better Cities program, and is this all to be spent on the MFP? The Government has already stated that \$15 million of Federal funds would be spent this financial year on the MFP core site and \$25 million next financial year as part of the Better Cities program. The budget papers do not indicate whether all the \$15 million is to be spent on the MFP or whether all or some of the \$15 million is to be spent on council projects.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There was a specific earmarking for Commonwealth purposes of just over \$5 million in the budget papers for the MFP. It was nothing to do with Better Cities; that was the MFP. In addition, members are aware that there is close to \$70 million to come to South Australia, and that was to be over a four-year program for Better Cities. A component of that was earmarked, and had always been earmarked, for the MFP.

However, it was made clear in the budget last evening—and this is where we are attempting to get more information—that the Commonwealth would be seeking to shift forward what is at this stage still a four-year program into the first two years of that program. We are trying to determine at officer level how much of the money that was originally to have flowed to us in years three and four will immediately come into years one and two. Once that matter has been resolved, I will have more information for the honourable member which I will gladly make available to him. All I can say is that as a result of the original announcement and last night's

announcement it is now quite clear that we will be spending substantial sums in this financial year in the non-MFP component of the Better Cities program.

#### STATE BANK

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** Is the Acting Premier aware whether or not the *Advertiser* journalist was authorised by the Adelaide *Advertiser* to assist the State Bank in preparing dossiers on people's personal lives, dossiers which were reported on by that newspaper in a front page exclusive—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you pulled me up for something that was totally irrelevant on my very first day in this House. Now you are willing to allow the Whip—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Until I can hear what the point of order is, I cannot make a decision. If members will remain quiet, I shall be able to hear the point of order. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The point of order is that the question is out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader is correct. If he will resume his seat, I will rule in that way. The matter is not one for which the Acting Premier is responsible to this House. Therefore, it is out of his area of control and out of order.

#### FRINGE BENEFITS TAX

**Mr OLSEN (Kavel):** What does the Acting Treasurer estimate that the Government will have to spend in fringe benefits tax each year following the announcement in the Federal budget that all employers will have to pay the tax for providing car parking for their employees? It has been estimated that a company employing 250 employees will have to pay \$112 125 a year based on a \$5 a day car parking rate. The State Government currently has more than 6 000 vehicles operating in its fleet for its employees, mostly in the cities and suburbs.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The assessment has not been made. It will be made and whatever tax is due will be willingly paid.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Because this Government supports the Federal Government taxing perks.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** We believe in the Government taxing perks, we believe in the fringe benefits tax and we believe that the more privileged members of the community who can arrange their salary package to unload some of their taxable income into non-taxable areas ought not to be allowed to get away with it. We have encouraged the Federal Government to tax

fringe benefits, whether they be the so-called businessman's lunch or whether they be in the areas of providing school fees for private schools. I do not believe that any—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Goyder is out of order. The Chair cannot hear the response over interjections. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Thank you, Sir, for your protection from the member for Goyder. The member for Goyder has behaved like a hooligan since Parliament has begun. He has been brought into line.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Standing Orders very clearly provide for the relevance of an answer. The actions of the member for Goyder, whether or not they are to the Minister's liking, are of no concern to the House. I would request the Minister to come back to the subject of the question and the answer.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Thank you, Sir. This Government does support such measures; there is no question about that, and we make no apologies for it. There ought not to be ways where people can avoid tax without somebody taking action against it, and in this case there is no doubt that there are salary packages which include free car parking space in the CBD. I believe that the Federal Government is absolutely correct in seeing that those people who have that as part of their salary package pay the appropriate rate of tax. I make no apologies for it. When the figures have been calculated they will be made available to the member for Kavel.

## BUDGET

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. What was the increase in discretionary funding to South Australia in yesterday's budget, and can the Minister confirm the press comments that South Australia's budget received an extra 10 per cent from the Commonwealth? Is this figure correct?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** As Minister of Finance, and having some responsibility in putting the budget together, I wish that the figure was not only correct but also relevant to the budget. The problem with the figure that has been used by the Leader of the Opposition—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Well, I am answering it. The problem with the figure used by the Leader, among others, is that somehow this amount is an increase in South Australia's revenues. As I said, I wish it were true; I wish it were correct. To put the record straight, it appears to us, as far as we can make out from what the Deputy Leader is referring to, he has used the bottom line net payments figure. This includes the distortion of repayments that are lower 1992-93 and so exaggerates the growth of net payments.

The gross payments are actually payments to be made to the State and (this is the critical part) payments through the State, including funding for higher education financial assistance grants; grants to local government; and grants to non-government schools which will

increase, I am very happy to say, by 10.5 per cent but which are simply passed through the State budget. The higher education payments, for example, will be paid direct to institutions in the very near future. So, there has been a direct benefit to South Australia, but no benefit at all to the South Australian budget. We are used by the Federal Government (quite properly) merely as a postbox and, when we get the money for higher education institutions, we immediately send it out. They can double it, triple it, and that is very good for the institution, but it does not help our budget by one cent.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mitcham, the Deputy Leader and the Leader are out of order. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** On a closer analysis of the figures, I think the Leader will have the graciousness to state that he had not seen all the picture.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** It is payment to the State (and I underline that) that represents those funds that will be paid to the State Government for State purposes. They will increase by 6.8 per cent and not 10.1 per cent. Whilst this represents real growth in funding, to respond to the Leader's assertion that taxation measures would not be needed because of Commonwealth assistance, we need to examine even those figures more closely. It is a feature of Federal budgets that it is many days before anybody gets through to the fine print and finds out precisely what is on offer to the States and the nation as a whole.

Of the estimated total increase in funding of about \$160 million, about \$100 million will be provided as specific purpose grants. The funds must be spent on the purposes for which they are provided. The State's budget flexibility is not changed by the level of program activity; maybe it can be increased. Where specific payments are made—and an argument has been going on for as long as I have been involved and probably longer—on specific purpose grants as opposed to general purpose grants, the States have the flexibility to set their own priorities. The Commonwealth Government canvassed the whole of the argument and said that it had a responsibility in certain areas and that it would direct where the funds go. Depending on which side of the argument you are, that is all very well, but the essential point is that it does not help the State Government's budget.

If the Federal Government wishes to put more into child-care, it can and we will welcome it. It is all very good, but it does not help this budget at all. The general purpose funds represent over 60 per cent of the Commonwealth's payment to the State and indeed are an essential element in shaping the budget to achieve an acceptable budget outcome. I remind the House that the State Government faces a range of demands (including constant demands from members opposite) for additional expenditure which is important in improving the long-term economic development prospect for the State's economy.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Sir, this should be a ministerial statement.

**The SPEAKER:** I was about to mention that when the Minister finished. However, when complicated and complex questions are asked—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! When complex questions are asked requiring a member to be wide-ranging in his response, it is difficult to specify the matter referred to by the person who asked the question. I suggest that questions be more pertinent and lock in the person responding.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Both sides have the right to ask questions and I am making that point to the House. Because I may be looking at the member for Mitcham, there is no need for him to feel badly about it. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** In conclusion, the need for taxation measures must be measured against the real picture of Commonwealth funding but also against the overall budgetary situation facing the State. A simplistic reading of the budget papers is inadequate. It means that the Leader of the Opposition, for example, shoots from the hip with little understanding and depth and says things—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister is now straying very much from the path. I ask him to resume his seat.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** —that I wish were true.

#### FRINGE BENEFITS TAX

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** My question is directed to the Acting Treasurer. Will he confirm that the Royal Adelaide Hospital will have to pay in the vicinity of \$2 million in fringe benefits tax a year for car parking for its employees; and can he give an assurance that this money will not come from the provision of clinical services? I am told that the Royal Adelaide Hospital now provides 2 000 permits for staff who are at present charged \$1.80 a day. The value of the nearest car park is \$8 a day. Therefore, fringe benefits tax would be paid on about \$6 a day per parking permit for 365 days a year. The total fringe benefit liability would be \$4 380 000 and, taxed at 47c in the dollar, the total fringe benefits tax would be \$2 058 000.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The member for Adelaide has laboured long and brought forth a mouse. Until such time—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Victoria.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Until such time as the Commonwealth, and particularly the Australian Taxation Office, clearly spells out who is liable for this tax and who is not, none of us knows. I heard a number of people on the air this morning who said exactly what I have just said. It is unfortunate, but we will have to wait until the details are spelt out. When they are, whatever tax is due to the Commonwealth will be paid by the Government.

#### GREENHOUSE EFFECT

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. What conclusions can be drawn from the recently released Greenhouse strategy for South Australia that was prepared by the Climate Change Committee?

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on the Minister, I again remind Ministers of their access to ministerial statements if it is a long and involved response. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will be extremely relevant.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question. Now that we have the frivolity out of the way I would like to say that this is a very serious matter. In fact, the recently released Greenhouse Strategy for South Australia, which is the annual progress report of the Climate Change Committee, makes it very clear that the greenhouse effect is a very real problem and is happening now—it is not something that might happen in the future. The report says that in the past century global temperatures have increased between .3 and .6 of a degree centigrade, that the 1980s was the hottest decade in recorded history and that 1990 was the hottest year on record. In addition, sea levels have risen between 10 and 20 cms since the turn of the century, and professional advice from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change indicates that temperatures will continue to rise by .3 of a degree centigrade every 10 years unless we take immediate action throughout the world to curb greenhouse gas emissions.

It is essential that Governments everywhere hasten the move to renewable energy resources and provide greater incentives for the use of low carbon dioxide emitting fuels such as natural gas. Things such as energy audits, fuel efficient vehicles, higher vehicle occupancy rates and urban consolidation are all policies that Governments can and must pursue. Briefly, it is vitally important that the shape and orientation of new houses, the insulation of ceilings and walls, the energy labelling of domestic appliances and the use of energy efficient technologies, such as cogeneration in industry and commerce, are vitally important.

In conclusion, I am delighted and proud to inform the House that South Australia is acquitting itself well in most of these areas. Although much still needs to be done, I believe in recognising that South Australian industry in general, and the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the STA in particular, can be very satisfied with their efforts thus far to contain the greenhouse problem in our State.

#### FOSTER PARENTS

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** My question is directed to the Minister of Family and Community Services. What savings is the Government and the Department for Family and Community Services anticipating from the new restrictions being placed on foster parents and those in the Intensive Neighbourhood Care scheme; and what effect does he expect these new

budgetary restrictions to have on people volunteering to look after children who have been neglected, abused or are at risk of both? I have received a copy of a letter from a regional officer in the Department for Family and Community Services sent to foster parents, informing them of new limits on reimbursements for care travel, meals, entertainment, clothing, etc. This question is particularly pertinent recognising that this is Child Protection Week.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Well, a new system of payments to foster care is being instituted which we believe is far more equitable than has been the case in the past. It will mean that some of the what might be called fringe benefits that have been attached to fostering will no longer be available, but that pool of funds will be available to provide more resources generally to the area. I will obtain that information for the honourable member. In any event, it will all come out in the budget process.

We have to appreciate that there is a difficult philosophical question that operates here. For example, a family who live in Woodville and send their natural children to Woodville High might take on a foster child who is also sent to Woodville High. However, another family living in the eastern suburbs might send their natural children to a private school. Should there be additional taxpayer assistance to ensure that the foster child in that family also goes to a private school? I cite that as an example of the broader philosophical problem. I understand that you cannot have a situation where, in the one family, the foster child is seen as the poor relative, as it were, but at the same time the effect of what we have been doing over the years has been that the more well off foster parents get more resources and more assistance from the State than the less well off. That is a very difficult situation to sustain, particularly in periods of fiscal restraint.

I will obtain the specific details for the honourable member. He has only a small portion of that from the letter that he has read. I have taken the opportunity to lay out for the House the philosophy of what we are trying to do, and most people would see that, once you look at it at that broad level, what we are doing is equitable and fair.

#### FREMONT HIGH SCHOOL

**Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth):** Is the Minister of Education able to confirm that Fremont High School will be relocated to the Elizabeth City High School site, and can he give the House a firm indication of when this will occur? The second Joel committee report into the structure of education at Elizabeth and Munno Para prepared earlier this year recommended, *inter alia*, that the Fremont High School should be relocated to the Elizabeth City campus and established as a year 8-10 school. The Government has recently endorsed the report but reserved its decision on the relocation of Fremont High School. A meeting of the Inbarendi Board last Friday evening endorsed the Joel committee recommendations and sought an urgent resolution of this one outstanding issue.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question and for his ongoing commitment

to schools in the Elizabeth-Munno Para area. Both he and the member for Napier have contributed significantly to the restructuring of schools in that important part of our metropolitan area. The restructuring that began almost five years ago now, with the first Joel committee report, has progressed, and the second Joel committee report has now come to hand and is being implemented.

The first announcement as a result of that report—the transformation of the Smithfield Plains High School into a junior secondary campus—was made some weeks ago. The department has asked the Inbarendi College board to advise it on the future implementation of the Joel committee recommendations.

As the honourable member has indicated to the House, that board met last week and recommended to the department that the second major recommendation of the Joel committee—the relocation of Fremont High School site in the form of a middle school for years 8 to 10—be implemented, and the department and I have agreed to that.

The Fremont school will continue to cater for students in years 8 to 12 in 1993. However, the department will take advice from the Inbarendi board on the timing of its relocation to the Elizabeth City campus. That is a very exciting move for secondary education in that district and it will be associated with substantial expenditure. Prior to the establishment of the budget with respect to relocation of the Fremont campus, there is money to be spent in this financial year on the restructuring of Elizabeth City High School.

Previous commitments have been made in the amount of \$384 000 for that restructuring of the Elizabeth City High School arising out of the very serious fire that occurred there a while ago. Additional planning commitments amount to \$2.12 million. So, there is a very substantial redevelopment to occur in the current financial year; that will be followed by additional expenditure with respect to the relocation of Fremont High School, establishing what will be one of the most comprehensive and advanced senior secondary campuses in the State.

#### MENTAL HEALTH

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I direct my question to the Minister of Health. Why is the Government not providing sufficient assessment, care and supervision of persons with a history of mental instability? Constituents of Brooklyn Park have complained to me about the frightening behaviour of a person with a long history of mental illness.

In one 24-hour period, police were required to attend this person on six occasions. He has entered several houses, exposed himself, directed traffic and kissed motor cars, ransacked rubbish bins and deposited rubbish in other residences, and misbehaved in a children's playground, to name a few of his recent escapades. Constituents inform me they are frightened of him, as are the 50 tenants of the block of flats where he resides.

I understand this person has been taken to Glenside several times and was held for 30 minutes on one occasion. My constituents ask how much longer they have to put up with this unruly, annoying behaviour by someone who obviously needs special help and care?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** First, I take issue with the assumption behind the honourable member's question, although at the same time I would be only too happy to take up this individual case and determine whether in any way there is any defect in the way in which professional assistance has flowed to that individual.

Obviously, assessment is something that the Government does not provide except in the sense that it provides the resources for this to happen. Assessment must always be in professional hands and it is not for me to judge whether the psychiatrist who is involved in this case—or a number of psychiatrists who may be involved—is doing the job properly.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I do not know; it is up to them to tell me. The honourable member would not expect to go to a lay person to get advice about pain around the appendix area. Nor, for that matter, would he expect that he would go to a lay person to get—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:**—advice about the mental condition of a person who obviously has a mental illness. We are clearly in the hands of the clinicians and the professionals. We can do two things. I have already indicated the first: we can provide the resources to enable that to be done effectively, and we do that; that is quite clear. The second thing—and I am going to anticipate the interjection by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—is that there is a legal framework against which this operates. People can have recourse to that legal framework if they want it. The only thing I am prepared to hazard in relation to this is that for the most part there has been a presumption in recent years on the part of both the legal framework and the profession of psychiatry generally that on balance people should be encouraged to get back into the community rather than into institutional care.

Again speaking generally and without any reflection on this particular case, there are people who want to argue that that has gone too far, but I do not know that I want to intervene, except again in a very general way, in this respect. My concern would be for the protection of that individual. I would be only too happy to say to the clinicians who are involved, 'Are you certain that in your prescriptions you are adequately taking into account the concern for that individual?'

*Dr Armitage interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Quite often, as a matter of fact. If at the end of the day the clinicians say that they believe that is the appropriate way in which this should proceed, I am not in a position, nor is the honourable member, to take issue with them. That is the general situation, but I am only too happy to take up the specific case and report back to the honourable member and the House.

## BUDGET

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education outline to the House the impact on South Australia of last night's Federal budget?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Before calling on the Minister, once again I point out the recourse to a ministerial statement if the answer is to be long and involved. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Absolutely, Sir, and I want to refrain from that, but there was some confusion, given an article in this morning's *Advertiser*.

**An honourable member:** Do you mean *Pravda*?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I think it is probably incorrect to compare this morning's *Advertiser* with *Pravda*: at least *Pravda* has *Izvestia* for competition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** More like the *Albanian Morning Post*. I think it is important to recognise that there has been \$34 million which should be our share of money for jobs and training for young people following the negotiations for the Youth Employment Summit. We are also pleased to see the almost doubling of funding for labour market programs to \$1.1 billion, and that, across Australia, should assist more than 420 000 people. I certainly welcome the jobs boost through the local capital works program: it will provide a special boost—and I know that this will be of special interest to you, Mr Speaker—for areas hardest hit by unemployment. We certainly hope that this will provide \$35 million for South Australian job creation using the local government infrastructure.

I want to emphasise, to make this brief, that it is vitally important that these funds flow quickly and immediately. The problem with One Nation in terms of employment and infrastructure programs is that most of the programs have long lead-in times and we have to get the jobs flowing now.

## AMBULANCES

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** Will the Minister of Health ensure that all ambulances used in country districts are fitted with roo bars in the interests of driver and patient safety? I have seen a letter from senior officers of the Hawker division of the St John Ambulance Brigade stating that one of its vehicles had recently been damaged in a collision with a kangaroo. Fortunately, the ambulance had been fitted with a roo bar, thus minimising damage and allowing the patient to be transported safely to hospital without delay. However, the division was provided with another ambulance while the damaged vehicle was being repaired. The replacement, formerly based at Port Augusta, underwent various modifications before being sent to Hawker. These modifications included the removal of its roo bar, thereby exposing patients and drivers to unnecessary injury.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I think it is a very good suggestion, and I will take it up immediately with the Ambulance Board.

### NATIONAL RAIL CORPORATION

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House of the current situation with regard to the signing of the National Rail Corporation agreement? I am aware that there were a number of unresolved issues regarding that agreement and that South Australia was not prepared to sign it until these issues were resolved.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Stuart for her question and for her ongoing interest in the issue of the National Rail Corporation, because of course it was critical to the State seat of Stuart, as well as critical to the whole of South Australia. I am delighted to be able to announce that the Government has now signed the National Rail Corporation agreement. Members will recall that there was a special Premiers Conference at which all the States signed the agreement, but South Australia declined to sign because we had these outstanding issues, as mentioned by the member for Stuart. One of the issues was that we wanted to ensure that there were some improved benefits for South Australian workers involved, and I am pleased to say that has been achieved.

Particularly and quite specifically for the member for Stuart, we were determined that the Australian National workshops at Port Augusta would be given some special consideration. They were used almost entirely in servicing Australian National and, if Australian National was to be in some way subsumed or fragmented, the question of the railway workshops would of course be very important. The Federal Government has announced a significant upgrading of the railway workshops at Port Augusta—something of the order of \$3.5 million—which will assist the workshop in being able to compete on a purely commercial basis for National Rail Corporation work.

I was very pleased a couple of weeks ago to have a commitment by the Federal Government to the railway workshops at Islington—\$4.4 million—to enable those workshops also to be upgraded, and to compete also for National Rail Corporation work. We kept the pressure on until the very last minute, but the Federal Government announced two weekends ago that there would be a \$12 million upgrading of the Indian Pacific and, further, that negotiations were taking place so that Australian National would be the organisation that ran the Indian Pacific from coast to coast. I know that that \$12 million decision to refurbish the Indian Pacific has been criticised by the Liberal Party but I can assure the member for Stuart and the House that this Government supports it strongly.

The standardisation of rail from Adelaide to Melbourne is again an investment in infrastructure in this country which I believe will benefit not only South Australia but also the country as a whole. To have the standard gauge running all the way from Fremantle to Brisbane I think is a magnificent achievement. It is 100 years too late, but these things do take time. However, I am delighted to say that this Government has got around to it. When one looks at all the projects that we have been able to achieve since the National Rail Corporation was first mooted and we first expressed our disquiet about what was being proposed, one would agree that we have had a remarkable result and achieved all we could reasonably

have expected. Given that there is now no longer any reason for South Australia to be the only State to hold out against signing the agreement, we are very pleased to announce that we have signed it, and the Government believes that South Australia will benefit enormously from it.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Sir, several times this week the Speaker has made statements about ministerial statements and I believe that the Minister is making a ministerial statement.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure the Minister of Transport will conclude his answer shortly.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Had I not been interrupted by the member for Hayward, I would have concluded long ago. I believe that, now that all States have signed, the National Rail Corporation will be of enormous benefit not only to South Australia but to the whole of Australia.

### FISHERIES LICENCE

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Minister of Fisheries advise why he is allowing many marine scale fishery licence holders to have their licence renewed for a full 12 months (until 30 June 1993), even though the licence holders concerned have paid only one quarter's fees; and will this mean the Department of Fisheries may lose up to three-quarters of its revenue from marine scale licence holders this year? A marine scale fisherman in my electorate has shown me his licence renewal which indicates, 'This licence is current from the date of the validation hereon until 30/06/93.' However, the fisherman has paid only the first quarterly instalment of \$219.50 of the total \$878 fee. Several other marine scale fishermen have similar licence renewal endorsements. Professional advice my constituent has received indicates the Department of Fisheries will be legally bound to honour this 'quarter-paid' licence for the full year.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The department has set fees after approval by Cabinet for all fisheries licences including the marine scale fisheries licence. They are 12-month fees and payable by all people requiring a licence. The situation mentioned by the honourable member I will have investigated to ascertain whether or not the form of licence issued may not reflect the situation. There is the matter of whether or not licence fees should be payable by quarterly instalment as opposed to the full annual fee being paid at once. I have had submissions made to me about that matter over time and I have been very sympathetic. Measures are in place for that to happen and people can pay the fee quarterly. That may be happening in this situation and it may be (I do not know as I have not seen the licence form) that the wording on the form does not correctly reflect that as the case: it may not point out that it is the first of four instalments. I will obtain a detailed report but advise that a 12-month fee has been set and a 12-month fee will, in the 12 months, be payable.



### AVIAN INFLUENZA

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** Will the Minister of Agriculture outline the incidence of avian influenza in South Australia and state whether there has been a recent epidemic of this disease in other States? I have been contacted by constituents worried about the possibility of avian influenza producing an egg shortage in South Australia or the possibility of a chicken meat shortage.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for this question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The member for Hanson derides the question without realising how serious avian influenza is. It is a very serious situation. I am pleased to point out that to this point we do not have an outbreak in South Australia, but if there were to be an outbreak in South Australia it would not only affect the hatcheries and egg producing areas but also have the potential to affect hens in backyards all over the place. It is a very serious condition—so serious that South Australia is part of a national agreement to participate in the eradication cost of outbreaks wherever they take place.

There is presently an outbreak in Victoria and we have agreed (I have given my ministerial approval) to sharing 4 per cent of the cost of that outbreak in Bendigo, Victoria. Ultimately, we may have to pay \$80 000 to \$100 000 for that outbreak, given the cost of the 1985 outbreak in Bendigo in which we also participated. I have a set of figures that form a table, and I seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

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

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

#### STATE DISEASE CONTROL HEADQUARTERS, BENDIGO PROGRESS REPORT ON AVIAN INFLUENZA OUTBREAK 13 August 1992, 17.00 hours

##### CURRENT SITUATION:

1.1 In control area	
Infected premises .....	1
Dangerous contact premises .....	3
Premises under quarantine .....	18
Premises under surveillance .....	127
Animals under surveillance .....	946 799
Total premises inspections .....	344
Total animal inspections .....	7 547 979
Stock destroyed:	
Birds 0-8 weeks .....	65 392
Birds 9-20 weeks .....	147
Birds 20+ weeks .....	21 518
Fertile eggs .....	497 527
Table eggs .....	1 233
Laboratory tests:	
Necropsies .....	3 412
Hi-serology .....	4 102
IFAT impressions .....	3 412

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Briefly, in Victoria about 80 000 birds have had to be destroyed as a result of the outbreak. About 497 000 fertile eggs and just over 1 000 table eggs have been destroyed as a result of the outbreak. I have approved officers going to Victoria to monitor the situation and to see how the outbreak is being handled in case, in a worse case scenario, we have an outbreak in South Australia. They can use it as a training opportunity so that we can handle anything here

as effectively as possible. It is a serious matter and I thank the honourable member for his question and hope that we receive the support of other members.

### TOURISM SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** I direct my question to the Acting Minister of Tourism. Can the Minister explain to the House why Tourism South Australia did not take up a stand at the *Advertiser* Australian Federation of Travel Agents Exhibition last weekend? The travel exhibition is the biggest of its kind, at which 9 000 South Australians, 2 000 more than the previous record, attended last weekend at Adelaide Exhibition Hall. There were 82 exhibitors from the industry—93 in all—including five country regional groups from South Australia, all State Tourism authorities, except Western Australia and international tourism boards from Singapore, Germany, Malaysia, South Africa, Britain, Greece, New Zealand and the Cook Islands were there but Tourism South Australia was not there. Why not?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I will find out for the honourable member.

### MARINE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr HERON (Peake):** Can the Minister for Environment and Planning advise whether policies and guidelines to control discharges to the marine environment have been issued as required by the Marine Environment Protection Act?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in this matter. The policies and guidelines to control discharges to the marine environment in South Australia have been released and include such things as quality criteria for estuarine and marine waters, policies for licensing and the formula under which we can set fees.

Industry now has a clear and concise set of guidelines to be able to plan for environment improvement programs over the next eight years which have been allowed to companies by the transitional arrangements in the Act. Each licensee will be required to prepare an environmental improvement program showing how that operation will meet environmental standards before the end of the transitional period. Work over the past two years has identified about 120 industries and Government instrumentalities which will need to have a licence. About half the licenses will be issued without fee, because of their relatively small impact, with about 40 paying about \$300. Many of the remaining dischargers liable for higher fees have already begun work on major environmental enhancement programs and this will indeed reduce their fees in the future.

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

**The SPEAKER:** The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I draw attention today to the problems that have arisen in the Department of Agriculture in recent times in its relationship with the University of Adelaide's Faculty of Agricultural and Natural Resources Sciences. It is particularly a consequence of the Minister's indifference to his responsibilities. It seems that the pressure on this irrelevant Government is getting to him, even though he is usually unflappable. Judging by his attack on Professor Harold Woolhouse, we can see that the Waite Institute Campus, the Faculty of Agricultural and Natural Resources Sciences at the University of Adelaide and his own department even have not escaped from these attacks. The bottom line is that the Government is so strapped for cash that it has decided to attack the defenceless rural sector, which has neither the money nor the numbers to fight back, other than politically through people like me who represent them.

Wasting \$1 million on a review of the department is one thing, and that is what is happening. However, if the consultant's review which is being undertaken at that cost to the taxpayers is not needed to examine the Government's opinion that there were inadequacies and shortcomings, for what other reason do we need it? What is more, to attack the department by saying, to quote the Minister, 'It [the department] had not really given farmers and rural industries proper marketing advice' is self-flagellation, surely. It seems that the stress has caused the Minister to become a political masochist.

The Labor Party has been in office now for most of the past 25 years. Its policies have spanned two generations. If there is a mess, it has been created by Arnold's ALP ministerial forebears and perpetuated by the Minister himself. That \$1 million could be better spent elsewhere in the department other than on a consultant. I have been calling for proper marketing advice to be provided to rural producers by the department for the past 13 years. The problem which the Minister has been referring to has been caused by the Government's refusal to provide funds for this essential work. The Government could have done this long ago by simply re-ordering its political priorities.

In a recent press release the Minister said, 'We now realise there are other areas that the department should be involved in.' Some timing—he is a Johnny-come-lately! Then the most outrageous, half-witted statement I have ever heard from any Minister, 'We will have to negotiate those aspects with the Public Service Association.' As if it knows anything about agriculture! It does not run the rural industries in this State; nor does it have any competence to advise on or determine the needs of rural industries. Why do we need to have members of Parliament representing rural communities and their industries, and why do we bother to pay our subscriptions to the UF&S, for instance, and why do we keep the Advisory Board of Agriculture if the Minister only needs to consult the Public Service Association?

The inadequate marketing returns which rural producers are receiving are a direct consequence of the long-term effects of the Labor Party's policies, both State and Federal. There is budgetary policy, insufficient extensive service funds, fiscal policy—the dirty float on

the dollar and relatively high interest rates—science and technology policy and cuts to research funding for both programs and facilities which then required increased industry contribution from an already cash-strapped rural sector. There are micro-economic reform policies, inefficient and expensive transport, waterfront and other contrived influences, and politically convenient but inadequate attempts at reform there. Then there is the industrial relations policy—high labour input costs on everything the rural sector must buy or use. All these are Labor Party botch jobs.

The Minister admits that the consultant's review is being regarded as a tool to cut staff numbers, with 45 abolished in 1990 and another 35 to go in the next few weeks. That number is expected to increase by as much as 10-fold as a result of that report. For the Minister to then attack Professor Woolhouse, claiming that the ambiguities in the arrangements for the relocation of departmental staff and the facilities from Northfield to the Waite campus were in some way the professor's fault or the fault of his predecessor, or that the faculty board or the university council is in some way to blame is inane in the extreme. To try to get himself off the hook by saying that only some of these delays are the fault of others is an admission that he is at least partly to blame. If this wimpish approach is the best that he can come up with—

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

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I have a few remarks to put before the House regarding this very strange and bizarre story of the State Bank files. In doing so, I would like to read briefly from the statutory declaration by Mr Michael David Hughes, Senior Manager Media Relations of the State Bank, which was in the Ombudsman's report handed to you, Sir. He said, among other things:

Both I and the Chief Manager, Group Communications of the Bank, Mr Tim Sauer, contacted a number of present and former employees of State Bank, in particular Executives, to whom David Hallaby had referred in the said telephone conversation as persons who should have knowledge of the files. These calls were made in an attempt to ascertain whether the files did in fact exist.

The statutory declaration describes how the State Bank was turned upside down until 10 o'clock at night in the search for these files that have been referred to in the somewhat sensationalised and fanciful article of Friday, 14 August on the front page of the *Advertiser*, under the rather lurid heading 'Personal Files kept on MPs, Judges and Police—Bank's Secret Dossiers' and under the by-line of David Hellaby and Colin James. There is the clear inference that something very distasteful had gone on and they had obviously gone to the effort of getting responses expressing various degrees of outrage and bemusement from you, Sir, from the Chairman of Committees and from the former farmer Leader of the Opposition. Regarding the hunt for these files, Mr Hughes stated:

I believe at the time I was not provided with an accurate description of the documents said to be in the possession of the bank. In the circumstances, whilst the search for these alleged files was conducted it was restricted as the documents had not been identified by the media reporter.

In other words, you, Sir, and the Ombudsman were not clearly advised as to what you were actually looking for, although one would think that, in view of what has come to light since, the *Advertiser* journalist would have been in a very good position to know what it was you would be looking for. Mr Hughes went on to say:

I was cognisant on Friday 14 August 1988 of the report on pages 1 and 2 of the *Advertiser* (marked 'B'). As a result of this article I recalled that several years ago in the course of my normal duties I had been asked to prepare a background briefing paper on Mr D. Baker, Mr M. Evans and Mr N. Peterson. As I recall this was done at a time when Mr D. Baker was likely to be elected Leader of the Opposition, Mr N. Peterson had been appointed Speaker of the House and Mr M. Evans had been appointed Chairman of the Parliamentary Standing Committees.

That is not quite correct. The article goes on:

I believe to the best of my knowledge and information at the time it was the custom of executives to have some biographical knowledge of leading politicians and persons either new to politics or who held new positions.

He then states:

I was of the opinion that the most convenient source of information would be supplied outside of the bank by people with a special knowledge of politics. Accordingly, I approached a reporter from the *Advertiser* to ask whether he could supply me with some background biographical detail on the three politicians. At the same time, I approached a political lobbyist employed by a public relations company and asked for commentary on the same persons.

He concludes by stating:

To the best of my knowledge there was no organised or systematic practice in the bank at the time of this document or subsequently whereby information was gathered on persons in an improper manner . . .

Mr Hughes refers to it as being normal business practice to be aware of the sort of people one is intending to meet. Certainly, as a member of Parliament, when meeting new people and if there is some reason for me to become aware of aspects about them that I should know, I do a little bit of homework. I think it is a courtesy to the people one meets that that sort of homework be done. For example, one can be aware of what subjects to avoid in the course of a discussion.

However, the very curious aspect of this whole story is the role of the *Advertiser*. There was an inference in the article on Friday that something very untoward had happened. However, it appears to have had a role in the very process of generating these files itself. Did the *Advertiser* authorise the journalist to prepare the material what was used? The *Advertiser*, out of a degree of integrity, ought to acknowledge its role. However, on page 3 today, under the by-line of Mr Jory and another journalist, there is no reference to that. Instead, we have had this amazing closed circle of reporting whereby the *Advertiser* assists in generating the files, reports on their existence, the Ombudsman is called in to report on the allegations in that press report, and his report on the allegations is then reported in the *Advertiser*, apparently by the same person who first generated the files initially reported on. I believe that the case of that journalist represents the greatest amount of gall since the boy who killed his parents and then pleaded for mercy on the grounds that he was an orphan.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

**The SPEAKER:** I have to inform the House that Her Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the Speaker and honourable members for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 3.20 p.m. today. I ask the mover and seconder of the Address and such other members as care to accompany me to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting the Address.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the State of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

*[Sitting suspended from 3.15 to 3.52 p.m.]*

**The SPEAKER:** I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to Her Excellency the Address adopted by the House on 18 August, to which Her Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

To the honourable Speaker and members of the House of Assembly, I thank you for the Address in Reply to the speech with which I opened the fourth session of the Forty-seventh Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best consideration to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

Debate resumed.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** Earlier today I asked the Minister of Family and Community Services a question about the reduction in assistance to foster parents, specifically in regard to the savings that the Government and the Department for Family and Community Services were anticipating from new restrictions on foster parents and those in intensive neighbourhood care schemes. I asked the question to determine what effect they expect these new budgetary restrictions will have on people volunteering to look after children who have been neglected or abused or are at risk of both. I have to say that the Minister's response was most disappointing. The Minister referred to fringe benefits that previously had been made available to foster parents and to INC parents, indicating that it was a philosophical question that needed to be referred to and that he would obtain more information for me. I await that information with interest, because I believe it is important that those people who have accepted responsibility and are keen to assist young people have the situation explained to them in some detail.

In my explanation to that question I referred to a copy of a letter which I had received from a regional officer in the Department for Family and Community Services and which has been sent to foster parents informing them of delimits on reimbursements for car travel, meals, entertainment, clothing and so on. One foster parent has written to me saying that these restrictions will eliminate music, craft and speech lessons, sports clothing, and special clothes for children with arthritic complaints and will severely disadvantage country people who do not

have access to public transport and rely on private cars to get to hospitals, psychiatrists, therapy sessions and so on.

That is of particular concern to me, because I have now been contacted by a number of people, particularly in country areas; who are concerned about these budgetary restrictions being placed on them. A typical example of the kind of effect these cutbacks will have is a young foster daughter who has progressed from an inability to read and write to being an A-grade student in four years, with 11 distinctions last term. That has come about through self-esteem gained from lessons in speech and drama, organ, guitar and other areas. These payments have now all been cancelled, and that is a very sad state of affairs. This child to whom I am referring has now been adopted by foster parents in Murray Bridge. These parents are also anxious to take in a second child, and that second child has afflictions similar to those of the first to whom I referred. I understand that the parents are very capable people and the member for Murray-Mallee, in whose electorate these people reside, knows them well and I am sure supports the case that I am putting forward today.

As a result of the budgetary restraints and restrictions to which I have referred, this second child, whom the foster parents are keen to take into their home, will miss out on all the advantages gained by the first child and that, I believe, is completely unacceptable. It will be very embarrassing for the foster parents, because they will have been able to provide to the first child a lot of assistance that will not be available to the second child they are taking into their home. I look forward with anticipation to the information that the Minister will provide, and I urge him and the Government to reconsider the decision that has been made regarding these budgetary restrictions, mainly because of the important work that foster parents and INC parents are doing throughout the State. This question is particularly pertinent, regarding that this is Child Protection Week.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I am glad to see on the front bench the Minister of Emergency Services as the Minister responsible for police activities, because I want to direct this issue to him and to give him notice that tomorrow I will be asking him a question about this matter. Too often we see in the media such headlines as 'High-speed car chase', 'Police vehicles damaged', 'Juveniles in high-speed stolen car chase', 'Car chase deaths', or 'Shoot-out ends wild 180 kilometre per hour bus chase', and today an article appears in the *Advertiser* headed 'Three wheel car chase', in relation to motor vehicles or buses that have been stolen. It is rather fortuitous that yesterday I spoke to the Minister about this issue and indicated that I would like to get a question on this matter.

Today I received a call in my electorate office relating to this article on the 'three-wheel car chase'. It has been my observation over many years that these high-speed car chases may not be necessary, particularly when this morning a constituent asked whether it was possible for spiked steel plates to be placed across a road so that, when vehicles are stolen and they speed off at a high rate of kilometres per hour, a road block can be installed so that the vehicles in question hit those spiked steel

barriers, which will automatically puncture the tyre and bring that vehicle or bus to a halt.

It would eliminate many of these high speed car chases and the need for police to chase at high speeds. It would possibly eliminate danger to other road users where road blocks are put up. Although it could be argued that in some way it could endanger the lives of other motorists on the road, nevertheless, the matter should be seriously investigated by the Minister and the police. I am not blaming the police or the Minister, but the practice of baiting the police with stolen cars has gone on far too long and people in the community, quite frankly, have had a gutful of it. I have had a car stolen and recently a son of mine had his car stolen and it was not recovered, so I can understand the intense anger of people out in the community—thousands of them—not to mention the cost in terms of motor vehicle insurance premiums.

So, I declare my pecuniary interest in relation to the impact this matter has had on my family over many years; I feel angry as a father and as a citizen of this State; and I believe also that I represent the view of my constituents. The people concerned should not be allowed to get away with such practices. The matter I have raised is one of the options that should be considered. This idea should be trialled in an effort to curtail chases which we know can result in damage to vehicles. My major concern is for the police officers engaged in these high speed car chases. I am not saying that they are irresponsible as they act through their radio base to determine when and where to call off a chase. Nevertheless the community has had enough.

Why should these people endanger other people on the road, even causing death and the sorts of thing that have happened in Western Australia? This type of device should be trialled at least to see whether it can curtail the problem and signal to this ratbag element in the community that we will no longer cop this sort of practice and will trial every possible suggestion in an endeavour to reduce the incidence of stolen vehicles and the trauma caused to these people who work hard to purchase a car, only to have it stolen by a ratbag who smashes it up and destroys it.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** This afternoon I raised a question with the Minister of Health about the behaviour of a person in my electorate last weekend. The person concerned was mentally unstable and obviously crying out for help. Assistance was not forthcoming. Unfortunately, he successfully tied up police activities for 24 hours, as on six occasions they were called out by local residents to rescue this person. He was acting in an abnormal manner. On one occasion he was out in the middle of the road directing traffic. He would then stop the motor cars, run up and kiss them. He had been taken back to Glenside on several occasions. The staff said there was nothing they could do with him as he is in the grey area. Anybody who has had anything to do with psychiatrists, social workers, psychologists and so on knows that if they say that someone is in a grey area they do not know what to do. They pass the buck back to the community.

People are becoming tired of the deinstitutionalisation of mentally unstable people. We have to wear the problem and rescue these people and it becomes

extremely frustrating when innocent people have to put up with the antics of others. This is particularly so with the frail aged, the aged and people who have their own family problems and who live in close communities, as this person does in a block of flats housing 50 tenants. Everyone is being affected by the behaviour of this person and it comes down to the fact that, since the closure of Hillcrest, the pressure has been put on Glenside to handle some of these problems. No matter how good or brilliant the Glenside staff may be, as we are led to believe by the Minister, there is obviously a need for additional staff and accommodation to care for these people.

It is all very well for the Minister to pass it off in one of his typical pedantic moods, but the clinicians had already assessed this person and decided that he was capable of independent living. They decided he could look after himself and cope, but he was unable to cope. It often happens with people who have been institutionalised over a period that, when they are released into the community and are not provided with at least daily contact and supervision, they do not follow their medication or normal meal pattern and they slip into all sorts of other lax living habits and soon they become a menace to society.

Society cannot understand why this or any other Government would want to force on it the problems that should be handled by a proper institutional organisation. We do not like the word 'institution', and we do not like the thought of people becoming institutionalised, but deinstitutionalisation is even worse because, unless such people are properly assessed and given supervision and back-up care, they will never be able to behave themselves in public.

The Minister claims that it is his responsibility to look after the welfare of the patient, but it is also his responsibility to look after the rest of the community. Everyone in the local community at Brooklyn Park has been affected in some way by the behaviour of this person. Members can imagine the traumas this person caused to the young children when he visited the playground last week and menaced them. Members can imagine the traumas he is causing the parents of those children and the traumas he is causing those people living on their own when he enters their property and goes through their rubbish bin and throws their rubbish all over the place.

Members can imagine the difficulties that everyone in the community experiences in handling this character, so much so that even Neighbourhood Watch was brought in to try to help, but the problem was even beyond that organisation. This whole matter comes down to psychiatric assessment, yet the lay person who observes the behaviour and the person who has to live with these people is ruled not wise enough to be able to guide some of the people who make the decisions. Something needs to be done within the area of mental health care in this State. Something needs to be done to resolve this situation.

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

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Much has been said in the House over the past three years about its

history, particularly about what we should do with the centre hall doors. Like me, Mr Speaker, perhaps you are a bit weary of that kind of argument and so I want to talk about some other aspects of this fine and gracious building in which we spend most of our time, hopefully legislating for the benefit of the people of South Australia. When I take school children through the House I talk about the little bits and pieces that we have here at Parliament House to give them added interest. What they respond to most is the story about the angels on the top of the pillars. Edward John Woods was the Architect-in-Chief at that time. Incidentally, 'Architect-in-Chief' is the old title for the Minister of Public Works, and I had the honour to hold that portfolio some time ago.

Edward John Woods was a rather whimsical man with very strict morals. He designed practically the whole of this building and actually supervised its erection. His reason for putting the angels on top of the pillars was that, no matter wherever a member of Parliament was sitting or standing, an angel would be looking down upon that member. Sir, I noticed that you just looked up. You have the unique opportunity of having two angels above you to ensure that your contributions to this House are proper and correct. Not that you need any angels, Sir—as I said before, you have the wisdom of Solomon. Anyway, Mr Edward John Woods put those angels there to ensure that, whenever we were on our feet or whenever we were sitting down, an evil thought never passed through our minds and, whenever we spoke, an evil word never came from our lips.

The story goes that, if any member dared to utter an untruth or something that they did not really believe in, the angels would close their eyes and drop their wings forward. In the 15 years that I have been in this Parliament, I have known that when I stood on my feet all the angels looking down on me could rest easy. However, each time another member has stood and made a speech I have looked closely at the nearest angel to that member. Many a time I could swear that I have seen movement but, on closer examination, maybe it was just a figment of my imagination, a trick of the light or perhaps my glasses needed cleaning. In any event, I have given the member on his feet the benefit of the doubt.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** On a point of order, Sir, I do not think it is appropriate for the honourable member to take us down this path. It would be wiser for him to point out to you, as Speaker, that three of the ceiling tiles are not correctly placed, that the architect made an error, and it would be better to have that corrected at some time in the future.

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

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Now I will struggle to finish my speech in time, so I will go a little faster, with all due respect to *Hansard*. On 13 August, at approximately 10.32 p.m., it happened. The member for Kavel stood up and uttered the words, 'I will forgive them, but I will not forget their names.' At that time, every angel on the other side closed its eyes, hung its head in shame and their wings dropped forward.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable standing committee reports (except those relating to subordinate legislation or supplementary development plan matters) on presentation to be dealt with in accordance with Standing Order 346.

Motion carried.

#### ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I bring up the report of the committee on the proposed public work of the construction of facilities for the Department of Agriculture on the Waite Campus of the University of Adelaide and move:

That the report be noted.

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until 10.30 a.m. tomorrow.

Motion carried.

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

That private members' business take precedence over all other business between 10.30 a.m. and 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Motion carried.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 18 August. Page 217.)

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I would like to refer to two matters. First my concerns about consultants and the manner in which consultants are used within the Public Service and, secondly, the way committees of public servants and others added to those committees are used to make reports on behalf of Government about projects which, on many occasions, are never reported on or the reports are never made public. Several committees of inquiry are being conducted all the time. In fact, at the moment one is being conducted into a project at Glenelg in my electorate which is causing us a great deal of concern in the district. Before I refer to that project at the Seaforth Community Centre, I will say a few things about consultancies generally.

The Opposition has been ringing warning bells now for some time about the number of Government consultancies. We found that, when we initially analysed the budget papers over the past five years, the

Government had disclosed approximately \$5.4 million worth of consultancies. However, it is a matter of history that, during Question Time, it was revealed that the Economic and Finance Committee has been able to determine that the spending of Government departments and agencies has now soared over \$100 million, and in fact could be significantly higher. Many of these consultancies report back to Government, and some are acted on, but the majority seem to stay within the department.

I consider it to be a gross waste of taxpayers' money that the reports from these consultancies never see the light of day. It is also of concern that overseas and interstate consultants are being used without giving local companies an opportunity to compete. To award a consultancy at any time without going to a competitive tendering system is something that I consider is just not on. The Government has been guilty of this for some time now. It has been brought to the attention of this House on many occasions. I put on notice that the Opposition will be watching right through the budget Estimates Committees and again next year to see whether the Government changes its attitude towards the awarding of consultancies.

It is one thing for the Government, through the Acting Premier, to have argued the case this week that it is a type of privatisation—of letting out to tender—of some of the Government's work, but one really has to understand that this Bill relates to Public Service supply and the provision of salaries. One has to analyse what is happening within departments if so many consultancies are being set up so that departments can get an opinion. I heard a statement by one of the members of the Economic and Finance Committee that, indeed, public servants were using consultancies as an excuse to cover their own back or to get an opinion on an opinion to justify their opinion; if there were any complaints about the final recommendation, they could always say that the consultant made the recommendations and not the public servants.

When one sees the salary line in the budget which indicates how much we are paying for very senior public servants to give their advice to Government, and one then sees another \$100 million on top of that for consultancies, one has to have a close look at the administration of government, and the Ministers have to take a close look at what is happening in their departments and at the quality of advice coming through to them. I do not think that at the end of the day the public will accept these extraordinarily high consultancy fees.

Certainly, we will need outside consultancies for particular projects; I do not dispute that for one minute. However, I believe it is close to becoming an abuse of the system by public servants that consultancies are constantly awarded to justify their actions. I am sure that not on all occasions has the request for consultancies come from the Minister. I can see very clearly that middle level and senior level managers of departments recommend a consultancy when they should be doing the work themselves.

I also wish to refer to those committees which are comprised of public servants from one or more departments and which never report. They constantly

consult amongst themselves to come up with a decision, but they do not report. That is something that the public would never hear about. There are others about which the public certainly do hear, because they may include a decision on the disposal, for example, of a public building.

This afternoon I will refer to one such committee that has been meeting for well over a year, I believe, to decide the fate of the Glenelg Community Centre. Many members will recall this centre as the old Seaford House. Several thousand people a month go through that very popular centre, but the Government has decided it has to go. We know that the Government has taken this decision because on one occasion an employee of the Department for Family and Community Services attended one of our meetings at the community centre and he told us that the department had already pre-budgeted the sale price of the centre in suburbs far distant from Glenelg and Somerton Park. If the department has already made that decision, one wonders why it has established a committee comprising SACON, the Department for Family and Community Services, the Brighton council, the Glenelg council and, I believe, the coordinator of the centre. They are putting the centre through an exercise clearly designed to make the centre and the public feel that they are having an input into the decision-making process. However, no input is required; the Government has made up its mind. It is quite clear that it has made up its mind, and we are going through this charade of community consultation.

This is also of concern because the members of the committee have been led to believe that they are doing something useful. Suddenly we have found that, over recent months, the committee has stopped meeting. I submit to the House that that is because the Government has already made up its mind, it has its timetable worked out and it will now move to put it into place.

There is another interesting aspect to this exercise and that is the fate of the Mawson High School. It was hoped that the occupants of the community centre would be moved to the Mawson High School, and that would completely destroy the community centre. It all rings true of another community consultation committee which was set up by the Education Department and which undertook a process of public consultation to decide whether Glengowrie High School or Mitchell Park High School would be closed down. After much consultation between the school communities, it was decided that Glengowrie High School would be closed. I was able to tell the council of Glengowrie High School what was going to happen some six months or so before the final announcement because I had already been told by contacts in the Education Department that the decision had been made and that Glengowrie High School would be sold.

It is just intolerable that members of the public have to work in that type of atmosphere. It is not fair to instruct public servants what decisions they are to make. It is something that we in the community find quite intolerable. Consultancies and committees of inquiry are extraordinarily expensive, and we must question the public benefit of so many consultancies and reports.

I now refer to the cost of 2020 Vision—the vision for South Australia or the planning review. We believe that it

has cost some \$2 million and two years to complete. A few of us who have concerns about the cost of consultancies will now do quite a deal of work on this document to analyse the \$2 million value. Many consultancies and a lot of money has been put in; when that sort of money is spent, at the end of the day, we must ensure that we get the equivalent value. There has been a pattern with consultancies and committees of inquiry; they have cost extraordinarily large sums. Some have been cost effective in terms of the recommendations made: others have not seen the light of day and the quality of the recommendations has not warranted the expense.

As I said on the radio this morning, 2020 Vision, according to some urban planners, solicitors and architects who have been working in the field, is a document that does not show too much change of direction for the State. I am sure that members will analyse it in great detail. We had all hoped that this document would get South Australia up and running. Many urban planners, architects and developers who have been sitting on their hands for two years had hoped that the document would provide a sense of direction so that they could get off their hands and look forward to progress in South Australia.

However, after an initial analysis, the document does not give a great sense of direction. It certainly shows a change in geographical terms as to where industry should locate. It indicates change for the disposal of stormwater and the type of housing, specifically in terms of energy efficient housing and buildings. Those issues have certainly been picked up, as has ecologically sustainable development, which has been referred to often. However, I am advised by those who have analysed the document that, for those who have relied on this \$2 million consultancy to turn around the State and set it in a new direction that will give life and hope to our young people and young families and also to the developers who are sitting across the border waiting to come into South Australia as a State of new hope and vision, it is deficient to some degree. However, no doubt there will be a spirited debate in this House when the Bill is introduced, and I look forward to that.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** This Supply Bill is notable because it calls for supply that is \$200 million less than that which would be expected to be sought, as the supply required is \$1 000 million. However, the difference is accounted for by the fact that the Government is now allowing departments to retain revenue which was previously paid into the Consolidated Account. This is an extraordinary departure from standard budget practice. It makes it very difficult for the Parliament now and in the future to assess the true state of the budget and the various sources of revenue.

I think that every Opposition member has, over the past 10 years, commented upon the difficulties experienced at budget estimates time by the regular, if not annual, changing of the formulae for presentation of budget information to the Parliament in one subtle way or another. Sometimes there are major changes which make it difficult to compare the current year with the previous year and preceding years and, therefore, to give the Parliament a true picture of the State's finances. At other

times the changes are quite dramatic. It is clear that it is impossible to compare what amounts to apples with pears.

I make this point because I think that the Government is plunging further and further into the mire and, in doing so, is now deliberately attempting to fudge the figures so that the Opposition's role is made more difficult. I warn the Government that that merely defers the inevitable day of reckoning which will come soon—in fact, I hope very soon—when the Liberal Party wins government in South Australia. The books will then be opened and the public will see the true position, because the true position has not been made clear to the Parliament.

Day by day, week by week, month by month and year by year a clearer picture emerges of a Government that has been plunging the State into debt and has not been by any means a good custodian of public money. I make the point that not only is the Parliament's capacity to assess the budget's progress limited as a result of these changes but that it creates a poor precedent and raises the wider principle whether the Government can effectively manage its budget. Every member of the House should be concerned about this; it is not only a matter of concern to the Opposition. Every member of this House has a responsibility to the electorate, and it is not possible to fulfil it effectively if the figures that we are assessing are not presented in a way that makes them meaningful to the Parliament and the public.

I want to concentrate particularly on State debt, because it is the debt and the way in which it is handled that will determine the economic future of South Australia and thus the Government's capacity to provide services that are the constitutional responsibility of State Governments and to ensure not only a reasonable quality of life for South Australians but a reasonable opportunity for us to achieve prosperity in our own right as individuals, families and businesses as we head towards the next century.

One of the key components of managing debt is interest servicing costs. It is worth noting that for the Consolidated Account alone, which is a sub-set of the total public sector, the net interest servicing costs have risen dramatically since the last State election. In 1992 those net interest servicing costs were estimated at \$694.2 million, and that is the equivalent of 47c for every tax dollar raised. We are paying almost half of every dollar that we raise in taxes in interest servicing costs. That is a truly frightening situation, one that would appal any householder in terms of the management of debt. It is interesting that, in the year leading to June 1989, net interest servicing costs totalled \$440 million. More important than the total is the fact that they were equivalent to 35c in every tax dollar collected, so there has been a dramatic increase in the percentage of the net interest servicing costs.

The principal component of debt is State liabilities. It is clear from questions asked in the House today, and indeed every day since this session started, that Parliament is by no means fully aware of the extent of State liabilities. Questions asked today about the ASER project revealed that a lot more information needs to be given to the Parliament before we have a clear picture of the extent of State liabilities. However, the picture that we have from State Treasury is that the total liabilities of

the South Australian public sector stood at \$10.9 billion as at 30 June 1991. That included \$6.6 billion in State debt, \$3.2 billion in unfunded public sector superannuation and \$500 million in unfunded public sector long service leave. It does not include (for the benefit of members opposite) WorkCover's unfunded liability or the unfunded liability for Government workers compensation.

Against this picture we need to look at the other side of the ledger, and that is Commonwealth funding. We need to realise that South Australia has done relatively well not only in the past three years but in last night's Federal budget—to which I will refer later—and it has done relatively well at the annual Premiers Conferences. Since the 1989 election Commonwealth grants have increased, yet we are still falling deeper and deeper into debt. It is a question of this Government's spending what it gets in recurrent expenditure rather than attempting to settle debt.

The assessment of debt that is particularly interesting comes not from the Opposition but from the Public Service Association, the members of which in the main might be expected to be supporters of this Government. Therefore, their view is not politically biased in any way: it is the perspective of people who work for Government regarding the way in which the Government is managing the debt. The PSA in its papers explodes the Government's proposition that, as a proportion of gross State product, debt has returned only to the level of the early 1980s. The PSA says that it is highly misleading to draw comparisons between debt levels (as a percentage of GSP) in 1990-91 and similar proportions in the past. It is worth reading into the record the PSA's assessment of this, because it goes back to what I said at the beginning, namely, a constant, if not an annual, changing of the way in which the papers are presented, and that makes it difficult for Parliament to assess the position of the State budget by comparison with former years. The PSA makes the following point:

Economic conditions are now such that a debt to GSP ratio of over 25 per cent is significantly more problematic than a similar ratio even a decade ago. The reason for this is twofold. In the past, a higher proportion of outlays was targeted towards public infrastructure and industry development.

That was one of the reasons why South Australia in the 1950s and 1960s, was able to attract so much industrial development and consequently to provide so much employment: the Government at that time saw it as its role and function to provide services and infrastructure, not bread and circuses which this Government has seen as its function as a diversionary tactic from its political ineptitudes.

In recent times the proportion of outlays on recurrent spending has risen markedly. Capital spending has fallen from 21.7 per cent of outlays in 1981-82 to 13.63 per cent in 1991-92. In 1954-55 the capital spending was a staggering 45.3 per cent of total spending. Real interest rates then were low; real interest rates now are still high, notwithstanding a fairly dramatic drop from the horrendous levels of the late 1980s. The damning PSA report also claims that the prospect of further State Bank indemnity costs should not be overlooked. I think we could all confidently predict that, when the Premier brings down the State budget, there will be further bad news about the call on the State Government guarantees



for the State Bank. According to the PSA, the South Australian economy will be at least \$400 million per year worse off in the foreseeable future. That is \$400 million that cannot be spent on schools, hospitals, roads and environmental services, as well as on the justice system and public safety. So, from all perspectives, there is a bleak future ahead. That is the PSA assessment.

Another objective assessment from right outside the Government sector is Standard and Poor's Australian ratings which have downgraded South Australia twice since December 1989 from AAA to AA, and its April report of this year indicated a negative future outlook. It criticised the Government for financial adventurism—something the Opposition has been doing for the better part of the past 10 years—and it was very critical of inadequate measures taken to slow the growth of program expenditures, which will not stabilise debt. This Government has no comprehensive plan to stabilise debt, despite the fact that it is facing the most serious debts any Government of this State has faced since the early and mid 1930s, when the State was almost literally bankrupt and the Treasury had to be bailed out by a private philanthropist in order to continue to pay public sector salaries.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** It was £100 000, if I recall correctly, from Sir Langdon Bonython and, instead of the Government repaying that money, as it would ultimately have wished to do, Sir Langdon gifted it to the State in the form of the completion of this House of Parliament.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** You are right; he gave it to the State as a gift. The picture is appalling, and it is reasonable that in speaking to the Supply Bill the Opposition serve notice on the Government that, if the State budget does not contain a clear program for the management of State debt, does not contain a proposal for a sinking fund for the State Bank debt and does not give a clear message to the financial markets of the world that we will put our own house in order, we will find that no-one will touch this State for investment purposes. No-one will want to deal with us and we will simply be paying off interest on interest and the rate will not be 47c in the dollar as it is now, in contrast with 35c in the dollar as it was three years ago; it will be 50c or more in the dollar, and heaven help the State and our children when that occurs.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** In taking part in this debate on the Supply Bill, which is seeking the concurrence of the House for the Government to appropriate approximately \$1 000 million, the House should give very close attention to how the Government intends to spend that money on behalf of the people of this State, because up to this stage its track record is dismal. In my judgment, the House should not lightly give approval to appropriating further funds unless we have strict assurances and evidence put before us that it will be not only in the short term but also in the long-term interests of the people of this State.

My concern is that insufficient funds are being invested in long-term projects which will give lasting benefits to the State—benefits which will assist industry and

commerce to develop and therefore employ members of the community. I believe that the role of State Governments is fairly simple: they should provide the basic services that cannot be provided by private enterprise, such as housing, health, education, water, roads and similar services, to assist the community in those areas that are fundamental to a decent society. I am one of those people who believe there is nothing wrong with the Government being involved in those areas, but some of the areas where the Government has got involved are not only unwise and unnecessary but they have also cost the taxpayers dearly. At the end of the day, the people who will be in the worst position are those on the lower socio-economic level.

**Mr Atkinson:** Do you mean they are poor?

**Mr GUNN:** That is right: people who are less able to look after themselves.

**Mr Atkinson:** Why didn't you say so?

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

**Mr GUNN:** If the member for Spence gets permission to speak he will have the opportunity to address the House and give us the benefit of his wisdom or otherwise, and I look forward to that contribution. My concern is that the further one lives from Adelaide the less attention one is getting from Government, and the best social welfare policy any Government could have is to create jobs. I do not care whether it is in South Australia, Los Angeles or London; there is only one way to do this, and any Government that neglects that aspect will create social problems of which it will lose control.

Having had the opportunity to look around the world, I have no doubt that, wherever there has been social dislocation and riots, the core reason is that people have been socially deprived, and the only way to look after those people is to create an environment where people can employ. That does not mean high technology jobs: it means giving people the opportunity to be involved in the community. A range of jobs must be available to them. All people like jobs that are attractive to them, but most people today just want the opportunity to be employed and to have a reasonable expectation that their children will be employed. Therefore, my concern in relation to appropriation and the general economic thrust of this country is that we have forgotten that it is necessary for Governments to take actions that will employ people.

The matters that I want to address briefly this afternoon relate to railways, agriculture and other road matters. The first is that earlier today I raised with the Minister of Health a problem that had been brought to my attention in my electorate, where bureaucracy has made an arbitrary decision that could affect the life and limb of anyone who is injured. For the life of me, I do not know why any person would issue an order to have kangaroo bars removed from ambulances. I live farther west than any member in the history of this House, and I have had some experience in driving through kangaroo-infested country. Everyone knows that it is only a matter of time before we hit one. The road between Hawker and Port Augusta is prone to kangaroo infestation.

The people involved in the ambulance service and hospital at Hawker are some of the most prudent people one could find. They manage and look after the hospital and health facilities there in a manner that no-one could

question. They do an outstanding job. They have looked after the taxpayers' money most carefully and, if the Health Commission were to take a leaf out of their book, it would be a far better organisation. After this arbitrary decision was made, the Hawker Division of St John Ambulance wrote a letter on 30 July as follows:

Dear Sir,

We write on behalf of all members of Hawker Division currently doing volunteer ambulance duties. Recently our ambulance 157 was damaged in an accident with a kangaroo. Fortunately our vehicle was fitted with a roo bar, minimising damage to the vehicle and allowing the patient to be delivered safely to hospital without delay. Had the vehicle not been fitted with a roo bar, it would undoubtedly have been rendered undriveable with serious, perhaps fatal, consequences to the patient involved.

As a result of this accident, car 132 has been based at Hawker. This car was formerly based at Port Augusta. Before being brought to Hawker this vehicle underwent various modifications in Adelaide, which included the removal of the roo bar. Removing roo bars may or may not be St John or Government policy. As far as we are concerned an emergency vehicle in this area without a substantial roo bar fitted to it is highly unsatisfactory and could easily cause patients to die due to delayed transport.

We encounter kangaroos almost every night trip we do. Please heed the advice of experienced local people and endorse the refitting of the roo bar to the ambulance stationed at Hawker as soon as possible.

It is signed by the district superintendent, the transport officer, the corporate superintendent, the former superintendent and a police officer. Whoever was the absolute dimwit who made the decision does not understand the decision, is a dill or fell on their head as a child. Why provoke and cause undue concern to a decent group of people providing an excellent service to the travelling public and local citizens? Why should they have to go through all this nonsense because some dill has taken it upon himself to make an arbitrary decision? One telephone call to the ambulance people at Hawker or to the executive officer of the hospital would have cleared up the matter.

I have had a large number of cars and unfortunately have hit a lot of kangaroos in my time. The purpose of a kangaroo bar is not to stop the vehicle being damaged but rather, nine times out of 10, to enable one to complete the trip. It will save the radiator. If kangaroo bars were not necessary, Mr Gibson out there, would be out of business. He would not have people lining up getting new kangaroo bars fitted to their vehicles. It is unbelievable.

**The Hon. M.K. Mayes:** I needed one for the member for Murray-Mallee when he backed into me.

**Mr GUNN:** I do not enter into personal disputes with members. I hope the Minister will use his influence to bring these people into line, because commonsense has not prevailed.

We were told today in Question Time that the State Government had signed a National Rail Corporation agreement. The Minister gave us a lengthy spiel, which did not amount to anything. The question I raise with the Minister of Transport on this occasion relates to what guarantees he has been given on the future operation of Australian National in South Australia. Will he tell the House whether he has discussed it with his Federal colleague, Land and Transport Minister, Bob Brown? This House is entitled to know what future Australian National has. I do not know whether the Minister or the

member for Stuart has read the National Rail Corporation's statement of intent or, more to the point, whether they understood it. I draw the attention of the House to the second to last page under the heading 'Work-force requirements', wherein it states:

The creation of National Rail will ensure that the role of rail in interstate freight transport will continue and grow, with consequent employment benefits. In its early years particularly, National Rail will be a significant employment generator, mainly as a result of its capital program.

However, the rail industry as a whole is under some stress as a result of historic under-investment and obsolete work practices. Placing interstate rail freight on a competitive and profitable footing is the priority for National Rail. Work undertaken for the National Rail Freight Initiative Task Force indicates that, compared with over 9 000 people employed in 1990 on interstate rail freight, approximately 4 000 would be required at standard costs.

Direct employment by National Rail will concentrate on its core functions; that is, those necessary to 'keep the wheels turning'. Other activities (for example, track maintenance and heavy overhaul of locomotives and rolling stock) will be subject to competitive tendering to be phased in over the transition period. This policy will mean that not all of the workforce required for interstate freight will be directly employed by National Rail; therefore direct employment in National Rail is likely to represent only half of the 4 000 mentioned above.

I ask the Minister to explain to the House (because the State Government has powers under the rail transfer agreement) what will happen to the maintenance people at Tarcoola, Cook and Port Augusta and what long-term guarantee in relation to those historic railway workshops at Port Augusta can be given. The Minister did not tell us today.

He went on to mention the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific, which we all support and which will maintain existing employment for approximately two years. But what about the future? The people who operated those facilities for Australian National had an expectation that if they did the right thing they would have reasonable employment opportunities not now but in the future. What will happen to those small centres along the line? I was told that they are considering flying people out to derailments. Unfortunately, trains do not go off the line alongside air strips. So, how will people get on site? The House and the people of South Australia are entitled to know what will happen to Australian National and to the long-term prospects at Port Augusta and Islington. Money has been spent there, but a lot more should have been spent in the past to upgrade the workshops because the contest will be between the State Rail Authority in New South Wales and other commercial operators. The social consequence of this decision will be horrendous if those jobs are not guaranteed.

I challenge the Minister to report back to the House with a detailed statement on what will happen to Australian National. Will it maintain the Broken Hill to Port Pirie freightline or will it be taken over by the National Rail Corporation? What about the coal transported from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta—who will operate that line? What about the other services? What will happen to Australian National? If you take away most of its income earning capacity it will not be able to operate effectively. Those questions must be answered in relation to the welfare of all citizens in this State as we are entitled to know.

I look forward to the Minister of Transport responding to what I have had to say and I call on him to give an

assurance and written details of concrete undertakings given. What will happen to the people laying or producing the concrete sleepers? Those people are entitled to know their future employment prospects. I put to the House and to this Government that it has an obligation to tell us. It is all very well for the member for Stuart to ask the question today, but her question should also have asked what concrete undertakings have been given. That is what I want to know and it is what many people in this State want to know: what future is there for Australian National? Is it to be wound up and abandoned to just fade away? Many people depend on AN and it is important to the future economic development of this State.

As the Government is spending this large amount of money on behalf of South Australian taxpayers, the Minister of Agriculture in this State should make the most strenuous representations to the next Agricultural Council meeting to ensure that there is the opportunity for the average agricultural enterprise in South Australia to be able to continue to invest in the latest technology, plant and equipment. Unfortunately, nothing was said about that last night.

The Commonwealth Government has a sorry record of removing the incentives that could put the agricultural and pastoral industry in this State at the forefront of agricultural producers in the world. We used to have a simple system whereby accelerated depreciation and investment allowances allowed farmers to turn over their agricultural plant, equipment and technology on a regular basis so that they could keep far ahead of producers anywhere in the world. As well as doing that, it built up in Australia one of the finest agricultural manufacturing sectors in the world. Mr Deputy Speaker, you know how important the motor car industry is at Elizabeth, and I believe that there is nothing wrong in people who drive Australian motor cars paying a few dollars more to keep their neighbours employed. I have no problem with that concept at all, and the same thing applies in the agricultural sector.

Along with farmers, we have to have people to deliver the fuel, to operate the ports and the grain handling systems and run the railways. We need people to service that equipment and supply new equipment, and people have to be able to buy that equipment. Unfortunately, the cost of technology and equipment is expensive, and in Australia we have had a dramatic rundown of our marvellous manufacturing sector. Shearers in South Australia provided employment for hundreds of people. A few months ago when I visited the plant to get parts one could have fired a shotgun through it and hardly hit anyone. Shearers was one of the finest manufacturers of tillage equipment in the world. A few years ago, because of a strike affecting the airlines, I travelled to Sydney by train. When the train stopped at Sunshine, I saw the abandoned Massey Ferguson factory that used to make the finest headers in the world.

In about 1972 the Massey Ferguson agent at Streaky Bay sold 32 headers. That source of employment in that town began in Melbourne and went throughout the community. There should be sensible taxation incentives so that genuine people—not crooks and not people like Bond and Skase who have rorted the system—the average decent Australian, can participate in the great

benefits that can flow from the agricultural sector. That is what we should be doing because, if we have a successful agricultural sector, it will create employment for people in rural South Australia, in regional areas and in capital cities. Surely, at the end of the day that is what we should be all about. I am concerned that the sort of people who are calling the shots in Canberra and to a lesser extent here have never been in the real world.

One of the great tragedies in Australia was the decision to build the nation's capital in Canberra, where they are out of touch with reality. Canberra has hijacked the economic debate. The people there have never been in the real world. Our nation's capital should have been established in one of the existing capital cities with real people rather than being isolated and protected like bronze-wing pigeons. Unfortunately, there is no recession in Canberra, but there is certainly a recession in the rest of the community.

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** It is with deep concern for the major public institution that conducts business in the interests of the people of this State that I rise to support the Supply Bill, but with reservations. It is also with deep concern that I watch as that great institution flounders over the line where private companies would long since have gone bankrupt. I refer to the South Australian institution of democratic government and its public entities, mismanaged and taken to the brink of disaster by the most incompetent Premier and Ministers in the history of South Australian State Governments. In all honesty I wish that I could stand here and support the Bill and compliment the Government on its initiatives, foresight and any positive actions towards rebuilding the economic and industrial prospects of this State. Unfortunately, this is an impossibility and I would suggest that not even the most ardent Labor supporters would possibly deem otherwise.

Not only is there a void of policy direction for the economy and industry but there is also a distinct lack of management capabilities, combined with certain unsavoury accounting practices which have irretrievably marked this Government as untrustworthy. In June this year we heard through the auspices of the Economic and Finance Committee of this State Parliament that the Minister of Forests (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder) had approved a radical new accounting system for his department. I would suggest that 'radical' is the complimentary term for an accounting system that can miraculously turn a huge loss of \$9.9 million into a profit of \$56 million. Once again, this incompetent Minister chose to disregard the valid recommendations against this radical method of calculation issued by the Auditor-General. Perhaps the Minister contracted the services of the now infamous consultants for advice of this kind, and that might make one wonder whether the position of Auditor-General may become redundant.

I also wonder about the inconsistency in Government policy when calls from business and industry suggest that areas of incentives should be considered to encourage and support industry growth and business development necessary for employment gains. These calls are totally ignored on the one hand but, on the other hand, we find that certain selected sons of the establishment, hand in glove with SGIC, can manipulate the system to gain

substantial financial gains and financial benefits not available to the ordinary citizens of this State or to private enterprise. I refer to the \$4.25 stamp duty paid on a \$20 million mortgage from SGIC. The latest alterations to provisions within the Supply Bill, whereby Government departments retain revenue previously paid into Consolidated Account, appear to assist the Government in hiding budget allocations and reduce the Opposition's capacity to assess truly the progress of Government budgets. It is for this reason that I support this Bill with some reservations. A Government that already has a propensity to divert proper accounting practices into radical diversionary accounting methods has to be questioned over this new approach to budget accountability.

Positive action that the Government should consider has been reiterated repeatedly in this place by members of the Opposition, and again I place on record some of the action that could be taken at least to attempt to halt the rot that eats away at South Australia's ability to rejuvenate its economic life. The Government could remove payroll tax or at the very least consider providing payroll tax concessions to export companies, sell the State Bank, maintain capital expenditure on infrastructure, on roads, schools and hospitals, amend WorkCover legislation, which in itself is a massive deterrent to employment reconstruction in this State, and amend equal opportunity legislation, which is contradictory to its own intent by discriminating against unemployed youth.

Awards already distinguish age-related rates. Graded levels of wage rates relate to age. Either the award system discriminates against youth by relating wages to age levels or the Equal Opportunity Act is wrong in its intent or its interpretation. These two areas are most definitely in conflict with each other and need to be addressed if this Government is serious about employment opportunity for the youth of this State.

I will now comment on other areas where the Government's mismanagement of State funds has direct effects across the board, and in doing so I will relate it to my electorate of Newland and the effects on its residents. This is the time of year when ratepayers receive their rate notices from local councils. It is also the time of year that residents receive accounts from the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It is generally the first notification whereby home owners are made aware of the increases in the land and capital values of their properties. I well recollect the outcry from the public last year at this time when outraged home owners faced the effect of, in many cases, these outrageous valuations which meant that home owners paid increased rates to councils and an added wealth tax to the E&WS Department. Again this year we see further increases in land and capital values which are out of all proportion to equitable and reasonable valuations.

During debate on the Water Works Act Amendment Bill in February 1991, Liberal Opposition members were staggered by this Government's approach to classify lower to middle income earners as wealthy. These are the unfortunate citizens who lived on properties valued at over \$117 000 and who received this wealthy classification and were penalised by fine for every \$1 000 of value over that threshold. The threshold has now been lifted to \$140 000, but the valuations have also been

increased, and quite substantially. Many of the people caught up in this iniquitous revenue raising Government tax are now asset rich but still income poor. Many of them have lived on their properties for years with no intention of selling. Therefore, inflated market value increases used for revenue raising in this manner become encumbrances of major proportions.

Undoubtedly, members will be aware of the *Sunday Mail* article where constituents from my area had their land valuation increased by 100 per cent. The result of that unacceptable increase means that, as council rates are linked direct to valuations, my constituents will now pay rates of \$807 compared with last year's amount of \$410—quite an increase. The constituents themselves cannot understand how, in the depths of a recession, the Valuer-General's office can say that the value of their property has more than doubled in 12 months. The article describes part of the property and the reasons for their great concern. They live in the original township district of Golden Grove, which is the old district of Golden Grove, not the new development, within sight of the new Golden Grove housing estates. The article states:

Unlike the new estates in the Tea Tree Gully council area, the Ross' property does not have access to mains sewerage, the road in front of the house has no kerbs or gutters, there is no gas or even postal delivery. Moreover, the property is zoned in an 'extractive industries' area as it is near a number of quarries and brickworks.

With online computer systems keyed to give Government departments up to the minute information in respect of land and house sales, it would appear that an *ad hoc* system of valuation still exists with the benefit of doubt resting solely with the department. Another of my constituents took his valuation concerns to the Department of Lands. In his appeal, he noted the fact that his 1990 rated value was \$46 000 and in 1991 it had increased by 15.2 per cent to \$53 000, and the 1992 value increased by 22.6 per cent to \$65 000. That is a 41.3 per cent increase over two years. As this gentleman states in his appeal letter:

Clearly market values of land have not, in the current depressed market, uplifted to this degree over the last two years. Further, he states:

We are, we are told, in a period of restraint, and certainly this is reflected in community incomes, and funds available to purchase and or build on land. It is my understanding from a telephone conversation with your office that no similar blocks of land have changed hands in [my area] recently and that you have no firm comparison on which to base your valuation.

That did not deter the department from increasing the valuation by 22.6 per cent over last year's valuation. I have appealed many such site and capital values on behalf of constituents who did not believe that the assessed value of their property could be realised on the open market—appeals that have been successfully upheld and have seen reductions of anywhere between \$10 000 and \$40 000 on the original assessment. Even with those types of reductions, increases in valuations still remain between 12 per cent and 90 per cent, but those increases are all the more unacceptable as the 90 per cent increases affected the lower to medium range residential properties.

I will read into the record part of the debate and comments I made on 14 February last year which in fact were predictions about this very aspect. I stated:

This Bill should clearly state to all South Australians that, if they dare to achieve a certain standard of living, they will be

penalised by this Government. They will be penalised by this socialist Government in an attempt to bring them down to a benchmark standard where no person shall have more than their neighbours.

To those people whose present residence falls below that benchmark of \$117 000, I would suggest that, if they indulge in a sigh of relief because they have eluded this latest revenue-raising tax, they do not spend the extra dollars saved at this time but budget those dollars in preparation for their next water bill, as I predict that property values will rise and many more property owners will find that they have been elevated to the status of 'wealthy'.

These *ad hoc* valuations are a devious means of raising further revenue for the Government. As land and property values are linked to council rates, the higher the valuations the greater the rates collected by councils. As this government continues to cut local Government grant allocations, it compensates councils for the loss of those funds by a more direct method of collecting taxes payable direct to local councils. It also defuses some of the anger directed at the government for its continual tax grab by directing that anger at local Government as there are many ratepayers who are unaware of the land and property value link that dictates the cost of their council rate bill.

I turn now to another great concern of the people in the north eastern districts, and I refer to the fact that this Government has again cut hospital budgets across the board, as we are all aware, by about 1.4 per cent. The Modbury Hospital has suffered a further savage 2 per cent reduction which, in monetary terms, is a loss of \$750 000. The actual shortfall from the hospital's budget will in fact be far greater than that \$750 000 as that amount does not take into account wage rise claims or award restructuring. This monetary loss means an even greater health care loss to the people in my electorate and, indeed, to those 250 000 residents within the catchment area of Modbury Hospital.

One of the greatest concerns at the moment is that 828 patients in the north-eastern area are on a waiting list for elective surgery. Of course, those figures are growing continually as the area grows and funding decreases. Another great concern is in the area of urology; there is a waiting list of 180 patients for admission to Modbury Hospital and only one surgeon is available at the hospital. That means that, with those cuts, 32 beds are liable to be closed at the Modbury Hospital. That horrifying waiting list is surely another indication not only of the ineptitude of the Government but also of the lack of care and compassion that this Government has for its citizens.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** Yesterday in this Parliament we noted the untimely death of Dick Geddes. I wish to add my comments to those expressed yesterday, because he was known to me when I was young; he would visit my family as a colleague of my father. As a 5-year-old I met Dick Geddes, and found him to be very friendly. He was a very capable man. Dick and my father were in opposition when they fought for the seat of Northern in the Legislative Council, and I saw the friendly rivalry that went on at that time.

As a Young Liberal, I appreciated the wise counsel of Dick Geddes. He was always a very entertaining guest speaker and very helpful. As I said, he was a great colleague of my father. My father would like it known that it is sad that Dick Geddes is no longer with us. On

behalf of my family, I would like to pass on our condolences to members of his family and to the community that he served.

There is plenty to talk about when debating the Supply Bill: one wonders where to start. I want to talk primarily about positives and what we want in a budget. I will refer to last night's Federal budget and the State budget to be brought down next week; I will talk about what we want to see and what we do not want to see. Last night's budget is a curious document. The *Financial Review* editorial quite succinctly states:

New spending of a gross \$5.3 billion. A \$13.4 billion deficit accompanied by a pious pledge to return to surplus 'as soon as possible'. A somewhat thin prediction of better State economic performances. An expectation of 800 000 new jobs being created in the next four years.

In March 1991 came an industry statement. In August Mr Kerin presented his budget before self-destructing. In November 1991 came Mr Hawke's prime ministerial swansong, his employment statement. In February this year Mr Keating presented his prime ministerial debut, *One Nation*. And now an exhausted nation is digesting Mr Dawkins' first budget.

It's a 'she'll be right' budget all right.

It is too stimulatory, too late in the economic cycle, and too darn political. And it is Labor's fifth attempt to get it right in the last 18 months.

That says it very well. I was nonplussed to hear that South Australia has done very well out of the Federal budget. However, we heard from the Minister today during Question Time that last night's Federal budget does not affect next week's State budget; apparently, this extra money comes with strings attached. It is no surprise to me that that is the case, because it is obvious that Federal Treasurer Dawkins does not have the confidence in the South Australian Government to get it right. So, the Federal Government has allocated the money, but there are strings attached to ensure that the State Government does not waste the money.

I realise that the Federal budget is not the province of this House, but I think it warrants discussion here. Why does the Federal Government cut—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that this is a Supply Bill and as such is related to the finances of the State of South Australia. I ask the honourable member to link his remarks to the finances of South Australia.

**Mr VENNING:** Thank you, Sir; I note your comments, but I believe that the whole financial scene in South Australia is linked directly to the budget of last night. No doubt our budget next week will be very much linked to it. I will not comment further about the Federal budget.

I hope that in our State budget next week we stop throwing money at non-performance. We are about to spend \$1 000 million through this budget. The most notable feature of this Bill is that the supply of \$1 000 million is \$200 million less than the sum allocated last year, because the Government is now allowing departments to retain revenue previously paid into the Consolidated Account. Effectively, this reduces any capacity to assess budget progress. It also creates a precedent in relation to the traditional treatment of revenue and raises the wider principle of budget management and control.

I support the Bill, but I question the status of the budget. Ministers should supply the House with a list of those revenues now being credited to departmental

accounts and ascertain the criteria being applied to revenue retention. I would hope that we do not go on throwing money at non-performance and mediocrity. A well known gentleman, the late Sir Robert Menzies, made the following statement, which I believe applies very well to budgets and the spending of money: I hope this budget will be one 'in which ambition is encouraged, in which there are rewards for the courageous and the enterprising, in which there is no foolish doctrine of equality between the active and the idle, the intelligent and the dull, the frugal and the improvident'.

That says it all about a lot of the problems we have today. We cannot go on accepting mediocrity; we cannot go on accepting equality across the board. We have to have achievers in this country and we must reward them. We must have business and investment. If we do not promote it we will not get this activity, and we have not had such promotion. The results are on the State balance sheet and on Australia's balance sheet. We cannot continue to penalise those who have, in the past, got out there and done it—they have done it for themselves and for Australia.

I now wish to refer to the problem of decentralisation. As a rural member, this is probably the most serious issue affecting the people whom I represent. Why do people leave the country to live in the city? The reason primarily relates to jobs and education. There are other issues, but they are the two main issues that I will raise today. We must give incentive to rural business, manufacturing and cottage industries. We must promote the value-added industries, and I have said that previously. I hope that as we go on spending money that we target it rather than throwing it around; we must target it so that we see an end result. As I said, we must promote value-added industries.

Many other countries in the world add value to their products. We have been talking about it for four or five years, but basically we are still exporting our raw products. We should target industries in country areas. For instance, in the small town of Farrell Flat an enterprise has been making leather products, last year exporting 2 000 leather hats to America. That might seem a small number, but the principle is spot on. I hope that, if that industry is looking to expand, it does not find it too difficult to get funding to launch itself and to increase its market share, particularly in an export industry. In spending Government money, we should prime the pump so that the State can generate its own wealth.

Much of the money spent on WorkCover and training levies is wasted. We have to cut the bureaucracy. I appreciated the comments in the Governor's speech about red tape. I look forward to seeing some concrete evidence that that will be done.

**Mr Meier:** It has been promised since 1982.

**Mr VENNING:** We have heard this rhetoric for a long time; it goes on and on. We are at the bottom of the list of OECD countries. It causes me a great deal of stress to realise that we are down there with countries like Turkey when once we were at the top of the list. We must encourage overseas manufacturers to build their products in this country, because we do not have many industries left. We have a few companies that are on their last legs, one being John Shearer Limited, close to the District of Albert Park. We must make sure that this company gets

up on its feet; otherwise next year we shall be importing all foreign machinery. If that company goes, we shall not be able to reverse the situation.

We must fight to hold onto our technology. In the Supply Bill it is basically a case of 'steady as she goes'. We have to see where we are spending the money. We have had various high technology projects in this State. One is the Merino sheep machine, which has been sold off for a pittance. The Government was asked for assistance, but nothing came of it.

I do not think that the MFP will be a success because other countries hold onto their technology so dearly and we sell ours off so cheaply. I am sure that there should be money in the Supply Bill to look at that aspect. We are an intelligent nation and technologically we are very bright, but we do not have the results to show for it. Australians invented the microwave oven and other things, but we have not benefited from that technology.

The Mid North Regional Training Group at Clare had its funding cut back this year by one-third. I am very pleased that these people have the zeal to do the job they do. They employ 31 apprentices and one trainee. I give those people full credit, particularly Trevor Peake, the officer involved, and the Mayor of Clare, Bob Phillips, who keeps me informed of what is going on. There is nothing in the Supply Bill to give them any heart on this matter. There is far too much regulation.

The Premier and Treasurer made a promise during the 1985 election campaign that the Government would set up a one-stop shop for small business. I have taken up issues with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and asked for assistance for small businesses in my electorate to expand or at least to get started. He knows that there are many, but none was able to get anything. Some were enterprising and smart businesses, but they were not able to get anything. I was particularly frustrated about that.

Education is an issue very much before us and we heard about it in the House today, as we have heard about it many times before. We all pay for education. However, it is not available in rural areas, as we have heard before. There is no equality or social justice. The number of rural students seeking entry and being accepted into tertiary education is unacceptably low. I have heard the Minister's comments. However, we all agree that it gets worse, not better. Country families are less able to send their children to boarding school in Adelaide to get the necessary tertiary education. Surely this key area should be looked at all the time.

The fair way system worked very well last year, but it had minimal success; it needs further strengthening. Only three students were admitted to the medical school last year under this scheme and only one was a genuine country student. The problem is that parents and students do not know about it and they do not qualify because they are not taking the right courses or they do not attend the right university or institution. I hope that the budget will make the system more equitable and look to providing boarding options for rural students who have to come to Adelaide for a secondary education.

Another important point in relation to the Supply Bill, especially at this time, is the education of farmers. Our farmers do a sterling job for this State. We must realise that our practising farmers need a much higher level of

education. Therefore, we should maintain the levels of funding to the various research groups and to the Department of Agriculture, and we should disseminate information via the department's extension offices and work in liaison with the private sector in this area. As we heard in Question Time, the Department of Agriculture is coming under heavy scrutiny after paying a consultant approximately \$1 million to find out how to cut jobs. That causes me much stress.

Young farmers are almost a rarity—an endangered species—and they are not encouraged. There is no future in farming for young people. We really must do something about that problem. We should be looking at these areas, particularly the maintenance and promotion of Rural Youth. That organisation, from a good position 25 years ago, has been slowly dying. That was when the first Labor Government came into office. Not one cent increase has been spent on it, and it is almost on its last legs. It is distressing to see such an organisation that did so much in that situation. Many of our rural and State leaders had their grounding there. The member for Flinders is in that position. Surely that organisation should not be so starved of funds as it is today. I think about half of a full-time person is involved in the running of Rural Youth today. It is a disgrace when we consider that about 20 years ago up to 15 full-time personnel were working for Rural Youth.

It is relevant that I should now discuss the Blyth Hospital. There was a meeting in Blyth last night to which 300 people rocked up. Why? Because the Government is trying to close the hospital. Why would it want to do that? Because it thinks that it will save \$900 000. What about the Blyth community and its medical needs? What will happen if this institution is closed? The Government is out to save money. It has got out the scalpels and the choppers and it is hitting the less fortunate—those who cannot stand up for themselves and whose votes do not count. I have news for the Government. Those people will fight for their hospital. I am sure that the member for Goyder will stand with me and with them to make sure that it is not closed.

**Mr Meier:** This has been going on for nine years.

**Mr VENNING:** It has been going on for nine years. There will be a fight, because we know that after Blyth another hospital will be targeted. A stand will be taken on Blyth Hospital. The Government has one unholy fight on its hands. I have told the people in the Blyth community that we will fight for them.

I was gratified to hear Government members say that both Federal and State money will be spent in the regions. That gives me a lot of heart. We have heard about what we are doing with the Indian Pacific, and that is good. Let us hope that we can also get some roads done, particularly the important roads. The member for Chaffey talked about a road in the Riverland. The Spalding-Burra-Morgan road is a disgrace. That road has been a State-wide disgrace for 50 years; it is a road that nobody loves and a road on which no-one wants to spend money.

What one sees there now is a continuing disgrace. I think it is a total abdication of responsibility for any member of Parliament to stand in his place representing that electorate to allow it to remain like that. I would hope that in my time here, of all other projects, that road

would be sealed, because it is a major east-west road. I invite any member to inspect it; I will personally take members up there, wine and dine them and show them that road—rocks, punctures and all. If members have not seen it they ought to see what a disgrace it is. I notice your pricking up your ears, Sir; that is a standing invitation, any time you like.

**The SPEAKER:** I would like to draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he cannot offer inducements to any member of Parliament.

**Mr VENNING:** I note your comment, Sir. I am looking forward to seeing what the State budget has in relation to continuing Supply in this State. I hope we do not throw money at those things that do not matter; I hope we throw money at those things that will not only create but also retain permanent jobs. I support the Bill.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** This Bill is before us to allow the allocation of a further \$1 000 million to provide moneys to fund the Public Service until the assent to the Appropriation Bill. I note with interest that this amount is \$200 million less than the \$1 200 million allocated at this time last year. During his second reading explanation the Minister of Finance stated:

This reduction has come about as a result of important changes which the Government has introduced in the way funds are made available to departments. The changes involve the transfer of departments, which previously operated through the Consolidated Account, to their own Special Deposit Accounts created under the provisions of the Public Finance and Audit Act. Departments are now able to retain certain receipts, which previously were paid to Consolidated Account, and apply these funds towards financing their activities. The amount of appropriation required from Consolidated Account is reduced accordingly.

**Mr Brindal:** Are they cooking the books?

**Mr MATTHEW:** My colleague asks whether I am saying they are cooking the books. Certainly, it is an extraordinary change of direction that is hidden within this Bill when attention has been diverted by the Treasurer's evidence to the Royal Commission into the State Bank. My colleagues and I appreciate the aim of this approach, that being quite obviously to provide financial incentives to the Public Service to manage itself effectively and thereby contain costs and contain the Government's borrowing requirements.

However, there is no doubt that it does create some hidden problems and it does at least three things: it effectively reduces any capacity to assess budget progress; it creates a precedent in relation to the traditional treatment of revenue and it also raises the wider principle of budget management and control. So, while the Opposition supports this Bill, it is certainly our intention to question the Minister in detail on such things as the status of the budget, on revenue not being credited to departmental accounts, on the criteria being applied for revenue retention and on the level of accountability by Government departments.

This Supply Bill follows yet another round of increased taxes and charges. During June of this year alone we saw more than 400 taxes and charges increase, and this was in the midst of Government propaganda that proudly proclaimed that increases had been kept below the inflation rate. Mr Speaker, I do not know how people in your electorate reacted to this but certainly those in my electorate were not warned at all by the fact that these

increases were below the inflation rate; they were incensed that the increases were there at all. This Government continually increases taxes and charges aimed at areas of business, but the taxpayers of this State—the South Australian public—now know that, even if they are not directly involved in that type of business activity, at the end of the day they will pay the increases through increased retail prices and service costs; increased costs that have been thrust upon them by this Government.

The Government's actions through these increases completely ignore the fact that these fees and charges affect the very businesses which at this time are struggling to make a living, which have continually had to make cuts to survive the recession and which have now been hit with yet another round of taxes and charges. This also overlooks the thrust of the often referred to Arthur D. Little study, which stated specifically that we must look at all ways to give our industry a competitive edge. Before the ink of that report was even dry, yet another round of taxes and charges increased.

Quite clearly, we will not get that competitive edge until this Government makes real cuts in the costs it imposes on businesses—real cuts—to try to help them become competitive and to give them that competitive edge they need so desperately. We have seen that this Government has no coordinated strategy for the economic development of our State. It is relying on the general public increasingly having poor memories about such things as on the spot fines, and we see massive increases in that type of revenue earning, too, with on the spot fines increasing by at least 40 per cent since the last State election.

The Premier's tenth budget will be an interesting document indeed, following on the heels of this Bill, because we will see annual State tax collections move closer to the \$2 billion mark. Taxes have increased from a mere \$631 million in 1981-82 under the Tonkin Government to an alarming \$1 891 million in 1990-91. This occurred even before the tax increases of 1991-92 and the more recent increases. The fact of the matter is that taxes have tripled in the Bannon Government decade.

*Mr Holloway interjecting:*

**Mr MATTHEW:** The member for Mitchell might like to sit there and bleat about that, but the fact remains that taxes in the Bannon decade have more than tripled. I challenge any members of this Government to deny that taxes under the decade of their Government have tripled. The tripling of those costs has assisted in crippling business in our State and has contributed to the long unemployment queues we are presently witnessing.

*Mr Venning: It's a disgrace.*

**Mr MATTHEW:** As my colleague the member for Culance said, it is a disgrace indeed.

*The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:*

**Mr MATTHEW:** The Minister might ask me to settle down a bit, but he as a member of this Cabinet must take direct responsibility for what has happened. I am sure the members of his electorate of Unley would not be at all happy about his participation in those increases. I would hope that the people of Unley will vote accordingly at the next election. The whole point is that next financial year's total tax take will be the equivalent of at least

\$79.60 a week for a South Australian family of four, compared with \$28.76 when the Premier first came to office in 1982. Now, of course, we are seeing the Premier send his bills for the 1992-93 financial year to South Australians already, before he has even told them through the budget what they will actually be paying for, for example, whether or not some of these tax increases are necessary for yet another State Bank bail-out.

We could have seen a program in place to reduce the cost of Government operations instead of budgeting yet again for a further 10 per cent increase this financial year. The Premier could have imposed on Government the same discipline which the businesses and families who are having to survive this recession are having to place on their own budgets to be able to keep their heads above water. But, no, we do not see that happening; we still see this Government go on without control or direction.

It has been interesting indeed to note that during June this year, with these problems, we saw 400 taxes and charges increase once again. It has been interesting to see where some of the critics of this Government have come from, and I recall hearing earlier today that my colleague the member for Coles mention that the Public Service Association (an association for which the Minister present at the moment was an advocate prior to his entering Parliament) has been critical of the Government. There is no doubt that there are valid reasons for that, simply because the Public Service as an organisation is fed up with the pressure being placed upon it also in order to survive this recession.

It is very much aware that this Government is having to participate in a desperate cash grab to cover its ailing coffers, to cover the State's record debt which has now reached \$7.4 billion and which is almost \$5 000 for every South Australian and over 25 per cent of our gross national product. So, while all this is occurring Public Service morale is taking an almighty buffeting and one which it is starting to speak out about very loudly. Shrinking resources and lack of assets and equipment maintenance, which have been identified in a study released by the Public Service Association on 2 July this year, illustrates the *ad hoc* decisions made by the Premier in his last State budget. We have seen hospitals, schools, areas of public safety, transport and other key service responsibilities thoroughly run down. Health workers and teachers continually voice their concern to Opposition members about the way in which this Government has allowed the system to crash and how the Premier has failed to consult as he slashes and burns essential services.

In my role as shadow Minister of Emergency Services I am contacted daily by police officers who are fed up with the cuts in resources they are experiencing. Indeed, the Public Service Association is to be commended for coming forward and saying, 'We have had enough.'

*Mr Holloway interjecting:*

**Mr MATTHEW:** The member for Mitchell seems to need reminding of some of the things that have occurred. I am happy to do that, because his constituents must be feeling the problems experienced through hospital waiting lists. I know that last night the Federal Government handed down a budget giving a small amount of money—not enough—to our State to be used to reduce



those waiting lists. Almost 10 000 South Australians are waiting for surgery. Surely that is not a record that the member for Mitchell or his other colleagues will try to defend. Our hospital administrators, doctors and nurses are all pushed to the limit and are fed up. They are saying, 'Enough is enough.' All this is occurring while hospital buildings are crumbling and decaying. They need new equipment. What about the response of the Minister of Health? The Minister said that they have to cut their budget by a further \$20 million to cover budget shortfalls.

I have talked about the approaches I have received from members of the Police Force. Since the new batons came into use—the two handled version—there are not enough to go around the Police Force. If we had a major riot in the city we would not have enough batons to equip the Police Force in order to defend themselves and the public appropriately at such a time. Members may smile and say that that does not happen in little old Adelaide, but it can. We had riots a few years ago in Glenelg and it is absolutely vital that the Police Force is properly equipped. In other areas we have had up to 45 detectives working in the CIB and being unable to get access to enough vehicles to undertake their job effectively. If they need access to an unmarked vehicle they have great difficulty in being able to access that equipment. We have Drug Squad detectives often hindered in their duties because they cannot get access to an unmarked vehicle or one that does not look like a Government vehicle. Certainly they can get access to a white Commodore, but that does not go with the image of an undercover police officer. It is a ludicrous situation in which to place them.

We have problems with cramped accommodation in police headquarters. Recently I became aware of an official complaint lodged under occupational health and safety guidelines in order to get more work space around the desk in that office accommodation area. The occupational health and safety complaint was upheld and the response to that complaint was to throw out some of the desks and there are now not enough desks to go around. That is the sort of run down that is occurring. I have previously raised these matters in the Parliament. The Minister has finally responded to me and he cannot deny that any of these things are occurring because the fact is that they are occurring and something needs to be done about it.

*Mr Holloway interjecting:*

**Mr MATTHEW:** The member for Mitchell asks what are our priorities. Through the Leader of the Opposition the Liberal Party has been gradually putting down its policies and detailing its plan for government. I suggest that the honourable member read those policies as they are there, unlike the situation with this Government, which appears to have no direction.

The other area that gives me great concern is the manner in which existing moneys are being utilised. Recently I revealed that the Police Department contracted a computer company, Aspect Computing, to undertake a review of police systems on both the Justice Information System (JIS) and on its own IBM mainframe. I was given a copy of that report and I was appalled to see a recommendation that the Police Department rewrite its total computer systems. This is the same JIS that has

blown out its cost by more than \$20 million, and the Government is now looking at rewriting the whole lot. If that is not throwing good money after bad, what direction do we have? I for one will stand up in this Parliament and fight this sort of nonsense and keep highlighting it so that this sort of extraordinary waste is prevented from occurring.

The confidential reports that have been leaked to me, critiques of the Aspect Computing document, suggest that fortunately there are many Government employees who are absolutely horrified at this direction that the Police Department is considering taking, and they are giving sound reasons for its not occurring in the first place and are already starting to warn this Government of the heavy costs that could eventuate should that happen. By way of evidence I wish to quote from some of the confidential memos involved. One memorandum, sent from the Manager, JIS Applications Development, to the Project Director, states:

... the approach described will not provide the best value for the justice dollar, is not consistent with endorsed or proposed JIS objectives, and the impact of the implied work is significantly underestimated.

Another confidential memo from the Manager, System Support, to the Project Director, states:

The OSI Report is almost totally devoid of any financial details ...

I further quote:

... the focus of the OSI project to integrate the South Australian Police Department operational systems must take into account the broader implications, not only from a South Australian Police Department perspective but also from the wider JIS community.

Finally, another confidential memo from the JIS capacity planner to the Project Director states:

This is a significant project ... it will have a major impact on all aspects of site and will certainly have a major impact on JIS capacity requirements.

While the Supply Bill continues to recognise the funnelling of money into accounts with details not being revealed to this Parliament, this sort of wastage is going on and my colleagues and I are certainly concerned about it. This project follows an announcement by my colleague the member for Heysen who revealed recently that the State Government, through the E&WS, signed a contract for a \$38 million computer.

It looks like yet another computer operation is about to go berserk. There is another reason for raising computing, particularly in relation to the Police Department and others, and that relates to the crime statistics that have been released by the Police Department. I am concerned that the preliminary crimes statistics recently released by the Police Commissioner are drastically understated. Members will recall that recently the Police Commissioner announced that crimes such as house breaking, car theft and larceny had decreased by as much as 15 per cent. Should that be the case, I would be the first member in this House to say that I am pleased about it and welcome it.

However, when those figures were released I received numerous phone calls from concerned police officers and Neighbourhood Watch representatives who said, 'We do not know anywhere where the crime rate is going down.' I took it upon myself to investigate this matter further and I revealed some alarming discrepancies. My inquiries

found that there has actually been a major change to police statistical classifications in order to conform with national standards. Therefore, these changes effectively invalidate some statistical comparisons with previous years. My inquiries further reveal that many crime reports were not even keyed into the computer system at the time the Commissioner made his announcement.

I raised this matter in the Parliament during Question Time and the Minister refused to contradict my statement. Instead, he said that the statistics when released were done so guardedly, with the statement that they were 'preliminary statistics'. I call on the Government to release the true level of crime statistics in our community in order that we can find out where the problems are so that we can ensure that our Police Force is adequately equipped to fight crime and not have to be resourced against phoney or fudged crime statistics that are probably done in that way to make the South Australian public feel good about a drop in crime, which appears may not be the case.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I have spoken to various Supply Bills over a number of years but I approach this Bill with a certain element of trepidation because, although it has only a couple of clauses and the explanation appears in *Hansard* in a few paragraphs, it opens up a whole new world. Yes, it supplies for the Public Service for a period but, because it is highlighted that the Bill is based on new fiscal policy, unlike in the past there is no way of making use of this document or the others that will follow to crosscheck or effectively check Government spending. On this occasion the Government has told us that it is allowing funds generated in a department to stay in that department. However, it has given us no indication of exactly how that will be monitored or whether it will be hollow logs within hollow logs. We have no real opportunity to look at total Consolidated Revenue for the fiscal year.

Yes, I recognise that there is clear indication in the explanation that money can be expended only as it has been in the past, that there can be no additional spending on any line greater than that which has occurred in the past, but that is where the similarity with previous Bills ends. It makes great play of the fact that it provides for \$200 million less this year than last year because of this changed attitude and that funding within departments will make up that \$200 million. Again, there is no clear indication of how we can compare things now that have been readily comparable in the past.

For that reason alone, one is cynical and believes that the Government, with all its difficulties, fiscal and otherwise, in the 1992-93 year, has taken the opportunity to fudge the figures so that the tracking down of Government expenditure and Government excesses will be that much more difficult. Thank goodness we have in place parliamentary committees that will allow continuing questioning of fiscal activity and will call for reports from senior staff in the various departments to make sure there is some accountability or that there is the possibility of tracking down some of the evidence that now will not be so readily available.

What are the problems? What is the hidden agenda? What has not been told to us by the Government in bringing forward this measure? Is it widely known—and I know that this is a fact—that senior sergeants in the Police Force have been taken off the road after the afternoon shift? It is no longer possible for senior sergeants to provide that balance between the experienced and not so experienced with respect to patrols. It is a cost cutting measure at a time when we are told the Government is serious about community policing, juvenile crime and ways to approach it, yet at the same time it is refusing senior people in the Police Force that opportunity to give that balance throughout the whole of a policing day.

I recall some years ago relating an experience I had as a child at Brighton during the war. On one side of the Brighton jetty, leading northwards, was a whole host of barbed wire fences to protect against invasion. On the other side, leading back towards Seacliff, there was no barbed wire fence and no defence at all. As an impressionable youngster, one played with the truth and said that, if the enemy came in around the wrong side of the jetty, they had done the wrong thing. In other words, they were not playing the game: they were not playing cricket if they came in on the southern side of the jetty. If they came in on the top side, they could tangle with the barbed wire. I draw that same analogy here. We have a circumstance where the Government says that it wants to be fair dinkum about giving support to the community with its police and policing routine. It wants to give the opportunity to fight juvenile crime but, at the same time, we are withdrawing as a cost cutting measure so there will be no overtime and no penalty rates. All senior sergeants are grounded other than on ordinary day shift.

Other activities directly associated with commissioned officers are also affected by this same strategy. What does the Government think it is doing by continuing to squander its money with some of its largess activities and some of its high salaries, yet cutting back on the funding of those services to which it is giving lip service, claiming that it is supporting them but in actual fact not doing so?

Let us forget about the police situation for the moment and talk about what is happening in relation to youth housing. There is a great need and, unfortunately, whether we are on this side of the House or the other side, we accept that family situations today are under some strain. As a result of that strain, some youngsters go off the rails or, more particularly, will leave home and, if they are not picked up by a caring agency, they are headed for skid row. What are we doing now? Currently we have over 240 beds between Gawler in the north and Noarlunga in the south to assist those people who are without a home, having just left. That number will be cut back almost immediately to 190.

**Mr Atkinson:** Is that the 'largess' you were referring to?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The member for Spence would do well to listen to what is being said and not—

**Mr Atkinson:** I am. I am the only member paying attention.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The honourable member is playing with young people's lives with his frivolous comments. It is intended in this critical youth housing area to centralise the activity. No final decision has been reached yet as to whether it will be one administration or four, where 33 organisations today play a vital part and with local knowledge are able to stem some of the difficulties which these youngsters will get into if they are not cared for and given attention quite early in the piece.

Who suffers as a result of cost cutting? It is the youngsters in the first instance and families across the State in the longer term. We have these actions by a Government that is so bereft of ideas and so impotent in the labour force. It plays with young people's lives, taking actions that are against the demands and needs of the community at the same time as the unions are allowed to overrun the whole labour arena.

Members should consider the WorkCover dilemma. They should look at the costs we are incurring and the add-ons to industry. Why are people not providing job opportunities? The simple reason is that the add-ons and their not being able to get decent cover for a reasonable price are forcing them to the wall and out of production. A letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* of 17 August quite succinctly draws attention to some of the problems in the Australian scene. I am not referring to one of those frequent letters to the Editor from Ministers of the Crown who seek to get their point of view across because they have been unable to convince the reporters to outline their programs. The letter is entitled 'Increasing wages not the answer' and it states:

I hear and read many words from clever people on reasons why we are in the awful position we are in today. Well, from a bloke who left school at 13, let me expound my wisdom. I visited Australia in 1969 and en route passed through Singapore. I travelled in a Chinese-driven taxi and asked what was this thing blowing cold air on my legs. I meant the air-conditioner, not a thing I had encountered before. He thought I mean what car. 'Is Holden,' he said, 'From Ortralia, very good car, we much like.'

I'd never heard of Holden at that stage. 1969, okay, I settled here, fags 35c for 20, petrol 35c a gallon, wages \$70-\$90 a week, good place to live. Shangri-La I thought.

And well he might think that, because we were in a productive phase; we were exporting, including motor vehicles, and we were in a competitive State with plenty for all, yet there were no exorbitant wages. The letter continues:

Enter Whitlam era, wages explosion, everybody happy, paypacket doubled, trebled, etc., etc., everybody rich. I again went through Singapore, Holdens gone. When I asked the taxi driver where are Holden taxis, he said: 'Too dear, all buy Toyota.' Upon my return home an article in the *Advertiser* said Holdens had lost 25 per cent of the export market in the year. All the unions scream that we can't compete with the starvation wages of other countries.

Are they starvation wages? I have a tennis racquet imported from Italy, a TV made in Spain (by Philips), a hose clip from Canada, for heaven's sake. Are they all starving? I'll give you my philosophy. If you earn 20 rupees a week and you can live on 18 rupees, you're doing okay. If you earn a million rupees a week and it costs you a million and one to live, boy, you're in trouble, especially if that million rupees has to go on the cost of the object you're trying to sell to the rest of the world.

Rising wages never ever was the answer (especially with an export nation), it was cost of living. We must export to survive, it is life or death. We are a tennis country, a fishing country, a TV watching country and yet we cannot buy a rod or a tennis

racquet or a tennis hat without it being labelled Korea, China, etc. The unions squeal, not enough population to make these things profitably. Tell that to Sweden. What, 12 million population?

We can say that we can now have a population of 17.5 million or 18 million in Australia. The letter continues:

Why do you see Volvo trucks, cars and Saab cars all over the world? Because they got their act together. I never said I knew the answer to our problem, but I believe I'm right about the reason.

The letter is signed by Allan A. Samm of Eden Hills. I believe that in that letter to the editor he has encapsulated a great deal of the problem currently facing us at both State and Federal level. In so many ways we have allowed largess into areas and there has been no value for the community. We have taken away from those who are in desperate need a number of the essentials of life. I have referred this evening to police senior sergeants and to youth housing, which is under threat at this very moment. There are other examples. Other members can make their own contributions in so many different areas. However, we have allowed these things to happen.

There was a Prime Minister who came along after the one I mentioned during the quoting of that letter who said that we are a lucky country and that we ought to do something about it. We are a lucky country if we make proper use of it and we are a lucky State but, unfortunately, we are going to be a very depressed State for a long time because of the failings of this Government. When I say 'Government' I mean all members who support the Government, whether they be on the back benches or in the Ministry, whether they be at the top of the cherry tree, as the Premier is, or the most junior of the Ministers.

**Mr Atkinson:** Every voter?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** No, not every voter, because at the last election more than 50 per cent of the voters said that they did not want Labor. As I am sure you, Sir, will appreciate, I was proud of this Parliament when it was mature enough to make changes to the electoral system in this State which will introduce an element of fairness into the future. I do not know how it will turn out in numbers on the floor, but at least it will get much closer to the proposition that the Party which wins the greater number of votes will win the opportunity to be the Government and to put its policies into effect.

The hypocrisy this afternoon during Question Time was hard to believe. I am pleased that the Minister of Finance is present, because he was the perpetrator of great hypocrisy when he indicated that the Government would not shirk its responsibilities in the payment of tax. We have always been lily white and honest clean; yet when I, quite out of character as you will appreciate, Sir, interjected and asked about the ETSA deal, suddenly he was silent. He did not want to tell us about the \$84 million that we have to find in this Supply Bill by other means to pay the tax on the ETSA deal and other deals.

We questioned the validity and integrity of those deals at the time they were being made. I was told by the Premier, no less, 'My Government would not do anything wrong. Yes, we are quite okay. I cannot tell you anything about it; it is commercial confidentiality. But you can trust me, little John. I have done the right thing and we have done the right thing. The State is quite okay; the State will not suffer any impediment.'

What we know now, some months later, is that the State has the impediment of at least \$84 million to be found to pay for a tax which was due to be paid earlier but which, with some fancy footwork in the accounting business, was quietly pushed under the carpet. I see in this document a certain amount of this so-called 'commercial confidentiality'. We are not getting the full truth, and we will not get the full truth in the future, because funds will be hidden away in the names of the departments and will not be comparable immediately with the details that were available to us in the past.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): This supply debate is one that I take most seriously. It is a debate that does not reach great heights in the press—it is hardly reported—and many members do not take it all that seriously. However, it does give members of the Opposition an opportunity to tell us what they would about supply. After listening to the Opposition for hours on end since this debate started, I can feel nothing but depression, because all we have heard from members opposite has been doom, gloom and despair. How could a group of people ever hope to aspire to lead this State if all they can do is stand up and grizzle and moan about performance and not put forward anything constructive as far as their own policies are concerned? I listened with deep interest to the Leader of the Opposition's remarks. I remember the Leader when he was a member in 1975 and I remember him as a shadow—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is aware that this is a Supply debate, and I am sure he will draw his remarks back to it and relate them to the finances of the State.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker; I think you missed the first part of my speech. Unfortunately, your attention was being drawn to something else and I do not think you heard the introduction to my remarks.

The SPEAKER: I will listen closely.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you very much, Sir. The way that the Leader of the Opposition would influence Supply was one of the few things that drew my attention to his contribution. I remember him when he was a shadow Minister in 1985, and when he was defeated in an election by one of his own colleagues, and I remember the trips he used to make down to my electorate when he was the shadow Minister, making all sorts of promises in relation to what he would do as far as his portfolio was concerned, which related to transport. I remember the promises he made prior to that election, of building another road alongside South Road, which promises must have lost the Liberal Party at least three seats during that election. Not only that: in 1985 (just as an aside, and I know you will allow me this little digression, Sir) he walked across the Chamber and said to me that this was the last time he would see me in this Chamber, meaning I would be defeated and he would be re-elected. Unfortunately for him it proved to be wrong, because the reverse was the case: he was defeated and I was re-elected.

I took great interest in the promises he was making about the way that he would influence Supply. It is only fair that I should make one or two comments on his proposals. One of the main planks of his policy (if you could call it a policy) was that he would attack the work

force of South Australia by lowering taxes and charges and reforming WorkCover. In talking about reforming WorkCover, he really means reducing benefits to workers, and I want that to be made crystal clear instead of the airy-fairy proposition 'We will be reforming WorkCover.' In fact, he means 'We will be reducing benefits.'

He also suggested that members should look at the complete breakdown of planning approvals and that something should be done about our planning legislation, but he was extremely careful not to express an opinion on what he would do about that legislation. Such airy-fairy propositions are all one can get when one listens carefully to the way that the Opposition would like to handle this State. He made the point that he believed the key services were education, training, health, community security and public transport—all very laudable objectives—yet four paragraphs later in the same speech he states:

The fifth key direction that a Liberal Government would take in this State is smaller and more efficient government so that taxes and charges can be kept lower.

Can members understand the logic of that? On the one hand, he says that 'the key services are education, planning, health, security and public transport' and, on the other hand, he promises to make government smaller. One cannot make government smaller and yet provide the same services. This is something that I find difficult to understand.

The Leader of the Opposition in his speech promised a single jump in productivity of 40 per cent for 100 per cent of our industry. There is only one problem: he did not tell us how he was going to do it. Anyone who has had any experience at all in industry, be it farming through to manufacturing, will tell us that it is impossible to increase productivity by 40 per cent in one step across the board for the whole of South Australia. Soon we will be moving to grievances and members will have the opportunity to say what they like, and I want members of the Opposition to tell me how they are going to increase productivity across 100 per cent of our industry. The Leader's words were 'to increase productivity by 40 per cent in one leap'. There is not a country anywhere in the world to my knowledge that has been able to do that. Both the people of South Australia and I would be enlightened if Opposition members could name a country that has increased productivity by 40 per cent across 100 per cent of its industries in one leap.

It is fairyland stuff. When speaking about one factory, he said:

It has had to abandon work practices because they are in direct conflict with the industrial award, which, for instance, lays down that at 12 o'clock everyone must stop for lunch. Therefore, the company cannot keep machines working over the lunch hour because it is against the industrial award, it cannot have half the work force stopping for lunch at half past 11 and the other half at half past 12.

Apparently, this is the way in which we are going to increase productivity by 40 per cent across the whole of industry: by having people work through their lunch hour. I have never heard of anything so preposterous in all my life. If this company would like to give me a phone call I will tell it how to go down to the union representatives with whom it deals and discuss with them the proposition that their machines work through the lunch hour. I would

be extremely surprised if anyone with any expertise whatsoever in industrial relations could not manage to negotiate to have their machines work through the lunch hour. It has been done hundreds and hundreds of times. If that is an example of how we are going to increase productivity in this State, I will 'go he for chasey'.

Another proposition was made, and I have read it over and again because I could not believe my eyes. The Leader said:

South Australia must aim to produce at least 200 000 jobs, create and maintain a 4 per cent annual growth rate and increase our export share over the next 10 years. Whilst that is undoubtedly a very big task—

that is an understatement: it is a very big task—

it is achievable with new policies that give the highest priority to economic development and the creation of real jobs.

What are those policies? Tell us: will the Liberal Party please stand up and tell us what are those policies that will create a 4 per cent increase in State productivity? It does not matter what happens to the rest of Australia or whether Victoria is going down the drain or anything like that: South Australia is going to produce a 4 per cent increase in gross State product not for one year or two years but every year for 10 years.

Even Queensland, which has mineral deposits that we do not dream about and which is blessed with a climate that is very good for tourism, is struggling to be able to produce a 4 per cent increase in State product every year. I would say it was impossible to do it for 10 years. If Queensland were able to do it, I wonder what the inflation rate would be.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

Mr FERGUSON: I have been to other countries. I have just returned from China, which has increased its productivity every year for the past seven years by more than 5 per cent, but it started with nothing—only with green fields.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: I am terribly sorry; I did not mean to upset the Opposition. I thought I was being very reasonable.

The SPEAKER: It is the Chair that you must not upset.

Mr FERGUSON: I am not the only one who has been complaining about the Liberal Party not producing its policies. Even its greatest advocate, the *Adelaide Advertiser*, the champion of the Liberal Party, the bastion of conservatism, the supporter of nearly every Liberal candidate in this State, is prepared to say in its editorial of Tuesday 18 August:

That is not to say we in South Australia do not want to see vigorous debate. We do. And we want to see policies from the Liberals, just as we want to see the incumbents get on with the serious business of trying to turn around the State's unhappy fortunes.

The Government has spelt out its legislative program for the present parliamentary session. A Budget is in the offing. There could be no better time for the Liberals, under Mr Brown, to be stepping up their policy formulation and dissemination process so that South Australians can judge the Liberals on more than political sloganeering.

I do not think that I could be more eloquent than that. It is time for members of the Liberal Party to stand up. They are constantly telling us that they want to run this State. I believe that there might even have been certain

suggestions to you, Sir, that the Liberal Party wanted to run this State. I am not privy to any of those discussions, but I understand that in the air and around the place, in public meetings and elsewhere, certain suggestions have been made that you might sort of help the process a bit.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach is not reflecting upon the Chair, I hope. The honourable member should be very careful about the comments he makes in relation to the Chair, or action will need to be taken.

Mr FERGUSON: I absolutely apologise if I have offended you in any way, Sir. I had no intention of doing so.

The SPEAKER: It is not a matter of offending me personally; it is a matter of offending the Chair. It holds a position of some significance in this Parliament.

Mr FERGUSON: If there is a way of apologising to the Chair, I would certainly like to do so. But it is time for the Liberals to stand up and tell us what their policies are. If they want to go to the people and become the Government of this State; if they want to prove to the rest of South Australia that they can do it, what they must do is stand up in those little green chairs over there and tell us what those policies are.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr FERGUSON: I refuse to be provoked. I and, I am sure, the rest of South Australia would like to know what the Liberal Party will do about health. Will the member for Adelaide tell us the Liberal Party's policy on health? What will the shadow Treasurer do so far as Treasury is concerned? What will the member for Victoria tell us about his portfolio? What are the policies of the Liberal Party? What do members of the Liberal Party backbench think that they will do when they get into Government? Lay us down the plan so that South Australia can judge what the Opposition can do.

We have already told members opposite what we are doing about freezing court charges; about freezing electricity charges; about introducing international best practices; about modernising industry; about expanding the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing; about support for major infrastructure projects; about tourism infrastructure; about the two-year exploration program, more minerals and more petroleum; about the new manufacturing technology; about upgrading the TCFs; about the Skills and Resource Centre; about the multi-million dollar upgrading in the motor industry; about the Chair of Automotive Engineering through TAFE; and about the attempt to introduce eastern standard time, which will save this State millions of dollars. Let us see whether we obtain support from the Opposition on that.

We are taking every opportunity to explore Asian markets. We are taking action on the MFP and educational exports. We are already doing something in relation to TAFE services to Indonesia. We already have our policies on the plate. What we and the people of South Australia want to know is: what are the Liberal policies? How can they be so cheeky as to expect to get into office without providing to the people of South Australia one policy paper?

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

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Before dealing with the member for Henley Beach, Mr Speaker, I want to take your mind back to the election campaign of November 1982 and to the promises that the Government made then, namely, that there would be flair and light in South Australia and that it would lead South Australia out of the wilderness. Mr Speaker, I also ask you to remember those promises which were made to bribe the population, after a good term of the Tonkin Government and which are well known and well documented.

Of course, the next policy direction that this Government had to indicate was in its first budget, and each year in succession it has brought down budgets in which it has documented its policy direction for the next 12 months. Each year it has been judged on that. At each election since that period, this Government has made claims about where it has taken South Australia and said, 'We stand on our record,' and made promises of where it will take South Australia. No other Government in Australia has had as many promises and budgets to put before the people. This Government has had so many opportunities to say where it will take the residents of South Australia and how it will make them world competitive and competitive with the other States. That is all factual; it is on the record.

The member for Henley Beach has asked, 'What about the Liberal Party policy?' The number one policy is to rid South Australia of this Government and get some good financial management back on that side of the House. The member for Henley Beach has the temerity in the Supply Bill debate, which is about another \$1 billion to pay public servants in South Australia, to tell us that he wants to see some Liberal Party policies. He must be in dreamland, because he has been part of the Government, although I will admit that he could not get on to the front bench. In my opinion, he should have got on it, because at least he is one person on that side who has some personal wealth, and some knowledge of managing his money, although he did not show a lot of that knowledge tonight. For the honourable member to get up and talk about Liberal Party policies when he has had to sit on the backbench for 10 years in the Bannon Government is the greatest hypocrisy this House has heard for a little while.

Let us go back over the 10 years in office of this Government. We have just heard that the level of unemployment is 12.5 per cent. Any other Minister of Employment—as he likes to call himself—would have resigned in disgrace at 12.5 per cent unemployment in this State, that is, 90 000 South Australians who have put up with the financial mismanagement of this Government for 10 years and who are now on the dole queue with absolutely no chance of getting a job, not even with the new Keating/Dawkins budget that has been brought in, and not even under the amazing financial management of the Minister of Finance, whose performance in Question Time today left even the most sceptical amazed at his financial knowledge. At a level of 12.5 per cent unemployment, any decent Labor person would cry in shame and resign. But not this mob; not this group; they could not care less about South Australia; just let us keep in power and try to sell the good news about the future. That is the first thing.

What about in 1982 when the Labor Party came to power? This State at that time had been pretty well run. We had a State debt of \$2.6 billion; per capita, we were right up with the best in Australia. We were going places. All the hard work of Sir Thomas Playford to make this the manufacturing centre of Australia, to make it the low cost State in Australia, and all the good work of the Tonkin Government to rid us of some of the nonsense that went on during the Dunstan years, was manifested in a \$2.6 billion State debt, and that was something commendable.

After 10 years, with the member for Henley Beach on the backbench I will admit, look at what has happened. We have a State debt of \$7 billion—the highest State debt per capita in Australia. If one takes the unfunded liabilities and adds them to that, one sees that we have a State debt of some \$11 billion—per capita, the highest in Australia. What a fateful day it was in November 1982 when the public of South Australia listened to the election promises and to the Premier saying, 'I will provide you with flair and light.' So much for flair and light—the lights are about to go out. That is a legacy that this State will be left with for generations, and that has been from the stewardship of this Government in South Australia for the past 10 years.

What about our 'equal to the highest in Australia' credit rating in 1982 when this Government came to power. Look what has happened to that. Any financial documentation of a Treasurer's management is the Moody's credit rating or the Standard and Poor's credit rating—they are the things by which a Government is judged; they are the independent people who tell the public of Australia whether the Government has been managing efficiently. We have seen two downgradings in the credit rating of this State. Who are we to blame? Who is the Government blaming? The buck stops on the Treasurer's desk. For him to try to get out of it is absolutely ridiculous. For members opposite to get up and ask, 'What about the Liberal Party's policies?' is ridiculous. I think that every South Australian is saying, 'What about the Labor Party's policies over the past 10 years?'

What about some of the election promises that we had? What about the interest rate freeze, that sleazy under-hand deal that the Premier of this State made with SAFA and the State Bank of South Australia to secretly freeze interest rates in this State, because he said naively, 'I did not want to be political.' What a load of garbage. Of course, that has been shown up, and this Parliament, Mr Speaker—and you will have a great part in it, Sir—will judge those lies that the Premier told to this Parliament which are now coming out in the royal commission.

I can assure you, Sir, that the Opposition will make sure that we put on the public record all the untruths, all the lies, that have been told to the Parliament in the past 10 years by the Treasurer and by this Government, and those will be judged and are now coming to the fore in the royal commission. Then the people of South Australia, Mr Speaker, with your assistance, can make sure that this Government has been judged on what it has done in the past 10 years. How can any member of the Government say, 'Where are the Liberal Party's policies?' Where have the Labor Party's policies been

over the past 10 years? Just look at the financial state we are in.

We can be quite sure that there has been no financial management, and our children are the ones who will have to pay for it. It will be interesting to see whether the Premier bites the bullet in the forthcoming budget. It was very interesting to see the performance of the Minister of Finance today who tried to claim that there was not an increase of \$288 million coming into South Australia. He said that that is all nonsense; that that is coming into South Australia but that we cannot spend it how we want to. Thank God for that! Look at what the Government has done with taxpayers' money in the past.

It is just as well that their friends in Canberra have put some strings on the money that is coming to South Australia. That money will be channelled into TAFE, hospitals and some development. If it were left to the fiscal fools who are running South Australia to spend it, it would be frittered away just like the \$2 300 million that has been frittered away with the State Bank. We do not even know what the injection will be into SGIC. Once again, there was no-one in charge, no-one keeping his finger on the pulse. Along with all the things going on at the royal commission, it is glaring that no-one cared.

The Government's attitude was that it would write press releases full of good news to tell the public of South Australia that there is flair and light on the horizon. It told the parents of schoolchildren that they would have free bus rides. They were conned before the election so that the Government could scrape in for another term. Straight after the election, it took away that program. It told the people that there would be an interest rate subsidy so they could get cheaper housing. Then the Government did a sleazy, underhand deal with the bank to make sure that it was not found out. Thank goodness the Opposition forced the Government into the royal commission, otherwise the South Australian public might never have known what was going on behind the scenes.

Let us look now at the development that has gone on in South Australia under this Government. It is obvious that everything it tackles falls in a hole. We have the Grand Prix, and we have given credit for that, but it has never made a profit. I wonder whom the Government will appoint as the next general manager, or who will get a pay-off and a big salary. The Grand Prix has been good for South Australia but it has lost money every year. What about the Marineland development? That involved a big pay-off to the unions because they said that they would not build it. Instead of saying, 'You will build it because it is good for South Australia,' they were paid millions of dollars in slush money—taxpayers' money—to sweep the facts under the carpet.

What about the Mount Lofty development, which was mooted before the last election? It was to be a grand development but, as soon as the developers spent their money in working up the proposition, the Government got nervous and pulled the plug. It did not go ahead. What about the marina development? What a wonderful development! I remember the headlines in the *News* that 4 500 jobs would be created by that development. Just before the election, it was announced that \$450 million was to be spent on it. What happened? It evaporated with the west wind.

Another good example is that of a tannery that was to be established in South Australia. Because of the incompetence of the Minister's department, the people picked up their money and wandered over to Victoria where they are now building it. The Government would not give them any assistance. What about the greatest dream of all, which was to rescue this Government in the run-up to the next election, although how anyone could think that this Government could put forward a development that would rescue it, I do not know? I refer to the MFP. What a joke! Amidst the glitz and glitter, the Premier announced what it would do for South Australia; yet not one sod has been turned. All the Better Cities money has been sunk into a swamp at Gillman to try to get this Government re-elected. That money should have been spent in your electorate, Mr Speaker, because some of it is run down, or in the electorate of the member for Elizabeth, which is desperately in need of money from that program. Some of the unfortunate people in Millicent would like to see that money in their township.

The Government will not be re-elected, that just will not happen, but it has the arrogance and the temerity to be prepared to spend \$40 million or \$50 million on an election campaign and not care two hoots about the disadvantaged people in your electorate, Mr Speaker, in the electorate of the member for Elizabeth and in my electorate of Victoria, which has a lot of disadvantaged people. That shows just how much it cares for the 80 000 people who are unemployed in South Australia, many of whom are their constituents.

They would have been the people who would have supported this Government, but they have done it for 10 years and why would they carry on their support? Of course they would not. No-one in their right mind would do it. Businesses are leaving South Australia in their hundreds. Unemployment is rising, and it is all because we have lost the plot. There is no incentive to do business in South Australia. There is no incentive for people to make profits. We have equal to the highest taxes and charges of all the States in Australia and we have the second highest electricity charges. They are the things that affect business profitability. Above all, they are the things that allow business to employ people.

You cannot put the burden on business that this Government has done progressively over the past 10 years and then sit down, wring your hands and say, 'I can't understand why we have 80 000 to 90 000 people unemployed.' All the quick fix money that it is now on its knees trying to suck in from the Federal Government in its desperate attempt to get another term is money sucked in for temporary jobs. That will not help your electorate, Mr Speaker. All it will do is give us the best trained dole queues in Australia. What will that do for South Australia? This Government lost the meaning of the word 'compassion' the day after it was elected. Why does it not think of those families and the unemployed members of those families? Why does it not think of the people who have been bankrupted by its policies?

I refer to payroll tax, a direct tax on employment. The Premier will not join with the Opposition in trying to get rid of payroll tax. If we could do that, it would help employment in South Australia to a great extent. Why does the Government not get squarely behind the Fightback package that will help save Australia? There

are not many members left on the other side but in the four minutes I have left, I will tell those members who are here that the one simple business principle that puts incentive into any business—and that is the only way to get employment—is to shift taxation from inputs and put it over to consumption. It is very simple. Just about every other OECD country does it. The Prime Minister of Australia would love to do it, and he is right behind it, but he cannot say it because it was not his idea—it was about seven or eight years ago.

If we have any compassion for South Australians, we have to provide some incentive for people to make profits. We have to provide incentive for them to obtain and retain jobs. If we are to do that, we have to alter our total thinking. The member for Henley Beach referred to policies. We have put forward policy papers and position papers consistently over the past three years. He raised the subject of health.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

Mr D.S. BAKER: Well, the Minister of Finance wakes up and says, 'Have you?' Very simply, with respect to health, by tendering out in the major hospitals in South Australia, and giving the Chief Executive Officers the ability to manage their hospitals, you could save \$40 million. How many beds would that provide? How many more operations, and how would that cut down the waiting lists? It is no good getting behind the Federal Government when it brings in a fringe benefits tax on car parking for hospital employees. That will not help. That is the greatest sham I have ever heard of. The Minister of Finance said today, 'I am squarely behind it.' What about those people on those queues waiting for operations? Is the Minister of Finance squarely behind them? If he were, he would attack his Federal colleagues. Then we had the member for Henley Beach talking about productivity. Well, I could increase his productivity 40 per cent very simply. He need not walk around the House so much for a start, but just sit there.

It is amazing the number of members on the other side of the House who do not understand what industrial relations is about. They do not understand that employees and employers want to work together for their own betterment. Everyone says that we cannot get more productivity. That is just a joke. Once one stops talking about wages and starts worrying about the unit cost of production, productivity automatically follows. That is one good thing that is happening in this State: employers and employees are getting together, not listening to the union nonsense—they are irrelevant—and saying, 'We want to have a profitable business; we want a job. Let us sit down and talk about how we can do it because that is in our best interests, in our families' best interests and the best interests of South Australia.' The Liberal Party's policy is: get rid of this Government and then South Australia might get going.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): The Supply Bill is traditionally introduced at this time of the year. It is designed to appropriate, in this case, \$1 000 million so that the Government can pay the Public Service until the beginning of November. It is effectively a blank cheque with little or no parliamentary guidelines as to how that money should be spent. However, it is an acknowledgment by the House that the appropriation of

funds is necessary to pay the Public Service during that time.

I will make just a few comments about the way in which the accounting procedures have been changed. This concerns me, because most of us like to look back to draw some parallel as to what is happening with the fiscal management of the State on a year-by-year basis and, more particularly, to draw some comparison in respect of what has happened over a number of years. It is nigh on impossible to go back over 10, 15 or 20 years to work out just how much money goes into the capital account, how much goes into the recurrent account and thereby draw some conclusion. That particular aspect worries me because we all know that 15 or 20 years ago it was possible to work out what the capital account and current account were.

Back in the Playford era, the Government would earn more money by way of receipts and would take money out of the current account and put it into the capital account construct and build many of the enterprises that this State still enjoys and uses very effectively. As the years went by, the Governments of the day became a little more cunning. They were not prepared to tax the people sufficiently to pay off the day-to-day expenses. They kept taking moneys out of the capital account—most of which was Commonwealth Government grants—to pay for the day-to-day expenditure. So, over that 20 year period we have seen a scaling down of the capital infrastructure of the State to prop up the day-to-day expenditure and all of those other little issues that are seen to be important by some people but which, in the overall scheme of things, are relatively minor. I believe that the time has come when we can no longer afford the luxury of those incidentals that have been used by Governments as vote catchers.

The most recent example is the behaviour of the Minister for Environment and Planning in relation to a report on cats. I am not particularly fussed, nor do I want to take on the argument or the issue of cats. I realise there is some significance to them and for some people cats are important. However, in the overall scheme of Governments of the day, they are irrelevant. If the cost of the reports were used to buy buckshot, the cat problem would be solved.

That is being flippant, to a degree, but I am trying to point out that it is insignificant in the overall management of the State and the Government. If we were in buoyant times, if we had the funds and the income so that we could afford such luxuries, by all means we could look at those sorts of things. However, we cannot do that now when we are so desperate for funds for the fundamentals—health, education, transport and water supply—which every citizen of this State should have provided to them as a basic commodity.

We need legislation that can make Governments accountable for their actions. We do not have that at the moment. Over the past 25 years we have had Labor administrations for 22 years. They have allowed the deficit to run out at State and Federal level to astronomical proportions. The deficit has blown out to the stage where our families, our children and probably their children will not be able to see the end of it. Even with a very austere and conservative-type Government, they would never be able to work their way out of it. So



extensive has the debt blown out that it will take generations to pay it back. It is not right that we as a Parliament or the Government of the day should saddle future generations to it.

I understand that some years ago a similar scenario occurred in most of the States of America. One by one each of the States and the people of those States jacked up. They made constitutional changes so that, if a Government overspent and came in with a deficit, it was morally obliged by law to make the correction in the next financial year. In other words, if it overspent by \$10 million or \$100 million, or whatever the figure might be, it had to make it up the next year with increased taxation or a reduction in services, whatever the case might be. The Governments of the day were obliged and forced by the changes in the constitutions of the respective States to make good the damage that they had done.

In this instance the Government of the day does not do that. To use a phrase that has cropped up in the past couple of days, it is a Bankcard Government. It spends now in the hope that somebody else will pay at a later time. That situation must come to an end and a responsible Government must step in and take over. Unless we can do that, we shall not get any further on. The \$1 000 million is admittedly a smaller figure than was the case last year, but, as I mentioned earlier, the changing of the financial accounting causes me some concern because we cannot draw a parallel with exactly how we were going this time last year or over a period of years.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr BLACKER:** As the member for Custance said, it is a deliberate fudging of the figures. I tend to agree. If the Government is genuine, why can we not have a graph or a parallel set of figures put before us to see how we are going? From the figures that we have we do not know; neither does any member of the House; and I venture to say that no member of the Government is able to explain where we are at this stage. We need to address the accounting measures that are put before the Parliament and the people of South Australia so that a fair assessment can be made. We must get our priorities right. We must ensure that the funds that we spend—the \$1 000 million—are spent for the appropriate purposes or the basic commodities that are the fundamental right of every citizen in this State, irrespective of where they live.

Unfortunately, South Australia is the most centralised State of the nation. A very large percentage of our population live within a 50 kilometre radius of the GPO. That is the sad part. Whilst some people might say it is cheaper per capita to service people in that situation, we must consider the primary production area which is more sparsely spread, because people in that area are also entitled to reasonable basic facilities such as water and roads and access to health and education. At present they are not getting that. One of the brighter lights, I suppose one can say, is that we can see where the growth and development are.

This is the opportunity for members to look around their electorates in order to do that. It is not with the Government or Government instrumentalities. In fact, they are the areas where costs have grown out of all proportion. Any growth and development are with private enterprise, agriculture, fishing and those people who,

despite the odds, knuckle down and demonstrate that it is possible to develop. I would like to spend a minute or two talking about the new tuna farming enterprise that is developing in and around Port Lincoln. It is a value adding exercise, the best example I can think of.

**Mr D.S. Baker:** It is a very good one.

**Mr BLACKER:** It is certainly a very good one and has been developed by the entrepreneurial skills of the fishing industry. Members of the fishing industry recognised that the tuna resource was limited. They have suffered the torment of cut backs in their industry because of the over-exploitation of the natural resource; they decided that if they were to survive they would have to look at a value adding exercise. This happened many years ago, and some of the fishermen looked at the sashimi market, where they could value add to the normal canning tuna caught by the pole method, bounced on the decks and carted in; basically, most of that tuna was canned. The sashimi market was then developed; sashimi was a higher priced commodity, and the raw fish was sold principally to the Japanese market. That was a value adding exercise in itself.

Since that time the tuna farms have developed, and the value adding in terms of that tuna product has been astronomical—from \$6 a kilogram for the tuna that would normally be canned up to about \$40 a kilogram for the tuna sold for the prestige sashimi market, and I believe the highest price for the best fish is about \$80 a kilogram. That is value adding; it has been brought about because of the entrepreneurial skills of the fishing industry—no thanks to some of the other people who would like to step in their way and no thanks to those people who did not want tuna farms because they could not believe there was any room for them.

We all know that, if we are to survive economically they are the sorts of industries we need to establish. I must point out that that value does not all go into the pockets of a handful of people: it is a very big employment generator. In order to produce those fish, it is necessary to start another fishing industry, that is, the pilchard industry. I overheard two fishermen say the other day that they anticipate that within five years it will be necessary to have a pilchard industry of between 25 000 and 30 000 tonnes per annum.

That completely new industry has grown up in conjunction with the value adding exercise of the tuna farm. There are some interesting aspects to that. My immediate inquiry was whether a pollution problem would be created around the pond. There are nets under the ponds, which are approximately 40 metres in diameter; every day the fish are fed with a tonne of pilchards per pen. There is an interesting biological aspect to this which should be noted in the House, although perhaps not in terms of a financial measure: in the wild, the feed stock for the tuna would normally be salmon trout or small salmon; in the pens, because the tuna do not have to chase their food, they get fat and, to an extent, lazy.

The salmon move into the pens and are also fed, in turn growing to such a size that they cannot get out. It is a strange quirk of nature that the normal feed stock of the tuna have now become their partners in the fish farm pens. Every now and again the fishermen have to reduce the number of salmon swimming around in the ponds

because the salmon cannot get out. That is only a sideline, but it is an addition to the industry.

That industry has created many dozens, if not hundreds, of jobs, and fishing vessels have been modified. Many of those fishing vessels now have rubber mattresses on the decks so that the fish are not bruised. Quality control is at its absolute highest at present, and the ultimate aim is to provide to the Japanese market fish without a single bruise mark on them. That is happening, that is where the value adding has come in and that is what is bringing in export dollars to South Australia and Port Lincoln. It is creating jobs for the industry, and that is the sort of thing that we should be promoting a little more often.

I believe that the Government should be looking at a few other areas. I am referring to areas such as marketing cooperatives with other countries to try to process and sell some of our agricultural products. The Government should be looking at joint venture operations with other countries. We have the ability to supply raw products such as wool and grain that could be used on a joint venture basis where other countries have the production and manufacturing sectors and employment available to jointly value-add or process that product.

The New South Wales Government is doing that and working in conjunction, certainly in one instance, with China and I believe that there are other joint marketing ventures and cooperatives going into Europe on much the same basis. The State of New South Wales becomes the supplier to another country, which becomes the manufacturer or processor; they market the products jointly and both parties benefit. That is value-adding with another country in mind, and I believe there are opportunities that could be further expanded in that area.

I would like to wind up my comments with a statement of concern, in this case in relation to the Cleve Sporting Bodies Club Incorporated. The club is making a statement on behalf of a group of citizens in the community, complaining bitterly about the way in which the Government has been over-taxing and increasing charges willy-nilly to the detriment of the wider community. In its letter the club states:

Dear Mr Blacker,

I have been instructed by the management committee of the Cleve Sporting Bodies to write to you to express our disappointment and outrage at the recently announced State tax increases. Specifically, limited licence fees to hold functions outside normal training hours. This fee has risen from \$6 to \$20, a rise of 233 per cent. Our club feels the State Government has acted irresponsibly in the actual percentage rise. Surely a rise in line with the consumer price index or inflation would have been fairer and equitable. We have also written to the Liquor Licensing Commissioner expressing our outrage.

In these hard financial times all persons, clubs, businesses etc. are acting with restraint and trying to contain costs. We should expect and demand our State Government and its ancillary bodies to recognise this and act with integrity and fairness.

Yours faithfully,

Secretary, Cleve Sporting Bodies Club Incorporated.

That letter expresses the sentiments of almost every citizen of the State. It does not matter who or where we are, whether we are in the country or the city: people are expressing those same views, one and all. I know it is not possible for me to talk in detail about a Bill that has been introduced to Parliament, but the point I wish to make is that one Bill provides for an increase in stamp duty from 20c to \$10.

I thought that that was a mistake, but it has been checked by a land broker in my area who rang the Adelaide office. The increase is from 20c to \$10 for the tax stamps on certain documentation. That is a disgrace and an anti-development measure: it will restrict development. Whether or not it is designed to restrict it, I do not know, but that is the effect of it. The Government does everything it can to stand in the way of development that will create jobs and enterprise. Jobs create returns within the community and cash flow. Every job that can be created means more dollars circulating in the community and thus more job opportunities.

The member for Henley Beach made a number of outlandish remarks in his contribution and I believe he should be chastised for that. He claimed that the Opposition is doing nothing but spreading doom and gloom. Without the doom and gloom, the Opposition would have nothing to talk about, but of course the Government created that doom and gloom. The proof is in the pudding. The bottom line is that we are in diabolical trouble. Who has put us in diabolical trouble but the Government and the administration of the day? When the Government has been in office 22 out of the past 27 years it cannot blame the Opposition. The Government must accept every skerrick of the blame. It cannot point the finger at anyone else; it must accept the blame where it lies. I support the Bill.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** As we consider this Supply Bill and approach the State budget next week, I think it appropriate that this Parliament should give some thought to the financial plight that now faces South Australia.

**Mr Holloway:** Here we go again.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Yes; it is about time we outlined some facts, particularly for the benefit of the Minister of Finance. I am delighted that he is present in the House this evening, because he has been incredibly silent and less than factual with the public of South Australia on the financial position that this State Government now faces. We have consistently asked for figures—and I will deal with a number of those shortly—but he and his Premier have refused to supply them.

**Mr Holloway:** It's a bit hard when you are in the royal commission.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The honourable member says that it is a bit hard when you are in the royal commission: the Premier is attending the royal commission because of his lack of accountability in the past. As a result of that, he has led this State to a total loss, so far, through the State Bank of \$2.3 billion. What we need now is a factual statement from the Minister of Finance and the Premier that is widely made public and informs South Australians of the financial plight this State faces.

**Mr Holloway interjecting:**

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I assure the honourable member that he will not get much fact about the grim financial situation of this State in the budget next week. I have sat through 12 budgets—I suspect many more than the honourable member—and the budgets I have seen from Premiers of this State have attempted to put a gloss on what is a disastrous situation. I am sure this year will

be no exception; in fact, I believe every attempt will be made to hide the real facts. South Australia faces a very grim financial situation. It is essential that people know the magnitude of the problem and that attention be focussed on solutions to that problem.

After the last State election, the Premier promised this State—I think his words were—‘light and flair’ over the next four years. Instead, the Government has produced deep and dark despair. The performance of the Labor Government over the past decade makes the job of any incumbent Government (which will be a Liberal Government) all the more difficult, but at the same time it makes the Liberal Party’s task of giving a new direction to South Australia all the more important and urgent.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I point out to the member for Henley Beach that only one in five South Australians support the direction in which his Government is trying to take this State at present—and that is a fact. It is reflected in the poll today of about 27 per cent. I think the Premier’s present rating is down to 24 per cent—Mr 24 per cent. It is a clear indication that the people of South Australia are fed up with this Government. They want a new direction. Members opposite still cannot see that the people are crying out for a new direction, new policies and economic development in South Australia. This Government is blindly bound to its ideological dogma, which includes, of course, a huge Government at the expense of the private sector, Government interference and a Government with central control. Last week, the Liberal Party set out a broad framework for the development of South Australia with a very clear focus on what it is trying to achieve.

Under that policy we would have been achieving an annual growth rate for the next 10 years of 4 per cent, which would have created 200 000 extra jobs. It was interesting to hear the Acting Premier say within a few hours that the figures looked extremely rubbery and could not be achieved, even though here in South Australia we find that the Government created only 100 000 jobs over the past 10 years when Queensland created 355 000 in the same period. But members opposite reject the whole concept of a 4 per cent growth rate. What I find particularly interesting in that is that the whole basis of the Arthur D. Little report is a 4 per cent growth rate over the next 10 years.

The Acting Premier himself rejected that basis in criticising what I said last week. It would appear that the Government has commissioned that report, which is to be released in its full version next Friday by the Premier and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, but before the final version comes out the Government has openly rejected the 4 per cent growth rate and said that it cannot be achieved, even though it funded the report itself.

One starts to wonder what is the real basis for coming out with such reports and responding to them as the Premier has done. I should like to highlight some of the key parameters in terms of the economic development of this State’s finances at present. First, we have record unemployment, which peaked in June at 12.5 per cent, with more than 90 000 out of work.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The honourable member said, ‘Was it any better under the Liberal Government?’ Yes, if you look at the facts I gave to this House just last week, you will find that it was substantially better than that, even though there was a very severe recession at the time the last Liberal Government was defeated. I take the second key factor, the State debt, which is now more than \$7 billion, even though it was only \$2.6 billion when this Government took office in 1982. In 10 years it has gone from \$2.6 billion to \$7 billion.

*An honourable member:* Doom and gloom!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It is interesting to hear the honourable member suddenly talking about doom and gloom. Talk about who has thrust doom and gloom on this State! It is you and your Government, and you are just as responsible as the Premier. You have sat there in the same Caucus meetings and allowed the Premier to rape the finances of this State.

**Mr FERGUSON:** On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, the honourable Leader is getting carried away by referring to me as ‘you’. My title is the member for Henley Beach.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr De Laine):** I uphold the point of order and ask the Leader to refer to members by their titles.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I will certainly refrain from referring to him as ‘you’ and refer to him as the temporary member for Henley Beach. I point out to members opposite that they have sat in the same Caucus room and the Minister of Finance has sat around the same Cabinet table. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology sat there knowing that the State Bank was in financial trouble and for two years, despite the questions in this House, despite hearing the questions raised day after day, what did they do? They sat on their hands.

They are as guilty as their Premier of sitting on their hands for two years despite all the warnings, despite all the publicity, and doing absolutely nothing. As a result of their doing nothing, this State now has a total debt of more than \$7 billion. What is the consequence of that? First, there has been a double downgrading of our credit rating as a State from the top AAA by Standard and Poor’s, Moody’s and Australian Ratings. It is now down to AA with a minus outlook.

That in itself has created an additional cost of about \$50 million to the running of the State’s finances each year. But that is not the important part: the important part is that it is the large companies overseas, the large potential investors, who might be about to invest in South Australia, who look at this State and ask ‘If that’s the location, what is its credit rating?’ When it sees the State with an AA credit rating with a minus outlook, that will ring all the alarm bells which say to them, ‘Don’t invest there; there is a State with deep financial troubles.’ That is exactly why we are now facing a gloomy outlook when it comes to industrial development.

This State debt, having been created, it is worth looking at the impact of that on interest payments. The interest servicing costs on Consolidated Account are now estimated to be \$694 million for the past financial year. That means 47c in every tax dollar collected by the South Australian Government is currently going into paying just the interest bill. Just imagine what we could do if we did

not have that debt around our neck. We could halve the State's tax bill.

**Mr Ferguson:** Turn the clock back to 1985.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** To the member for Henley Beach I say, 'Turn the clock back to 1982'. That is the time frame we would need to go back to, when the State debt was a mere \$2.6 billion, we had a viable State Bank system, a viable SGIC and a workable workers compensation scheme, and we did not have any of the financial disasters that have been inflicted upon this State by this Government. The State's liabilities now total \$10.9 billion as at 30 June 1991, and we know that they are growing at an ever-increasing rate. This includes a State debt, as I have just pointed out, of \$7 billion, plus \$3.2 billion of unfunded public sector superannuation fund liability and \$500 000 of unfunded public sector long service leave. On top of that, we have the further losses on the State Bank, which I believe will be announced next week, the SGIC, which I believe will require a major input of capital next week, and further unfunded losses on WorkCover.

State taxation from 1988-89 to the present time has increased from \$1.25 billion to \$1.5 billion. Payroll tax has increased from 5 per cent to 6.1 per cent. FID has doubled from 4c to 10c per \$100. The BAD tax has been doubled without any offsetting removal of the stamp duty which has occurred in both New South Wales and Victoria. The annual consumption by the Government has increased from \$4.1 billion in 1988-89 to an estimated \$4.8 billion in 1991-92, an increase during those three years of 17 per cent. Net capital spending, that is, the money spent on trying to put in new facilities, namely buildings, sewerage infrastructure, and so on, has been cut from \$570 million in 1988-89 to a mere \$408 million in 1991-92, a 28 per cent reduction.

Just look at the breakdown in infrastructure that is occurring in this State. I ask members opposite to think about the fact that this has been inflicted upon this State by a long-term run-down on their capital spending by their own Government. If I were a Labor Party member, I would feel disgusted at that break-down in community services, especially when it is supposed to be the whole basis of my philosophy. I point out that workers compensation levies here in South Australia, which are at 3.5 per cent, are now the highest in Australia. New South Wales has an average levy of 1.8 per cent, with a large capital surplus in its funds.

We in Adelaide have the highest inflation rate of any capital city in Australia. We are the inflation capital in Australia. We have had the second highest electricity charges of any State in Australia. We have had increases in SAFA borrowings from \$9 billion to \$13.8 billion. We have had massive losses, as I have pointed out, in the State Bank and the SGIC. We have had major escalations in construction costs of Government buildings.

Only during the past 24 hours we have pointed out how the ASER development costs have blown out from \$140 million to \$340 million. I am interested to see that those figures have now been confirmed publicly, despite the Minister of Finance not being able to tell this to the House yesterday or today—and he had 24 hours to get the information but could not do so. That shows how little he knows about the state of the finances in South

Australia and the cost escalations of \$200 million on the ASER site.

In addition, we find that the waiting list of the Housing Trust escalated from 24 000 people in 1982, when the Liberal Government lost office, to 43 000 people under this socialist Government as at 30 June 1991. Here is the Labor Government that will do so much for the working people, the disadvantaged—those in need within the community—

**Mr S.G. Evans:** That is 43 000 families.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Yes, 43 000 families cannot get a home in South Australia. Yet, here we have a Labor Government that says, 'We stand up for the less advantaged in the community.' What is its record? Its record is that it has condemned those same people to 10 years of having to pay back an enormous State debt through its own financial mismanagement.

There is no doubt that this Government has been the worst financial manager that this State has ever experienced since it was formed in 1836. No Government has inflicted the increase in State debt to anywhere near what has happened under this Government and, as a result, this State—and, more particularly, its young people—is facing the prospect for the next 10 to 15 years of having to pay the interest burden on that debt and trying to pay off that debt. It is quite clear that this State will suffer for many years due to the financial neglect, incompetence and mismanagement that this Labor Government has for the past 10 year inflicted upon the people.

**Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I would like specifically to address myself this evening to expenditure relating to the Ombudsman. I noted with interest the contribution that was made by the member for Napier on this subject when he made specific reference to the Ombudsman's report on a journalist from the *Advertiser*, Mr Rex Jory, and in particular to a member of the Liberal Party, Mrs Joan Hall, who has been denigrated in the extreme by that member. I have not often heard the well respected member for Napier go down this very unfortunate track. I knew the member for Napier for a long time before I came into this place, and one of the things for which he was noted, even though he was on the opposite side of politics, was his integrity—and I say 'integrity' in a public sense, because I remember him as the Mayor of Elizabeth—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** Well, he wasn't—when he was involved in local government. One of the things that concerns me in this place is the continual denigration of individuals when there is no evidence whatsoever to back it up. In the past three presentations that the member for Napier has made to this House, there has been nothing at all about the direction that this State needs. He has said nothing that relates to his electorate. Purely and simply, his speeches have involved the denigration of individuals. This evening I received a fax from Mrs Joan Hall, who has asked me to read her statement into *Hansard* to put clearly on the record the position in which she has been placed by the member for Napier.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I am sure that, the moment he has concluded that, the member for Bragg will link his remarks to the Supply Bill.

**Mr INGERSON:** I will, Mr Deputy Speaker, because, as I said earlier, they are related to the Ombudsman's report and, as you are aware, Sir, the Ombudsman is part of Government and a line of finance is required to support that role. The Ombudsman has made a specific report on this matter. I will now read into *Hansard* the statement in defence made by one of the people so named. Mrs Hall's statement reads:

I refer to the report of the Ombudsman, Mr Biganovsky, tabled in the House of Assembly last night on 18 August 1992, concerning files prepared for the State Bank of South Australia. These files purport to contain biographical details about Mr Dale Baker MP, Mr Martyn Evans MP and the Hon N. Peterson MP, Speaker of the House of Assembly.

I also refer to a transcript of *Hansard* of 18 August when Mr T. Hemmings MP, member for Napier, spoke at some length about the Ombudsman's report, and in referring to me said in the context of the files 'Let us look at the second person, the political lobbyist' and 'she was a certain lobbyist who at that time was employed by Michels Warren'. Today the Acting Premier Dr Hoggood MP cavalierly referred to me in a question put to him by Mr Hemmings as possibly being associated with the reports investigated by Mr Biganovsky. I am angry that my name has been associated with this material.

I now refer to the statement sworn by Mr Michael David Hughes about the origins of the reports. In part (6) he states, 'As I recall this was done at a time when Mr D. Baker was likely to be elected Leader of the Opposition.' In part (7) he states, 'I approached a reporter from the *Advertiser* to ask whether he could supply me with some background biographical details on the three politicians.' This reference locks all three reports into the same time frame. In point (8) it is stated, 'nothing has been added to it since 1989'.

I now refer to the report entitled Dale Spehr Baker. The last paragraph on page two begins 'Baker is now heir apparent'. Clearly the writer in this reference predates the report prior to Dale Baker's election as Leader of the Opposition. I refer again to Mr Hughes point (6) 'likely to be elected Leader of the Opposition'. Mr Baker was elected to that position on 12 January 1990. I now tender certification of my employment record with Michels Warren provided by management late this afternoon.

That reference concerns a letter from Michels Warren, which states:

Following your request for your employment details with our company, I certify that you were employed by Michels Warren Pty Ltd between 27 February 1990 and 30 September 1991.

Her statement continues:

My employment with that company began on 7 February 1990. I had not worked with it, or provided any material to that company before that date. I am not the person referred to concerning the three reports investigated by Mr Biganovski and I demand an apology from those who have made this false accusation. I will instigate legal action against any person who makes this allegation outside of Parliament.

She goes on to say:

And they are attacking me because they know I will continue to take this message to the electorate as the preselected Liberal candidate for Coles. In ending this sorry episode I want to say that Michels Warren is a most reputable South Australian company that places a high value on its clients and business confidentiality. I left there in September 1991, and it is certainly not for me to comment on its activities. Any comment about it is entirely a matter for the Chief Executive.

The point I did not make in reading the reference on behalf of Mrs Hall was that the reference to her employment was signed by Janet Grieve, General Manager, Michels Warren. That reference puts beyond doubt the point that the member for Napier in this instance has exceeded once again his ability to tell what I think is the truth in this matter. I am very concerned that the truth be put on the record so that not only this Parliament but the public of South Australia clearly

understands the position. After this incident, the Labor Party can no longer go around creating scuttlebutt in this matter in which it has no evidence. Knowing the member for Napier, and noting in particular his last four or five presentations in this House, I do not doubt that he will find something else to run out that again will prove to be quite incorrect.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** To follow what the member for Bragg has said, it is a very clear indication of the policy and attitude of the current Government that it will fabricate anything. We have had many examples in this House over the past few years of Ministers fabricating all sorts of issues, including allegations against the Leaders and front bench members of this Party.

**Mr Lewis:** They've got a fine model in Rann.

**Mr BECKER:** As the member for Murray-Mallee says, the Minister of Employment and Further Education is the fine model in that regard. That is very true. We are sick and tired of the fabrication of falsehoods in trying to trick the public of South Australia into believing that the current Government is most responsible. You know, Sir, as well as I, that that is not so.

We are considering the Supply Bill at the moment, to provide approximately \$1 000 million. The Supply Bill simply ensures that accounts and public servants will be paid, and that the State can continue until we receive the budget. It is normal practice that everyone supports the legislation so that that can be done. I cannot support it. I do not give a continental as to the ramifications of whether or not I support it. I will not support it simply because I have no idea of the financial affairs of this State. Before we consider any financial matters at the moment under the current circumstances in South Australia, we should be told the facts. The end of the financial year was 30 June. It is now 19 August, and we have yet to receive the final statement of the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 1991-92. That in itself is a shame; it is a disgrace. The budget for the last financial year was to be \$5 071 million, just over \$5 billion.

We have no idea whether or not the budget is on track. The estimates that I have received and the latest statement of the Consolidated Account relate to April 1992. We find that in recurrent receipts the Government was expecting to receive \$1 487 million. In property tax it expected to receive \$70 million. Up to the end of April this year it had received \$73.4 million. It appears that it is running reasonably on budget. In relation to gambling, it is absolutely scandalous to realise that the Government was depending on \$143 310 000. At the end of April it had received \$109.7 million and the indications are that there will be a considerable shortfall in gambling taxes, which reflects the recession this State is in. Payroll tax was estimated to bring in \$511 million and at the end of April the State had received only \$407 million. There could well be a considerable shortfall in payroll tax.

One of the most insidious taxes ever introduced in this State is the financial institutions duty. The State is expecting to receive \$115 million and as at the end of April it had received only \$87 million. Therefore, on those figures, there would be a considerable shortfall. Stamp duty was expected to return \$330.7 million, and at the end of April the State had received \$262.6 million.

Again, there could well be a shortfall, although those receipts could come close to budget, depending on real estate sales in the early part of this year. The debits tax, which is, of course, the partner to the financial institutions duty, was expected to return \$28.6 million. The State had received \$23.5 million as at the end of April and there could be a slight shortfall. Business franchise receipts are estimated at \$239.6 million and appear to be on budget as the Government has received \$197.6 million. Business undertakings receipts of \$42.8 million were budgeted for the financial year 1991-92 and the State had received \$31 million as at the end of April.

No matter what is the final result, there will be a shortfall and the State does have financial difficulties. We have heard during this debate about the huge public debt that the State now has with the bail-out of the State Bank, involving the huge interest bill that is taking away from the people of this State very valuable dollars. That means that the priorities being set by the Government now take away from the people the normal services they have expected from Government in the past.

It is an absolute tragedy that, in a budget estimate of just over \$5 billion, 50 per cent of the money comes from the Commonwealth Government, either as specific purpose grants or general purpose grants. So, the other \$2.5 billion is raised directly by the taxpayers of this State. The pressure that is placed on taxpayers in this State is such that they are now being forced to pay for the mistakes, errors, swindles, cheating and deception that has occurred in several Government departments and statutory authorities. That is why it is so necessary that parliamentary committees such as the Economic and Finance Committee—formerly the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee—must vigorously undertake their role in relation to Government accountability.

The accountability of this Government is the worst on record. The new committee is doing the best it can to highlight the difficulties and problems that the taxpayers of South Australia will face in the future. I would have thought that by now the public servants of this State would have got the message that there is a parliamentary committee concerned with the financial management of this State.

Many years ago, as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, I brought out a report—'Let the Managers Manage'. I just wish that the managers had managed and had had the courage to stand up to some of the incompetent administrators of this State, particularly the ministry. I am quite sure that had we then had in place whistle-blowing legislation we would have found some years ago that we would not be in the position we are in today of having to bail out some of these incompetent statutory authorities.

No matter what happens in the royal commission—and I shall not hold my breath over the results—certain people involved in the administration of the State Bank of Australia must be brought to book for the disgraceful loss of money in that organisation. The Savings Bank of South Australia was a mutual organisation owned by the people of South Australia, not the Government. The deposits were guaranteed by the State, but the Savings Bank of South Australia was the people's bank. It was taken over by the Government and merged with its own State Bank of South Australia, with the blessing of some

of my colleagues, and just look at the mess. I said that it would not last five years, and tragically it did not. It was unforgivable that the directors and executive staff of that bank did what they did, particularly the people who were involved in Beneficial Finance. All these things are on record in this House. There are still questions on the Notice Paper that have not been answered. The Government has a lot to answer for in respect of the administration and management of that bank. It is unforgivable to think that we and future generations in this State will be paying for a long time to bail out the mistakes of those who were responsible.

When I worked in the bank one of my colleagues made an error of judgment in the vicinity of \$20 000. He lost his branch as a manager, he was reduced to being a teller and he never advanced again. Those people in the State Bank of South Australia have lost hundreds of millions of dollars and they have helped themselves to generous commissions and generous bonuses. In Beneficial Finance they even had forgiveness loans. Fancy a Government allowing the staff to borrow money on hire purchase terms from their own organisation, to make two payments and then write off the loan! Would it not be great if one could go out and buy the latest television set or baby grand piano, as one person did, or all sorts of furniture, not put a penny down, borrow the whole lot, make two payments and have one's employer write off the rest of the loan? That is what was going on in Beneficial Finance.

Mr S.G. Evans: Hey, any chance of getting a job there?

Mr BECKER: Unfortunately, Stan, the thing has folded. You and I miss out on all these perks. The trouble was that it had the blessing of this Government and the unions. Nobody did a jolly thing about it; it just went on. When we find such things happening within the general staff of that sort of organisation, imagine what was going on at the top. I am told that they worked in the early hours of the morning, Saturdays and Sundays, and that mortgage documents would be signed at 7 o'clock at night. If they were going out to a dinner somewhere a whole heap of documents would be brought along, share transfers and so on. All sorts of shady transactions were being done day and night. There were cover-ups galore. No matter what royal commission we have, we shall never get to the bottom of it. But give the Economic and Finance Committee the rightful powers and the staffing and it will soon get to the bottom of it because we will know where to look. If we get the whistle-blowing legislation in as soon as possible within the next few months, then we shall be able to get on the track of pinning down and bringing to justice the people who were responsible for the most disgusting and disgraceful exhibition of financial management that this State and country has ever seen.

I always thought that the burglars came from other States and that South Australia had responsible, well trained, solid, sound, conservative administrators who were highly regarded. However, this fiasco of the State Bank has brought the State into disrepute around the world. Let us not kid ourselves that it has been confined within the boundaries of this State or country. It has impacted right around the Commonwealth of nations and right around Western society.

It has been very difficult in the past couple of years to put on a big smile and say everything is going well in South Australia. The Economic and Finance Committee must be given the resources and the opportunity to delve into these organisations and prove to the people of South Australia that at least the Parliament is concerned and wants to reassure them that the administration is back on the right track. Anyone who was supervising the State Bank of South Australia (as I told the member for Coles on many occasions), and looking at the statistical data that were coming through on banking in Australia could see the warning signs. The State Bank of South Australia was borrowing heavily overseas. Yet, about 18 per cent of its deposits were interest bearing deposits, compared with the rest of the Australian banking system, where the percentage was about 6 per cent. It was paying too dearly for the money that it required, it was lending on very fine margins, it was lending all over the world and it was involved in every tax haven one could think of.

Here was a State Bank whose major responsibility, through its major sponsoring bank (the Savings Bank of South Australia)—its core business—was cheap housing loans, and that is where the State was let down. I tackled Marcus Clark time and time again in front of my shadow Cabinet colleagues and Leader that the major role of the State Bank of South Australia through the Savings Bank of South Australia was to borrow money from the depositors in South Australia and pay an extra quarter per cent interest over and above the other trading banks, that the deposits were guaranteed by the State and that the money was lent for housing and the housing interest rates charged were less—in some cases up to half a per cent less—than those of any other financial institution.

Had the State Bank of South Australia stuck to that charter, had Marcus Clark and his executives stayed within those guidelines, the housing industry of South Australia would have continued and there would have been stability in the housing industry. The employment created throughout the building trade, suppliers and the whitegoods industry would have brought stability to employment in this State. But oh, no, that was not good enough for Marcus Clark and the executives he brought in from outside the bank to go on their merry little way in building up a great empire. He absolutely ruined this State and brought disrepute to South Australia. Mind you, I blame the directors of the bank as well, because not one of them had the courage to stand up and come out publicly well before all the troubles were discovered and either resign their position or make known publicly that they were dissatisfied with the running and managing of the bank.

Many people have a lot to answer for over the fiasco and of course now we see this little white-washing exercise of the present moment—the almost annoying paranoia that the bank had a dossier on a few politicians. There are dossiers everywhere; the trade union movement has them, Trades Hall has them and the Australian Labor Party has them on every Liberal candidate and Liberal politician this State has ever seen. I can imagine what the Labor Party would have on me: it would be a beauty. I can remember a few years ago when my Party lost Government. The filing cabinets were brought back from the Premier's Department and put up on the second floor. John Mathwin said to me one night, 'Have a look at this.

There is a file here; the ALP candidates have been putting in dossiers on each election.' You should have seen the report the member for Hartley put in about me, the year he stood against me in the seat of Hanson.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! As interesting as this is, it is not related to the Supply Bill, and I would ask the honourable member to draw his remarks back to the Supply Bill.

**Mr BECKER:** I am sorry, Mr Speaker, I was thinking the remarks made by a previous speaker and in relation to paying salaries to people employed in the Premier's Department. I am talking about the Economic and Finance Committee, of which the member for Hartley is Chairman, because I am about to come to a very interesting point that may make you cross. I hope it will not, but I am not very happy about it. I want to explain how these dossiers are kept everywhere. The Public Service keeps a dossier on every public servant. When I worked in the bank it was my job to keep a record on every member of staff.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** As President of the union I upheld the great principle that, if I wrote a report about my staff, I called in that staff member and asked him to look at that report and sign it. If he was not happy about it, we discussed the pros and cons. I told many a staff member that they would be better advised to get another job. One became a famous television actress and another became a successful used car dealer, Bob Moran. I had no fear of letting my staff know where we both stood.

I am not paranoid about dossiers. I think they are a joke and I cannot see anything wrong with the State Bank or anyone else wanting dossiers, but we should bear in mind that the greatest collators of dossiers are political Parties. The Economic and Finance Committee has been working under great difficulty and is having tremendous problems in finding accommodation. I am absolutely disgusted that \$80 000 has been spent in renovating the Riverside Building for the parliamentary committees. We cannot even get in there.

**Mr Hamilton:** How much?

**Mr BECKER:** More than \$80 000 has been spent on refurbishing those offices, yet the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, when the member for Albert Park was Chairman, had a beautiful office and had plenty of room. We had a comfortable room and we had meeting after meeting there. However, since the name of the committee was changed to the Economic and Finance Committee we cannot get in there and we have to meet in the Second Floor Committee Room and the first floor ALP Caucus room—we are meeting all over the place. Mr Speaker, it is not good enough that we have an important committee of the Parliament, that is all about accountability and supervision of the Government, having had at least \$80 000 spent, yet since the beginning of this year—over eight months ago—when the new committee was formed I have not yet attended a meeting in that office. That is not good enough and I appeal to you, Mr Speaker, and to the Government to give us a fair go and give us back our accommodation.

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

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): During the debate on the Supply Bill my colleagues have taken the opportunity to spell out clearly the disastrous financial situation facing all the people of this State. My colleagues have also referred to the services that have been reduced or in most cases removed because of the financial mismanagement of the Bannon Labor Government. These are services removed or reduced to repay some of the massive debt—only some of the massive debt—caused by the mismanagement of the State Bank. We have seen a Government and a Premier with no credibility and we have seen the results of that reflected in the difficulties faced by people throughout the State.

Earlier today I referred to the difficulties confronting foster parents and INC parents who are now finding that some of the financial assistance that quite properly can be passed on to children under the care of those families is significantly reduced. I cannot understand why, instead of hearing the number of Dorothy Dix questions that day after day are brought up in this House, some of the Government backbenchers are not asking questions about the restrictions and removal of services in their own electorates.

Mr Ferguson: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The member for Henley Beach says, 'Hear, hear'. I am sure the member for Henley Beach would be concerned, if he has any thought at all for his constituents—and I believe he has—about the services that are being removed or reduced in his electorate. But what is he doing about it? What are he and his colleagues doing about, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and other services? How often do we hear members opposite refer to any of the services that are being removed from their electorate? It is a disgrace that the people who are represented by members on the other side are not catered for by their own member bringing to the notice of this House, and more importantly to the notice of the Government, the difficulties being faced by people in their electorate.

I want to refer tonight to yet another area in which services are to be reduced, and that is neighbourhood houses. It is interesting that I should talk about this subject because many of the neighbourhood houses and community centres that are to have their funding reduced are in Labor held electorates. I suspect that many of them have not even found out about this reduced funding and that some of them do not even want to know. The Department for Family and Community Services has just sent out letters regarding funding under the family and community development program which is due to expire on 31 December. The department is in the process of inviting applications from organisations to fund its proposed services from 1 January 1993. In fact, the letter states:

We are now in the process of inviting applications from organisations.

That is a funny way of telling these neighbourhood houses and community centres that their funding is to be reduced substantially. It is not a matter of an invitation; it is a matter of their being told what is happening.

Let us look at what is happening in regard to a number of these organisations which have been asked to apply for decreased funding. The current level of funding for the Bowden and Brompton Mission is \$51 075; for 1993, it will be \$31 365; and for 1994, \$8 000. So, funding for the Bowden and Brompton Mission will decrease from \$51 000 this year to \$8 000 in 1994. The current level of funding for Camden is \$35 570, and that will decrease to \$15 680 in 1993 and \$8 000 in 1994. For Clarence Park, funding will decrease from a current level of \$20 980 to \$15 680 in 1993 and \$8 000 in 1994. Goodwood will decrease from \$13 990 to \$8 000; the Hut at Stirling, from \$13 990 down to \$8 000; and Mannum, from \$15 680 down to \$8 000. For Mount Barker—and I will have more to say about that neighbourhood house a bit later—the current level of \$23 520 will reduce to \$15 680 in 1993 and \$8 000 in 1994; Mount Burr will go from \$16 420 to \$8 000; Peterborough, from \$15 680 to \$8 000; Surrey Downs, from \$15 680 to \$8 000; the Women's Centre at St Peters in the Norwood electorate, from its current level of \$42 590 to \$15 680 in 1993 and \$8 000 in 1994; and Wynn Vale, from \$23 520 to \$8 000. The overall reduction is from a current funding level of \$288 695 down to \$150 085 next year.

That is a disgrace and, if members opposite do not recognise that, if they know what takes place in their community and neighbourhood houses, I pity the people they represent. Many of these houses and centres have recently received notification of a potential reduction in their current funding levels, and the Executive Director of the Community and Neighbourhood Houses and Centres Association has written to the department spelling out its concern that some groups have not been given sufficient notification to adjust, plan and/or look for alternative sources of support.

In most instances, local government budgets have been prepared, and subsequently there is no opportunity at all to include items in those budgets for the following year. The letter states that the lack of appropriate progress is causing undue stress for staff and management committees, who will be thrown into crisis management at a time when the end of financial year workload is upon them and annual general meetings are pending, not to mention—and do I need to remind this House yet again—that we are in the middle of a depression?

This is a time when more demand is being made on community and neighbourhood houses than ever before and, if members opposite do not recognise that, I invite them to visit the neighbourhood and community houses on Friday, or at any other time when the House is not sitting, to find out just how desperate is the situation that they are facing. It is interesting to find members on the other side bursting themselves laughing about the situation.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Heysen has reflected on me as an individual member of this Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair did not hear the reflection.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Heysen, when talking about neighbourhood houses, said that I was sitting on this side of the House laughing. In that way, it will be seen by the readers of *Hansard* that I



am showing scant regard for the plight of those people he is talking about. I was not laughing.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has explained very clearly. I might point out to the member for Napier that it is not beyond the observation of the Chair that there have been similar occurrences in this Chamber including the member for Napier himself.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** Not now, Sir; not at this time.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I am sure that the record now shows very clearly what the member for Napier feels about it, but I do not uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** There is no doubt that members opposite and, in particular, the honourable member who has just taken a point of order, have scant regard for the people in their electorate.

**Mr FERGUSON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the honourable member is reflecting on members on this side and suggesting that we have no care for those poor people who are taken care of in community houses. Nothing could be further from the truth.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order. The member for Henley Beach has once again taken the opportunity to put his point of view on the record. I do not uphold the point of order, but I point out that frivolous points of order are out of order. The member for Heysen.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I find it very sad when they sit there with a smirk on their face and make this sort of comment. I support the strong representation that has been made by the Community and Neighbourhood Houses and Centres Association. It has urged the Minister to continue to recognise the movement and to ensure that funding to the sector is not reduced. It has made the strongest representation and, even then, we see this dramatic reduction in funding in the facilities to which I have just referred.

One of the centres to which I refer is the Mount Barker Family House in my own electorate, because I have been told that its funding will be cut drastically in January of next year and again in 1994. The Family and Community Development Unit of the Department for Family and Community Services must understand the work that is carried out by that facility, the support that is provided to people who are disadvantaged in the Mount Barker area.

The Chairman of the Family House Management Committee at Mount Barker has made quite clear that the proposed cuts would make the running of the service extremely difficult. She has indicated that attempts are to be made to keep the family house open because of the excessively high demand for its services. This family house was built in 1985 through the Commonwealth employment program; a kit home, donated by the South Australian Housing Trust, was constructed on council owned land.

The family house has offered a range of services such as adult education courses and vacation and occasional child care. It is also a drop-in centre, and has helped numerous lonely people and new residents who have moved into the district. Since the FACS office has been moved from Mount Barker, the family house has picked up extra work, including requests for food, domestic violence cases and social security inquiries. I understand

and support the work that that facility is carrying out in Mount Barker. In writing to the Minister, the Mount Barker Family House has attempted to draw to the Minister's attention the difficulties that will be faced if the funding is reduced.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** Read the letter.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I would like to read the letter, but I won't, because I haven't got the time to do so. But I would invite members opposite who are, again with a great deal of mirth, suggesting that this is not a serious subject—

**Mr FERGUSON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Heysen will resume his seat.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Murray-Mallee may find himself on the way shortly. I did caution the House about frivolous points of order, and I draw the attention of the member for Henley Beach to that.

**Mr FERGUSON:** Yes, Sir, but I am afraid I cannot let this opportunity go; I point out that the honourable member was suggesting that we were laughing at the poor people in his area. I was merely sharing a joke with the member for Napier: it had absolutely nothing to do with it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I do not uphold the point of order. I did hear the member for Heysen. He said that members were showing signs of mirth: he did not say anything about the poor people in the honourable member's electorate, in my electorate, or in the district of Napier.

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe you have spoken twice about frivolous points of order, and it is within your power to grant an extension of time to the speaker on his feet. I ask that you consider that.

**The SPEAKER:** I have done so in relation to questions, but I am not sure that I have done so in relation to the Supply debate. I do not uphold the point of order on this occasion.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Mount Barker Family House is the only community centre between Murray Bridge and the metropolitan area that offers direct service delivery. This delivery includes adult and community education, a free venue for community groups and Government agencies, counselling regarding finance, relationships, domestic violence, drug and alcohol problems, housing, parenting, health and helpful information given to people new to the area. Respite and emergency child-care, vacation care and out-of-school hours care are also provided.

Since the restructuring of the Family and Community Services which resulted in the severe reduction in services to the Mount Barker area, the Family House has seen a substantial increase in the number of people seeking help. With regard to the social justice policy, the management committee of the Mount Barker Family House believe that it is addressing anti-poverty issues in a practical, effective and much needed way.

Their target groups include the new and long-term unemployed, single parents, low income earners, young people and isolated women and men. I know that the Mount Barker Family House is lodging an appeal with

the Family and Community Development Unit, and I wish it well in that appeal because it deserves to have support. Support has been given very freely by a large number of organisations in the district. The town and country community access groups through Strathalbyn, Southern Hills and the Lakes District have all written to the Executive Director of the Family and Community Development Unit. Letters have also been received from the Stirling and Mount Barker Crime Prevention Board and Christian Care and Share at Mount Barker, which has written passionately to the department to try to have extra funds made available. The Children's Services Office and the Child, Adolescent and Family Health Services have also written, and so it goes on.

Mr Speaker, I only wish that I had time to read all those letters to the House, but I do not have that time. I urge the Minister and members to approach me, and I would be happy to provide them with copies of the correspondence that I have. I urge all members of this House to put the greatest pressure on the Government and on the Minister of Family and Community Services to ensure that these community and neighbourhood houses continue to receive the funding they deserve.

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

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** Mr Speaker, I will attempt to make my contribution as short as possible, for it is no longer possible for me to speak for long, by virtue not so much of any time constraints as of the condition of my voice and the audibility of my remarks. All my remarks will be related to the failure of Ministers, as members of Cabinet, and Executive Council, to meet their statutory obligations under both the Constitution of this State and the statutes of this Parliament.

We have all heard of feral goats, feral donkeys, feral cats and feral dogs, and they are animals that are inappropriately located in the environment in which they are found, both foreign and detrimental to it. Presently, we have a feral Government. It is foreign to the task that it undertook; it made commitments to the people of South Australia; and, on crook electoral boundaries with less than majority support, it was nonetheless able to squeak back into office.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** What I have contemplated we might best do with it is provide it with some electoral 1080—that is, sodium fluoroacetate. I know of no better way than that to get rid of feral animals. I have seen the effect that it can have on rabbits and goats—in no time at all there is none left. In this instance I am quite sure that the people of South Australia would welcome the opportunity to give them a couple of free feeds, then a bait trail and be done with it. What we need is an election to clear up this mess.

We were promised flair and light, but what have we got? Scare and fright. I am not talking about the kind of clothes they wear, for they are garish enough, goodness knows. I am talking about the impact of their policies on this State and the way in which they are affecting the people who live here and the businesses that are trying to employ those people and at the same time pay the taxes

that are required to make it possible for us to appropriate supply.

It is scare and fright all right. Businesses are going offshore and out of this State at a rate of knots. If it is not flair and light, it must be something like blare and blight. There is a lot of disease in it and it is having a disastrous effect on our ability as a society to do anything sustainable. Unemployment is increasing. Indeed, I suppose the worst aspect of it is that retail sales are still on a downward trend in South Australia despite very modest growth in the rest of the country, which includes the downward trend in South Australia in establishing that very modest growth. It is the kind of growth that one would expect from a crop planted in dry soil in a drought. Motor vehicle sales and building approvals for residential and non-residential construction are weaker in South Australia than in the rest of the nation. They are the kind of indicators of how terrible the economy is that we are taxing to provide supply to this Government.

This Government is not doing with that supply what it promised it would do. We are supposed to have responsible government. The only context in which it is responsible is that it is responsible for this disaster. We know that, nationally, the GDP estimates indicate that the economy is growing, technically, once more but that is only because of extraordinary transfer payments that have been made in the public sector. Professor Cliff Walsh, who is a very dynamic, young and distinguished professor from the Centre of South Australian Economic Studies, has pointed out that growth is weak and lacking in any major impetus. That is because it has not come from any improvement in investment or confidence inspiring that investment. It has come from the Federal Government's fiddling.

Professor Walsh's report also suggests that there is a serious crisis of confidence. It is impossible for us to get anything like the projections of 4 per cent growth in this financial year. I think that the South Australian economy will continue to contract and unemployment will get worse because we have passed a crucial point in this State where our middle and upper income earners are employed predominantly in the public sector. There is not sufficient investment by business in jobs and in the kind of enterprise that would be undertaken by those jobs in the private sector to give us that economic growth. It is just not there.

The indication is quite clear that, if you do not have anyone managing or capable of managing that kind of enterprise, it will not happen, so you will not get the taxes. You can tax your public servants and get money back from them as they change houses, with the stamp duty involved and things of that order, but it certainly will not be sufficient to enable us to obtain the desperately needed revenue to provide this Government with the Supply that it has sought.

We find also that here we have not experienced the same drop in inflation that there has been nationally. We still have an inflationary problem, because businesses cannot succeed at the depressed prices they have had for their goods and services. There has been excessive competition among those businesses for the existing market. That is what has forced down their prices. They have sought to obtain a contribution from sales, but that contribution has not been adequate to furnish both the

fixed costs of supplying the service and the variables on top.

There has been a contraction in their marketplace which has caused that. In consequence, these small businesses are going broke. Now, we find that, to stay in business, those that remain have to put their prices up at rates greater than in the rest of the country because they have suffered this kind of economic malaise longer than the rest of the Australian economy. Just around the corner there is probably a fairly unpalatable State budget. But we must produce a situation in which domestic production begins to exceed domestic demand again. We have not yet done that.

Let me come back to the Government's actions. It is a Government which will go down in history as being famous for its ability to axe and tax. Since the resumption of Parliament, we have heard from members on this side of the Chamber examples of where the Government has cut back heavily on services provided to the community in the electorates represented by members on this side, and less heavily in those electorates represented by members opposite which are regarded by the Executive Government as being crucial to their continued presence in this place. They are now pork-barrelling in damage control mode. They do not expect to win, but they are planning to minimise the loss.

As it stands at present, and has stood for several months, the Government of the day, with 48 per cent support at the last election, knows that it faces a wipe out. It will be lucky to have 11 of its members re-elected at the next election. That is what has been shown for months by the public indication of support. The public is fed up with a Government that basically does not care, a Government that does not want to be seen to be associated with the bad news that comes from its own ineptitude.

I will illustrate some of the points that I have made where they are relevant to the provision of Supply and the way in which it will be applied in my own electorate. I have said that it is a Government notorious for its ability to axe, and tax, to increase the demands it makes upon the public for revenue, to finance its grandiose schemes, damage control pork-barrelling and gross mismanagement, especially where the Premier and Minister of Finance have been involved.

We all know about the disasters of the Government's excursions into private enterprise-type activities, including the State Bank, Scrimber and SGIC; the list goes on. I warned of the risk of that. Governments cannot pick winners. Governments, by definition, are not risk takers in the venture capital sense; they do not understand and they should not risk taxpayers' money in competition with taxpayers themselves.

This Government has gone further than that. It has become involved in some ill-advised schemes which will cost us even more money. It now finds it convenient, in consequence of the way in which it has washed its hands of statutory responsibility for local government, then to hop into bed with the Local Government Finance Authority. It has already made a muck of the South Australian Financing Authority—its own instrumentality—and more will be disclosed about that as soon as the State Bank royal commission is completed. The Government is not content with that and the

international community—through Moody and Poors—has shown us just how badly the Government has managed our public finance affairs. It has gone to the Local Government Finance Authority with a proposal to borrow hundreds of millions of dollars. So, it is now asking ratepayers to guarantee its ill-advised excursions.

I will not start quoting documents tonight, but I will quote them during the rest of the session because I think that is absolutely outrageous. It is even worse that local government is prepared to contemplate the proposal to get into bed with the Government without so much as thinking about the desirability of using what might best be described in the vernacular of contemporary times as a 'political condom' because, to get into bed with this Government, one would need one. Those kinds of projects make me shudder to the bone; they chill me.

For the benefit of members, let me look at what happens in my electorate in the framework of axe and tax. We find that Keith is an example of a stupid excursion by the Minister of Water Resources to authorise the closure of a number of E&WS Department depots. Some employees are housed at Keith. Under the arrangements made by the Government with the PSA, they still remain in Keith, as they properly should. However, they are now required to drive to Bordertown every morning in a Government vehicle before they get their work instructions for the day. They then drive back to Keith to do the work. Having done that they must report to the Bordertown depot at the end of the day's work before they can knock off and drive back to Keith. That is the kind of thing for which this Minister is famous. She does it now and fixes it later.

*The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:* What a load of rubbish!

Mr LEWIS: The Minister says that that is a load of rubbish. I can prove to her, just as I did over the Finnis Springs debacle—

*The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:*

Mr LEWIS: There is the honourable Minister—

*The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:*

Mr LEWIS: One man, the brother of another, is given authority to determine where sacred sites exist—when there are no sacred sites at that place—and the rest of the family shares my view. That is because the Minister spent a few nights in the desert with the said man whom she then believed when she was up there only a few months ago.

*The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:* Excuse me!

Mr LEWIS: Yes, I will excuse you at any time you like. The Minister knows what I am talking about. I am telling the truth and she does not like it.

*The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brindal):** The Minister is out of order and the member for Murray-Mallee will direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr LEWIS: With the greatest respect, Sir, I am. The Minister does not like the truth in that respect. In the cavalier fashion in which she usually does things, the Minister does them first and fixes them later, and that will have to happen in this instance. What is happening at Keith, as I have related to the House, is happening all over the place, not only in the Minister's department but also in other Government departments. There are others in fact—the Department of Environment and Planning and the National Parks and Wildlife Service. She has

removed the office from Murray Bridge and put it at Victor Harbor.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I actually did it myself!

**Mr LEWIS:** You did that yourself?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I actually picked up the pieces of timber and bricks and moved them physically!

**Mr LEWIS:** I am pleased to have on the record the Minister's comment to that effect. If she did not authorise the shift, who is responsible? Is this not a responsible Government? Do we not have Ministers accountable for the decisions taken in their departments? Do they not examine the implications? Or are they all willing to follow the lead example given by their hapless, half-witted Premier who simply said that he did not know what was going on in the State Bank, even though we were telling him all the time. The hapless, half-witted member for Todd, the Minister of Forests, said there was nothing wrong with the Scrimber project while it was losing millions of dollars with no prospect of ever recovering, as was pointed out by my colleague the member for Victoria on numerous occasions.

Ministers cannot deny that they are or should be responsible. It is improper for them to expect the continued confidence of this Chamber. It behoves all of us to consider whether or not we should retain and continue to support this Government. A motion of confidence ought to test that opinion, and the sooner we do it the better. There is a catalogue of incompetence and waste to be brought to account so that all Labor members in this Chamber, if they regard themselves as responsible representatives of the people first—and that is what they should be—can put behind them their loyalty to a discredited organisation to which they may belong, called the Australian Labor Party, or otherwise support it. It is about time they did that.

The last thing I say is that I tried to find in the Library, where the Minister is responsible to put it, information relating to the prevention of cruelty to animals code of practice. It is not there, yet the regulations are clear. As a member of Parliament, I am supposed to be capable of researching that and deciding whether or not they are competent and appropriate, yet I cannot do that.

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

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker; you are acting very well. I wish to speak briefly in this debate, and I shall not take my 20 minutes. I think it is appropriate that someone should raise the matter of our public servants. The money that is to be made available under this Bill is in the main to pay our public servants until the budget is passed by this Parliament and the money is made available. There is no doubt in my mind that those in the Public Service whom I meet are embarrassed. They are embarrassed not by their own work effort but because this Government has placed this State in a terrible financial situation. Unfortunately, there is a tendency amongst the Australian community to attack or make derogatory remarks about those who work in the Public Service because of the position that we are in when in the main it is not their fault.

There are a few people at the top who may have failed—I am not talking about the bank, but other

areas—and there are also some who are political plants and who have been put there for a purpose. I do not refer to them: I ignore them because they are part of the political agenda that the Government has used to ensure that the right message is given to the media when the message has to go out and that the right controls are put on those who may wish to tell others about what is happening. The vast majority of our public servants now find themselves in a difficult situation. I refer in this instance to those of what may be called lower status in the State Bank or in the State Government Insurance Commission.

I feel sorry for the position they find themselves in through no fault of their own. I would ask, as much as is possible for me to get this message throughout the State, that those who read it take note and at least show a bit of compassion for those in the Public Service because of how they have been placed in the position they are in. I know there are thousands of them, there are also thousands who have left. They have received their redundancy package because of some cuts, or they have seen an opportunity out in the private sector or to go into small business, and I hope where they have done that they are successful, even though, as most of us know, it may be tough to survive in a small business under these socialist Federal and State Governments.

I also have some sympathy for those young people who saw that they would like to go into the Public Service and have a Public Service career. Those opportunities are now virtually non-existent. Some of the more capable young people who wanted to go into that field, who have high principles themselves and who are prepared to put those principles into practice, are reluctant to apply to join the Public Service when we have a Government that has done so much damage to the image of the Public Service, through its bad administration. All I wish to say in this Supply debate is that I ask those who read or have any knowledge of what I have said to show a bit of compassion, respect and sympathy for the position in which our public servants find themselves, where I believe they are being judged unfairly by many people, because it is not their fault. I wish them luck under a better administration in the future where they can hold up their head in dignity in a State which is managed properly and in which they can carry on the job they are doing with the respect of the rest of the community.

Bill read a second time.

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

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

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** The member for Playford reached a new low in his blatant political attempt to discredit me during his Address in Reply speech. I do not believe the member realises how far afield his unwarranted, unjustified, unfounded and malicious allegations have scurrilously denigrated a whole community of people in Tea Tree Gully. The hypocrisy inherent in those allegations is exceeded only by the member's ignorance. That ignorance is exhibited by the member's statements: 'I know the Minister will do his

utmost to ensure that we have the best possible training facilities in our TAFE institutions.'

Skillshare programs are not, and I repeat, are not TAFE institutions. That is only the first of many incorrect assumptions and allegations made by the member for Playford. Skillshare was never intended nor designed to compete with TAFE. Programs run by Skillshare are not apprenticeship courses; they are in fact basic level training courses. The disadvantaged, long term unemployed and the disabled benefit from these programs. Guaranteed local community funding support is required to gain federal funding for these projects; there is no State funding available.

The most blatant untruths were uttered by this member of the South Australian Parliament in his statement, in part as follows:

I would have thought that members of Parliament would have been badgering Governments at the Commonwealth and State levels to put their money where their mouth is and to put equipment in these places and to match the excellent staffing with the necessary computers, modern business machines and all the other resources necessary for education. Not a bit of it.

Unless in the last month, since my visit with the Leader of the Opposition, the equipment the member talks about has mysteriously disappeared, 15 modern computers with their corresponding resources were housed centrally in the major transportable building. Computers worth thousands of dollars were purchased only two years ago. Now, I would hardly consider that two-year-old computers would warrant absolute dismissal by the member for Playford as if they did not exist, with his throwaway line, 'Not a bit of it.' I would suggest that our three-year changeover criterion gave a quality of equipment that members of Parliament do not have in their electorate offices. The equipment at Avago is comparable at the very least with every Skillshare operation throughout Australia.

Over the 10 year life of the project, upgrading has taken place with the introduction of temporary buildings onto the site as funds were raised and allocated into the budget and, I might add, maintained in a better condition than the temporary buildings used as classrooms in many of our State schools. I have yet to hear the member abuse his Government for the use of temporary accommodation for schoolchildren in this State. That is not to say that members of Avago committees have rested on their achievements. No committee has ever considered that facilities were ever adequate or that equipment could not be improved upon.

The member for Playford's grubby, hypocritical little exercise in dirty politics only serves to put this project at risk. His questions would be better directed to the present day committee of his Labor colleagues and Party stalwarts who, I am told, to this date have not yet managed to hold a meeting due to a successive lack of members to form a quorum. The member for Playford had the remarkable effrontery to state that he wished to put on record that Governments have a responsibility to upgrade those facilities so that the educational training of young people in that area can be fully realised.

Where has the member for Playford been for the past three years when his Government has refused to take responsibility to upgrade educational facilities? He is a member of the Government that has cut staff and resources from our schools and refused to carry out

proper maintenance. The only increase we have seen has been in student/teacher ratios in our schools which now stand at 34:1. Where has the member for Playford been when he has not been accusing his Government of cutting back resources necessary in our own schools?

I want to put on record very quickly some of the achievements of Avago under the old board membership. These are recent and current achievements. Avago was the first Skillshare project to receive TAFE accreditation for some of our courses. We were the first to introduce self-paced modules. We were the first to introduce written curriculum and the first to introduce continuous intake and the only project to successfully complete it. Other projects came to us as the trendsetter in skills training and used the programs we had developed. We attracted national interest as a role model for Skillshare projects and the most important achievement accredited to Avago was the high success rate for placing participants into employment. None of those achievements would have been possible without modern up-to-date equipment and the resources required to match the equipment.

The member for Playford's attack knows no bounds. The mechanics' training area is classed as substandard, with a dangerous pit. The member with unbelievable crassness declared 'I am no great expert in that area, but I could tell there was a shortage of adequate tooling'. The member for crystal balls! Again, I repeat for the member's edification, this is not a TAFE course, this is not an apprenticeship course: the objective of this course was, in fact, a precursor to the State Government run youth scheme 'Street Legal'. The object of this project was to take youth off the streets and help them fix their cars. The garage has been supported by the community since its inception. In fact, business and industry donated all the necessary tools, motor parts and, at times, old cars to be panel beaten, spray painted, etc. Greater advantages of this course became apparent when self-esteem and dignity was resurrected and youths actively sought job placements with their new skills and in most cases were successful.

There is no shortage of tools. As for the dangerous pit—the member again chose to ignore that in the 10 years of operation not one injury or accident occurred, which equates to a perfect safety record. The member for Playford also stated that Ms Gluche, Project Manager, had her employment threatened by me and the former Chairman of the committee because staff had contacted the department. This is a further puerile and offensive distortion of facts and events. I am aware that Ms Gluche wrote a letter to the Department of Education and Training, but I am not aware that any other staff member wrote to the department. I state quite categorically that neither I, nor any other member of the committee, in all my years at Avago ever instructed anyone not to write to the department or discuss the topic with any participant, staff or committee as it was never an issue that was raised or considered or even contemplated.

The staff at Avago have been excellent. Unfortunately, newer staff members were disappointing—you do not seek to dismiss excellent staff—however, Ms Gluche has not been threatened by me nor the former chair of the committee as I do not consider that direct action is a threat. A series of events involving Ms Gluche, including complaints by participants to the Commonwealth

Employment Service about another staff member, led the executive to hold discussions with the Federal departments involved with the project. The executive, acting under the advice of the national Skillshare organisation, issued Ms Gluche with two consecutive warnings. Ms Gluche survived the advent of her dismissal notice by encouraging participants, their friends and families to attend the Avago AGM and support the Labor Party takeover of this committee. These unprofessional actions extended to badgering participants during classroom activities and phoning past participants and their families who were told that if they did not vote for the Labor Party ticket at the AGM the project would close and the participants would not have access to a skills training centre.

The member for Playford has had plenty to say in his unfounded allegations directed at me. I believe the member to be beneath contempt to support such actions that coerced and intimidated participants and their families into supporting an action based on deceit with the threat that access to skills training would be terminated on a project that was never in danger. If this exercise was engineered for political opportunity to assist the Labor candidate for Newland, who is one member of the new committee, I suggest to the honourable member that it has failed. His allegations are false. Political gain will not come about through political chicanery.

I advise the honourable member that if he has any interest in Skillshare projects he should attend his own Skillshare project at Pooraka called 'Employment 2000'. I give that name to the honourable member because I have it on good authority that he has never set foot on that project. Perhaps if he had, he would have understood the background of that project. I would advise the member for Playford to take an interest in his own Skillshare programs the next time he comes into this House with the facts of something he never understood in the first place.

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brindal): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mrs KOTZ: In order to bring his interest in the Avago program into this Parliament, the honourable member had to hop, step and leap over two electorates to get to the electorate of Newland. As I have said, if the member for Playford wishes to continue his interest in Skillshare programs, perhaps he should start in his own electorate.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I do not need a written script to address some of the comments that were just made. The last comment was interesting: this House was told that I had to hop, skip and jump over two electorates to get to the Avago Skillshare program. Let me make this clear to the House: indeed that program is not in my electorate. It is down the road from where I live, in fact, it is only about four kilometres from where I live and many of my constituents attend the Avago Skillshare program. The Avago Skillshare program is situated in the electorate of Newland; in fact, the member for Newland has to go considerably further and pass some other electorates.

*Mrs Kotz interjecting:*

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

Mr QUIRKE: Last year, when we had a problem with the Unley situation, we had no problem at all with the member for Newland coming in here and making baseless allegations against the member for Unley and some of his constituents. Another thing that came out of the whole debate that was very interesting was the letter that was sent to a constituent in Newland from the member for Newland who inferred that she had been living in that area for many years. As we all know, the reality is that she is not a resident of Newland. In fact, where this matter is concerned she is a constituent—

*Dr Armitage interjecting:*

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is out of order.

Mr QUIRKE: —of the member for Briggs. Another thing that came out quite clearly in that debate at that time was that the letter from the member for Newland was, word for word, the same as the letter that the member for Briggs had sent out earlier. Flattery is always one of the nicest things that any member can get, but when it comes down to plain plagiarism it shows quite clearly that the honourable member cannot even write her own letters.

The letter was the same word for word, but that should not come as any surprise, because she is a constituent of the member for Briggs. In fact, she needs a road map to find her way to her own electorate which, I point out, goes through my electorate on the way. She has the cheek and utmost gall to come in here with a prepared text like this and say—

*Members interjecting:*

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

Mr QUIRKE: —that I have to leapfrog through two electorates to get to the Avago Skillshare program. If I do, then she has to go two or three times further, because she has no relevance to the area of Newland. She never has had any relevance to the area of Newland. She does not live anywhere near Newland. She has never lived anywhere near Newland, and has made no effort to go out there and relate to those people. What happened that night at the Avago Skillshare was clearly illustrated in the address I brought before this House. The reality is that in her own words, in the newspaper article she has put in, that she supported and was quoted in, were, 'We were rolled'. 'We were rolled', indeed, by many people who took the view that her conduct and the conduct of the board was reprehensible.

What is more, two pieces of advice that I gave in my address last week were quoted in that same newspaper. These are the two laws of politics: you do not whinge about it afterwards; you do not whinge in here. What you do is get the numbers beforehand. You do not whinge about it afterwards: you cop it as it goes. If you do not service the electorate and the members out there, you deserve to get what is coming. The second piece of advice is, you do not clear off immediately you have handed in your ballot paper, because that annoys even your own supporters. Quite clearly, that is what happened that night. I can understand why she wanted to get away from it that night.

Mr INGERSON: On a point of order, all members of the House should be addressed by the district they represent, and I ask you to rule accordingly.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I was temporarily distracted by the entrance of the Speaker. If the point of order is valid, it is correct, so I would ask the member for Playford to refer to all members by their title.

Mr QUIRKE: I have no problem with that: I am sorry for that omission. The member for Newland was wise that night to have left at that time, because many people there were seething with discontent at the way in which the member for Newland had sought to exercise her position on the committee of the Avago Skillshare program. It should be made quite clear to this House that the member for Newland comes in here and makes the statement that I have to leapfrog up there to this Skillshare program. She also says that I have never been down to the Skillshare—

Mr INGERSON: On a point of order, Sir, I draw your attention to the fact that members of the House should be addressed by the district they represent, and ask again that you rule accordingly.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not allow the point of order. I heard the member for Playford refer to the member for Newland, but I would remind him not to use the pronoun 'she' when he refers to the member for Newland.

Mr QUIRKE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Of course, I will always be advised by wise counsel. The reality of this is that I have been down to the Pooraka Skillshare program. They have sought my assistance on projects, and it is a plain untruth to say that I have not been down there. It is true that the Avago Skillshare program in the Newland electorate is also relevant to many of my constituents, particularly those from Para Hills. In fact, from Para Hills East and those areas, it is the favoured venue for those programs. That is because it is straight down the road—in fact, the road that I drive down. It is a very short distance from where my electorate is and from where my house is to that project.

Unlike the member for Newland, I do not need a road map to know where my electorate is—it surrounds my house. It is where I live with my family, where I have made the commitment for my family to live. The member for Newland passes out letters to her constituents that ought to be covered under the Fraud Act. They imply that she lives in the electorate but, in reality, she lives electorates away—in fact, a lot of electorates away.

Mrs Kotz: I have lived there for 22 years.

Mr QUIRKE: She has lived there for 22 years, so she tells us. The member for Newland makes the statement that she has lived there for 22 years. The member for Newland does not live in Newland, or anywhere near it; she has to drive through the length of my electorate, and through the length of Florey to get into Newland.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: That is what has to happen. The member for Newland brought up this topic and, if she wants to make it clear, she had better take the advice that she was offering before.

Mr MATTHEW: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

The SPEAKER: As there was an interruption that I think was possibly unfair at that stage, the member has two minutes instead of one in which to finish his contribution.

Mr QUIRKE: I congratulate the member for Mount Gambier for supporting my having that legitimate use of time and for not supporting his colleague, who so frivolously wishes to take points of order. I was winding up my address in relation to the member for Newland's making statements about people leapfrogging electorates. I have to say this: it is absolutely essential that, if you live in a glasshouse, you do not start throwing rocks.

That is the third law of politics; I gave members the other two last week. This week, the member for Newland has the third one. If you live in a glasshouse, do not start throwing rocks. It is all very well to start talking about members with crystal balls, but a few members opposite have a glass jaw. I could make some disparaging remarks about a few other members opposite. The reality is that in the Skillshare program the Liberal Party showed what it was all about. Members opposite masquerade and say that they care about the young people who need the training. They say they care about this and they care about that, but they care about none of it. They care about nothing but the wealthier classes in society. To them, it is charity duty, and that is the way the member for Newland conducted herself out there, with charity and with condescension. What is more, that is what came across in her contribution tonight. The other thing is that members of the Skillshare program and the constituents of Newland do not thank her for the condescension.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): We are well aware of the economic plight of this nation and this State, which is reflected in high unemployment and a decline in our international competitiveness in terms of exports. We are aware of exhortations about becoming the clever country, the smart country, and so on. We are encouraged to upgrade our skills and competencies, particularly amongst our young people, and we are told that the skills of our workers need to be relevant to industry, and so on. Those sorts of calls are reflected in what is commonly called the Carmichael report—The Australian Vocational Certificate Training System—and in many other inquiries such as the Finn report and the Mayer report.

It is strange that, at a time when reports such as Carmichael's are exhorting those in the community to increase their skill level, we find that the Government is about to close Goodwood High School which, for many years, was known as the Goodwood Technical High School. I admit that I have a vested interest in this matter because I, along with many other South Australians, went to Goodwood Tech. It is ironic, at a time when Carmichael and others are talking about the need for senior colleges to focus on vocational training and other related aspects, that this Government is proceeding to close down one of the most successful schools in that category—Goodwood High School. I will quote briefly

from the Carmichael report. A recommendation of that report under 'Executive Summary' is as follows:

To meet the target of having 90 per cent of young people complete Year 12 or equivalent by 2001, the Employment and Skills Formation Council recommends the development of more vocational options in Years 11-12, more extensive use of contextual learning methods, the nation-wide development of public and private senior colleges to provide mature learning environments for delivery of upper-secondary programs, and improved careers education, including exit plans for early school leavers, to enable young people to make appropriate decisions about pathway.

Two other brief extracts from that same report are as follows:

Year 11 and 12 students in senior colleges would be able to acquire vocational competencies to level 1 as well as generic key areas of competence, through vocational courses including work based training during school years and/or structured work experience after completing school.

Students who have completed Year 12 could undertake a 'vocational year', delivered by TAFE or senior colleges, which prepares participants to attain an Australian Standard Framework level 2 certificate after further structured work experience, the duration of which would depend upon the sector involved.

The point is that the Carmichael report gives a very strong endorsement to the concept of senior colleges which is, in effect, what Goodwood High School currently is. Yet, what we have is a proposal, which this Government seems committed to for some obscure reason, to close down that school.

As I indicated earlier, that school has been in existence for approximately 60 years and has made a significant contribution to technical education in this State. Sadly, many years ago, this Government got rid of technical schools on the basis that high schools would take on that role and train students in the technical studies area. That has been only partially fulfilled—certainly not to the extent that would have been possible if the technical high school system had been maintained.

Unlike New South Wales, which has moved to a system of technology high schools, the young people of this State, particularly those at upper secondary level, have been short changed because the high schools under a comprehensive model have never delivered the technical education that is now sought and recommended by inquiries such as the Carmichael report.

Many of us would be familiar with some of the other technical high schools—Thebarton, Croydon, Le Fevre and so on—which used to exist and which have now been converted into new high schools or have met another fate. Those schools, like Goodwood, produced many students who went on to do productive and constructive things in the technical area as well as in other areas.

One of the characteristics of Goodwood Technical High School was that students received in-depth training in technical drawing, woodwork and metalwork as well as some liberal studies. That has been replaced with less detailed studies in the technical area as an option in high schools, and I acknowledge that woodwork and metalwork as taught then would be inadequate today. Goodwood High School, which still has students, albeit in its last year, runs courses on electronics and other modern technologies including computer-assisted programs particularly in relation to lathes and other such aspects.

Let me digress in a light-hearted way for one moment. When attending Goodwood High School, we used to travel on the Belair line train. The member for Albert Park would be aware that there used to be what were called green and cream carriages which had a toilet in them with a flush button which squirted water to the exterior. I confess that, as one of the students attending Goodwood Tech, as it was then, travelling to Goodwood or Millswood on the train, one of my sins was to use that pedal to flush the students attending Unley High School.

One of those students was my honourable Leader, Mr Dean Brown. As those students got off the train at Mitcham and walked down the mesh-covered raceway, the students on the train attending Goodwood used to ensure that the Unley High School students and, better still, the students of Scotch College, received their second christening. I publicly apologise to my Leader by confessing that, during my youth, I was one of the culprits who ensured that he was christened on his way to that more prestigious school up the road, that is, Unley High School.

On 13 September there will be a back-to-Goodwood High School day, and I am sure it will be well attended. One of the aspects that needs to be considered—and I would like the Minister of Education to take it on board—is that, if the school is not to be saved, the paintings in the school's possession, which include original Heysen works, be auctioned to provide or contribute towards a scholarship for students in any of our secondary schools or the equivalent who are seeking a technical career. I understand that within the Education Department there is a suggestion that the paintings be given to other schools. Obviously, the Art Gallery should have first choice but be required to purchase them, and any funds derived should go towards establishing a scholarship or scholarships for students wishing to pursue a technical career.

The scholarship could act as a reminder of the contribution of Goodwood High School, if it is to close. I acknowledge that there are engineering pathway schools and I believe that a scholarship which recognises the contribution of Goodwood Tech and Goodwood High could be used to assist students attending those schools or even for further study. I draw this matter to the attention of the Minister sitting opposite and trust that the school will not be closed, but that, in the event that does happen, the Education Department supports a scholarship scheme to acknowledge the work and contribution of the people who went to that school and of the school itself.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** In this debate I will address the manner in which the Labor Party in this country has attempted to look after our women workers. Over many years I have noted with a great deal of interest—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** I am delighted with the interjections from the clowns opposite. Listen to that silvertail from the country! He talks about—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** I understand what the member for Henley Beach is saying. The member for Goyder, who is a great supporter of Dr Hewson and his policies, is hell bent on destroying the working conditions of women in



this country. They have given very strong support to the New Zealand model: there is no question about that. Let us look, for example, at what has happened in New Zealand in terms of its women workers.

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** This is the model that the honourable member opposite (who tries to shout me down but will not be able to do so) is trying to ram down the throats of women in this country. Let us look at it. Women workers in New Zealand, especially in the services sector, are suffering significant pay cuts up to 30 per cent. They are working longer hours over longer weeks, usually with no overtime, penalty rates or other forms of compensation. They cannot resist because the award system has been abolished, and the capacity of the unions to help has been cut by law. This is the model that these silvertails opposite, born with a golden spoon in their mouths, who really do not understand what it is like to work on the shop floor, are following.

As I have illustrated to the House on so many occasions, last year over 75 000 workers in this State were injured on the job—one in every eight. Do we hear from members opposite, and particularly from the man on the land, about industrial relations and occupational health and welfare? I am yet to hear them talk about safety in the rural industry. I have not heard once from the member for Goyder about safety conditions for his own people whom he purports to represent—the man on the land. He does not want to talk about that.

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

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

**Mr HAMILTON:** Thank you, Sir, for your protection, because he is a bit of a bully. They will not address safety. It is a cost, and they talk about the cost to the man on the land. I have been on the land and done the harrowing, the sowing, and so on.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** I have a great rapport with people in the north, and I do not want to tarnish that walk by my political views—and I do not say that in an unkind way regarding the Labor Party. From talking with those people up there, I believe that I understand the problems of the man on the land. The member for Mount Gambier would be aware of my background and the fact that my mother came from the land. Indeed, I have a brother on the land in that area, so let not the member for Goyder interpose and say that I do not understand the problems of the people on the land, because that is arrant nonsense.

The facts of the matter are that, if he were sincere about the man and the woman on the land, he would know that the industrial policy of Hewson, the silvertail who drives around in his big Ferrari, and his ilk are not really concerned about those people: they are more concerned with reducing the benefits to workers in this country. I have challenged members of the Liberal Party again and again to tell me when they have ever supported an increase in wages for the working class. When have they ever supported a proposition in terms of increased annual leave, sick leave, holiday leave loading, maternity/paternity leave—any of those? Never! Never in the time that I have been on this earth have they supported any of those propositions. They know that. I am disappointed with the member for Hanson, because he

comes from an association that purports to represent those people in the banking industry—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** Yes, a union official. If the member for Hanson really showed his colours he would come to this side of the House. I have some time for the member for Hanson. However, he is not been prepared to show—

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** The member for Mount Gambier can shout in the forest, but I cannot hear what he is saying. The reality is that I have never heard members opposite talk about industrial safety and working conditions. They are not particularly interested. They are persuaded by their own rhetoric and they are not concerned about working conditions.

Let us look at what the Hewson package proposes in relation to women workers in this country. It is stated:

Women workers would be among the worst affected victims of the Hewson consumption tax package. As well as the extra tax burden it would impose on working people, the package proposes to cut out Government activities which have broad community support because they are especially designed to help women overcome the every-day problems they face at work.

These programs include the Affirmative Action Agency and two special programs in the Department of Industrial Relations. The Affirmative Action Agency was set up by the Government to ensure that equal employment is a practical goal. It . . . reports to Parliament on the equal employment performances of all workplaces in the private sector with more than 100 employees and all higher education institutions.

The agency has received more than 2 500 inquiries from business in the past year alone. The Hewson consumption tax package proposes that the agency should be abolished.

So much for the concern of these silvertails opposite! They profess that they are concerned about working women in the community. We on this side of the House know that over the years members opposite have supported proposals that women not receive the same wages as men. Indeed, they support such terminology as 'couch potatoes' and 'dole bludgers'. They do not deny that and suddenly they have gone quiet. What an offensive and outrageous suggestion!

The press in this country stand condemned also. They attacked Hawke when he called a man at Whyalla 'a silly old bugger'. What did they say about Dr Hewson when he used the derogatory term 'couch potatoes', which was repeated by his colleagues and followers in Canberra? How demeaning of the youth of this country. Members opposite are hypocrites. I castigated my own people about unemployment in this country as far back as last year. As my colleagues, and in particular the member for Price will recall, I have always been prepared to criticise the Labor Party. However, never do we hear the silvertails on the other side do the same to their Party; they are persuaded by their own rhetoric.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** I believe it is appropriate that, prior to the bringing down of the State Budget, I again refer to funding for the southern areas, because my colleagues and I who represent southern electorates are fed up with this Government consistently ignoring our region when budgeting each financial year. I draw members' attention to the recent Coopers & Lybrand national population survey for 1990-91, which found that 55 per cent of Adelaide's population growth occurred in the area of the Southern Region of Councils. However, an analysis of the recent State budget shows that the

Government's priorities do not reflect the south's rapid population growth. I remind members that during the 1990-91 financial year, 55 per cent of Adelaide's population growth occurred in that area.

There is no doubt that southern residents are particularly frustrated about the lack of road funding. Those residents who commute to the central metropolitan area are experiencing delays of up to half an hour per day at the Darlington bottleneck. Without the construction of a third arterial road which will bypass Darlington, travel delays will become progressively more intolerable as the population south of O'Halloran Hill increases by a projected 68 per cent over the next 10 years to a total of 200 000 residents.

My colleagues and I have consistently argued in this Parliament for bringing forward the construction timetable for the third arterial road. At the end of the last session, Parliament again refused my request to advance the construction schedule for that road. The motion on that occasion was defeated by three votes. Those who supported the motion were Liberal members and a National Party member of Parliament, but as usual Labor members voted against the bringing forward of that construction program. I find that vote particularly repugnant as a number of Labor members in this Parliament purport to be southern suburbs representatives, two of whom sit on the front bench: the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Deputy Premier, now Acting Premier. Those members voted against bringing forward the road funding to try to alleviate the pressure that their own constituents are experiencing day by day. Some of that is understandable, for we have heard the member for Playford talk about the residential location of the member for Newland, but it is interesting to refer to the residential location of the Minister for Environment and Planning. The Minister for Environment and Planning, presently the member for Mawson, now the Labor Party candidate for Reynell, happens to live at Glenelg. There is no doubt that that Minister would not personally have to experience the problems that southern residents have to undergo each day.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr MATTHEW: Members opposite might not like that.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATTHEW: The third arterial road has become of paramount importance to the southern region councils and all southern suburbs residents. We have recently been told by the Government that the arterial road is now to be built in two phases. The Government has identified phase 1, which is simply a road widening exercise. That phase will widen Main South Road from Flagstaff Road to Ayliffes Road and Marion Road from South Road to Start Road. That will do very little to alleviate the traffic problems being experienced by southern residents.

Phase 2 involves the construction of a new 8.5 kilometre road from Main South Road, Darlington, to Reynella. The vital part of the project has yet to be scheduled. Road Transport Department staff are expressing serious concern as to whether that will ever occur. Indeed, we know that phase 2 will not commence before 1996. Based on current construction times taken for new roads, it means that people in the southern

suburbs will have no chance of an adequate road network this century, and that is completely unacceptable to the Opposition.

While referring to the problems being experienced by southern residents, it is appropriate for me to refer to a letter that I sent to the Premier on 19 May of this year. I still await a detailed reply, other than a mere acknowledgment, from the Premier. The subject of my letter was southern funding. I reminded the Premier of the problem of the third arterial road and further that a total of \$51.9 million was allocated for major roadworks in the financial year 1991-92, but of that money the south received a paltry \$6.5 million. At the same time as the southern suburbs were experiencing 55 per cent of the population growth of metropolitan Adelaide, they attracted a paltry \$6.5 million of the total of \$51.9 million road fund package.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

Mr MATTHEW: One member opposite says that that is not bad. I am sure that southern residents will be pleased to hear that that is how the Government regards that allocation of funding. Those residents are well aware that since 1984 this Government has continually promised that their road problems would be alleviated and has continually announced road projects which have never come to fruition. After State elections those promises seem to be forgotten. I also reminded the Premier in my correspondence that a total of \$25.5 million was allocated for major capital expenditure projects for education during the last financial year.

Once again, only \$8.2 million of this was allocated for southern education facilities. I would hope that by now all members were aware of southern residents' concerns about allocation of funding for sport. I reminded the Premier that in the last budget \$14.3 million was allocated for major capital works programs, of which absolutely nothing was allocated to the southern suburbs for sport. There is only one major football stadium sitting south of Anzac Highway, and that is a completely unacceptable situation. Southern residents have to travel far to be able to participate in the normal recreational activities enjoyed by other residents of Adelaide, but those residents are paying their taxes and they are not getting their fair share.

The southern residents are not asking for anything above and beyond their rightful entitlement, and they are fed up with the poor Government representation they are receiving. Is it any wonder the Liberal Party is receiving back reports of the damage that is being done to the morale of Labor Party candidates, as they move around the southern suburbs and get knocked back after knock back, door after door? I am confident that at the next election that knock back will be reflected in the poll result. This Government will be struggling to hold a single seat in the southern suburbs because of the appalling track record it has demonstrated in this Parliament. During its last decade the Government has completely ignored the needs of the southern suburbs.

As I said, I still await from the Premier a reply to the correspondence I sent to him in May of this year addressing the shortfall of funding in the southern suburbs. When talking about funding shortfalls, one must also refer to the Flinders Medical Centre. Time and time again in this Parliament I have reminded members that

the Flinders Medical Centre project has never been completed. That project was brought about during the terms of the few innovative Governments we have had in this State over the past half a century. That was the Playford Government, which in the 1960s recognised the need for a hospital system to assist with the needs of the southern population.

Phase 4 of the Flinders Medical Centre was cancelled by the Dunstan Government. It was a vital phase of the Flinders Medical Centre project and to this day the centre has only a 500 bed capacity instead of the 700 beds it was recognised that area would need at that stage. Since that time this Government has encouraged development in places such as Seaford but it has not provided the infrastructure needed. The final nail in the coffin was the insult that was handed to the southern residents through the so-called '2020 Vision' project which some southern residents call the '2010 Vision' project and which has done nothing other than try to turn the southern suburbs into an unemployment ghetto or a dormitory suburb. Members opposite may bleat, but the facts stand undisputed. I challenge any Government member to stand up in this place and prove me wrong. My comments in this Chamber tonight are the facts; they are undisputed.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** In 1988 the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Riverland Development Corporation commissioned a study into the rehabilitation of Government irrigation areas. This study was undertaken by Kinhill Engineering Pty Ltd in association with Australian Agricultural Consulting and Management Company Pty Ltd. The purpose of the study was to look into the feasibility of the rehabilitation of the Cadell, Cobdogla and Moorook irrigation areas. At this point, about 60 per cent of the Government irrigation areas has been rehabilitated and the remaining 40 per cent is still in extremely poor condition.

During the Address in Reply debate, I referred to the need to have a healthy Murray-Darling Basin which will supply the water needs of Victoria and New South Wales, and in South Australia, not only our irrigation water but also water to dry land farmers throughout the length and breadth of our agricultural areas and a substantial proportion of metropolitan Adelaide's water.

The Minister has been negotiating with irrigators in the Riverland for a considerable period about arrangements for the rehabilitation of the remaining 40 per cent of Government irrigation areas. The summary of the 1988 report states:

The Government irrigation areas in the Riverland of South Australia are upwards of 80 years old. The irrigation areas under State Government control have been progressively rehabilitated, particularly during the 1970s and three areas (namely, Cadell, Cobdogla and Moorook) remain to be rehabilitated . . .

Those irrigation areas that have been rehabilitated have demonstrated benefits in terms of greater efficiency of water supply and distribution, improved on-farm efficiency of water application to irrigated crops, increased yields, higher rates of adoption of improved irrigation practices, greater freedom with regard to crops grown and reduced drainage flows.

Besides the benefits that accrue directly to growers, proven and significant benefits have been shown to accrue to local towns, downstream water users, Federal Government and State Governments. The activities of the growers in the irrigation areas create employment to carry out on-farm operations, and to transport, grade and market the produce. For every job so

created and every dollar of value added in the process, additional demands appear. These so-called multiplier effects arise from both forward (output) linked and backward (input) linked activities, since the supply of fertilisers, pesticides, packing materials, irrigation equipment, social amenities and the like also contribute to employment, personal income and yet another round of demands.

That report was delivered in December 1988, and since then there have been ongoing discussions between the Minister of Water Resources, the water boards in the Riverland and irrigators to try to reach agreement on the basis of the funding for the rehabilitation of the remaining 40 per cent of the Government irrigation areas.

As a result of significant discussions over a number of years, agreement on funding has been reached on the basis of a 40 per cent contribution from the Federal Government, a 40 per cent contribution from the State Government and a 20 per cent contribution from growers. Growers have accepted that they will be required to fund their 20 per cent contribution, and an indication was given that both the State and Federal Governments would each provide 40 per cent. However, to this point little indication has come from the Government through the Minister as to just when the rehabilitation will really get under way.

A small amount of work has been progressing for the past year or so but at a minimal rate. If the rehabilitation proceeds and is to be completed in a comparatively short time, considerable expenditure will be required each year. We are talking about a total expenditure of between \$30 million and \$40 million to complete the rehabilitation. As I said, while that amount has been agreed to, there is no clear indication from either the Federal or State Government that the money will be provided in their annual budget. The budget is coming down in the next week or so in South Australia, and it is absolutely essential that the Minister honour the commitment that she has given and the negotiations that she has agreed to and makes sure that the contribution that she committed herself to in relation to these negotiations will be provided for in the budget.

There is no way that we can have efficient irrigation industries in South Australia if we do not have efficient irrigation distribution systems. The old system of open channels leaves a great deal to be desired. There is enormous waste from these distribution channels in the form of seepage that builds up the water table in the area. As well, there is an enormous waste of water that can be put to far greater use than letting it seep into the groundwater and build up the salinity problem in the irrigation areas. Modern irrigation techniques have been available for a considerable period of time. In the areas that have been rehabilitated, such as Berri and Waikerie, a large percentage of the irrigators have availed themselves of the opportunity to install modern irrigation equipment, and this has significantly increased their productivity.

So, we are really talking about the amount of production that can be achieved from a given amount of water taken from the River Murray in South Australia. If we are to have a further contribution from the horticultural industries in this State with the production of further wine grapes, citrus and stone fruits, we cannot compete on an equitable basis with other parts of the world unless we have an irrigation distribution system to

enable that to happen. It has been clearly identified that, in those areas that have been rehabilitated, there is a significant benefit to the operator (the Government). The costs have been dramatically reduced, and the enormous loss at which the Government has been running the irrigation areas over a long period of time can virtually be eliminated. The sooner the remaining 40 per cent of the Government irrigation areas is rehabilitated and handed over to the growers to run and operate, and the sooner Government withdraws from the irrigation operations in this State, the better it will be for all concerned.

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** I wish briefly to join this debate. First, I want to rebut some of the pronouncements we heard earlier from the member for Bright when he spoke about the third arterial road. I think he alleged in his speech that the first phase of that project, which is to address the problems in the bottleneck around Darlington, would be of no benefit. In fact, anyone who travels that road would well know that the major traffic congestion problems in the south at the moment occur in that region around Darlington. The first phase of that project will address those problems; that phase is highly desirable, and it should and will proceed in the near future.

The member for Bright, of course, has tried to create this misrepresentation about the southern suburbs not getting their fair share of the cake. If the member for Bright wishes to stand up in this place and set out the policies of his Party for the southern regions, let him do so. Let him set out how many millions of dollars his Party will spend on particular projects there, and let him say which projects in which other areas they will cut to reallocate the money or, alternatively, let him say which taxes he will increase and raise to do it.

Is it any wonder that politicians have a bad name when, on the one hand, members opposite have spent the past two weeks in debate telling us how this Government has been spending too much money and yet, at the same time, the honourable member gets up with a shopping list and says that we should be spending hundreds of millions of dollars more in his electorate.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** It is the old, old story, as my colleagues say. I should now like to turn to some more misrepresentation by members opposite in relation to economic policy. I want to refer to a speech made by Russell Cowan, the Manager of Corporate Affairs in the SGIC.

**Dr Armitage:** Good bloke!

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** I am pleased that the member for Adelaide interjects, as he was the subject in question of one of these misrepresentations. The member for Adelaide asked this question on 20 February, and it is referred to in this address by Mr Cowan, who is pointing out some of the difficulties under which his organisation has had to operate because of the scurrilous and unsubstantiated allegations made in this Parliament by members opposite. The member for Adelaide said:

Will the Treasurer use his powers under section 3 of the State Government Insurance Commission Act and direct the Commission not to allow the shredding of any files or documents which may be relevant to inquiries into that organisation?

He went on:

I have been approached by a practitioner in the occupational health field who treats employees of SGIC. He has advised me that during the past week some of those employees have advised him that a number of people employed by the commission have been given additional overtime to shred documents.

I am sure that we can all remember that scurrilous, disgraceful question being asked by the member for Adelaide. What I should like to do, since the member for Adelaide has not done this, is to put on record the true facts as pointed out in Mr Cowan's address. This related to the shredding that supposedly went on because the member for Adelaide had heard from some practitioner friend of his about a conversation relating to the shredding of documents. Mr Cowan said:

And so for two days we conducted an exhaustive inquiry which found that this alleged situation never happened. And every member of our property and investments division declared that he or she was prepared to sign a statutory declaration stating that no shredding had occurred.

But the public reality was that SGIC was suffering financially because a politician asked for an inquiry because he said he had been told by a doctor friend that the doctor had been told by some of his patients that they knew of some people at SGIC who allegedly were shredding files.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** As a matter of fact, Mr Cowan did comment about one of the committees of this House and its relationship to the candidate for Napier. Perhaps it would not be appropriate to go into it at this stage; we will come to that later if we have time. Mr Cowan concluded:

Of course it was fortunate for our internal inquiry and process of verification that this politician's friend was a doctor, and not a vet. If that had happened the RSPCA might have joined our list of critics and, given that our Chief General Manger Denis Gerschwitz had described some of our badly performing investments as dogs, and that we had sold them, we might also have been accused of cruelty or neglect to animals. And that is an allegation from which we would have never recovered.

Certainly, Mr Cowan treats it lightly, but for days SGIC was having to deal with what Mr Cowan described as a fire storm of radio, television and newspaper headlines, devastating loss of staff morale, immediate loss of confidence in SGIC by policy holders and, with a run on the SGIC life fund, it began to lose nearly \$1 million a day. That is the consequence of such a point scoring exercise in this House. It was really quite a grubby and disgraceful exercise.

Before I go on to the member for Hartley, I should like to refer to another member of the Opposition, the shadow Treasurer (the member for Mitcham) who, of course, was Deputy Leader at the time. Mr Cowan said this about the member for Mitcham:

... Mr Stephen Baker unveiled what he called the "latest revelation" that SGIC has written "new interstate risk insurance of up to \$1 billion". He demanded that "the rot be stopped". And he was heard on every radio and television news programme in the State and quoted in the *Adelaide Advertiser*. But before he lassoed his headlines Mr Stephen Baker hadn't researched his facts.

That wouldn't surprise us at all. The article continues:

The \$1 billion total was, in fact, \$250 million. This \$250 billion of business was generated after SGIC was approached by a wholly owned subsidiary of the AMP, the same company which the ideological ancestor of Mr Stephen Baker, one of the fortune tellers of the 1924 Parliament, Mr Richard Butler, had predicted would be driven out of business by an SGIC.

Further, he states:

Of that \$250 million only \$62 million was not reinsured. And of the \$62 million, the whole was for domestic mortgages, not one of them for more than \$250,000 and each and all of them subject to due diligence financial inquiries. In short, Mr Stephen Baker got it wrong by between \$750 million and \$938 million. Not bad for the man who would be, or will be, Treasurer of South Australia.

They are very perceptive comments from Mr Cowan. Those two examples illustrate very well to us the sort of campaign by members opposite that we have witnessed in this Parliament over the past 18 months. It has no integrity at all. It has been a series of wild, unsubstantiated allegations made to engender headlines in newspapers. They have had no cognisance at all of the consequences that these allegations may have had on the institutions concerned.

Of course, it is amazing that members opposite are now showing great hindsight. What is interesting, certainly in the first year that I was in this Parliament—and I am sure that members who have been here longer could comment on whether members opposite had shown this great foresight back in the 1980s—is that I never heard any of this great vision these members now claim to have had. Certainly, there were never any comments from members opposite about how the various Acts, and so on, should be reformed in this case. Of course, these members have now discovered the benefit of hindsight.

I will conclude with a final comment made by Mr Cowan. He was referring to the great deal of scrutiny with which the SGIC has had to cope over the past few months. He referred to the various committees. Mr Cowan said he had to satisfy the select parliamentary committee of inquiry into SGIC, which followed the three-man committee of recommendation into SGIC, which followed the Government Management Review Board inquiry into SGIC, the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the other members of the parliamentary Liberal Party, the Australian Democrats, the members of the parliamentary Economic and Finance Committee, the member of the committee for the re-election of Terry Groom, the next King of England, King Rupert the first, and the other members of the royal house of Murdoch, the tea lady at the *Advertiser*, the one-legged tea lady at the ABC, and various other people who had to be satisfied—

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

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** May I say how delighted I am to speak immediately after the member for Mitchell and to see the member for Spence here, because I wish to address a matter that he has raised in this House. I want to address the matter of Mr Russell Cowan and the allegations which the member for Mitchell read out. When I raised those allegations in relation to that matter, I was asked by Mr Ian Altschwager whether I would attend the *7.30 Report* for an interview that evening. I remember it well; I was asked about 4.30 in the afternoon. It must have been a Friday afternoon, because in my marginal electorate I had a major fundraiser on, and it was absolutely most inconvenient that I attended. However, he indicated to me that Mr Russell Cowan—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Dr ARMITAGE:** There's another \$20, Mr Speaker; You see, I have a \$20 bet for the number of people who mention it—was going to attend and that I ought to be there to defend the allegations. Well, I was only too delighted to attend in those circumstances. So, I contacted my contact—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Dr ARMITAGE:**—and I will come to that in a minute—and I got a statutory declaration. Sir, having made the effort to attend the *7.30 Report*—and I repeat that it was a difficult time for me—which was to be pre-recorded, let us assume at 6 o'clock, and when I was there—

**Mr Hamilton:** What time was it?

**Dr ARMITAGE:** It was certainly before 7.30, anyway. When I attended I said to Mr Ian Altschwager, 'Ian, you may be interested in this statutory declaration that I have which indicates that all my allegations are valid.' What happened then is that Mr Altschwager got onto Mr Cowan and said, 'Dr Armitage is here. He has made all these efforts to come in so that you two can debate, and do you know what, he has a statutory declaration.' Do you know what Mr Cowan said? He said, 'I can't make it.' He would not come in to debate me because he knew—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Dr ARMITAGE:** I got on. The member for Spence indicates that I did not get on. I was only too happy, Mr Speaker, to go on, and I defend my position. But Mr Cowan, who was only too happy to fly by the seat of his pants, and faced with a statutory declaration, could not make it. I know that the member for Mitchell read out Mr Russell Cowan's recent contribution. What I also note is that Mr Russell Cowan did not mention me by name in that speech, and the reason he did not mention my name is because when he first flew into press about this I took legal advice and I was told that he had in fact been defamatory. So, I sent him a letter which said, 'Look, Russell, I would be a bit cautious about this if I were you,' and that is why—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

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

**Dr ARMITAGE:**—he did not name me. I do not bother with Mr Cowan's speeches—and I had not bothered to read it before—but I note from the member for Mitchell's quotation that Mr Cowan assumed that my source was a doctor. What I specifically said in the question was 'a practitioner'. Now, a practitioner can be a physiotherapist, a doctor—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Dr ARMITAGE:** Precisely, as the member for Spence says, 'A practitioner of what?' It could be occupational therapy, physiotherapy or chiropractic—he or she could be a doctor, it makes no difference. But the very fact that Mr Cowan jumped to the conclusion that my source was a doctor indicates the glibness, the lack of attention to detail and the jumping to conclusions which is only too characteristic of Mr Russell Cowan.

**Mr ATKINSON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I wonder how this relates to the Supply Bill.

**The SPEAKER:** I really think the member should pay attention to the stage of the debate we are in. The honourable member for Adelaide.

Dr ARMITAGE: I draw your attention, Mr Speaker, to the fact that you have previously extended a speech because of something you considered to be frivolous, and I would expect similar consideration from the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Well, the member for Adelaide will be anticipating in vain. Carry on.

Dr ARMITAGE: Mr Speaker, I find that an amazing comment, given your behaviour about half an hour ago.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the member for Adelaide wish to take issue with the ruling of the Chair?

Dr ARMITAGE: Mr Speaker, certainly not. I merely expressed my amazement. I wish to address a number of other issues, including some further furrphies which have been perpetrated. Tonight great content has been given to whether or not people live in their electorates. I would like to assure everybody that I am very proud, as the member for Adelaide, which does not take in the Federal electorate of Makin, to actually represent the member for Makin. I am very proud, as the member for the State seat of Adelaide, which does not take in the Federal seat of Bonython, to represent the member for Bonython. If we look federally, there is the well known example of the Prime Minister, the member for Blaxland, and all the troubles he had with his allowances when he was living in Canberra. It does not matter now, of course, because he is in Kirribilli House; and he probably does not bother to go to Blaxland, either.

We all remember that Kirribilli House was the scene of that infamous conference between the previous Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister when, not trusting each other well enough, they had to get witnesses to their well-known pact. Not only am I proud to represent the member for Makin and the member for Bonython, more importantly I am proud to represent the Premier, who is the member for Ross Smith. However, he happens to live in my electorate. Following the redistribution after the last election, he now lives even further into my electorate.

I wish also to address the matter of the closure of Mildred Road. The member for Spence has quoted a number of names in this Parliament, but I will not go down that line. However, I point out to the member for Spence that a number of people who have been quoted in circulars as having lived in North Adelaide for seven years and who are supposedly disaffected with this closure are not on the electoral role. I also draw the attention of the member for Spence and other members opposite to the fact that one of the people who is so aggrieved by this lives in Beviss Street, North Adelaide. He says that he has no exit to the west. I point out that there are a number of roads that one can use to get easily onto the ring route.

Mr Atkinson: Name one.

Dr ARMITAGE: Jeffcott Road, for one. I also point out that, when I was doorknocking during my campaign to become the member for Adelaide, I was surprised to see in North Adelaide a poster for the member for Spence. Whose house was it on? It was on that of the same person who is now campaigning for Mildred Road. The member for Spence told me that this man was his campaign director.

Mr Atkinson: That is not true; that is not true at all.

Dr ARMITAGE: That is what the honourable member told me. I put it to the House that the honourable member's championing of Mildred Road is all about campaigning because he is worried about the next election. He badly needs any local issue that he can get. That is why the member for Spence sits in here signing letters routinely; he has a stack of letters on his desk tonight. The member for Spence is probably sending out copies of his contribution on this subject, and that indicates clearly that he is worried. Every time the member for Spence mentions this and gets his campaign director to campaign on his behalf—despite all the other exits—it indicates how much effect our Liberal campaign is having and how disastrous is the effect of the Labor Party on the chances of the member for Spence in the next election.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

Mr MEIER: I will ignore the inane interjections from some members opposite. Tonight I will mention a few issues of concern to me. The first is the lack of maintenance on jetties in my electorate.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: You have done that one before.

Mr MEIER: When?

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: In your Address in Reply speech. Give us something new.

Mr MEIER: I did not mention jetties in my Address in Reply.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: You mentioned it in your Address in Reply.

Mr MEIER: I prefer to ignore the member for Napier, given his totally unsubstantiated and vicious attack in the House last night. I used to have a lot of respect for the member for Napier but that disappeared after hearing a statement earlier today. I thought better of him than that he would make unsubstantiated allegations in this place, particularly given the positions that he has held. The member for Napier would do well to learn that, while he is in this House—

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

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder will resume his seat. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: For the past 15 seconds, whilst you, Sir, have been talking to the member for Adelaide, the member for Goyder has been reflecting on my character, credibility and integrity, and I take extreme exception to that.

The SPEAKER: I have no idea what the reflection was. As the honourable member said, I was distracted when talking with the member for Adelaide. Because I did not hear it, I cannot uphold the point of order, but I will listen very closely to every word that is uttered for the rest of the 10 minutes.

Mr MEIER: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I was expressing my extreme dissatisfaction and discontent with the way the member for Napier has reflected on certain persons in this House in the past 24 hours or so, but enough said of that. The situation as it applies to jetties generally is not good around the coastline of Yorke Peninsula. I wish to highlight the example of the Edithburgh jetty. That jetty has reached the stage where the Department of Marine and Harbors has now put up

barriers to stop vehicles going onto the jetty. That particularly affects commercial fishermen.

The commercial fishing industry in this State has been worth a lot of money, and it is a great tragedy that now the fishermen are not allowed to unload from the Edithburgh jetty because of the unsafe situation as determined by the Department of Marine and Harbors. As a result, the fishermen now have to go around to Port Giles, and one of the first fishermen who tried to moor at Port Giles found that the pylons were such that the boat would not extend between two pylons, and the side of his boat was smashed, causing some \$3 500 damage, and approximately one tonne of fish dropped into the ocean to be wasted for all time. The fish were valued at approximately \$750 to \$1 000. Understandably, the fisherman was very concerned, and together we looked at both Port Giles and Edithburgh, and it was quite clear that there has been a distinct lack of maintenance at Edithburgh over many years.

The one positive point was that certain planks and other materials had been ordered. At this stage that has yet to be put into place at Edithburgh. I contacted the Department of Marine and Harbors to find out when the jetty would again be made safe for fishermen's vehicles required to transport the fish from the jetty, and was told that even after the repairs are made there is no intention to reopen the jetty to those commercial vehicles.

Once again, it is causing a great problem for people in that area and, unfortunately, with Port Giles not having the appropriate material between the pylons, the people on southern Yorke Peninsula can rightly say, 'Why hasn't proper work been done over the past years?' Well, I guess it is clear that the Government's maintenance program in this area, as in so many other areas, be it roads, schools, hospitals - just about any area we could mention - has been neglected and not maintained as it should have been. I hope that the Minister will see fit in the coming budget to make some more moneys available for our very important jetties and wharves.

I could also cite the example of Wallaroo, one of the State's most important rural ports. It is really a tragedy when one walks up the Wallaroo jetty to find that some of the planks actually move up. In fact, it was pointed out to me that when a vehicle travelled along the jetty, a plank moved up and literally hit the side of the vehicle. That is how bad it is in places. On a deputation to the Minister in April this year, he indicated that some minor moneys would be made available. He was referring to moneys in the order of \$100 000 plus. That will only effect temporary repairs and will not get to the base of the structure. It will not ensure that the jetty has a long-term future. Again, it is another tragedy, the way this Government is ignoring some of the State's essential resources for future development.

Someone from one of the fertiliser companies said that, if things do not improve, it is just as likely that the company will move away from the area and could well locate in Adelaide. We need people to move to the regional areas as much as possible. Every incentive needs to be given to the rural and regional areas for them to develop, although that seems to fall on deaf ears as far as the Government is concerned.

Unfortunately, the Wallaroo jetty has got to the stage where it has to be closed off to the public when the

superphosphate boats are unloaded. One can well imagine how people who travel a long distance to fish at Wallaroo feel when they are confronted with a closed jetty and are told that it will be closed for two or three days, depending on how long the boat will be there.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

Mr MEIER: Well, as the honourable member says, they can go to Moonta Bay. Certainly, one can go to Port Hughes, too, but there is a problem, as one would appreciate if one had been there. Wallaroo is a very long jetty, and whilst fish may not be biting at Port Hughes or Moonta Bay during the day, one can invariably find a fish biting somewhere along the Wallaroo jetty—depending on the type of fish that is acceptable to the person fishing at the time. If the repairs had been carried out properly over the years and if the maintenance had not been allowed to fall behind, we would not be faced with this situation. We cannot blame the local workers at Wallaroo, because they have pointed out the problems to me ever since I have been the local member. I have taken up the matter many times. They are frustrated out of their mind with the way the Government refuses to make moneys available.

If the repairs had been carried out, we would still have a safe situation. Mr Speaker, you may recall that for many years railway trucks went up and down Wallaroo jetty. People were allowed to fish then and it was completely safe. People were not fussed by the railway trucks going up and down and the operators of those trucks also did not mind the people fishing. Now, unfortunately, it has reached the stage where the people driving the trucks onto the jetty say that it is too dangerous for spectators or fishermen on the wharf, and as a result it has had to be closed off. It is a great tragedy. I hope that the Minister of Marine will endeavour to do something to try to bring some of our key jetties and wharves back to a state of proper repair. We have to look down the track at the long-term future of South Australia. That has not been done in the past decade and it certainly needs to be done now so that we can look forward to a positive future decade.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.53 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 20 August at 10.30 a.m.