

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 9 September 1992

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr M.J. Evans) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### PETITIONS

#### FISHING NETS

A petition signed by 804 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ban the use of monofilament gill nets in South Australian waters was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

#### FREEZERS ROAD RAILWAY CROSSING

A petition signed by 582 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to upgrade the Freezers Road railway crossing at Port Lincoln was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

#### JUVENILE OFFENDERS

A petition signed by 216 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to lower the age to 16 years at which a person is treated as an adult in criminal matters was presented by Mr Such.

Petition received.

### QUESTION

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

#### ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

In reply to Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen) 12 March.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Engineering and Water Supply Department manufactures a range of specialised components for use in the water and sewer infrastructure throughout the State keeping in focus the asset life, location of installation, inventory costs, current financial impact, capital and maintenance costs. After completion of construction of the infrastructures, the department assumes responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of the asset and thus has a vested interest in ensuring that suitable components of appropriate design and quality are included in the construction. Further, not all components required in construction are available in the market. For the sake of uniformity and ease of maintenance all departmentally-designed and manufactured components are preferred.

The costs of Ottoway manufactured items are constantly compared and monitored with prices which are obtained in the market place. Some items are dearer while the majority are cheaper and others are not available at all. In relation to the honourable member's example, the policy is to use Ottoway manufactured valves in a buried application because of the corrosion resistant qualities. The valves obtainable in the market

are inferior when the life of a total asset is considered. The cost comparisons over the years have shown that there are no overall and consistent savings available to the department if all of its needs are purchased in the open market. The Ottoway workshops supplement their production from private industry when resources and equipment are not available in-house.

The departmental policy to use Ottoway manufactured items is often questioned quoting examples of some cheaper alternatives available in the market. This policy is based on experience over the years that using items of several different designs and manufacturing origins complicates maintenance, increases labour and inventory costs resulting in increased costs to the customers. It is therefore not a question of subsidising the Ottoway Foundry but provision of a cheaper overall service to home owners.

#### AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Acting Speaker, this is a statement which relates to concerns over the future of the automotive industry in South Australia and the jobs of tens of thousands of South Australians. In recent days members will have read and heard of the disquiet expressed by leaders in the industry, not just in South Australia but in other States, over the Federal Liberal/National Coalition plans for a total removal of tariffs on imported vehicles. The policy, which calls for a zero level by the year 2000, was confirmed in statements by the Federal Opposition Leader, Dr Hewson, and his shadow industry spokesperson, Mr McLachlan.

Only today, Dr Hewson is reported in the *Australian Financial Review* as having emphatically reaffirmed that he would stick to his hard line position. Dr Hewson claimed that car industry leaders were colluding with the Federal Government over the issue. Members of Federal Parliament ought to be aware that the automotive and related industries are a vital part of this State's economy. South Australia supplies more than one-third of Australian motor vehicle production, and the share is growing. Direct employment in the industry is about 14 000 but, as well, this activity generates a further 40 000 jobs in our economy.

As honourable members would be aware, South Australians have long had a vital interest and involvement in debate about the industry and reform to it. As members would be aware, the State Government argued strongly to the Industry Commission in 1990 that a minimum tariff level of 25 per cent was required for the industry. We reluctantly accepted the decision to reduce the tariff to 15 per cent. However, we cannot stress too strongly that this figure must be an absolute minimum protection level for the automotive industry. Automotive exports have increased substantially in recent times and further improvements and greater investment in the industry are expected. However, these moves are predicated upon a minimum 15 per cent tariff regime in the year 2000. Even now, ongoing investment in the industry is being threatened by the uncertainty created by the Liberal/National policy proposal.

Recent comments by automotive industry leaders have clearly shown the disastrous consequences that would flow from a further reduction in tariffs. This would be particularly acute in South Australia, where the Managing Director of Mitsubishi Motors, Mr Mike Quinn, has said

his company would abandon plans to invest \$600 million in the State if a coalition Government imposed its proposed zero tariff policy on the industry. The comments echoed concerns expressed by other automotive industry representatives. A reduction in the automotive tariff to zero by the year 2000 would cause a significant fall in the GDP, a 5 per cent increase in imports, an increase in the current account deficit and a dramatic fall in employment.

Mr Acting Speaker, I have today delivered to the South Australian Opposition Leader a letter expressing these concerns. The letter is addressed to the Prime Minister and the Federal Leader of the Opposition. I believe it is essential that we have a bipartisan approach to this issue. Consequently, I invite the Opposition Leader to join with me in signing this letter so that both the Federal Government and Federal Opposition are left in no doubt about our united approach on this issue.

*Members interjecting:*

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

### OIL SPILL

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Marine):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** During Question Time yesterday the member for Morphett asked me a question concerning the ability of the Department of Marine and Harbors to control the oil spill and manage the clean-up operation. First, let me say that once again the Opposition has got its facts wrong. The member questioned whether sufficient tonnages of dispersants were held in reserve at Port Bonython by the Department of Marine and Harbors. Under the National Plan to Combat Pollution of the Seas by Oil, stocks of dispersants are provided and maintained at Port Bonython by Santos.

The Department of Marine and Harbors does not maintain stocks at this port as it would be a duplication of reserves. At the time of the spill, Santos had 10 tonnes of dispersant available. Of this, only 3 tonnes was used immediately after the spill occurred. On the day of the spill, the department arranged for 7 tonnes of dispersant to be transported to Whyalla airport for aerial spraying. Only 3 tonnes were used the following day.

The honourable member also questioned, and I quote, 'Why was it necessary to utilise a tug on its dash to Port Pirie, to bring back additional dispersal agents to assist the clean up operation to get under way, thus wasting valuable time?' I have been told by the Chairman of the State committee of the national plan that there was no such tug, either going to or coming from Port Pirie, as described by the honourable member. I do not know where the member for Morphett got his information from, but I might suggest he refrain from any further statements until he gets his facts straight.

In addition, the honourable member claimed the department had no reserves of dispersal agents or other boom equipment available other than at Port Pirie and Geelong. Again, the honourable member is completely misinformed. The Department of Marine and Harbors, on behalf of the Australian Maritime Safety Authority, has

oil spill equipment at Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Thevenard, Wallaroo, Port Giles and Port Adelaide. This was available for immediate transport to Port Bonython, had it been required. The equipment from the Australian Marine Oil Spill Centre at Geelong was obtained to supplement locally available equipment.

There is also an arrangement between all the States, the Australian Maritime Safety Authority and the oil industry to provide a pooling and sharing of dispersants and equipment should they be required by any party. The majority of equipment in the Spencer Gulf area was in the possession of Santos at Port Bonython. In accordance with a recent agreement, Santos indicated that it would give permission for use of this equipment for any oil spill in the area. Therefore, the movement of the oil slick towards Port Pirie was not caused by a lack of equipment as suggested by the member for Morphett but through rough weather conditions hampering containment measures.

As Minister of Marine, I resent this continual attack on the ability and expertise of the Department of Marine and Harbors to do the job. Might I suggest the Opposition wait until the findings of the investigation have been released before they make any further comment on the Port Bonython incident.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume his seat and not continue to talk over the Chair. The member for Coles.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, leave is given for ministerial statements, not for debate.

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

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The point of order is that the Minister is debating his statement.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister sought and obtained leave to make a statement; its content is a matter for the Minister but, of course, it must relate to public affairs and be a statement. I believe that the Minister has concluded his remarks, anyway.

### QUESTION TIME

#### TRANSPORT MINISTER

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** As the new Leader of the Government, will the Premier appoint a new Minister of Transport in an effort to reverse the alarming decline in public transport patronage which has now reached the lowest level since full bus and tram services became available in the metropolitan area in the 1930s? The Auditor-General's Report discloses that commuters are voting with their feet against rising fares and reduced services on STA bus, train and tram services.

The report states that the number of passenger journeys fell by more than 4 million last financial year and that losses by the STA amounted to a record \$138 million—\$9.3 million more than in the previous year. It has now been revealed that internal STA reports state that hundreds of disgruntled passengers are being left on the sides of roads because of cuts and changes to services,

suggesting even further cuts in patronage in the near future.

*Members interjecting:*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has asked his question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: For the purposes of answering this question, I will assume that the short answer is 'No' and take it from there. The Auditor-General's Report points out something that I have been saying for a few years now—

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is right. I have been saying that the STA has to reorient itself to serving the main highways and the main roads with buses and, of course, with our rail system. What the STA cannot do and will no longer continue to do is to attempt to service every individual in Adelaide at enormous expense.

*Members interjecting:*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: What we can do and what we do very well is to stick to our main trunk routes. An indication of that has been given in this House on a number of occasions, but the Deputy Leader was obviously not listening, so I will have to go through it again. Very good examples of what we are attempting to do, and do very successfully, was the introduction of transit link services and express services on our train system. Transit link services commenced at the Aberfoyle Hub. I was very pleased to see the member for Fisher at that launch. That has been enormously successful.

Hundreds of extra passengers have been attracted to public transport, because transit link gives commuters precisely what they want and, not coincidentally, it gives us what the taxpayers can afford, that is, a very high level, fast and well patronised bus service. But we have done more than that. We have extended that very successful trial to Elizabeth, where we now have a transit link service from Elizabeth through the Modbury interchange, using the O-Bahn. Again, patronage has increased by several hundred passengers, and it is very early days.

With respect to our express trains from the outer suburbs, again we have received very favourable comment, and I know that both the member for Price and the member for Semaphore, although he is not present, would agree; those express services from those areas have been an enormous asset to their constituents. However, there is another side to the coin, and we make no apologies for it: the STA costs every family in this State, irrespective of whether they live in Kimba—

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am just about to. Whether they are farmers doing it hard in Kimba—and the member for Mitcham would know nothing about that, having worked only in the public sector all his life—

Mrs KOTZ: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I refer you to Standing Order 127 relating to relevance in answer to a question. I believe that the honourable member asked when the Minister would be removed from his portfolio.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is aware of that. Comments about individual members clearly were not relevant to that but were a sideline from which I

assumed the Minister was quickly going to move on and conclude his remarks.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Whether one is a farmer from Kimba who is doing it hard, or a miner, again doing it hard in difficult areas of the State—for example in Roxby Downs, just to pull a name out of the air—one's household is paying about \$400 to the STA. There is an obligation on every member in this House—and there are a few members opposite who appreciate this fact—to ensure that, if we are using the taxes from the farmer in Kimba and the miner in Roxby Downs, or from the unemployed person in Elizabeth, those taxes are used efficiently. It is not efficient to run empty buses and trains with a handful of people on them, if we are lucky, after hours and at weekends. It is important that, where we can attract passengers, we direct our services in those areas. That is what we are doing.

Regarding the changes to the new timetables, there is absolutely no question that there are hundreds of bus routes. Most of them have been changed, and it will take several weeks for the hundreds of rosters to be sorted out. I believe there are some problems at one depot at lunchtime on Saturdays. I can assure members that those problems will be solved.

There is no doubt that hundreds of people have been inconvenienced on a Saturday at lunch time—there is no question about that—but members should bear in mind that we have about 1 000 vehicles—buses, trains and trams—and we have hundreds and hundreds of bus routes, coupled with about 200 000 boardings every day, with everyone going in different directions. Clearly, within that situation there is the potential occasionally for something to go wrong and it does, but the STA is moving in exactly the right direction, delivering services where they are needed and withdrawing from those services where people no longer require them.

#### ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning indicate the role the proposed Environment Protection Authority will have in developing policies to give South Australia a real chance of becoming a significant force in the environmental industry in our region?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Environment Protection Authority will provide South Australia with a real opportunity to develop technology that is of a world class and competitive standard and to provide an environmental industry that is indeed of world class. The concept of effective application of ecologically sustainable development principles has the capacity, I believe, not only to provide effective control but also to help build a world-class industry.

A key principle will be the involvement of the private sector. Rather than developing technical capacity in the public sector, I believe development should be directed to the private sector and certainly, while the Government acknowledges that the public sector will have a major and vital role in managing the proposed legislation, specific tasks of an applied or technical nature should be directed to the private sector to develop capabilities and capacities for export.

I refer members to the section of the Arthur D. Little report where, under the heading 'Conclusions on environmental standards needed to benefit attracted industries and the South Australian environmental industry', it clearly states:

... it is clear that environmental standards needed in South Australia should be world class and of an international standard as publicised by the South Australian Government for the MFP Australia.

It goes on to say, for those members who might be considered to be doubting Thomases:

This does not mean the toughest environmental standards in the world, as has popularly been described for the standards that exist in California. Rather, it requires that the proposed legislation be managed by an EPA organisation equipped to cope with:

- detailed provisions of ESD policy,
- private enterprise involvement,
- development of new export opportunities, and
- industry adjustment issues.

In conclusion, I would like to answer the honourable member by saying that the report again highlights the fact that benefits to be gained by the South Australian environmental industry from world-class standards should provide a number of significant opportunities, including the development of industry specific engineering services and the technology to be able to export our new industries and to market the established services and technologies to other States of Australia and to overseas markets.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** In fact, the answer is contained in the report and I invite the honourable member, if he is serious in his new capacity as the shadow Minister for Environment and Planning, to look at the report and pick up and support on a bipartisan basis some of the clear directions the report gives in terms of the establishment of an EPA and also in terms of support for the MFP development. It is a sad day when Opposition members do not have any vision and are not prepared to support on a bipartisan basis the clear directions that I believe this Government is taking in developing industry.

## WORKERS COMPENSATION

**Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Why has the Minister of Labour ignored repeated warnings by the Auditor-General about rising workers compensation claims, and what assurances can he give the House that he will now heed the latest such warning tabled in this House yesterday that 'additional strategies are needed to control workers compensation costs of Government'?

In 1990, the Auditor-General said that he was 'concerned with the results reported for the year ended 30 June 1990 which indicate workers compensation costs are again on the rise'. The 1992 report shows that claims in the last financial year rose to almost \$46 million, an increase of 10.4 per cent over the previous year. It also shows that stress claims have risen by 8 per cent, now costing \$18 600 per claim and accounting for nearly 25 per cent of the total cost of workers compensation claims in Government departments.

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I thank the member for Bragg for his question and note that the member for Goyder interjected that workers compensation ought to stop.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I am sorry; he said that the rot has not been stopped.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** Whilst the Auditor-General reports that claims expenditure in 1991-92 increased for the third year in succession, this was included in the estimated expenditure of \$46.5 million. For the benefit of the member for Bragg, it was actually \$45.9 million. So, we will come in under the estimated budget, and I think that will be a reasonable achievement. The rate of growth is an anticipated effect of changing from a lump sum settlement system to one of pension-style benefits, and the projected expenditure will begin to stabilise in the next financial year with a marginal increase of \$1.5 million to an overall cost of \$47.5 million.

The rise in expenditure in 1991-92 was principally due to a substantial increase in lump sum payments under the 1986 Act for permanent disability compensation and commutation of weekly benefits. This is a trend experienced by all workers compensation administrators in 1991-92, and not only by the Government scheme. However, an important influence on increased payments in the public sector in the past financial year was the bringing forward of lump sum payments through the voluntary separation process. As a result, approximately \$1.25 million was expended, and that normally would be spread over future years according to the worker's normal retirement date.

## CONFISCATION UNIT

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister of Emergency Services provide the House with information on the successful achievements by the Confiscation Unit of the South Australian Police Department? Recently, I received a request from a Seaton resident, who has a particular aversion to drug abuse, seeking information as to what has been achieved by the Confiscation Unit, particularly in the area of drugs.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** As most members would be aware, the Police Confiscation Unit was formed in August last year to carry out specialist investigations to identify, quantify and trace property forfeitable under the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act. During the first year of operation, the unit was involved in 32 separate cases. Between 1 August 1991 and 30 June 1992, I am told that total receipts paid into the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund under this Act amounted to a little less than \$144 000, of which \$121 000 was due to the work of the Confiscation Unit. Also, additional property valued at a further \$72 000 has been forfeited and is awaiting sale.

As the honourable member would appreciate, actions by the unit in any given year may flow on into future years. This flow-on effect for the year 1991-92 reveals

that property valued at \$277 600 has been restrained pending court results, and affidavits for further restraint orders totalling \$200 000 have been finalised and are awaiting court availability for hearing. The Police Department believes that, while it is impossible to predict what the outcome of court proceedings will be, the amount that will be put into the fund that has been generated by the unit in its first year of operation could eventually amount to approximately \$500 000.

#### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** I direct my question to the Premier—the actual Premier. Will his Government heed the warning of the Auditor-General and stop borrowing money to fund the Government's recurrent or day-to-day operational spending, and will he give an undertaking that a mini budget will be introduced to give effect to the Auditor-General's advice on this and other matters?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I think it would be appropriate if the member for Mitcham actually read what the Auditor-General said in the fullness of its context.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Well, yes, I could do that now. He pointed out that during a recession it is not unreasonable for a Government to have deficit funding arrangements—that it might have to borrow more money to enable its budget to be fulfilled. However, the point he goes on to make is what happens over the fullness of time; what happens when the good times come, when the economy has recovered; what happens when revenues have the opportunity to be greater than expenditure and hence be used for the retiring of debt. The Auditor-General's very salutary warning—which I certainly accept—is that when those times come debt should be retired rather than allowing expenditure to increase to match the revenue funds.

The reality is that this Government has done precisely that. When we inherited the financial problems bequeathed to us by the Tonkin Government, when this State had the major debt problems that we had at that stage, what took place? Between 1982 and 1990 there was a substantial reduction in the level of debt in this State. How was that funded? It was funded by the fact that we did not allow expenditure levels to match the revenue base of the State at that time and we used the funds to retire debt. That is precisely what will happen when good economic times come again and when we are able to get into a situation where revenue projections are better.

There is no doubt that in the present recession our revenue base has been sorely hit. The stamp duty figures were given in the budget, which was tabled a couple of weeks ago. So, when the economy picks up, so will revenue projections and, at that time, we should be in a better position to look at a debt retirement program.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Bragg will come to order.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** One of the other things that needs to be noted is that it is acknowledged that the

State Bank has presented all of us with a serious financial problem that has to be met and paid for at some point. However, what is the alternative that the member for Mitcham and all members opposite are suggesting? What are they actually saying? If they are suggesting, for example, that in this year's budget there should not have been any deficit situation, that the total money paid out in expenditures and in interest expenditures should have been matched by revenue, I can only say that two options could have achieved that.

One is a massive increase in the revenue base of the State, but not by means of increased economic activity being speculated upon in the next 12 months, because no projections would indicate that it would grow by that much to meet the revenue shortfall. The option would have been clearly a vast increase in taxes, which would have been very counter-productive for the health of this State's economy. The other option would have been to have wiped the amount off Government expenditures, to have simply taken the figures off all of the services that South Australians have a right to expect that their Government will deliver to the highest possible standard.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** That is right; there is the STA question that we had earlier on. We could forget the STA if it is the contention of members opposite that there should not have been a deficit this financial year; and we could forget maintaining quality of education in our schools, in the health system or in many other areas of Government. The facts are that, yes, I do note the comment of the Auditor-General and I do agree with his comment. That is precisely the philosophy that this Government has had over its tenure in office, and it is precisely the view that we will continue to hold to.

#### MOUNT REMARKABLE NATIONAL PARK

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Can the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House what were the reasons for implementing a self-registration park entry system for visitors to the Alligator Gorge section of the Mount Remarkable National Park?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for her interest in this question, because it is near her area. The Mount Remarkable National Park—

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I wondered whether he was awake.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I am sorry, Mr Deputy Speaker. I apologise to the member for Eyre. The honourable member is most interested in this area as I am sure the member for Eyre is. As both members and, indeed, other members who are interested in our national parks system will be aware, the Mount Remarkable National Park takes in two very special areas. One is the Alligator Gorge, which is to the north, and the other is the Mambray Creek area, which is to the west of Mount Remarkable. It is a fairly large national park and most of the facilities are concentrated in the Mambray Creek area. Therefore, it seemed appropriate, rather than duplicate

and have rangers collecting park entrance fees at both points, to introduce a system of self-registration, which means that all park visitors can contribute equitably towards the running of the park. The funds that are raised by people who frequent our parks go into maintaining facilities such as barbecues, picnic areas, walking trails, toilets, drinking water supplies and so on.

I should like to set the record straight by making sure that people understand how much the fees are. They are as low as \$3 per vehicle or \$1 per bus passenger. Local residents can purchase an annual pass to the area for \$30. We believe that the community will support this system. I call upon those members of Parliament who visit this area to show leadership in terms of this new system of self-registration entry to this particular park, namely, the Alligator Gorge section of the Mount Remarkable National Park.

### PUBLIC SECTOR FRAUD

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** My question is to the Premier. Why has the Government failed to ensure effective management controls within the public sector to prevent and detect fraud? In his 1990 report to Parliament, the Auditor-General drew specific attention to the need to ensure management controls were adequate to prevent fraud. He emphasised that this was a responsibility of management, not an auditor. However, his latest report reveals that 'in the majority of cases' of suspected fraud reported to the Auditor-General last financial year there was a breakdown in internal management control.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I do not accept that the Government has failed in this regard. We certainly note the comments made by the Attorney-General in this matter. I should like to point out what has happened. In September 1991 the Attorney-General officially launched the public sector fraud policy in conjunction with a seminar aimed at chief executive officers and senior officers of Government agencies and statutory authorities.

In addition to the launch of the policy and seminar the following are the main achievements that have taken place in the past year. A major seminar on 'ethics and fraud' with an international key note speaker was organised; all agencies on fraud prevention and control were written to, including guidelines on preparing fraud control plans; relevant information on strategies being employed by agencies to prevent and detect fraud was received; a series of visitations to CEOs of public sector agencies was organised (I believe that so far 10 have been visited); it was instrumental in having included in Government Management Board Annual Report guidelines a requirement for agencies to report on fraud prevention and control measures.

Further, it commented on Treasury guidelines re credit card usage; it organised a joint training course on fraud prevention with the Institute of Internal Auditors and the Anti-Corruption Branch; it had discussions with agencies on the production of video as an education tool; it was instrumental in making amendments to the Treasurer's instruction re the involvement of the Anti-Corruption Branch in the investigation of fraud matters in agencies; members of the committee have given papers and

presentations in a wide variety of forums; it wrote to the Government Management Board re the review of Government business operations to include a focus on fraud control mechanisms; it prepared a submission to the Commonwealth inquiry into fraud; and it conducted an information and training session on fraud and ethics for 25 middle managers as the first of a series of seminars to be conducted progressively over the next year. Sir, I think that indicates the actions that have been taken over the past 12 months, and I appreciate that the honourable member wants to hear that information.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** He asked the question, so he must want to hear the answer. The coordinating committee does not have investigative powers, but it works very closely with the Anti-corruption Branch of the Police Department and the Government Investigation Unit of the Attorney-General's Department. It should be noted that the thrust of the fraud policy and the coordinating committee is on the prevention and detection of fraud being a management responsibility consistent with the provisions and requirements of the GME Act. The coordinating committee believes that, in the short time it has been operating, it has had a significant impact in raising the awareness levels of senior public sector managers to the risks of fraud. In the coming year, the committee will continue its focus on education and awareness through training and information sessions and visitations to heads of agencies.

### MOTOR REGISTRATION DIVISION

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** Can the Minister of Transport assure the House that motor registry information is kept in the strictest of confidence? I have been contacted by a constituent who, when he received his renewal or registration, received in the same envelope information about SGIC, a pamphlet entitled 'Your next holiday could be on us', by JM Insurance and another leaflet telling him that, if he bought his next car from Bob Moran, he would not need to worry about registration for 12 months. My constituent wants an assurance that these and other companies do not have access to his motor registry files so they can offer him some even better deals.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I can give the member for Playford an absolute assurance that there is no question of advertisers or anyone else having access to Motor Registration Division information, other than those persons so authorised. I have had a number of comments from members on this side and none, as yet, from members opposite, but I know they will come, because their constituents will see it as an addition to the junk mail problem that very many people do not like, and I accept that. I know that the members for Albert Park and Napier have both had representations made to them on this issue—and I would add that it is not a problem.

By way of information to the House, I will explain what actually happens. Renewal notices are prepared by the Department of Road Transport and forwarded direct to State Print for folding and enveloping. State Print folds and inserts the enclosures on instructions from the Department of Road Transport. There is absolutely no

involvement of the firm advertising on the inserts in this process: it is all done within State Print. It was—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The honourable member can ask that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** It is a legitimate question, although it is out of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! It is quite out of order but legitimate.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Nevertheless, it is an interesting question and I will respond to it in the Estimates Committees, should it be asked there, which I think is perhaps a more appropriate place than this. I can advise the House—and I know that every member in the House will be pleased to hear—that the Department of Road Transport receives about \$500 000 for permitting these advertising inserts in relation to motor registration, and that money is used for roads, and everybody—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Supplementary questions are not permitted. The Minister of Transport will reply to the substance of the first question.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Again, it is appropriate to ask that question in the Estimates Committees. Half a million dollars is a useful sum and, whilst I understand that some people might think that we have given advertisers confidential information, that is absolutely not the case.

#### TAB INQUIRY

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I direct my question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** It's all right, sunshine.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair is concerned by continuing interchanges between members and asks them to refrain from that kind of cross-Chamber interjection. The member for Morphett wishes to ask a question.

**Mr OSWALD:** I direct my question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. What is the nature of the Solicitor-General's inquiry into the TAB? Does it involve any members of TAB management and potential conflicts of interest? Who instigated the inquiry? Are there any other inquiries being held into the TAB by other authorities?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** This matter was raised by the media yesterday, and no doubt the honourable member has already heard my response on the ABC or another station. Certain allegations were brought to my attention and I directed those allegations to the Chairman of the TAB with a request that the Chairman request an investigation by the Crown Solicitor. At this stage, that is all I should say with regard to those investigations pending the response from the Crown Solicitor. Let me say one further thing. It is important that I give a clear statement that this does not reflect on the financial stability or wellbeing of the TAB. It is still a very sound and successful organisation. At this point in time, that is all I can say. I will report to the House once I receive a full report from the Chairman of the TAB.

HA36

#### KIDS HELP LINE

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** My question is directed to the Minister of Youth Affairs. Will the Minister advise the House whether the Kids Help Line that was recently introduced in South Australia is just a duplication of existing services set in place to assist the youth of South Australia, and is the funding for the program guaranteed? I received a letter from an irate constituent who attended the launch of South Australia's first Kids Help Line and who claims that there are already sufficient services in place to assist young people and that the cost of Kids Help Line would be taken from existing programs, thereby resulting in an overall reduction in youth programs in this State.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The honourable member's irate constituent is quite wrong. The Kids Help Line, which has proved to be an outstanding service in Queensland, Northern Territory and Victoria, is completely privately funded. It is funded by the Boys Town organisation through the Boys Town Art Union. We all would have received at various stages those lottery tickets promising homes on the Gold Coast. That is how Kids Help Line is funded. There are 70 paid professional counsellors, and the Queensland-based free service responded to 207 000 calls last year, of which 75 000 were directly problem-related requiring counselling. Young people aged between 5 and 18 years have a service that caters specifically for their needs. Obviously there is an information explosion, despite the computer age, and many young people are not aware of the services that are available.

Certainly, it does not duplicate existing services. Indeed, it helps to fill a gap and acts as a referral agency for those excellent services that we have here in South Australia. It works very closely with the other agencies to ensure that the right referrals and advice are given. As I say, it is operating currently in Queensland, Northern Territory and Victoria, and from now in South Australia. Other States have established State reference groups to provide local information and feed-back on the quality of the service. The reports from interstate are certainly very good. I will be asking State Youth Affairs in South Australia to convene a State reference group for the Kids Help Line, and agencies will be contacted shortly regarding membership of this group.

It is very important that, where States have mandatory reporting for abuse, protocols be established with relevant welfare organisations to ensure that young people receive the protection of State agencies where possible. Often the calls are for just straight information. I am told by the organisers in Queensland, the De la Salle Brothers, that sometimes the calls relate to homework. They might relate to different things that are on or a youth might just want to have a chat. Often they are more serious, relating to family problems and so on.

Indeed, they found in Queensland that many of the calls related to young kids being worried about bullying in schools and how to go about that. Telecom is assisting Kids Helpline by setting up special three-way links so that a young person can ring the helpline and, rather than being left to their own resources to contact a professional counsellor, the counsellor calls the agency and they can have a three-way conversation. It is an excellent service,



and I was delighted to join Archbishop Faulkner in launching that service officially last week.

### INFORMATION UTILITY

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** Will the Premier accept responsibility for serious failures identified in the Auditor-General's Report tabled yesterday to control costs and ensure security in the introduction of computer systems in the public sector; if not, can he say who is responsible and will the Premier give assurances that the proposed information utility will not lead to further possible waste of taxpayers' money? When the former Premier was questioned on 6 May this year about the cost of the information utility, he said that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology had the responsibility in Government for the information technology area as indeed he has for the broad technology issues.

In successive reports from the Auditor-General since 1988, and from the Public Accounts Committee report on the Justice Information System, the Government has received increasingly strong warnings about the cost of computer systems and the need to ensure security. This has followed blow-outs costing more than \$40 million for the JIS, the motor registration computer and the courts computer, but in spite of those and previous warnings and the failures highlighted in the Auditor-General's Report—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable member is not debating—

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** No; this is pages XV and XVI of the Auditor-General's Report, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member to bring his explanation to a reasonable conclusion.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The Auditor-General is still highlighting, and I quote precisely:

... ineffective project management, substantial cost and time overruns, systems not meeting user needs, nor achieving expected user benefits and the absence of management and user commitment to projects at a time when the Government is intending to spend somewhere between \$60 million and \$170 million on the future computer system.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I note that the honourable member quoted from the Auditor-General's Report, pages XV and XVI. However, it seems that he was interspersing some comments of his own. I hope it is picked up in *Hansard* that certain of his references are not, in fact, in pages XV and XVI of the report. The matter of the information utility clearly is one that is being looked at very closely indeed to ensure that that project can deliver for South Australia the very best of information handling, the widest benefits resulting from information technology, with at the same time the most appropriate financial accountability and the most appropriate protections of individual rights.

The question was raised in this place a few weeks ago about my view on that matter, and I reiterate my concerns that, naturally, people have a right to have their information protected, and we will ensure that all the necessary safeguards are put in place to enable that to happen. The Auditor-General's comments will be well noted, and I might say that on previous occasions we

have listened carefully to his comments on matters such as this and made the necessary changes or adaptations to the program.

As to the question here, an extensive review of the guidelines was conducted in May 1991 with several agencies as pilot sites. This identified a number of deficiencies in this area and the process that highlighted the management implications of each. Even though this was a pilot for the guideline in South Australia, the pilot agencies chose to act on the vast majority of the recommended changes. The review also recommended changes to the GMB guideline in certain areas. These were considered by the Information Systems Management Advisory Committee Reference Group and the Information Technology Sub-Board in June this year.

The Information Technology Sub-board endorsed the report, and its general findings approved the following actions. First, the documents should be updated for ease of use and readability. It refers to other common environments such as personal computers, networks and non-IBM architectures, and recommends that in marketing the material more emphasis is needed on how the process itself highlights automatically the management implications of any deficiencies.

Secondly, the chief executives should be reminded of their obligations on security protection and standards with the release of the updated manual and an update to the information technology guidelines. Thirdly, the Auditor-General—this is very pertinent, and it would be appreciated if the member for Mount Gambier would actually listen to the answer to his own question—should be kept informed at strategic points in the process.

### TRANSIT LINK

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister of Transport advise whether patronage on the new transit link service from West Lakes Mall to the city has justified its provision? Last month, on behalf of the Minister, I was pleased to launch this service, which was the culmination of over 10 years of representations through my electorate office by many of my constituents.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I apologise to the member for Albert Park, because I was remiss in my response to the first question of the day from the Leader when I forgot to mention the transit link service at West Lakes. I will not canvass the whole debate again as to why transit link services were introduced.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I know, but it is certainly not necessary as it would be fresh in the mind of everyone in the House. However, I will refer specifically to the transit link service between West Lakes and the city. In just three weeks it has shown an increase in patronage of about a third. In the first week, 439 people a day used the new service; this increased by 25 per cent in week two to 549; and in week three, as I said, by about a third to 582 passengers.

After the service has been in operation for a couple of months, we will survey the passengers to find out how many are new to the STA, because the thing that pleased us most about the first transit link service to the Aberfoyle Hub was the number of people who had not



previously travelled on public transport but who, because of the express service, had decided to use public transport. We will do the same thing with the West Lakes-City service, as well as the Elizabeth-City service, because as I stated earlier—and I will not go into detail now—I believe very strongly that, if you give people the services they want, public transport is a very viable option for most people in Adelaide, although I concede that for some people we will have to make other arrangements, such as the taxi link service in the electorate of the member for Bright.

### FIREARMS

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** What action will the Minister of Emergency Services take to discover the whereabouts of 3 600 firearms which, according to the Auditor-General's Report, are unlocated in South Australia; what action will he take to enforce the registration of 16 000 unregistered firearms, which are in the community; and does he concede that the existence of such large numbers of unregistered and unlocated firearms represents an opportunity for a black market in firearm sales? I have been approached by representatives of responsible shooting clubs who have expressed concern about the poor enforcement of firearm registration. They are concerned at the possible ramifications of this, including the potential for a black market in firearms.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I congratulate the honourable member. These firearms are actually a real issue unlike the issue he raised regarding 20 white fire trucks which he indicated were somewhere but which he has not yet been able to find for me. The Auditor-General in his report indicated that he had asked the Commissioner to make an extra couple of people available, and the department had responded that it was in the process of making several extra people available to work on the backlog on the new computer system.

Indeed, the comment that the Auditor-General made was that a check in early to mid August revealed that those people had not yet been taken on in that capacity. I have certainly put the issue down as something that I need to talk about with the Commissioner at our next meeting to ensure that that is done as quickly as possible, because I am as concerned as the honourable member that something needs to be done about it. As the Auditor-General also—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** —indicated in his report to the Parliament, a new computer system was up and running and that consequently—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** —it was not possible to compare the figures for this year with the figures for last year. Certainly, it is something that needs to be dealt with and I will be dealing with it.

### ROYAL SHOW

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Will the Minister of Education advise the House what effect the four-term school year has had on attendances of school students at the royal show?

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair cannot hear the explanation. The member for Stuart.

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** From discussions with students and parents in my electorate it is my understanding that the royal show is not only an enjoyable experience that tens of thousands of children look forward to each year but it is also used by a number of teachers as a learning opportunity for their students. As all members would be aware, over the years the date of the royal show has actually been scheduled during term time.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for her question and, as all members would know, record numbers of people are attending the show at this time. Royal Adelaide Show Society officers have advised me that they believe that a strong influence on the record attendances is the number of school students who are attending the show in school groups as part of their formal study programs. I believe there is a number of very fine exhibits of an educational nature and other educational opportunities for students as part of the show.

I want to put on the record the appreciation of the Education Department for those businesses, organisations and departments that have made a special effort to involve and include an educational component in their exhibits. The Agricultural Learning Centre, which is the Education Department's contribution in conjunction with the Commonwealth Bank and many other groups in our community, has staged what is a very effective learning experience for students. In fact, some 300 students are involved in the running of that centre and, of course, many dedicated teachers are attending each day and evening throughout the period of the show. There is also at the royal show the standing exhibit—the Hands On Science Centre.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The level of conversation is too loud. The Minister of Education.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** There is the Investigator Centre, which attracts many students throughout the year, but particularly at royal show time. There is also the photon flier component of the ETSA pavilion and many other opportunities for students to participate in a formal and educative way during their visit to the show. For those reasons the show is now proving to be a very valuable addition to the curriculum of students in our schools throughout the year.

### MOUNT LOFTY PROJECT

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I direct my question—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** —to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Will the Minister provide the

House with details of what is seen as a special arrangement between the Government and the consortium which, over a six and a half year period, has been allowed to delay continually the commencement date of the Mount Lofty project? The consortium has repeatedly sought to delay the commencement date for this project, while other developers—at least one of which responded to the expression of interest called for by the Minister in February 1986—could have completed some years ago a development which would provide an attractive focus for tourism in this State on a site which, for almost a decade, has been recognised as a Government disgrace by the many tens of thousands of people who visit the area each year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The concluding comment was clearly out of order. The Minister for Environment and Planning.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Notwithstanding the way in which the honourable member asked the question, I do take this matter very seriously and would like to provide him with a detailed answer. The honourable member will be aware that Cabinet made a decision to allow the current proponents of the development to organise the proposal and to seek finance to move forward with the proposal. The honourable member will also be aware that there was some controversy surrounding the proposal initially which called for a cable car to go down over the top of the waterfall, and that created quite a furore within the South Australian community. Cabinet approved a scaled down proposal, which the current proponents then took into the marketplace to seek financial support for. As we have been in an economic recession—and I am sure the honourable member would acknowledge this—they were unable to get finance for that proposal.

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I was asked a question and I am very happy to provide a full and frank answer. If the honourable member would pay me the courtesy of listening to what I have to say, I would be very pleased to provide that answer.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for 545 Victoria is out of order.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** The proponents of the development came to see me recently with a scaled down version which did not have the Omnimax Theatre, but had a number of smaller though equally attractive elements, and asked whether as a Cabinet we would be prepared to give them until the end of September to arrange finance, because there was a proposal at which they were looking.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I am very happy to provide the honourable member with the decision, because I have communicated that decision personally and today in writing to the proponents of the development; that is, that Cabinet is prepared to provide a time frame only until the end of September—

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I am quite happy for the honourable member to embark on his usual bullying tactics. I can stand here and cope with them because I am used to the braying of the honourable member and the fact that he is usually lacking in substance when he asks questions. Notwithstanding that, I am very happy to provide the information to the rest of the Parliament. The current proponents have only until the end of September to provide to the Government a commitment that they have the necessary funding, and there are a number of other conditions that the Cabinet has put on this development.

I say very clearly that if they do not provide that information by the end of September Cabinet will look at calling for a range of interests or other proponents to come forward with their projects, schemes and proposed developments. I think it is fair and reasonable to ask the Government to give the proponents until the end of September, and we have been prepared to do that. If Opposition members think that we just cut people off when they have been prepared to scale down a development and to seek community and other support, let them state that publicly; that is fine. The Government is not prepared to do that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I assume the Minister is concluding her remarks.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** All I can say is that we were prepared to give them a fair and reasonable time, and that will expire at the end of September.

#### CROYDON PARK TAFE

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Will the Minister for Employment and Further Education tell the House what the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education plans to do with premises at Croydon Park College of TAFE vacated by the closure of the hairdressing school; and, further, when will child-care facilities at Croydon Park College of TAFE be upgraded to licence standard?

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister of Employment and Further Education.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** These are tough questions but ones I am prepared, even without notice, to try to address at the end of Question Time. Of course, the honourable member is a passionate supporter of TAFE in his area, and is constantly on my back regarding upgraded facilities, so I am very pleased to be able to announce today that work estimated to cost \$650 000 will start on the Croydon College of TAFE this month. Croydon College of TAFE is one of the largest colleges in South Australia, offering a number of specialised courses, including business and commercial studies. It is also the sole State provider of the Certificate in Land Broking course.

The honourable member is right in mentioning that the recent rationalisation of space has resulted in the relocation of the School of Hairdressing from old and inadequate studios at Croydon to other metropolitan colleges to cater for growing needs. I know that the member for Newland would be aware of the facilities at the Tea Tree Gully College of TAFE. I am pleased to be able to tell the honourable member that the

redevelopment of the 900 square metre building will be ready early next year to cater for computer laboratories, community service areas and additional space for teaching courses.

The other part of the honourable member's question, of which he did not give me notice, related to child-care facilities, and I am very pleased to be able to tell him (and I will answer the question) that child-care facilities will be upgraded to licence standard by about February next year, and the service will not be interrupted during the changes. It is interesting to note that the college currently provides the largest State funded program in preparatory education. This includes a Certificate in Women's Studies and the new opportunities for women's courses, of which I know many members of this House are aware and support.

The upgraded college will better cater for the needs for unemployed in the area by providing courses that teach the skills most suitable for local industry requirements. Croydon's empire ranges far and wide, and this morning I was very pleased to be able to visit the North Adelaide School of Art to see its brilliant exhibition of works. Indeed, I recommend that all members visit their local TAFE colleges. Certainly, the member for Hanson and other members in this House make a very strong contribution to the provision of TAFE. TAFE is only as good as its community links and its industry links. What we need is members of Parliament from both Houses in this State who are willing to get in there and work to make this the best TAFE system in the country.

---

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The question is that the House note grievances.

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Yesterday I brought to the attention of the House the history of the unlawful closure of Barton Road, North Adelaide, and gave a few reasons why it ought to be reopened. I also sought to defend the people of the western suburbs against the libel cast on them by Mr Michael Abbott, QC, the Soapy Sam Ballard of the Adelaide Bar, who spoke for the North Adelaide establishment on Monday night in favour of the permanent closure of Barton Road. Abbott, QC, asserted without adducing evidence that the crime rate in that part of North Adelaide had dropped since the road had been closed against the people of Hindmarsh. Abbott, QC, said that increased traffic in Hill Street and Barton Terrace West, coming from the town of Hindmarsh, would lead to 'opportunistic and spur of the moment breaking and entering' and that the 'increased number of people leads irresistibly to that kind of behaviour'.

By these words, Abbott, QC, has established himself as Adelaide's No. 1 snob, a man willing to peddle a hurtful untruth for self-interest or a big retainer. Abbott, QC, could have maintained some decency and honour by saying straightforwardly that he did not want western suburbanites or their vehicles spoiling his residential amenity and bringing down property values. That was his brief. However, when Abbott, QC, implied that as a group western suburbanites were so prone to crime that,

filing through Barton Road one by one, they would increase North Adelaide's crime rate, his libelling put him beyond the pale. In closing this point, I should add that, as Adelaide's leading defence counsel, Michael Abbott, QC, of necessity mixes with criminals more often than do the people he accuses of a propensity to criminality.

I shall now deal with some of Michael Abbott's other arguments which were made with more dignity than was the argument I have been discussing. Mr Abbott argued that, if Barton Road were opened, some western suburbanites would use it as a route to the central business district instead of using it as a local access to western North Adelaide. He went on to ask, 'How do you identify a responsible driver from an irresponsible driver; a visitor to North Adelaide from a man on his way to work?' When Mr Abbott uses the verb 'identify', he means 'distinguish'. His is a good point, but the answer is to structure the Barton Road junction with signs, pavers, an S bend and narrow entrances so that city bound traffic will be deterred from using it. I think this deterrence can be achieved, because the city council's own report shows that Barton Road is not the quickest way to the city at any time of the day compared with Port Road or War Memorial Drive.

Abbott, QC, asked, 'Do St Dominic's School and Calvary Hospital really want Hill Street turned into a major arterial corridor to the city? I cannot believe that that is so.' Of course those institutions do not want that. What Mr Abbott avoids is that neither those in authority at St Dominic's nor those in authority at Calvary Hospital believe that the re-opening of Barton Road will lead to Hill Street's becoming a major arterial corridor. They support the re-opening of Barton Road for the good it will do for the vast majority of their employees and clients. They have taken a decision in the general interest.

The North Adelaide establishment is outraged by this and is trying to pressure and brow beat them into changing their mind. I shall detail this brow beating—in particular, that perpetrated by the odious Dr Hammerton of Hill Street—on another occasion. Michael Abbott, QC, can accuse Calvary Hospital and St Dominic's of false consciousness or betrayal of their immediate neighbours. He cannot say that they support his case.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** In February 1986 the Minister for Environment and Planning called for registrations of interest in regard to a development proposed on the St Michael's site adjacent to Mt Lofty. Members will realise that three years earlier that site had been devastated by the Ash Wednesday bushfires. That area has always been a favourite tourist destination, attracting tens of thousands of visitors each year. Earlier today I asked the Minister whether she would provide to the House details of what is seen as a special arrangement, and I use that term advisedly, between the Government and the consortium which, over a 6½ year period, has been allowed to continually delay the commencement date for that project. I find it hard to believe that the Government has been prepared to continue to allow the originally selected consortium to play around with a proposal for the St Michael's site virtually since 1986.

My particular concern is that there are other developers waiting in the wings who would be able to commence work immediately on a project on that site. In fact, many of them were prepared to commence building some time ago, but it seems very wrong that an exclusive offer made some six years ago can continue to be the only consideration of the Government. That is why it is important that those details be provided to this House. I am aware of other proposals which were put forward when the original expressions of interest were called for and which could have been up and running now. Proposals were put forward which were, and more importantly still are, valid, entirely appropriate and environmentally sound. Further, they would conform with all legislation, SDP and hills face requirements, are of a feasible scale and viability, and would provide a dynamic and highly attractive focus for both local and tourist visitors to Adelaide generally and to the Hills tourist recreation areas in particular. Yet, such proposals for this most significant site have been ignored. In fact, more than that: they have been rejected out of hand whilst the Government continues to want to know only about the exclusive offer made to the consortium in 1986.

In her response to my question today, the Minister said that the consortium had until the end of September this year to indicate whether it was able to find the finances to be able to proceed with that development. That is all very well, but the fact is that at least twice previously—and perhaps more than that—the Minister has made a similar request of the consortium. In fact, the consortium was supposed to have come up with a funding arrangement before the end of June, and that was further extended. Now we learn that it has until the end of September.

I do not believe that that is good enough. For 6½ years the Minister has played around with this site and with the future of this development. It is essential, for tourism in this State and because of the importance of that site, that a decision be made, particularly when other developers, had they been given the opportunity, would have had that development up and running well before this. I know that the first project put before the public met with some expressions of concern and, in fact, I was concerned about the original development, but the fact is that it has now been scaled down to an appropriate size and, if the consortium is to proceed, it should do so immediately. If not, it should stand down and inform the Minister so that other proposals can be considered. I hope that this matter will be sorted out once and for all at the end of September, as indicated by the Minister.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** A number of recommendations from the Arthur D. Little report exhort South Australians to build on the existing expertise that we have in this State. I do not disagree with that for a moment, because there is much expertise out there in the community. In my electorate of Albert Park there is a classic illustration of the engineering skills and expertise of a local company, and of course I refer to West Lakes Limited, which is now known as Delfin. As all members know, Delfin has developed West Lakes. I raise this issue because in May this year West Lakes was crowned the best real estate project in the world, and that achievement is worth pondering.

*Mr Oswald interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** The honourable member asks who is the member for that area, but we all know that I am the local member. This development is unique and one of which South Australia can be proud. The company could go overseas and sell its expertise. Mr Brian Martin, the manager of the company, together with all his staff have done exceedingly well. The award was provided by the French-based International Real Estate Federation, which represents more than one million real estate professionals throughout the world.

If we could get just a small percentage of those people to visit South Australia and look at West Lakes it would be worth many millions of dollars, not only in terms of the number of people visiting the development and seeing the skills and talking to Delfin management, because I suspect the company would have honed up on its skills since the development commenced in 1968, but also in terms of the marketing sale of some of those skills overseas.

West Lakes is reputed to be Australia's largest urban development and, as I indicated, it began about 20 years ago, transforming and developing about 200 hectares of wasteland. Those of us who lived in the area at the time know what an enormous task that was. This FIABCI Prix D'Excellence award was judged by a nine-member panel, which travelled the world assessing 12 finalists who were chosen from 43 entries.

We have the expertise and skills and this company and its management need to be congratulated. The early 1970s was a difficult time for the company. True, in South Australia there are many knockers, and when things get tough some knockers throw up their hands and say, 'The world is coming to an end.' However, here is a company that has proven by persistence and doggedness that it has a world-class development and one that I hope the company, if it is not already doing so, is marketing. I hope it can bring more and more people to South Australia—not just in terms of West Lakes, because the company is developing Golden Grove and I hope to have a lot more to say later about the skills of the Delfin company, which all members of the House will congratulate on its success.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** This afternoon I would like to respond briefly to the ministerial statement by the Minister of Marine in respect of the Port Bonython oil spill. Like most members in this House, I will be looking forward to the findings of the investigation when they are released and I have no intention of getting embroiled in the public debate on the details of what happened, other than to pick up a couple of points in the Minister's statement this afternoon. The Port Bonython facility is comprised of a jetty running out to the sea and across the end of the jetty is a T-section along which the ships are moored. The shoreline comes out along or under the jetty, although I do not have knowledge of it, but it follows the line of the jetty out to the T-junction and from there it connects—

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. There is to be an official inquiry but as yet I cannot advise the House whether it will be a judicial inquiry, but would the matter to which the member for Morphett refers be *sub judice*?

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr GUNN):** Order! I cannot uphold the point of order because it is not *sub judice*. However, I ask the member for Morphett to give an assurance that he will not mention matters that may be the subject of litigation.

**Mr OSWALD:** Certainly, I give that assurance, Sir. I would like to respond to the point of order, which is just one of the many irrelevant points of order that we get from Government members, and that member in particular who has tried—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest to the member for Morphett that he does not continue along that line, because otherwise he is inviting further points of order. The member for Morphett.

**Mr OSWALD:** I know that I might be inviting further points of order, because the honourable member does attempt to trivialise the activities of the House. However, I will now return to the subject at issue. I was trying to give the honourable member some background information on the jetty and to explain that the fuel lines come out along the jetty to the T-junction and hook onto a discharge point. When ships come alongside, the connection is made and the fuel is transferred from shore to the ship. The operators of the facility are responsible for carrying sufficient dispersants and other equipment to cater for any spillage involving their facility and occurring somewhere along the jetty.

Under an agreement, they have determined that that particular dispersant and equipment can be used around the jetty in the event of an oil spill such as this. However, the point that I made in my question was that there were no reserves over and above what would be needed for a major oil spill associated with the rupturing of lines associated with the loading of oil out to the linkage point. This should all come out in the inquiry, but therein lies some of the difficulties to be encountered in the inquiry. There were no reserves if it had been a major oil spill.

Members are familiar with the Richter scale. On a scale of 100 down to zero, the actual quantity of oil that was released would be at the lower end say, 10 or 15 points: a very small quantity of oil was discharged. If it had been a major oil spill and many more hundreds of tonnes of oil had been discharged, the Department of Marine and Harbours did not have the tonnage of dispersants available, and they would have had to be brought in at short notice.

My reference to the tug came from local knowledge. I did not refer in my question to 'a tug', as the Minister said, but to 'the tug' that went over to Port Pirie and, in the inquiry, the matter will be pursued as to whether the tug was the vessel bringing back some extra dispersant. The fact is that the department had not foreseen a major oil spill there and did not have available the required quantity of dispersants. The Minister admitted that in his reply when he said that they flew some supplies to the Whyalla airport in case they needed them. Although I am sure that much will come out in the inquiry, many questions will have to be answered.

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

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I put this matter to the Parliament with great reluctance, but I can only draw the conclusion from the activities of the Liberal Party over the last couple of days that it must have been bought off by overseas interests. The Federal Liberal Party's policy decision a policy to reduce tariffs to zero levels can only be described as giving in to the international quislings. In South Australia, over 14 000 people are directly employed by the motor industry, and this decision by the Federal Liberal Party to destroy that industry can only create one of the biggest and blackest holes in South Australian industry that we have ever seen.

I am amazed that not one member of the State Liberal Party has suggested in this House that their Federal colleagues are wrong. They are the lackeys of the Zurich gnomes, and the only conclusion I can draw is that they are trying to sell their wheat and wool on overseas markets and, in order to do so, are prepared to destroy the motor industry and, in particular, the South Australian motor industry. They are living in a Utopian Fuhrerland. Mr Quinn, the Managing Director of Mitsubishi Motors, said yesterday that Mitsubishi would walk away from a \$100 million engine plant expansion and would not proceed with a new Magna model under the Coalition's plan.

**An honourable member:** Do you believe him?

**Mr FERGUSON:** I definitely believe him, because if tariffs in South Australia were reduced to zero, then industry—

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** Take your medicine and get back in your straightjacket.

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, I take exception to that remark from the member for Henley Beach, in that he is reflecting on me by suggesting that in some way I am dependent upon medication for my sanity. That is a reflection on my—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair heard the remark by the member for Henley Beach and requires him to withdraw it, because it is unparliamentary.

**Mr FERGUSON:** In deference to you, Sir, and to the House, I unreservedly withdraw, and I hope I shall be able to continue my speech without interruption from the member for Murray-Mallee.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The Chair will ensure that that occurs.

**Mr FERGUSON:** Thank you very much, Sir. Not only is the \$100 million engine plant expansion in jeopardy but it has been estimated by Mr Quinn that investment in South Australia that would be harmed by this decision amounts to \$600 million. Only the other day we heard from the Leader of the Opposition in his new role that, if he was able to get into power, he expected to increase the gross State product by 4 per cent per year for every year between now and the end of the century. How could he possibly do that?

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

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I wish to raise the matter of outside school hours care and, in doing so, I wish to read part of a letter from a group in my electorate at Hawthorndene. This letter, which was

written to the Senior Project Officer of the Outside School Hours Care and VAC Care, states:

This letter details the collective concerns of the following School Committees:

Hawthorndene OSHC

Hawthorndene Primary School Council

in relation to present and possible future funding arrangements for Outside School Hours Care services.

A. Present procedures and processes in relation to accessing funding for Outside School Hours Care:

- (i) The above OSHC programs have been set up since initial funding to the Mitcham Hills local government area was allocated. These services have been in place for up to three years, meet the CSO licensing requirements and have forwarded the required 'expressions of interest' to appropriate bodies.

Because of the current structure of funding, however, we have all been operating for a relatively long period without access to funding . . .

The key point is that a process/mechanism needs to be established to ensure that new service providers obtain access to the existing pool of resources within the declared statistical/local government area.

B. Future Funding Arrangements:

The overwhelming majority of children using our services have parents who are in the work force. A significant portion of this group are sole parent families. The Commonwealth Government's stated highest priority is supporting labour market participation by providing funding to ensure the affordability, supply and quality of child-care for families.

Our centres provide services mainly to these families, but at this stage received no funding. We obviously seek funding in the planned national expansion of places in Outside School Hours Care. This funding is essential to ensure affordability and the continuation of the high standard of care that is currently provided. With current award rates, the quality and possibly even existence of these programs is put at great risk.

The key points are:

(i) Need to access funding as soon as possible to ensure continuation of quality service, particularly given that our clientele are the Commonwealth Government's stated highest priority.

Enclosed together with this letter is our expression of interest re-submitted. We understand that a review was undertaken in March of this year wherein community response was obtained in relation to the issues paper 'Commonwealth child care fee relief and operational subsidies'.

What we need to know urgently is when will funds become available to our centres given:

- (i) need for support;  
 (ii) being disadvantaged to date, by our inability to access funding either  
 (a) new  
 (b) existing funding within our area.  
 (iii) our clientele constitutes the highest stated priority yet there has been no flow through of resources to them;  
 (iv) our need to keep costs at a level which ensures affordability and maintenance of the quality services we have provided to date.

As much as that is a Commonwealth matter, I raise it as a grievance in this House because the same philosophy of Government is in power in this State as is in Canberra. The present Government is quite quick to get up and attack a policy of the Federal Opposition, but it does not attack its own colleagues for not meeting the commitments that they promised they would keep by saying that this type of outside school care for children will get a high priority.

As far as my electorate is concerned, it does not have a high priority. It is obvious that the Hawthorndene group has been disadvantaged. There are others in my area who do get some subsidy. I understand that and appreciate it. However, surely they should all be able to get some funding if the Commonwealth Government is to stick by

its word. It has not done that. I will take the opportunity of writing to my Federal colleague to ensure that the matter is taken up federally. I hope that members who sit on the socialist side of the House realise what is happening with the so-called promises that are not being kept and that people are being disadvantaged by that.

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

## ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I bring up the third report of the Economic and Finance Committee entitled 'Inquiry into the Public Accountability of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board' and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

## LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I bring up the minutes of evidence given before the Legislative Review Committee on the Corporation of Brighton By-law No. 1 concerning the control of the foreshore and move:

That the minutes of evidence be received.

Motion carried.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I bring up the minutes of evidence given before the Legislative Review Committee on Rules under the Magistrates Court Act concerning civil jurisdiction and move:

That the minutes of evidence be received.

Motion carried.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I bring up the sixteenth report of the Legislative Review Committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

## STAMP DUTIES (CONCESSIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 26 August. Page 391.)

Clause 2—'Exemption from duty in respect of certain maintenance agreements, etc.'

Mr LEWIS: Madam Acting Chair, I would suggest that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

## GAMING MACHINES

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I seek leave to amend the motion standing in my name to read:

This House urges the Government to establish regulations which require licencees of premises in which poker machines and other electronic gaming machines are installed for public use to ensure that the people who play them are not at risk of losing their family's housekeeping money or becoming bankrupt, and which require the licencee, if that happens, to:

1. Refund sufficient money of the player's losses to prevent his or her family becoming dependent on tax payers through the welfare system; and
2. Pay an equal sum as a fine into a fund used to research the adverse consequences of gambling and assist in ameliorating its effects in the community.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member is seeking leave to move the motion in an amended form. The amended form would then replace the motion on the Notice Paper. Is leave granted?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is the member for Napier granting or refusing leave?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I am seeking clarification, Sir.

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

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I would have thought that the amended motion would have been placed before all members of the House prior to our making a decision about whether or not to grant leave.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If members choose to circulate or discuss matters, that is not the province of the Chair or the Standing Orders. The Chair is placed in the position that the honourable member has sought leave to move the motion in an amended form. The Chair has asked whether leave is granted. If any member does not wish to grant leave, he or she must indicate that now.

Leave granted; proposed motion amended.

**Mr LEWIS:** Thank you, Sir, and I thank the House for allowing me to move the motion in an amended form. Accordingly, I move:

This House urges the Government to establish regulations which require licencees of premises in which poker machines and other electronic gaming machines are installed for public use to ensure that the people who play them are not at risk of losing their family's housekeeping money or becoming bankrupt, and which require the licencee, if that happens, to:

1. Refund sufficient money of the player's losses to prevent his or her family becoming dependent on tax payers through the welfare system; and
2. Pay an equal sum as a fine into a fund used to research the adverse consequences of gambling and assist in ameliorating its effects in the community.

The ideas contained in the amended motion are—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I assume the member does have copies to bring to the table.

**Mr LEWIS:** I do not know whether or not they are available, Sir. I have my copy.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am sure that copies can be made available.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am certain they can, Sir.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member may choose to speak to it while copies are being prepared.

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes, Sir. The motion, in its amended form, says the same kinds of things as were embraced by the original motion, except that it poses the proposition in more positive terms. It does not include any comment about the likelihood of a gambler committing suicide. As the House has recognised, that is the only difference, and

it is an insignificant difference in any case. It simply reduces the preconditions in which the proposition of the House would require the Government to act through drafting regulations upon this particular set of circumstances.

In addressing the substance of the motion, I point out that, at the time we allowed for the installation of electronic gaming devices in the Casino, we were given an assurance that the Government would investigate the sociological consequences of gambling in the community. We were given that same commitment years before when the Casino licence was first granted. On neither the first occasion when that commitment was given, nor on the occasion when the reassurance was given that it would be taken up immediately and complied with, has there been any attempt by the Government to do that. I believe that it is now incumbent on this House to remind the Government of its commitment in both contexts to do one and the same thing: to investigate the sociological consequences of gambling and, in the process of carrying out that research, to discover ways in which those adverse consequences, wherever they arise, can be ameliorated or salvaged.

You, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I know, as do many other members to whom I have spoken, that there will be instances when people will choose to gamble when they cannot afford to do so. Equally, we know that when that occurs the cost will be enormous not only to the taxpayers in South Australia but to the families which are adversely affected by the consequences of the ill-advised gambling of one of the care givers and providers in the family. The effect will be devastating. The family will suffer and the taxpayers will be expected to pick up the pieces.

To my mind that is not reasonable. As a Parliament we have passed legislation, but the legislation relating to electronic gaming machines and poker machines is silent in every respect on whether or not there is any obligation on the owner to ensure that no-one suffers if it is used by someone who, as an adult, is entitled to use it in law but is not capable of exercising sufficient responsibility for their families or themselves in the process of using it to the extent that they lose the money in their possession which should have been applied to the purpose of providing essential food and clothing and the like for their family and money essential for the purpose of securing their solvency.

I believe that the House must therefore act to ensure that the rest of the community is not required to pick up the tab for the devastation which will occur to the families affected and to the individuals who, without having the personal capacity to control their urges, gamble themselves into bankruptcy, losing everything they have and throwing themselves on the mercy of the State. Normally I am committed to and advocate the free exercise of discretion, but only in circumstances where it does not result in the individual becoming dependent on others.

We have provided the means by which people and businesses which are licensed for the purpose of selling alcohol can also be licensed to install electronic gaming devices or poker machines. We now allow that to happen in a way which will ensure that the owners of the machines who make the investment in those machines



will make a profit. We have licensed them to have the right to make a profit.

Some gamblers—very few in number—will in fact win despite the odds, but the vast majority of gamblers, as all thinking members know, will lose. The majority of people who play those machines, in keeping with the legislation licensing their operation and use, will lose. They will have some fun; that is their entertainment and their right. Whether we agree with that or not is another debate that we have had and the vote has been taken. It is not part of this debate. This debate is about whether or not the people who are going to profit from providing that kind of entertainment, which is about giving excitement to somebody in the prospect of winning against the odds, should be allowed to profit from doing so at the expense of the rest of the tax-paying community.

It is known in other constituencies that the cost of gambling is greater than the taxes raised. It is a fact. We required and were given assurances by the Government that we would have an investigation into the sociological and economic consequences of gambling. We have not been given that researched information. No attempt has been made by the Government to do it, and the ground on which the Government has refused to do it, around the lobbies and corridors of this building, is that there is no money to do it.

Already, millions upon millions of dollars have been collected as gambling tax from the Casino, yet none of that money has been made available for the purpose. This motion then seeks to direct the Government to do what this House can require it to do by such motions, namely, do that research and discover the consequences. Also, we are saying that nobody who has a licence to sell liquor and an additional licence to install poker machines can derive profit from their operation at the expense of the taxpayers of South Australia without otherwise being accountable. It should not be an expense on the taxpayers through the welfare system when the housekeeping money is lost and the family suffers or the gambler loses so much of what they have that they become bankrupt.

The motion provides quite simply that the Government at least should require the licensee to be responsible, to ensure that anyone who plays on their poker machines can demonstrate that they are not using housekeeping money or putting at risk their personal solvency by doing so. If by chance the licensee does not take that precaution, the taxpayers will be protected, because the licensee will have to refund sufficient money to the player to ensure that the family who will otherwise be deprived can indeed have its needs met by that breadwinner and, in the second set of circumstances, that the person and their family who depends on that individual—if there is a dependent family—will not suffer the ignominious consequences of bankruptcy. In any event, where the licensees fail to satisfy themselves that the player is indeed capable of gambling without putting either of those two circumstances at risk, they must not only refund sufficient money to the player but also pay an equal sum as a fine into a fund which would then be used as a dedicated fund to research the adverse consequences of gambling and to assist in ameliorating its effects in the wider community.

What could be fairer than that? If one seeks to profit by tempting someone to taste excitement in a form which is habit forming to the extent that they are prepared to risk more than they can afford to risk and then to throw themselves and family on the mercy of welfare services, the person who profits should not be allowed to get away with it. Why should you, Sir, or I pay to enable those people to make a profit without those people, or the business which owns the licence that enables them to get that profit, being in some way responsible for the consequences of their obtaining that profit?

It is just not sensible, and it is for that reason that I think the House could do as it did in the early 1970s, for instance: as in the case that I used as an illustration, instead of the Parliament's passing a law to prohibit the draining of further wetlands in the Murray Valley, it simply carried a motion, which the Government observed, that no further wetlands in the Murray-Mallee be drained. In this case, our passing this motion would require the Government to observe the will of the House in the same way and set about drafting the regulations to protect the public interest—the welfare interest—in so doing.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I oppose the motion. The member for Murray-Mallee said in his opening remarks (and at that time we had the problem that the amendment was not before us, so we could not see it) that the motion he was moving in an amended form was not dissimilar to that motion which appeared on the Notice Paper except, he said, in reference to suicide because, in the words of the member for Murray-Mallee, suicide was irrelevant. Well, Sir, I can assure you that suicide is very relevant. Those people who try it have no second chance; they are gone, and gone for good. Really, that exposes this motion for exactly what it is; it just stinks of hypocrisy.

If you recall, Sir, this motion was placed on the Notice Paper to coincide with the deliberations of this House in Committee on certain aspects of the gaming machine legislation. As a result of the hysteria that was being whipped up out there in the community, it was seen to be a good tactic to place something on the Notice Paper that would either coincide with or just pre-empt the debate on certain clauses where the Speaker had clearly identified that we would be dealing only with relevant aspects of that legislation. In his wisdom, the Speaker saw through the trick, as you would have done if you had been sitting there, Sir. Perhaps, you would have seen it a little more quickly than did the Speaker, because you are younger. The whole thing was seen as a shabby trick to maximise publicity. I have always accepted some people's attitudes to gambling *per se*. I am not a gambler; the only gambling in which I partake is when I seek re-election to this place every four years.

**Mr Ferguson:** You've been supremely successful.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** As my colleague the member for Henley Beach says, I have been reasonably successful. In fact, at the last election I think I recorded the highest margin of any member in a metropolitan seat, being surpassed by only the member for Stuart, but there was always the aspect that there were a couple of fliers in that election and, therefore, on the preferred Party vote she came out in front of me. But I digress. As I said, this motion is not about gambling; it is about poker machines.

It is about restrictions or responsibilities being placed on the licensees of premises where these machines are installed so that they have a certain obligation.

To a certain extent I do not mind the thrust of the argument put forward by the member for Murray-Mallee that there should be some obligation on those people who install these machines. But, if the member for Murray-Mallee is serious, why does he not talk about the obligations of, say, the South Australian Jockey Club; why does he not talk about the obligations of the Casino authority; why does he not talk about the obligations of the Stock Exchange? No, he will not talk about the obligations of the Stock Exchange, because that is made up of the kinds of people whom the member for Murray-Mallee represents. The politics that the member for Murray-Mallee represents actually endorses and lauds those people who gamble on the Stock Exchange.

What about X-Lotto, bingo, Keno, etc? He is not exactly asking for those people to provide some form of checks and balances, to run an investigation before someone puts 20c into a poker machine to ensure that all the requirements under the amendment are met. This amendment will ensure that the people who play the poker machines are not at risk of losing their family's housekeeping money or becoming bankrupt, and will require the licensee, if that happens, to refund sufficient money.

If we accepted this argument, what would happen on the floor of the Stock Exchange? What would happen if you, Madam Acting Speaker, picked up the telephone, if you were that way inclined, and rang your broker and said that you wanted to buy 2 000 SAGASCO shares? Would you expect your broker to make a running check on your finances to ascertain whether you were using your housekeeping money or the money you had saved to buy your husband's birthday present? Of course you would not, nor would anyone else. But the member for Murray-Mallee, in that usual quirkish way that he has, says that we have to do it. That is what the member for Murray-Mallee is insisting.

This is an insane motion. In the 15 years that I have had the pleasure to represent the people of Napier in this Chamber, I have never seen a more stupid, insane motion.

**Mr Quirke:** Fair go; there have been a few others!

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The member for Playford says that there have been a few others. I would not like to enter a debate as to which is the most insane: this proposal by the member for Murray-Mallee, the proposal on emu farming of the member for Murray-Mallee, or any of the other silly proposals of the member for Murray-Mallee. That is not the point. Perhaps we could have a competition later to work out which is the silliest. This proposal is so ridiculous that the mind boggles. The member for Murray-Mallee suggests that, if people lose their money, they can go to the licensee and say, 'I have lost my housekeeping money' or 'I have lost my kid's birthday money' and the licensee must give them back the money. It would make life on the racecourse extremely awkward. Can members imagine the situation at the Melbourne Cup, with everyone in their fineries rushing up to the bookies saying, 'I lost \$50 on this.'

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison):** Order!

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, I have said nothing in this proposition about gambling on horse racing. It is entirely about the compulsive aspects of electronic gaming machines.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. The honourable member can develop his argument. The member for Napier.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** That is the whole point of the rebuttal of this stupid, insane motion. We cannot have one set of rules for poker machines—because the member for Murray-Mallee says that poker machines attract compulsive gamblers—when we all know that, if people are compulsive gamblers, they would be gambling night and day on flies crawling up window sills, because that is the way people are. As I return to the argument that I have been developing . . .

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** And I remind the member for Murray-Mallee that I can talk over him; I am very good at that. If you, Madam Acting Speaker, took some time off from your electorate and went to the Melbourne Cup wearing your new dress and lovely hat, and if you lost your husband's birthday money, you would look a right sight rushing up to the bookie to say that, because this stupid motion had been passed in South Australia, 'I want my money back.' The bookie would laugh at you, and so he should!

What about scratch cards? Most of these scratch cards are run by charities. They are the beneficiaries. The same applies to bingo. If you scratch your five balloons, your instant pot of gold or whatever it is, and if it does not reveal that you have won \$5, you go back to the person who has given up their time voluntarily to sell the scratch tickets and say, 'I did not win; that was my bus fare home. Can I have my money back?' I could go on and on with the stupidity of this motion.

What the member for Murray-Mallee should have done, when he was caught out on this shabby trick to try, in effect, to keep the hype going on the gaming machine legislation, was to say, 'Fair cop; I have been caught out', but he did not. He came up with this rather—I will not use the word 'stupid' any more—insane amendment and expected all members of this Chamber to support him. If he had moved a motion under which we would look at the results of the introduction of poker machines 12 months down the track to see whether it had created a situation in the community that quite conceivably could receive some support from members in this House, I would not have criticised this motion. In all probability, I would have stood up and supported it. But that is the whole thing about poker machines. It is all conjecture.

When the Casino was opened, all the daily newspapers gave us these horror stories that there would be pawnbrokers on every street corner. They suggested there would be more pawnbrokers than delicatessens. However, there was not one movement in that direction. The people of South Australia have a bit more sense and a bit more ability to manage their own affairs without wowsers like the member for Murray-Mallee in effect trying to inflict their point of view on the common, decent folk of this great State. That is a lesson that the member for Murray-Mallee and his ilk have to learn. It is not up to those middle classes to dictate to ordinary people what they should or should not do. Members may recall that the

member for Murray-Mallee wanted to set up labour camps with Gestapo people in jack boots and with swastikas if anyone had the temerity to be unemployed.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, the member for Napier now reflects on me by suggesting—indeed saying—that I am in favour of fascist SS wearing swastikas in Nazi-run work camps. I have never said any such thing, and I find that particularly offensive.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I understand the point of order. I ask the member for Napier to withdraw that remark.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I do so, with the deepest apologies to the member for Murray-Mallee. I was trying to relate what the member for Murray-Mallee and like thinking people want to do with those of us who want to go out and put 20c in a gambling machine to his suggestion, made in this House, that there should be work camps for people who are unemployed. I recall in that speech that he talked about jack boots, but I do apologise if I misread his remarks.

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

### TRADE POLICIES

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I move:

That this House condemns the corrupt trade policies of the European Community and the United States, particularly the impact on Australian farmers of the United States dramatic extension of the Export Enhancement Program (EEP) for wheat; the increased use of other export subsidy programs such as for dairy products and extensions of the EEP program to canned fruit and its possible extension to other grains and agricultural exports; the further reduction in Australian sugar access down to 97 000 from 168 000 tonnes two years ago and 800 000 tonnes 10 years ago; the continued imposition of restrictive meat quotas which were 'voluntarily' imposed half way through the year and the prospect of even earlier quotas next year; and further this House calls on the US Government to delete from the EEP list those countries which are traditional Australian wheat markets and to provide fairer access for our agricultural products to the US market and also calls for renewed effort by all nations to make genuine progress with the trade negotiations of the GATT Uruguay Round.

This motion should have the full support of all members of the House regardless of their political persuasion or interests. It simply asks for a fair go and a fair deal, as the issue has been brought to a head by a recent statement by President Bush who, in his campaign mode, indicated that the United States would heavily subsidise wheat sales under the export enhancement program.

By its very nature this action seriously affects every Australian wheat grower and the producers of every other commodity throughout the nation. Just a simple comment made at a public meeting has put many of our industries at risk and certainly it has the potential to be quite devastating. I note that this move is in response to European Economic Community policy, and for that reason I have mentioned the EEC first in the motion because it is basically this trade war between the EEC and the US that is bringing all this to pass. The smaller nations trying to compete on a fair trade basis are finding that they are unable to compete against the heavy

subsidies provided by those particularly powerful nations. Those are the issues that I wish to raise in this House, which I trust will give the motion the support I believe it deserves.

The area of greatest concern is the wheat industry, and we should be looking to determine where and how it will be affected. There is no doubt that there is the potential through this price war for a loss of an estimated \$46 per tonne which could easily occur and which could be devastating to the extent that, as happened two seasons ago, the wheat price received by growers failed to return the cost of production at that time.

We know that the returns received for wheat last year were quite reasonable and there was an expectation that that return could be received this season. Many people were lulled into a sense of false security when President Bush visited Australia earlier this year and indicated that he did not wish to harm Australia with any of his trade policies. Many people were pleased with his comments then and hoped that he would be able to honour them.

It is some small consolation in his statement to farmers last Tuesday when he clearly said that his action was not meant to include Australia and other countries that do not subsidise but, despite his comment, one can argue that the very action of putting 30 million tonnes of grain onto the world market will obviously affect trade prices and, whether we are small or big players in the industry, the impact will be severe.

It would be naive of us to assume that President Bush's comments would not affect Australia. I am concerned about comments being made even today, with a report in the *Advertiser* suggesting that politicians should get out of the game. I am concerned about that; the implication of that statement is that we should wait until after the presidential election, because these trade policies might not come into force. It has been suggested that the Americans would not be able to produce enough wheat and so could not put that much subsidised grain onto the world wheat market. Many scenarios have been put up.

I wonder about the motive behind such statements. People who have been following developments know that if the Democratic candidate, Bill Clinton, is elected, there may be even greater subsidisation by the Americans, even more than has been indicated by President Bush. We are placed in a bad situation, on the one hand, and possibly an even worse one, on the other hand.

I hope that President Bush is merely politicking and does not have to exercise that threat. Nevertheless, within 36 hours of his making those comments in South Dakota 100 tonnes of canned fruit was committed to the Japanese market under the reviewed EEP scheme. We know full well that the whole issue is serious and that some aspects of President Bush's comments are already in place.

Not only the wheat industry is at risk; there is also a risk from a dairying point of view, because at this moment the US is shipping subsidised skim milk powder, whole milk powder, butter and butter oil to many South American and Middle Eastern countries under its dairy export incentive program. Australia is directly affected by subsidised sales into Saudi Arabia, but most of the targeted markets were previously held by the EEC. The result is that the EEC is now moving into traditional

Australian markets with its subsidies and lowering the world prices. That is the point I was making earlier.

It does not matter whether Australia is mentioned in the first instance because, in the second instance, we are being affected through our markets being absorbed by either the US or the EEC. Until 1989 the United States managed to utilise its own surplus dairy products on the domestic market or the Mexican market, but now it ships to many countries considered EEC markets, which causes the EEC to target Australian markets. Every export subsidy leads to an expectation by the country benefiting and by other countries purchasing products that they should be able to purchase as cheaply elsewhere.

In the dairy industry the average subsidy is \$1 527 a tonne. In regard to the canned fruit industry we must condemn the United States because it has already effected a sale of canned fruit to Japan, as I previously mentioned. Confirmation of the 100 tonnes of canned peaches to Japan under the export enhancement program came just 36 hours after President Bush knocked the wind out of the industry with his announcement.

This works out to a subsidy of about \$140 per tonne. Whilst 100 tonnes is a very small parcel in export terms, I understand that about 9 000 tonnes of canned fruit sold to Japan, Korea and Mexico under the EEP program could be involved. So, that 100 tonnes is only the tip of the iceberg; effectively, a further 9 000 tonnes could corrupt the world market in the canned fruit industry. However, it goes further than that. Although many people do not have an interest in the sugar industry, I think it is worth reporting that our access into the American sugar market has dropped from 800 000 tonnes 10 years ago to about 97 000 tonnes. So, a little more than 10 per cent, probably 12 per cent, of the market that was available to Australian sugar growers has been absorbed.

Several weeks ago, Australian meat exporters were forced to voluntarily impose quotas on beef and mutton exports to the US, which has been our largest market, or face compulsory restrictions. The result has been a significant reduction in prices for farmers, total confusion and bitterness between exporters and even greater uncertainty for the future. There is the threat of even earlier quota restrictions next year because of the amount of meat that Australia will have to hold in bond in the US through the restrictions this year.

I raise these issues because they are matters for concern. It is somewhat difficult as a member of a State Parliament—or, for that matter, the State Government—to know how best to express the concern and will of the people at this time. One could argue that a resolution before this House does very little to convey to our international counterparts what we fear could happen and the effect that the political manoeuvring of the candidates could have on our future and our industry in both the short and long term. I hope that commonsense will prevail in the longer term and that there is a more determined attitude by all parties to try to resolve these matters through the GATT and Uruguay rounds.

I hope our producers are not being misled, as some members of the press would have us believe, and that we can enjoy a reasonable future. I hope also that this is a non-Party political resolution. I have tried to word it in such a way that it incorporates the whole of the industry. I hope that all sections of the community will support

this motion, because we all know that this matter could have a catastrophic effect on our nation.

As a representative of the primary producing sector, of which wheat would be the greatest loser, in this instance, I fear for the financial viability of many of our producers if the United States goes ahead with its 30 million tonne subsidised growing policy. One of our greatest concerns is that, whilst the Americans claim they are not targeting our markets, the very fact that they are providing subsidised grain to those areas is, in turn, having the effect of downplaying the price and export opportunities for other grain growers, whether it be Australia, Canada or any other nation.

I call on the Parliament to give this resolution its full consideration and support. I trust that we will be able to convey our support to the Prime Minister, as I know that he has given this matter some consideration and has voiced some concerns on behalf of the Australian community. I believe all other political Parties have similarly given it their consideration and that they want to add as much support as they can and express their disgust and concern to the Americans and the European Community for the manner in which they have set themselves on a course which could well be very disruptive and damaging to our local community. I ask the House to support the motion.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### AIRLINE CARRIERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brindal:

That this House instructs the Government that, in the absence of a formalised tender process, its departmental officers and instrumentalities be required to use interstate airline carriers on an equitable and cost justified basis.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 286.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I move:

That all words after 'use' be deleted and that the following words be inserted in lieu thereof: 'airline carriers on a cost justified basis'.

The amendment should be self-explanatory. The first part is to remove the word 'interstate' before 'airline carriers'. It appears to me that, if we are to require the Government to act on a cost justified basis in respect of interstate airline carriers, it follows that we should operate with other airline carriers within the State. The second part of the amendment is to remove the word 'equitable'. The two objectives of cost justification and equity appear to me to be contradictory, and I will say more about that in a moment.

In his speech on this motion, the member for Hayward said there were two parts to it. He said that the motion, in effect, calls on the Government to institute a formalised tendering process for airlines. That may have been the member for Hayward's intention, but I dispute that the motion, as it stands, in fact states that. The motion moved by the member for Hayward instructs the Government that, in the absence of a formalised tendering process, its departmental officers and instrumentalities be required to use interstate airline carriers on an equitable and cost justified basis.

Nothing in the wording of the motion requires the Government to institute a formalised tender process; so, I would dispute that. However, I can inform the member for Hayward that the Government has considered the matter. Indeed, Tourism SA has undertaken a detailed examination of this issue with expert assistance from an outside consultant. I understand that the result of that investigation is that the Government's air travel account to a preferred carrier may result in savings—not in reduced air fares, as the member for Hayward suggested, but in either higher commissions or rebates to the Government.

However, the investigation by Tourism South Australia to which I have referred included an examination of the practices in other States and the Commonwealth, many of which have chosen the course of tendering for their travel accounts. I point out to the House that the issue is a little more complicated than perhaps the honourable member suggests, although tendering for airline accounts certainly would not result in an equitable distribution of airline use. Quite obviously, if one is operating on a tender basis and calling for contracts with a particular airline, that can hardly be an equitable distribution if all of one's business is given to one airline. Presumably what the member for Hayward means when he talks about an equitable distribution is that each airline should have a fair share of the Government's airline use. If that is not what the honourable member means, perhaps he will correct that impression later in the debate. Certainly, I cannot see what else the word 'equitable' could mean in the context of his motion.

Part of the examination that I mentioned earlier undertaken by Tourism South Australia has been to assess what effect the awarding of the Government's account to a preferred carrier would have on unsuccessful tenderers. Obviously that is a factor. If one were to give the business to a particular airline, one would need to know what the effect would be on the unsuccessful tenderers, particularly in a market like South Australia. Obviously, in the larger eastern States that would not have such an impact.

Also, other options such as tendering to an agent rather than to an airline itself may result in greater service enhancements. I think that that is why the issue is somewhat more complex than the honourable member suggests. However, as I indicated, it is being considered. It is important that any action that the Government takes must be measured and considered, and that process of consideration is currently occurring in relation to the work carried out by Tourism South Australia to which I have referred.

I turn now to the other part of this issue to which the member for Hayward referred; that is, he requires the use by the Government of airlines to be on an equitable and cost-justified basis. As I indicated earlier, I believe that those two objectives would be mutually contradictory. If one is using all the airlines, in relation presumably to their share of the market, that would be equitable, but it would not necessarily be the most cost justified. Conversely, if one takes the lower bidder—which may be one airline—it would not be equitable. So, to some extent, those two objectives are contradictory. I believe that the Government should be acting on the cost-justified

basis in relation to these matters. In other words, it should be taking the lowest cost.

We need to recognise that the whole process of domestic airline deregulation has been driven by the need to open the industry to competition and to provide consumers with choices and cost savings. That should apply to Government travellers no less than to any other consumers. Government travellers must select the air carrier that best satisfies their needs according to the particular circumstances of each journey. Obviously, the time tabling will be an important factor in that, or it may relate to the basis on which the carrier can offer the schedule most suitable to the business being conducted.

For example, there is no point in having an agreement with one particular airline if it requires Government officers to stay overnight because there is no return flight in the evening. Whereas that might save the Government money in terms of air fares, it may involve additional costs through the provision of accommodation. Obviously, the Government must have some flexibility in relation to the choice of airline. Any tendering process must allow the Government sufficient flexibility of choice to take advantage of the benefits arising from an increasingly competitive airline industry.

In his address the member for Hayward also referred to Compass Airlines. I should like to make several points about that. First, the introduction of Compass Airlines came about as a result of a decision by the Federal Labor Government to end the iniquitous two-airline policy, which of course originated under the Menzies' Government some years ago, mainly to bail-out Reg Ansett when in the 1950s his company purchased some unsuitable aircraft and was losing money. Of course, that two-airline policy was a disgrace for this country. Fortunately, that has been ended by the Government and there is now competition.

The member for Hayward suggested that the failure of Compass was in some way due to the Government's not patronising that particular airline. I guess the first point one would make is that South Australia has only 8 per cent of the Australian population, so any decisions by this Government would have a fairly small impact on Compass. However, there are other factors as well. Compass's Adelaide schedule did not allow same-day travel to Sydney and Melbourne, for instance, and it did not serve Canberra, where obviously many Government officers travel, and its terminals did not include business-class facilities. Quite obviously, there were difficulties in the Government's using Compass anyway because of the sort of service it offered.

One should also say that the reasons for the failure of Compass were somewhat more complex than that. From my reading of the financial press, the decisions made by Compass, such as not having a business class, the purchase of aircraft that were too large for the job and the pricing of seats below their actual cost, were far more significant reasons in the collapse of the airline. So, I certainly reject any criticism that Compass's failure was due to the Government. However, I point out that the new Compass Airlines does offer Adelaide a far more competitive and flexible schedule than its predecessor and there should be no reason why Government travellers should not use it when that is appropriate.

Certainly, I wish the new Compass Airlines well and I hope that it will be used by Government travellers and by other consumers. In conclusion, the selection of airlines by Government travellers should be on a basis no different from that of consumers at large and, if tendering has a part to play in that process—

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

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** I am quite happy to agree to the amendment. In closing the debate I understand the points raised by the member for Mitchell and simply say that, while I realise that there is some balancing between 'equitable' and 'cost justified', the reason I included both of those issues was that sometimes it may be in order to do it on an equitable basis provided that the cost-justified side of it does not get so far out of kilter as to be ridiculous. It is no good the Government's buying 30 per cent of tickets from each airline if one airline's price is half that of the others.

I accept what the member for Mitchell said, because I am sure everyone on this side of the House would agree that the most important thing to the Government must be the cost-justified basis. The argument for equity was merely to try—when all other things were equal—to cover the point made by the member for Mitchell when he asked about the impact on other carriers. All things being equal, perhaps the load should be spread. However, if it is to be on a cost-justified basis—and I believe that is the way the Government should work with all its departments—so be it. I am happy to accept the amendment and also to note, with some pleasure, that the member for Mitchell stated in his contribution that the Government is indeed looking at this matter. All members would know as a result of the budget that we must be responsible as a Parliament in looking at the cost of delivering the best possible service at the best possible price. If the Government is looking at this matter, I am pleased.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

## TRAM BARN

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr Armitage:

That this House expresses its sincere and profound admiration at the dazzling display of political flexibility exhibited by the Minister for Environment and Planning, which, with respect to Hackney Tram Barn A, required her to adopt a position on 11 August 1992 totally opposite to her stance of the previous day.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 287.)

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** I believe that this motion is frivolous and that it demeans Parliament, and I hope to dispose of it quickly. I have some personal knowledge of the Minister's outlook on the preserving of Tram Barn A at Hackney because it was the Spence ALP sub branch which moved a motion at the ALP State Convention seeking to preserve Tram Barn A.

*Mr Holloway interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** The member for Mitchell says 'Shame'. The fact is that that motion was fully debated at the ALP State Convention and, without any dissent, it became ALP policy.

*Mr Holloway interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** The member for Mitchell now says he was late back from lunch. That may be so. However, it was accepted as ALP policy, and I can assure the House that the Minister looked sympathetically on that addition to ALP policy. If it can be said that the Minister changed her mind, it was at a much earlier date than that indicated in the motion.

The issue of Tram Barn A at Hackney excited a great deal of interest and people of goodwill had legitimately differing opinions on the matter. Those who wanted to demolish Tram Barn A argued that the Bicentennial Conservatory cost a great deal of money, that it was a beautiful structure, and that nothing ought to obscure the view of it and that, therefore, Tram Barn A, because to some degree it might have obscured the view, ought to be demolished. Those people argued that all possible land should be returned to parkland and, therefore, demolition was justified. Indeed, the boffins at the Botanic Gardens were also in favour of demolition.

On the other hand, those who wanted to preserve Tram Barn A—and I number myself amongst them—argued that it was on the Register of the National Estate and on the Register of State Heritage Items and that it did not obscure the view of the Bicentennial Conservatory or, if it did, only at a small range of angles and that the uses of Tram Barn A after it was preserved would be compatible with its surroundings.

There were good arguments for and against the demolition of Tram Barn A. In the end, the Minister and Cabinet decided not to demolish it. I support that decision, but I respect those who hold a differing opinion. I congratulate the Minister on prevailing in this matter. I must say that the motion is not justified, that it is not truthful and that it is frivolous.

While on the question of dazzling flexibility, I must congratulate the member for Adelaide on his dazzling flexibility concerning the closure of Barton Road in North Adelaide, because he has managed to tell two different groups of North Adelaide residents different stories.

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I do not believe that the member for Adelaide's attitude with respect to another matter which is not part of this debate is pertinent to this debate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Clearly while the topic as such is not relevant, as an indirect reference I am sure that the House will permit it briefly. The member for Spence.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I am sure that Mr Noel Roscrow of North Adelaide, who is on one side of the Barton Road debate, and Dr J.L. Crompton of Barton Terrace West, North Adelaide, could usefully compare notes on what the member for Adelaide has told them regarding his attitude to the Barton Road closure.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr ATKINSON:** Furthermore, I ask the member for Adelaide to take a more kindly view of the heritage of Barton Road, because Barton Road was part of Colonel William Light's original street plan for Adelaide. Therefore, I hope that he has the same reverence for Barton Road as he has for Tram Barn A. I certainly have reverence for both, because I cherish Adelaide's electric

traction history, and I congratulate the Minister on preserving the barn.

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

### PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House, while recognising the important role select committees have had and will continue to have in investigating matters of relevance to the House, is of the view that the recently established standing committees provide a unique opportunity for investigations to be undertaken on an ongoing basis without unnecessarily placing strains on members' time and staff and other resources; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting this resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 26 August. Page 405.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): The motion moved by the member for Napier is quite ridiculous. It says that Parliament should do away with some of the protections that it might have for investigating certain issues that Parliament might find difficult to handle or which, in the community, are of such interest that people wish to come and give evidence. The suggestion is that we should rely more on standing committees which have permanent members who are seldom changed during a Parliament, unless there is a change in personnel further up the ladder. However, the members of a select committee have a special interest and can seek information and assess the evidence that is given.

I am not sure why this motion has been moved. I do not know whether the honourable member has a vested interest, because he serves on such a committee. I would not be so unkind as to suggest that is the reason. He may—and I am sure he will—respond to that in any summing up that he may make in the future. I ask the Parliament to ignore the motion. The sooner it is disposed of—I hope there are sufficient members present to dispose of it, although the honourable member may have the numbers—the better. I oppose the motion in the strongest possible terms and hope that the majority of members will do the same thing.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

### RAILWAY OPERATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mrs Hutchison:

That this House congratulates both State and Federal Governments on the funding initiatives to enhance rail operations in South Australia, in particular, funding for refurbishment of the Indian Pacific passenger train and upgrading of both the Port Augusta and Islington railway workshops.

(Continued from 26 August. Page 411.)

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I have a great deal of pleasure in supporting this motion for a whole range of reasons, many of which relate to the industry that provided not only me with my bread and butter but that of my father and three brothers.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

Mr HAMILTON: As the member for Henley Beach reminds me, my eldest son is an engine driver in that industry. The fact that I was an official of the Australian Railways Union gives me great pleasure to see the Federal Government allocating this amount of money for refurbishing of the Indian Pacific passenger train and the upgrading of the Port Augusta and Islington workshops.

Many years ago I remember writing to the Australian National Commission suggesting that upgrading of this service should occur. Indeed, one of the items that I suggested that the Australian National Commission could investigate was not only the upgrading of the coaches and so on but also the provision of entertainment on the train. Anyone who has travelled on the Indian Pacific from Perth to Adelaide or from Perth to Sydney will know that it takes about three and a half days.

It is a very enjoyable trip.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: You've done it a few times, haven't you?

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, as my colleague reminds me, I have done it a few times. It is a very enjoyable trip but, to break the journey a bit, entertainment on the train would be most pleasant, particularly for many of the elderly people.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Pokies?

Mr HAMILTON: No, not necessarily pokies; I am not particularly endeared toward poker machines.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Sex shows?

Mr HAMILTON: I understand that my colleague is offering himself for some sort of recreational activity on the train, but I will not pursue that. I noted in *Railways of Australia*, the 1992 Year Book personal directory (page 17), an article that gives an impression of the type of decor to be used in the first refurbished dining car of the Indian Pacific. Any of those who have ever travelled in the Queen Adelaide restaurant car would appreciate the type of decor that could be utilised by the Indian Pacific. There is no doubt that it is one of the great train journeys of the world. An upgrade is necessary because of the very strong competition, not only from air travel but also from road travel. It is important that we retain this service and upgrade it to world standard.

Only recently I was talking to members from the British Parliament, who expressed interest in this great train journey and wanted to know whether or not this service would be retained. I said that the Federal Government had indicated that it would retain it. The retention of this service is important not only in terms of tourism but also to retain skills in the workshops at Islington and Port Augusta. It is important that those skills be not only retained but also handed down to other employees, particularly apprentices. Apprentices should have the opportunity to learn those skills.

Whether or not they are retained in the industry is irrelevant. The fact that an important skill can be retained in the long-term is particularly important, especially for our rural cousins. It is also important because retention of those jobs impacts upon places such as Port Augusta, in terms of the workshops, and out on the east-west line, including Kalgoorlie, which relies quite heavily on the Indian Pacific traffic. Anyone who has travelled through there would understand what I am talking about. When the train pulls up, a service shows passengers around



Kalgoorlie, and that puts additional moneys into that very important town. Port Augusta is also one of those towns that relies on the workshops, and on many occasions we have heard the Deputy Premier and the member for Stuart talking about that industry and the need not only to maintain but also to enhance the rail operations in South Australia. It is worth pointing out that the *Railways of Australia NETWORK* magazine of April/May/June of this year, states:

Mr Keating's statement included the following major financial allocations. \$454 million is to be provided during the next two years to complement the NRC's 10 year \$1.7 billion investment program to provide by 1995:

- A complete standard gauge mainline network between Brisbane and Perth;
- A 12-hour terminal-to-terminal train transit time between Sydney and Melbourne;
- A 16-hour terminal-to-terminal train transit time between Sydney and Brisbane;

At the same time, funding of effective rail links to ports in Brisbane, Fremantle and Adelaide and the improvement of intermodal links in Melbourne will ensure that main line efficiency gains are not frustrated by handling delays at transshipment points. 'In order that the Government can be assured that this additional investment in rail is used to full effect, several conditions will need to be met before funds will be released.'

Those conditions are spelt out in this article. I am pleased that we have this undertaking from the Federal Government. I know that those railway employees to whom I have spoken were concerned, as were the officials of the unions involved in the railway industry. I believe they lobbied long, hard and very intensely to gain the money for this refurbishing. I want to place on record my congratulations to those union officials and to the shop stewards and rank and file members of those unions on the work they put into this effort. It is not easy for those members to go back and forward to Canberra; it is not easy either, for the local Federal member in the area to keep at the Cabinet and the Federal Minister responsible. I understand that from time to time there were some heated exchanges; nevertheless, the end result is pleasing, and I have a great deal of pleasure in supporting this proposition.

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

### TRADE POLICIES

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I move:

That the order of the House postponing Notice of Motion: Other Motions No. 2 until Wednesday 7 October be rescinded.

Motion carried.

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Blacker (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 551.)

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the motion moved by the member for Flinders. In so doing, I commend him for putting this motion before the House. I would like to give some

background information on the export enhancement program, which is causing us considerable problems at the moment. In mid 1985, the US Government introduced the export enhancement program with the aim of increasing exports of agricultural products that had been declining in that country for several years. The approach taken was actually to target export assistance to meet competition from other subsidising countries. Its particular focus was the European Community.

The program has covered a range of crop and livestock commodities and involves the provision of bonuses to exporters. The bonuses enable US exporters to sell specified commodities to specified countries at prices below those applying to the US domestic market or to any other export market. Although this export enhancement program has covered a wide range of agricultural commodities, it has been used to a far greater extent for wheat than any other product. Therein lies the problem for us. Last year, when President Bush visited Australia, these matters were discussed with him, and I believe he gave an undertaking at that time that any decisions made would not affect Australia. However, this latest decision does affect Australia markedly.

On 3 September the United States announced an expansion of its existing export enhancement program. Press reports in Australia indicated that the US would allocate \$1 billion to subsidise 29 million tonnes of wheat exports. That is an enormous level of subsidisation for that product. As I said previously, it is causing us considerable problems at this time. Not only did the United States add that \$1 billion to the subsidy but it also increased the number of other countries that could qualify for that subsidy; South Africa, India, Pakistan, Yemen, Brazil and Poland were added to the already fairly long list of countries under the export enhancement program. Exact details of the expanded export program announced by President Bush are not known at this time. The likely consequences for the Australian market are also not known, but there is another unknown quantity in that the European Community is yet to announce whether it will react and increase its subsidy. In effect, that would create a price war, one of the real losers being Australia.

It is all very well for the *Advertiser* to state that this might not occur, but already the effects are being felt, and the member for Flinders covered that quite well. It is very easy for the *Advertiser* to state that President Bush might not go ahead with it. He does not have to; he has announced it, and countries will actually be approaching the United States to see whether they can get that subsidised wheat. I do not believe that the quality of that wheat is as good as the quality of ours. I have had discussions with the member for Flinders, but that is not the issue we are looking at now. Other countries seeking a cheap commodity will obviously look at that subsidised wheat before they look at the better quality wheat from Australia. It will cause us problems, irrespective of what the *Advertiser* might have said in its article. It is a bit naive to expect that it would not cause problems.

An Australian Wheat Board spokesman has actually said that the first bid for US subsidised wheat since the announcement of the program by President Bush had been made by Egypt at a subsidy of about \$US24 per tonne, a similar level of subsidy as had previously applied. If the \$1 billion announced by President Bush

was allocated over that 29 million tonnes targeted for assistance, the subsidy would average about \$34.50 per tonne. Wheat industry sources have warned against our taking down the market price because of excessive early speculation upon the possible consequences of the US move.

It looked as if we were to start moving ahead. The rains have been good, and all areas of the State have had the follow-up rains that they needed. It looks as if we will have bumper crops, but then we find that the President of the United States is offering subsidised wheat on the world markets. That must have an effect here, and I am sure that the member for Flinders would know that very well, because there is a large wheat growing area in the District of Flinders. I am sure that members in this House from the South-East would be looking at the other products which will be subsidised under this export enhancement program.

The expanded US scheme highlights the need for a successful conclusion to the multilateral round of trade negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). One of the things that the Minister of Agriculture in South Australia has been pushing for is a successful conclusion to those rounds of talks to stop this very thing from happening, so there can be at least some sort of control over the export markets. Australia as one of those producers—and a major producer, I might add—would then be able to get a fair deal in those markets. The member for Flinders said that all our producers want is a fair go, and quite realistically. We do not want to have these highly subsidised products coming onto the market.

South Australia has consistently supported the Federal Government in its role as Chair of the Cairns group, which argues for rationalisation of what is virtually a corrupt world agricultural marketing arrangement—I cannot call it anything else. One of the major contributors to that is the European Community. It is very important that all of us in this House show our support for the motion moved by the member for Flinders and make sure that we let Canberra know our concerns about this very important issue for South Australia.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** In supporting this motion, I indicate clearly that, as someone who is personally involved in the wheat industry, and has been involved for four generations, I recognise the potential damage which this action can do not only to individual wheat farmers in this State but to this State and nation as a whole. In 1989-90, the gross value of wheat production in South Australia was approximately \$516 million; with a downturn in prices in 1990-91, that value dropped to \$274 million; and in 1991-92, the value rose to \$403 million—a significant increase but, nevertheless, still down on the 1989 figure.

The reality of the situation is this: unless there is a reasonable base price for wheat, the cost of producing it will exceed the return to producers. I wish to raise the point that many people fail to recognise because, under the export enhancement program of the US and the common agriculture policy of the EEC, in those countries the Governments appreciate what agriculture does for the general economy, unlike in Australia and in this State

where there is not a general recognition of the value of agriculture.

That is the stark difference and, if one looks at the policies that the current Federal Government has in place, one sees that it has set out on a deliberate program of taking away even limited assistance which has been invaluable to the rural sector and the economy. It has taken that assistance away. Even this State Government tried to take away primary producer registration and members, including the member for Stuart, voted for the removal of that concession.

The cost of registering an average farm truck is about \$600 to do 4 000 or 5 000 kilometres a year. Our Governments will not even recognise those sorts of things, so obsessed are they with the anti-rural attitude that they have developed over the years. Of course, only a fool would not oppose the economic policies on subsidies which the EEC and the United States have put into effect.

However, I put it to the House that the Canadian Government will soon get involved because, the last time I attended an Agricultural Outlook Conference in Canberra, Canadian delegates said, 'Never again will we allow the United States to have 50 per cent of the world wheat market. No matter what it takes we will maintain our share.' Only a few months after that the Canadian Government sent a cheque to every wheat farmer because Mr Mulronev said, 'If the wheat farmers are going bad, Canada is going bad.'

It is about time that there was a recognition in South Australia and Australia that to be successful on an international basis we not only have to be able to produce the best quality grain in the world but we also must have the means to produce it. There is only one way to do that, and that is to keep abreast of modern technology. That is why agriculture in Australia has been so successful. In the time I have been involved in agriculture there has been a revolution in technology.

In my first year I remember we lumped all the wheat on our backs. Today we do not even lump or see a bag of super because it is all done by machinery. There are computers on the air seeders to ensure that we sow the crop at the right level and in that way increase production per hectare, but this half-witted Government in Canberra took away all the investment allowances. Not only did that affect farmers and their ability to compete but it also helped destroy some of the finest agricultural machinery manufacturers in the world. I refer to Shearers and the position in Sunshine, Victoria, where the train stops. That area is now like a graveyard, all the result of foolish economic policies.

As well as supporting this motion, I support and commend the member for Flinders, because Australia has to be prepared to recognise that we have one of the best grain-growing industries in the world and we should give it reasonable support to allow it to compete on a sound basis. All that is required is a fair go. Anyone who thinks about it knows that we do not have the gross national product to subsidise our production in the same way as America has. That matter is not in question because we would bankrupt the country if we did that, but there are a number of things we could do.

We could improve handling on the wharves. The Government has refused to allow the Bulk Handling

Company to buy the facilities at a number of ports. In places like Thevenard they could have doubled the capacity and halved the turnaround time but, because the Minister of Marine has an ideological bent and is too thick to understand the reality of turning ships around quickly, that did not happen. That is one area that could be developed at no cost to the taxpayer and the Government could have got \$14 million or \$15 million, but it got nothing.

In conclusion, I hope the House supports the motion and I hope that there is a recognition of the things that can be done both State and federally to improve agriculture, to assist it and to allow it to continue in a reasonable and viable manner so that it can continue to make the tremendous contribution to the economy of the State and help all those industries that rely on it for a living. I support the motion.

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I also support the motion, which I believe will be carried unanimously. However, there are some problems with the Parliament's supporting the motion because of the fine contribution that has been made by America over the years to this country and by Australia to America. Without doubt America has been the most philanthropic country this world has ever seen. Members will recall what happened in the immediate post-war years with the Marshall Plan and the assistance America gave to many countries needing reconstruction, as well as the assistance Australia received from America in the time of our need when we were facing invasion.

I refer to the reciprocal arrangements with America, when we supported America in Vietnam (even though I was opposed to the Vietnam war), through to our arrangements in the Middle East with America and the recent Middle East hostilities, and one has to acknowledge the contribution America has made to our defence through the installation of American bases on Australian soil.

Therefore, it is with great difficulty that I have to support a motion which essentially is anti-American. I do have a problem understanding American foreign policy. Recently this Parliament sent me to southern China to look at developments there. To some extent I was surprised that America has given most favoured nation status to that country which allows tremendous upgrading of manufacturing industry in the Pearl River delta area of China. That has assisted China no end, and I support that because, if China can gain foreign currency, it will be able to buy our wheat, wool and other products.

However, that does not line up with the sort of propositions we have heard recently about subsidies being applied to American exports that are in direct opposition to Australian products. How can America offer favourable terms for imports to certain countries in the Asian region yet in respect of an American ally in this area through our past actions we are penalised? The member for Flinders referred to the penalties that have been applied to Australian agricultural products in respect of entry to America, and this does not line up with what America is doing for other countries in our region. This is one reason why I support the motion. I understand why the Federal Government is in a delicate position and I can understand why the Prime Minister has not taken off

his coat and gone into the ring as was expected of him by the Leader of the Opposition, Dr Hewson.

Dr Hewson's proposition is not particularly attractive to me because it does not assist South Australia. It is all very well to talk about exchanging sugar for wheat and giving greater input to Australian sugar and beef, but that does not particularly help South Australia. This is the South Australian Parliament, and we should be looking after our South Australian exports of wheat and wool. I believe this Parliament has a job to look after our wheat and wool exports, because our economy revolves around those two commodities.

However, we must remember that the Federal Government is in a delicate position because of the Uruguay round of multi-lateral trade negotiations (GATT). In January 1992, participating countries agreed that the Dunkel package provided a basis for completing the negotiations, the objective then being to conclude an agreement by mid-April 1992. To date, agreement has not been reached, but the Dunkel package appears to provide the best indication of the broad nature of any possible agreement that might be reached.

So, we are in the middle of these negotiations, and we may well be able to do something with the Dunkel package. If we can, that will assist Australian farmers not just in the current season but as far as one can see into the future. One cannot expect Prime Minister Keating in this very delicate situation to say to the American President the sorts of unkind things that the Leader of the Opposition (Dr Hewson) has said to him. The letter that Dr Hewson sent to the President of the United States was very intemperate indeed. In the short term, he may be shoring up his own political situation in what appears to be the run-up to a Federal election, and he may get cheap cheers from the farmers—particularly in South Australia, from what I have heard—but what the Prime Minister of Australia must consider is the long term. He has to look after the country in the long term, and I believe that all members of this Parliament ought to acknowledge that point of view and admit that we are in a very delicate area.

I was critical earlier in my speech of the foreign policies and the foreign trade policies of the United States. I think the United States should take another look at what it is doing as far as trade in this particular area is concerned. However, at the same time, I acknowledge that the United States has been a friend to Australia and has assisted us in many ways, and vice versa. Taking into consideration what is happening with the GATT negotiations, we must be extremely careful, but I have no hesitation in supporting the motion, because it is a South Australian view that will be conveyed to the Federal Parliament, and I hope it will add power to any negotiations.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I rise briefly to support my rural colleague, the member for Flinders. We are debating an extremely grave situation and a very important issue. Australia and its farmers are paying a huge price while the EEC and the USA play games. That is what they are doing: they are flexing their muscles at each other, shadow boxing in effect, just to try to prove a point in world trade, and Australia and its farmers are paying a huge price.

As well as grain, the motion refers to canned fruit, meat, dairy products and sugar, and we have all heard about the Canadian pork dumping. It would appear that all countries will get involved. As the member for Eyre said a few minutes ago, Canada has said that in no way will it allow the United States to have more than 50 per cent of the world market. So, it looks as though Canada could be entering the fray as well. We know that the Australian Government will not come to the aid of the Australian farmers. So, all we can do is try to make sure that we get the best deal for Australia, its farmers and the producers of all these products. What irks me is that the American Government appears to have no regard to what it does to countries, particularly old allies such as Australia. We can do nothing more than complain and make a lot of noise.

President Bush's visit to Canberra early this year gave us some encouragement and some hope that we would see the end of the notorious export enhancement program that has been going on since 1986, but it appears now that his words were hollow rhetoric. When presidential elections are in progress, the whole world is affected. I often wonder if Mr Bush loses the election what the other candidate, Mr Clinton will do—I think we could be worse off. So, I hope that President Bush is able to hold office for the sake of world trade generally. I shudder to think what could happen otherwise. Should we stand back and do nothing except talk as we are doing in the House at the moment?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** I appreciate the bipartisan approach to this issue that is coming from the other side. We are in an extremely grave situation because, particularly at the moment, Australia is having a good season. What is the good of a good season if the price is cut in half? We have had a row of excellent seasons. If this sort of nonsense was going on when we had a dry season—and we are due for a drought—where would we be? Our Government is not in a situation, either willingly or unwillingly, to assist. This sort of action could cut our price down by at least half, and it is causing some crazy things to happen.

The US has the hide to say that the Australian Wheat Board subsidises Australian growers. I heard that comment somewhere last week, and it made me very cross, because the Australian Wheat Board has done nothing at all. All it has done is give us orderly marketing. Every Australian grower has known the price of wheat since the early 1930s, and the Australian Wheat Board has done a fantastic job of selling the Australian crop. I do not want to see that come under threat. Over the years the Americans could not get their act together, but we certainly have done so through the efforts of our wheat board. It is not a subsidy and it is not unfair trading, so that sort of comment made me very cross.

It makes me even more angry when I hear the extremely inflammatory things that the Americans say. We get very anxious, and there are calls for retaliation. We have heard calls from right around our State and country that we should retaliate, but we are not in a position to do that. We have heard comments such as 'Restrict their trade with us', 'Ban General Motors products', 'Get rid of the US bases', and all that sort of rhetoric, but we all know they are not options for us.

All we are asking for is a reasonable go. These sorts of actions have put the industry in a complete spin. Farmers—and I am involved personally—are trying to protect the price. How can they do that? They race out and grab onto futures and options and try to hedge the price. There has been so much panic selling going on in the past three or four days that anything could happen. Farmers have put in their crop and incurred the cost but they do not know what their income will be; so, there is much instability in that area.

As I said, we will have a very good crop—it looks like it is almost in the bag—but when this is happening it makes one wonder. It is very destabilising to the industry. The last straw was when we heard two days ago that the US was going to target the Indonesian market. If that is not the final insult, I do not know what is. The Indonesian market is on our country's doorstep, and the US was going to target it. However, to the credit of Indonesia, it said that it would not jump into bed with the US for cheaper wheat, that it would look after its Australian supplier and buy the quality that Australia has given it, and that it would look after that guaranteed source of Australian wheat. So, I give Indonesia credit for that, and I hope we remember that comment when it comes to bilateral trade later: look after those who look after us. I wonder whether we will look back to the world wars and wonder whether any of the things that we did with our ally really count for much when it comes to issues such as this.

As the member for Eyre said, we only want a fair go. Australian Governments really have not helped. I will give the House a list of the things that they have done. In recent times in Australia farmers have lost the investment allowance, the super subsidy, some depreciation allowances and local machinery manufacturers—they have all gone. What have farmers gained? They now have capital gains tax, stamp duties, FID, the BAD tax, higher fuel prices—including a Government tax—higher cost of money, the increased value of the Australian dollar—which they must trade against—ridiculous work practices in the transport industry and on the wharves and so much bureaucracy and red tape. We all know about that. Where have we come in 15 years? I am amazed at the resilience of Australian grain growers in existing in this climate. We cannot go along with this. We have to put it right back to where it was; we must go back to the traditions.

I remind the House that the European Community started this process. I noted last night the comments of our British CPA visitors, who said that, although they were partners in the EC, they were not part of this sort of policy. I was heartened by that. I only wish the rest of them would come to their senses and stop this silly game. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I, too, support the motion, but I would just like to make a few points in relation to exactly what a motion like this will achieve. I have no problems with the body of the motion, but where does it go? We have had this dilemma in the past; in fact I moved a similar motion that was supported by the whole House. There was a general recognition that, although the motion was directed at the Federal Government, it would have no real impact. I am also

cognisant of the comments made by my colleague the member for Henley Beach that the vicious attacks that have been coming from some quarters in relation to the American Government are not appropriate. One has to look at the other side of the ledger and at what the United States has given this nation in our times of need.

In addition, there is the *ad hoc* reaction by some of the political Parties—and I will not identify them—in relation to what retaliatory methods we should adopt against the United States Government. Those issues have been well documented and there is no real need for me to go through them. One area I will raise relates to Dr Hewson's response of sending a strong letter to the United States and then advocating that we join the North American Free Trade Area and completely ignore the Pacific rim nations. That is complete hypocrisy; it is short-term gain.

There is no way that resolutions such as this will achieve the desired results. That was recognised by the member for Flinders in moving this motion. It simply gives us a chance to record the view of this Parliament in relation to the heavy subsidies which are currently being given by the United States Government, which will be matched by the European Community and which, if we are to believe the member for Eyre, will be matched by the Canadian Government to ensure its share of the wheat market.

I am not saying that the correct way to deal with this is through GATT because that is being proposed by the Federal Government—it is not for that reason. We are committed to GATT; we have always been committed to GATT. In fact, some of the advances that we have made in relation to some European countries have been as a result of GATT. So, we cannot simply say that we want to short circuit the situation and go through the North American Free Trade Area.

I would like to pick up a few comments made by the member for Eyre. I have a lot of time for the honourable member's knowledge of farming matters. However, to say that the problems would have been alleviated somewhat if this Government had not, in effect, taken away the rural registration subsidy or done other things that have been violently opposed by the Liberal Party is really a shade hypocritical because the viability of farmers in this country and in this State will not be enhanced by tinkering around with rural registration subsidies or whatever. That will occur when the world market participants sit down and make some commonsense decisions and everyone is given a fair chance to trade out in the wider community. That is what it is all about.

The mover of this motion, the member for Henley Beach, the member for Eyre, the member for Stuart and I serve on a select committee that is dealing with certain aspects of rural finance. Whilst I will not divulge the kind of problems we are looking at—because my Chairman would kill me—alongside the rural finance problems there has always been the problem of commodity prices. One could get a situation where some of the farmers to whom we have been talking and who may have been through certain rural adjustment schemes and have been able to trade out of their problems have been hit by this one and have suddenly found themselves behind the eight ball again.

I support the sentiments of the member for Flinders and all of the members who have contributed to this debate. However, what we need is a bit of sanity. If motions like this can reinforce the view of our Federal colleagues—and I know that some reasonable resolutions came from the National Party conference over the weekend and that some of the hot heads were hosed down, which resulted in some reasonable, rational resolutions being put forward—there may be a way for us to get ourselves out of this difficulty. However, it will not be by going through the North American Free Trade Area—it will be by sticking with GATT and improving our general relationship and our trading relationship with the Pacific rim nations.

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** I rise to join this debate and to commend the member for Flinders on moving the motion and my rural colleagues who supported it. I particularly note the contribution of the member for Henley Beach, because like me he represents an urban electorate. I do not exclude the member for Napier, but we know that he has a fetish for things agricultural and that he constantly tells the House that half of his electorate is agricultural. So, we have to put him in a semi-rural class.

A lot is said about level playing fields around the world, and it appears that everyone is in favour of a level playing field provided it is their playing field that is level and that they can set their own rules. As the member for a metropolitan seat, like most members in this House, I am more than conscious of the contribution of the electorates of Eyre, Goyder and all country electorates to the economy of South Australia and the efficiency and effectiveness of the rural sector as it has evolved over the 150 years of the history of this State. The rural sector has always been the flagship of South Australia and it is something of which we can be proud. In a fair world market it can compete. It is a cost competitive industry and, by any test of a fair market, our products are prepared and produced at cost-effective prices and should hold their own in such a fair world market.

Like other members, I deplore the fact that the market has been rendered unfair by the policies of large Governments. The member for Napier asked what could be achieved by the House passing this motion. I remind the honourable member that recently the House passed a motion about acknowledging support personnel who served in the Vietnam conflict. I hope that the member for Napier noted that the Commonwealth Government has now seen fit to grant an award. While we might not always be aware of the apparent and immediate consequences of what we do, we are elected to speak for the people of this State and we should speak for them. I commend the member for Flinders on his initiative.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I support the motion and commend the member for Flinders on having moved it. Two years ago I was in the United States and had the privilege of studying, among other things, agriculture. It was clear to me then that the subsidies that the Americans were giving to their farmers, not only wheat farmers but farmers in other areas, would stay for a long time. However, I got the clear impression that the Americans would move towards decreasing their

subsidies over a longer period, and that was heartening to me. Therefore, it came as a big shock when President Bush announced that he would contribute another \$US1 billion to farm subsidies through the EEP. Obviously it is a desperate situation for President Bush who recognises that the farm lobby is very powerful. I suppose it shows the tragedy of a political system when strong lobby groups can influence in a major way what a President or Party can promise.

Much has been said in this debate by members who are in the know, particularly the member for Flinders, who moved the motion, and the members for Eyre and for Custance, all of whom are wheat growers. They know the consequences more than anyone else. At a time when we have wheat crops which are looking magnificent, to say the very least, it is tragic that the Americans should move in this way.

We have heard a lot today about fair or unfair trade and the uneven playing field. All those factors come into it. The member for Eyre alluded to other factors also which need to be addressed and which are included in the Fightback package, but I will not go into those now. I fully support the motion and trust that by supporting it we will in a small way here, but hopefully when it is taken further in a large way, tell America that we cannot have this type of unfair trade towards Australia.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** The remarks made by other members about this matter need to be underlined and endorsed and a couple of other points need to be made. It is those matters that drive me to contribute to this debate in the limited time available to me. The motion is commendable so far as it goes. In addition there needs to be a recognition on our part that much of the problem confronting us would be solved if we were to allow our dollar to float honestly and freely and to find its real level relative to other currencies in which most trade contracts are written.

At present it is over-valued, because that is a convenient arrangement between a big Government which has no principles and sleazy big business which has no interest in the welfare of Australia but only in its own survival. If the dollar were allowed to find its own value somewhere between 58c and 62c, given the productive output of the people who earn it as recompense for their labours, much of the problem would be solved, because wheat prices would rise by more than 25 or 30 per cent straight away. Therefore, despite the corrupt trade practices of the EC and, in consequence, the United States which retaliates, we would still sell at proper prices which are profitable at the farm gate. I commend the member for Flinders on bringing the motion to the attention of the House and I happily support it.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I thank all members for their contributions to the debate and for the support that they have indicated they will give. I thank the member for Stuart for her comments about the debate and the need for this House to present a resolution in a non-partisan way. I thank the members for Eyre, Henley Beach, Custance, Napier, Hayward, Goyder and Murray-Mallee for their contributions. In a couple of instances, internal politics got a mention. I was hoping that we could keep out of that area because it is important that

the resolution should go forward in a non-partisan way. We would like that request to get through to the Federal Government and, hopefully, to the American President and people. There is another time and place to take up the internal politics of it, and I would be glad to be part of that debate, but now is not the time.

The member for Henley Beach indicated that the motion was a little anti-American. It was not intended that way. It was intended to be anti the two major powers with their trade wars. For that reason, my motion first mentioned the European Community and then the United States, although the latter part of the debate related to the most recent actions of the Americans. It is the context of the trade war that is the problem, not whether it is the EC or the United States. The trade war itself is causing the problem.

I think it is regrettable that the domestic political pressures of America have overridden US commitment to the pursuit of a less corrupted international trading environment for farm products. This latest measure threatens to escalate further the trade subsidy war between the US and the EC. Hence this motion, and I invite all members to support it.

Motion carried.

*[Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 7.30 p.m.]*

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

#### CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier):** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

In 1991, the Parliament legislated a very complex and detailed package of Bills which restructured the civil and criminal courts. The undertaking was a major one, and was the subject of extensive consultation and debate. One of the main reasons for the introduction of the package was to redistribute the business of the criminal courts.

One of the more significant contributors to the workload of the District Court were, and are, drug offences. The package proposed to remove some of the more minor cannabis and other drug offences from the District Court in to the Magistrates Court. The Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Courts) Act 1991 amended the Controlled Substances Act to achieve this.

One of the changes related to drugs other than cannabis. The change was an attempt to transfer minor non-cannabis trafficking offences from the category of a major indictable offence carrying a maximum of 25 years and/or a fine of \$500 000 to the category of a minor indictable offence carrying a maximum of five years and/or fine of \$25 000. This was proposed to be done within the existing sentencing structure of the Controlled Substances Act by reference to the amount of the drug involved in the offence.



The point of this part of the courts restructuring package was to change the court of trial for these offences—that is, the court in which the offences would be tried. It was most definitely not to change the effective penalties imposed for these offences. It now appears that, in this area, the objective may have miscarried.

On the advice now available to the Government, it appears that it is possible that any attempt to reallocate trials in this way may have the effect of lowering the effective penalties applicable to these offences. That was not the purpose of the legislation, nor is it the policy of the Government. It is therefore imperative that the matter should be put beyond doubt. That is the purpose of this Bill. It simply repeals the attempt.

The repeal must be made retrospective. That is simply because the original change was also made retrospective by section 22 (2) (a) of the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Courts) Act 1991 in accordance with the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

I have been advised by the Director of Public Prosecutions that while he understands and agrees with the intent of the original provision, there is no simple way to achieve its purpose without also affecting in some way the penalties actually applicable in these cases. He is of the opinion that what the current Bill seeks to do is an appropriate response to the problem that he has highlighted. While it is not possible to determine at this stage whether the passage of this Bill will affect the rights of any person to whom the original provision may have applied, he can say that he does not know of any sentence passed since the original provision came into operation with which he would be at all concerned.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides that this Act will be taken to have commenced on 6 July 1992.

Clause 3 amends section 32 (5) B (b) of the principal Act—

- by inserting 'or' between subparagraphs (i) and (ii);
- by striking out 'but one-fifth or more of that amount' from subparagraph (ii) (a phrase made irrelevant by these amendments); and
- by striking out subparagraph (iii).

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** The Opposition supports the Bill. It involves one of those mistakes that happens in the parliamentary sphere. The legislation that was passed in the previous session downgraded some offences so that they could be processed through the Magistrates Courts. Drug offences are very serious, but it was the opinion of this Parliament that some offences should be processed more speedily through the lower courts. However, the amendments that were accepted by both houses of Parliament downgraded not only the penalty but also the quantity that could be possessed; of course, that was not the intention of the Parliament. Parliament did not intend, for example, to categorise the possession of 60 grams of heroin as a minor offence. Parliament is thus in the process of correcting its mistake, and the Opposition approves of that process.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier):** I thank the member for Mitcham and the House for their cooperation. This is a technical matter that requires correction and, certainly, the cooperation that has been given is appreciated.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION BILL

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the protection of fruit and plants from disease; to repeal the Fruit and Plant Protection Act 1968,

the Fruit and Vegetables (Prevention of Injury) Act 1927, the Fruit Fly Act 1947 and the Sale of Fruit Act 1915; to make consequential amendments to the Expiation of Offences Act 1987 and the Phylloxera Act 1936; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill is to replace the Fruit and Plant Protection Act 1968 which had its origins in the 1880s. Despite various amendments, the current Act seems not to have broken from those origins and remains somewhat archaic. For example, the Act speaks of 'importation' and 'introduction' but not of sale or possession. These words recall the days of the interstate transport system before railways predominated when the arrival of goods was mostly by sea or river. Rail, in turn, has yielded to road transport which is particularly suited to perishable goods, so there now is great rapidity and diversity of interstate trade in plant products.

The measure before honourable members mirrors those changes and recognises that speed is of the essence in quarantine as it is in fire control. I do not believe it unfair to say of the present Act, that it would be hard pressed, in a legal context, to meet any dire quarantine emergency. This is largely because it requires either the making of regulations or ministerial notices before some types of action can be taken.

These remarks must be qualified by relating that South Australia has been fortunate, perhaps unique, in that the persuasive powers of departmental officers and cooperation by the public, has seen action precede legal formalities. However, it might equally be said that we are yet to face a true emergency and that the powers envisaged by this Bill ultimately must come into full play.

On a broader note, some may argue that the proposed measures are necessary as a buffer to the Commonwealth's revised quarantine policies. That point is as valid as the argument that the ease of contemporary travel and commerce between the States are sufficient reasons for the proposals.

Two things are quite clear—both industry and consumers (who were consulted on the issue) want to see this type of legislation, embodying the appropriate powers, retained. Secondly (and obviously), if South Australia had no such Act it would stand alone in this nation and would almost certainly be spurned as a trading partner both here and overseas.

The background to this Bill should not be concluded without stating that South Australia has developed sensible conditions of entry for a range of fresh products sought by both traders and consumers and moreover with the clear objective of reducing costs to the nation's growers and merchants, South Australia has impressed on other States, the need for rationalisation of interstate quarantine criteria. Thus far it appears to have succeeded in the most significant of areas, namely the provisions concerning fruit fly hosts.

As to specific aspects of the Bill, I believe several warrant examination. First, organisms previously defined as either diseases or pests appear under the single definition of 'disease' in the Bill. This change simply is for ease of expression in the Act and subordinate measures.

The general powers of inspectors in clause 9 have much the same intent as those of the present Act and in the main would be concerned with items illegally introduced from interstate. However, in recasting these along the lines of the Stock Act which Parliament saw fit to pass in 1990, there would be provision for the entry of residential premises under a justice's warrant. Such warrants would be desirable on rare occasions involving serious breaches of the Act or grave plant health threats. In addition, clause 9 provides for scientific testing of fruit and other items for the presence of disease or chemical residues. The objective in testing for the latter would be to substantiate any claim that a seized product had undergone a prescribed treatment before entering the State.

Proposed provisions for the reporting and investigation of diseases again are modelled on the Stock Act 1990. These are followed by clause 13 which, in prohibiting or controlling the entry of various things from interstate, mirrors the current Fruit and Plant Protection Act and adds two features. First it is proposed that the Minister may, after appropriate consultation, permit the introduction of a disease for the purposes of



research or biological control. It is possible that the current Act allows such action but it seems appropriate to clearly spell this out in the Bill. The use of sterile fruit flies in the biological control of that pest is one project that could be launched under this provision. Necessary safeguards would, of course, be attached to such proposals.

The second feature makes it an offence to purchase or take delivery of anything introduced or imported into the State in contravention of the Act. This would overcome the doubts expressed at the opening of this report and make it clear that the Act extends beyond 'importation' and 'introduction' of such goods.

Declaration by the Minister, of quarantine areas under clause 14 and the imposition of disease controls within these, are provisions taken from the current Act. These powers have been used successfully and, I might add, have been accepted by producers during outbreaks of the disease onion smut. The provisions have particular application to long-lived organisms such as that just mentioned. An addition to the existing powers is to be found in the proposal concerning prohibitions on the entry of material into a quarantine area.

Clause 15—orders relating to disease affected fruit or plants—is designed for the unexpected, such as the sudden emergence of a virulent exotic disease. The provisions are not unlike those currently in place but in conferring on the Chief Inspector the power to order things to be done, there is no longer a requirement to make regulations beforehand. However, that power is balanced by the proviso that the Minister must first approve the action to be taken by the Chief Inspector.

This feature sets the Bill slightly apart from the Stock Act 1990 which does not require ministerial approval of such action. In this instance, however, it is recognised that unlike farm livestock, fruit and plants are grown both by commercial producers and householders. This makes eradication campaigns more socially complex and justify ministerial overview. The proviso is also in line with the green paper which broadly argued that all such powers rest with the Minister.

The concept contained in clause 18 of accredited production areas was raised by industry and while the provisions are quite broad, their application is unlikely to go beyond the objective promoted by the industry. That objective simply is to reinforce with interstate authorities the fact that a particular area is free of disease and in so doing, ease the entry of produce to another State or States.

Payment of compensation for losses due to quarantine action is modelled on a provision of the Fruit Fly Act 1947. There would be no compulsion to make such payments.

Provision for the expiation of offences in clause 21 is a further suggestion by industry. In addition, penalties for serious offences would undergo a significant increase, but within this, it is proposed to set lower penalties for illegal introductions of material for personal use.

Clause 30 picks up a provision of the current Act which has proved to be particularly worthwhile since its passage by Parliament in 1986. Specifically, the operation of the Plant Quarantine Standard under a ministerial notice has set this State ahead of others in the speedy and effective administration of interstate plant quarantine. This standard has been accepted readily by importers and has enhanced the development and policing of sensible conditions of entry or where required, stringent restrictions.

The power to make regulations has been incorporated in the Bill but in all the circumstances is unlikely to be taken beyond the setting of fees.

This Bill will repeal the current Fruit and Plant Protection Act 1968 and also secures the repeal of the Fruit Fly Act for the reasons already given as well as two moribund measures, the Fruit and Vegetables (Prevention of Injury) Act 1927 and Sale of Fruit Act 1915. Neither of these has application to today's packaging and handling technology.

Finally it is proposed to concurrently amend the Phylloxera Act 1936. This simple change would provide that the Minister consent to the introduction of vines into the State by the Phylloxera Board. At present the Governor gives such consent but that process in an era of numerous introductions, is unnecessarily burdensome.

I commend the Bill to members.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows.

Part 1 of the Bill ('Preliminary') is comprised of clauses 1 to 5.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 provides for the definitions of words and phrases used in the Bill.

Clause 4 provides that, for the purposes of this Act, the Minister may, by notice in the *Gazette*, declare that a condition of fruit or plants is a disease. Such a notice may be varied or revoked.

Clause 5 provides that the Minister may, by notice in the *Gazette*, declare a place to be a quarantine station in which fruit, plants, soil, packaging or other thing may, subject to this Act, be held, examined,

disinfected, treated, destroyed or otherwise disposed of. Such a notice may be varied or revoked.

Part 2 of the Bill (comprising clauses 6 to 10) deals with administrative matters.

Clause 6 provides that the Minister may, by instrument in writing, appoint persons to be inspectors for the purposes of this Act. Such an appointment may be conditional and the Minister must provide an inspector with a certificate of appointment setting out any such conditions. Subclause (4) provides that an inspector must, at the request of a person in relation to whom the inspector has exercised or intends to exercise powers under this Act, produce his or her certificate of appointment.

Clause 7 provides that the Minister may, by instrument in writing, appoint a person to be the Chief Inspector for the purposes of this Act and a person to be the deputy of the Chief Inspector. The person appointed as the deputy has, while acting in the absence of the Chief Inspector, all the powers and functions of the Chief Inspector.

Clause 8 provides that the Chief Inspector may delegate to any person (including an inspector) any of the Chief Inspector's powers or functions under this Act. Such a delegation may be subject to such conditions as the Chief Inspector thinks fit, is revocable at will and does not derogate from the power of the Chief Inspector to act in any matter himself or herself.

Clause 9 provides that an inspector may, for the purposes of exercising any power conferred on the inspector by this Act or determining whether this Act is being or has been complied with—

- enter and search any land, premises, vehicle or place;
- where reasonably necessary, break into or open any part of, or anything in or on, the land, premises, vehicle or place or, in the case of a vehicle, give directions with respect to the stopping or moving of the vehicle;
- take photographs, films or video recordings;
- require a person to answer questions or to provide information;
- require a person to produce any books, documents or records in his or her possession or control;
- require a person to produce any information stored by computer, microfilm or by any other process;
- examine, copy and take extracts from, or provide copies of, any books, documents, records or information produced under this section.

Subclause (2) provides that an inspector may—

- identify any land, building or other structure, fruit, plant, soil, packaging or thing in respect of which powers have been exercised under this Act;
- require the owner of any fruit, plant, soil, packaging or other thing to deliver it to a quarantine station;
- seize and retain anything that may constitute evidence of the commission of an offence against this Act;
- seize any fruit, plant, soil, packaging or other thing brought into a place, removed from a place, or moved from one place to another, in contravention of this Act;
- use reasonable force to prevent the commission of an offence against this Act.

Subclause (3) provides that an inspector must not exercise the power conferred by proposed subsection (1) (b) in relation to any residential premises except on the authority of a warrant issued by a justice who must be satisfied (by information given on oath) that the warrant is reasonably required in the circumstances.

Subclause (5) provides that where an inspector seizes any fruit, plant, soil, packaging or other thing under proposed subsection (2) (d), the inspector may do one or more of the following in relation to it:

- retain it;
- cleanse, disinfect or otherwise treat it or subject it to treatment;
- submit it for scientific testing and analysis for the purposes of determining whether it is affected by disease or a chemical residue;
- return it to its owner subject to any specified conditions;
- destroy or otherwise dispose of it.

Subclauses (6) and (7) provide that a person may be required to answer a question put by an inspector or to produce books, documents, records or information notwithstanding that the answer to the question or the contents of the books, documents, records or information would tend to incriminate him or her of an offence. If a person objects to answering such a question or to producing such books, documents, records or information, the answer to the question or the contents of the books, documents, records or information are not admissible against that person in criminal proceedings (except in proceedings for an offence under this Act of making a false or misleading statement).

Subclause (8) provides that an occupier of land or premises or a person apparently in charge of a vehicle must give to an inspector (or a person assisting an inspector) exercising or proposing to exercise any powers under this Act such assistance and provide such facilities as the inspector may reasonably require.

Subclause (9) provides that an inspector (or a person assisting an inspector) who addresses offensive language to any other person or who, without lawful authority or a reasonable belief as to lawful authority, hinders or obstructs or uses or threatens to use force in relation to any other person, is guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of a division 6 fine (\$4 000).

Clause 10 provides that an inspector incurs no civil or criminal liability for an act or omission in good faith in the exercise or performance, or purported exercise or performance, of a power or function under this Act and that civil liability that would, but for this clause, lie against a person lies against the Crown.

Part 3 of the Bill (comprising clauses 11 to 20) deal with the control of disease in relation to fruit and plants.

Clause 11 provides that where a person knows or has reason to suspect that fruit or plants owned by him or her or in his or her possession or control are affected by disease, the person is guilty of an offence if he or she does not report the matter to an inspector by the quickest practicable means, does not furnish the inspector with such information as reasonably required and does not take all reasonable measures to prevent the spread of the disease. The penalty for such an offence is a division 6 fine (\$4 000).

Subclause (2) provides that a report is not required with respect to a particular matter if the person knows or reasonably believes that the matter has already been reported to an inspector.

Subclause (3) provides that a person who grows, propagates or processes fruit or plants for profit or gain will, if the fruit or plants are affected by disease, be taken to know or have reason to suspect that the fruit or plants are so affected in the absence of proof to the contrary.

Clause 12 provides that an inspector may carry out an investigation as reasonably necessary for the purposes of determining whether fruit or plants are affected by disease and/or identifying or tracing any cause or source or potential cause or source of disease. For this investigatory purpose, an inspector may examine, take samples from or test any insect, fruit, plants, soil, packaging or other thing.

Clause 13 provides that, subject to this proposed section a person must not introduce or import into the State a disease, or any fruit, plant, soil, packaging or other thing affected by disease.

Subclause (2) provides that the Minister may, by notice in the *Gazette*, declare that the introducing or importing into the State of any fruit, plant, soil, packaging or other thing of a specified kind that the Minister reasonably suspects is or might be affected by disease is prohibited absolutely or subject to exceptions and conditions specified in the notice. Such a notice may be varied or revoked by the Minister by further notice in the *Gazette* (proposed subclause (3)).

Subclause (4) provides that the Minister may, for the purposes of furthering agricultural interests, scientific research or the biological control of a disease, by notice in writing, exempt a person from complying with this section subject to conditions set out in the notice. Before taking action under proposed subsection (4), the Minister must consult widely with, and take into account the advice of, members of the agricultural and scientific communities. Such a notice may, by further notice in writing, be varied or revoked by the Minister.

Subclause (7) provides that a person who contravenes or fails to comply with this proposed section or a notice under it or who purchases or takes delivery of anything introduced or imported into the State in contravention of this proposed section or a notice under it is guilty of an offence. The penalty for this offence is two-tiered. If the offence consists of introducing or importing into the State not more than one kilogram of fruit or five plants for the person's own consumption or enjoyment or any soil, packaging or thing (other than fruit or plants) not intended for sale or use for commercial purposes (a 'prescribed offence'), the penalty is a division 7 fine (\$2 000). The fine, in any other case, is a division 4 fine (\$15 000).

Clause 14 provides that the Minister may, by notice in the *Gazette*, declare a portion of the State to be a quarantine area in respect of all diseases or in respect of those diseases specified in the notice. A notice under this proposed section may—

- prohibit the removal from a quarantine area of any fruit or plant of a species or kind or any packaging or other thing of a kind that might transmit a disease;
- require the owners or occupiers of land or premises within the quarantine area to take measures that are necessary for the control or eradication of a disease;

- require the owners or occupiers of land or premises within specified portions of the quarantine area to take more stringent measures than the owners or occupiers of other land or premises within the quarantine area;
- prohibit the planting and propagation of plants, or plants of a specified species or kind, within the quarantine area during a period specified in the notice;
- prohibit absolutely or subject to exceptions and conditions specified in the notice the importing into the quarantine area of any fruit or plant of a species or kind or any soil, packaging or other thing, specified in the notice;
- be varied or revoked by the Minister by further notice in the *Gazette*.

Clause 15 provides that where the Chief Inspector knows or reasonably suspects that any fruit or plant is or might become affected by disease, he or she may, with the approval of the Minister, issue such orders under this section as may be reasonably necessary to prevent the outbreak or spread of the disease to the person who owns or has possession or control of the fruit or plant or to the owners or occupiers of land or premises in the vicinity.

Subclause (2) provides that one or more of the following orders may be issued in relation to any fruit, plant, soil, packaging or other thing that is or might become affected by disease:

- requiring that it be kept at a specified place for a specified period;
- requiring that it be subjected to specified treatment;
- requiring that it be subjected to examinations or tests at specified intervals or that other specified action be taken for the purposes of determining the presence of disease;
- restricting or prohibiting its sale or supply or restricting the purposes for which it may be used;
- requiring that it be destroyed or disposed of in a specified manner;
- prohibiting the planting and propagation of plants, or plants of a specified species or kind, on specified land during a specified period.

Subclause (3) provides that where the Chief Inspector cannot locate after reasonable inquiry a person of whom the Chief Inspector intended to make any requirement for action by order under this proposed section the Chief Inspector may cause the action to be taken by an inspector or other person and recover costs and expenses reasonably incurred by action in a court of competent jurisdiction as a debt owed by the owner of the fruit, plant, soil, packaging or other thing in respect of which action was taken by the inspector or other person.

Clause 16 provides that an order under proposed Division 2 of Part 3 (comprising clauses 13 to 17) must be in writing but may be of general or limited application and may, by further order, be varied or revoked. If it is an order that is of a continuing nature, it has effect for such period as is specified in the order.

Subclause (4) provides that where an order of a continuing nature is issued under this proposed Division on the basis of a suspicion, the Chief Inspector must, as soon as practicable, take reasonable steps to determine whether that suspicion is correct.

Subclause (5) provides that if a person refuses or fails to comply with an order issued under this proposed Division, the Chief Inspector may cause an inspector or other person to take any necessary action to give effect to the order and the Chief Inspector may recover costs and expenses reasonably incurred in such a case by action in a court of competent jurisdiction as a debt owed by the person to whom the order was issued.

Clause 17 provides that a person to whom an order has been issued under this proposed Division who contravenes or fails to comply with the order is guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of a division 4 fine (\$15 000).

Clause 18 provides that where the Minister is satisfied that, through the exercise of good management by the producers and processors of fruit and plants in a specified area, the area is free of a specified disease or diseases, the Minister may, by notice in the *Gazette*, declare that area to be free of the disease or diseases specified in the notice and authorize the use of specified statements in respect of fruit or plants produced or processed in that area when advertising, packaging or selling those fruit or plants. Such a notice may be varied or revoked. It is an offence for a person to use a statement specified in a notice under proposed subsection (1) otherwise than in respect of fruit or plants produced or processed in the area specified in the notice which carries a penalty of a division 7 fine (\$2 000).

Clause 19 provides that the Minister may pay compensation to any person who has suffered loss in consequence of an order made under proposed Division 2 of Part 3. Such an application for compensation must be in writing, must be made in a manner and form determined by the Minister and must be supported by such evidence as the Minister

may require. No action lies against the Minister to compel him or her to make any payment of compensation.

Clause 20 provides that a person who, without the approval of the Chief Inspector, sells or supplies any fruit or plant affected by disease or any fruit or plant subject to an order under proposed Division 2 of Part 3 is guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of a division 7 fine (\$2 000).

Subclause (2) provides that the owner of land or premises in relation to which an order is in force under proposed Division 2 of Part 3 must notify the Chief Inspector of any intended sale of the land or premises at least 28 days before the date of settlement. The penalty for non-compliance with this proposed subsection is a division 7 fine (\$2 000).

Subclause (3) provides that where a person is guilty of an offence against this proposed section, a court may (in addition to any other penalty that may be imposed) order the person to pay to the person to whom the fruit, plant, land or premises were sold or supplied such compensation as the court thinks fit.

Part 4 of the Bill (comprising clauses 21 to 30) deals with miscellaneous matters.

Clause 21 provides that a person must not—

- hinder or obstruct an inspector, or a person assisting an inspector, in the exercise of powers under this Act;
- refuse or fail to comply with any request or requirement made by an inspector under this Act;
- falsely represent, by words or conduct, that he or she is an inspector;
- remove or interfere with any identification mark or device used for the purposes of this Act.

The penalty for offending against this proposed section is a division 6 fine (\$4 000).

Clause 22 provides that a person who, in furnishing information under this Act, makes a statement that is false or misleading in a material particular is guilty of an offence and liable to a division 6 fine (\$4 000).

Clause 23 provides that a notice or order required or authorised by this Act to be given or issued to a person may be given or issued by delivering it personally to the person (or his or her agent), by leaving it for the person at his or her place of residence or business with someone apparently over the age of 16 years, by posting it to the person (or his or her agent) at his or her last known address or by transmission by facsimile machine to a facsimile machine number provided by that person for that purpose.

Clause 24 provides that for the purposes of this Act, an act or omission of an employee or agent will be taken to be the act or omission of the employer or principal unless it is proved that the act or omission did not occur in the course of the employment or agency. It is further provided that where a body corporate commits an offence against this Act, each member of the governing body of the body corporate is guilty of an offence and liable to the penalty applicable to the principal offence unless it is proved that the member could not by the exercise of reasonable diligence have prevented the commission of that offence.

Clause 25 provides that in any legal proceedings, a document apparently executed by the Minister certifying as to a matter relating to—

- the appointment of an inspector under this Act;
- an order or approval of the Chief Inspector or any other inspector under this Act;
- a delegation under this Act;
- the amount of costs and expenses incurred in taking any specified action under this Act,

constitutes proof, in the absence of proof to the contrary, of the matters so certified.

Subclause (2) provides that an allegation in a complaint—

- that a specified person is or was the owner or occupier of specified property;
- that specified fruit or plants were within a specified area;
- that specified fruit or plants are or were affected by disease;
- that something done was done without the approval of the Chief Inspector,

constitutes proof, in the absence of proof to the contrary, of the matters so alleged.

Clause 26 provides that an offence against this Act is a summary offence and that proceedings for such an offence can be commenced at any time within three years from the day on which it is alleged the offence was committed.

Clause 27 provides that where an offence against a provision of this Act is committed by a person by reason of a continuing act or omission, the person is liable, in addition to the penalty otherwise applicable to the offence, to a penalty for each day during which the act or omission

continues of not more than an amount equal to one-fifth of the maximum penalty prescribed for that offence and if the Act or omission continues after the person is convicted of the offence, the person is guilty of a further offence against that provision and liable, in addition to the penalty otherwise applicable to the further offence, to a penalty for each day during which the act or omission continues after that conviction, of not more than an amount equal to one-fifth of the maximum penalty prescribed for that offence.

Subclause (2) provides that for the purposes of this proposed section, an obligation to do something is to be regarded as continuing until the act is done notwithstanding that any period within which, or time before which, the act is required to be done has expired or passed.

Clause 28 provides that it is a defence to a charge of an offence against this Act if the defendant proves that the offence did not result from any failure on the part of the defendant to take reasonable care to avoid the commission of the offence.

Clause 29 provides that a notice given by the Minister, or a regulation made, under this Act may be of general or limited application and may apply, adopt or incorporate, with or without modification, any code, standard or other document prepared or approved by a body or authority referred to in the notice or regulation as in force from time to time or as in force at a specified time.

Subclause (2) provides that where a code, standard or other document is applied, adopted or incorporated in a notice or regulation, a copy of it must be kept available for inspection by members of the public, without charge, and during normal office hours, at the office of the Chief Inspector. This subclause further provides that in any legal proceedings, evidence of the contents of the code, standard or other document may be given by production of a document apparently certified by or on behalf of the Minister as a true copy of the code, standard or other document.

Clause 30 provides that the Governor may make such regulations as are necessary or expedient for the purposes of this Act including prescribing a fine, not exceeding a division 7 fine (\$2 000), for contravention of the regulations.

Schedule 1 of the Bill repeals the Fruit and Plant Protection Act 1968, the Fruit and Vegetables (Prevention of Injury) Act 1927, the Fruit Fly Act 1947 and the Sale of Fruit Act 1915.

Schedule 2 of the Bill provides for consequential amendments to the Phylloxera Act 1936.

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

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COUNTRY ARTS TRUST BILL

Second reading.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning):** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Bill

The purposes of this Bill are—

- to repeal the Cultural Trusts Act 1976;
- to establish the South Australian Country Arts Trust and five Country Arts Boards and define their functions and powers;
- to transfer the property, rights and liabilities of the four existing Cultural Trusts, the Central Region Cultural Authority and the Regional Cultural Council to the South Australian Country Arts Trust; and
- to transfer the necessary staff of the Cultural Trusts, the Central Region Cultural Authority and the Regional Cultural Council to the South Australian Country Arts Trust.

The Government, over many years, has strongly supported regional arts development in South Australia. Figures show that in 1990, 23 per cent of all arts development resources went to regional areas in which 24 per cent of South Australia's population lived. The Cultural Trusts Act, originally assented to in 1976 and entitled the Regional Cultural Centres Act, provided for the establishment of bodies initially called

Regional Cultural Centres, later Regional Cultural Trusts, and presently known simply as Cultural Trusts, to develop and manage cultural facilities in proclaimed regions and support a range of arts activities and programs throughout country South Australia. In 1992 the proclaimed regions relate to—

- the Eyre Peninsula Cultural Trust;
- the Northern Cultural Trust;
- the Riverland Cultural Trust; and
- the South-East Cultural Trust.

The Central Region Cultural Authority, an incorporated association, was established to develop and manage cultural facilities and support a range of arts activities and programs in that part of the State not within the areas of the Cultural Trusts. The Regional Cultural Council, also an incorporated association, was established to coordinate, develop and promote cultural activities in association with the Cultural Trusts and the Central Region Cultural Authority in order that all country South Australians have the opportunity to experience the arts.

As part of the 1991-92 budget and legislative review processes, a review of regional arts development in South Australia was undertaken, involving the examination of the range of regional arts activities and programs supported by the South Australian Government, including the structural management arrangements of the organisations responsible for these activities.

The resultant report, *Review of Regional Arts Development in South Australia*, recommends the following:

- that the four Cultural Trusts established under the Cultural Trusts Act 1976 be abolished;
- that a single statutory body called the South Australian Country Arts Trust (SACAT) be established in place of the Cultural Trusts;
- that SACAT assume responsibility for the assets and liabilities of the Cultural Trusts;
- that SACAT oversee the coordination and management of regional arts development and assume responsibility for the financial and artistic aspects of regional arts activities;
- that SACAT establish five Country Arts Boards to exercise a devolved responsibility for decision-making and management of regional arts activities.

The Government believes that the proposed new management structure will provide a stimulus to regional arts activities and consolidate the excellent work previously undertaken to establish a network of regional theatres and Statwide performing arts programs.

The Review Committee, as part of the consultative process, met with all four Cultural Trusts, the Central Regional Cultural Authority, the Regional Cultural Council, the staff of those bodies and the unions involved. It also met with the Local Government Association and the local councils where the trusts are established. A total of 94 submissions were received from arts organisations and individuals and five public meetings were held in the designated regions. Following Cabinet's approval of the report on 9 March 1992, all the Cultural Trusts and their staff have discussed the report's implications with officers of the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage and there is general acceptance of the recommendations.

The proposed structural, managerial and operational arrangements detailed in the report can be implemented at a cost of \$2.5 million in a full year (in 1991 dollars). This represents a saving on 1990-91 expenditure of approximately \$500 000. More importantly, the proposed structure enables redirection of available funding to significantly increase arts projects funding which will ensure that a greater number of arts development activities (including regional touring) occur throughout regional South Australia.

There will be an increase in funding from \$70 000 to \$300 000 for the Regional Arts Development Officers, which is a change from \$5 000 to \$20 000 per officer. An additional two Regional Arts Development Officers will be appointed, one to Kangaroo Island and the Fleurieu Peninsula and the other to the Eyre Peninsula, bringing the number to 15 officers. The Local Presenters Fund will also be increased from \$40 000 to \$60 000 and a programming fund of \$20 000 will be provided to each of the four theatres for entrepreneurial activities and touring. There will also be a Cultural Promotions Touring Unit, which will ensure coordinated touring and access by all the regions to arts products.

A total reduction of 11 administrative and support staff was envisaged by the review. At this time four of these staff have secured alternative employment and 10 others are on time-limited contracts. The further reduction will be accommodated by normal attrition, completion of contracts or, where necessary, by redeployment. The relevant unions have been consulted and no practical difficulties have been identified.

I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal.

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

Clause 3 defines terms used in the measure.

Clause 4 provides for the establishment of the South Australian Country Arts Trust.

Subclause (1) establishes the trust.

Subclause (2) provides that the trust is a body corporate and has full legal capacity to exercise all the powers that are capable of being exercised by a body corporate.

Subclause (3) provides that the trust is an instrumentality of the Crown and holds its property on behalf of the Crown.

Subclause (4) provides that where an apparently genuine document purports to bear the common seal of the trust, it will be presumed in any legal proceedings, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that the common seal of the trust was duly affixed to that document.

Clause 5 deals with the membership of the trust.

Subclause (1) provides that the trust is to consist of 10 trustees appointed by the Minister:

- one will be appointed by the Minister to be the presiding trustee of the trust;
- one will be a person nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia;
- three will be persons who together will provide business, entrepreneurial and arts skills;
- the balance of the membership of the trust will be one member from each of the five Country Arts boards selected from two members nominated by each board (see note below on subclause (3)).

Subclause (2) requires at least two trustees to be women and two to be men.

Subclause (3) provides that each trustee who is a member of a Country Arts board will, until his or her office becomes vacant, have as his or her proxy the other member of the board comprising the panel nominated by the board under subclause (1).

Clause 6 sets out the term and conditions of office of trustees.

Subclause (1) provides for a trustee to be appointed for a maximum term, specified by the Minister in the instrument of appointment—

- in the case of the presiding trustee—of three years;
- in any other case—of two years.

Subclause (2) provides for a trustee to be eligible for reappointment but limits the period for which a person can hold office as a trustee to six consecutive years.

Subclause (3) entitles a trustee to such allowances and expenses as the Minister may determine.

Subclause (4) empowers the Minister to remove a trustee from office for misconduct or for mental or physical incapacity, or failure, to carry out satisfactorily the duties of his or her office.

Subclause (5) provides that the office of a trustee becomes vacant if—

- the trustee dies;
- the trustee completes a term of office and is not reappointed;
- the trustee resigns by written notice addressed to the Minister;
- in the case of a trustee appointed on the nomination of a Country Arts board, the trustee ceases to be a member of the board;

or

- the trustee is removed from office by the Minister under subclause (4).

Subclause (6) provides for the appointment in accordance with the measure of a trustee on the office of a trustee becoming vacant.

Subclause (7) limits the term of office of a trustee appointed to fill a casual vacancy to the balance of the term of his or her predecessor.

Clause 7 prescribes the procedures of the trust.

Subclause (1) provides for meetings of the trust to be chaired by the presiding trustee, or in his or her absence, by a trustee chosen by those present.

Subclause (2) specifies the number of trustees required to constitute a quorum of the trust and prohibits any business being transacted at a meeting of the trust unless a quorum is present.

Subclause (3) allows the trust to act despite vacancies in its membership, subject to a quorum being present.

Subclause (4) entitles each trustee at a meeting (whether personally or by proxy) to one vote on a matter arising for decision at the meeting and gives the trustee presiding at the meeting a casting vote, as well as a deliberative vote, in the event of an equality of votes.

Subclause (5) provides for a decision carried by a majority of trustees present and voting (whether personally or by proxy) at a meeting to constitute a decision of the trust.

Subclause (6) requires the trust to keep accurate minutes of its proceedings at meetings.

Subclause (7) provides for the procedure for the calling of meetings and for the conduct of business of meetings to be determined by the trust.

Clause 8 deals with conflicts of interest.

Subclause (1) requires a trustee who has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in a matter decided or under consideration by the trust to disclose the nature of the interest to the trust, to abstain from taking part in any discussion by the trust relating to that matter, to not vote in relation to the matter (whether personally or by proxy) and to be absent from the meeting room when any such discussion or deliberation is taking place. The maximum penalty for non-compliance is a division 6 fine (\$4 000) or division 6 imprisonment (one year).

Subclause (2) provides that it is a defence to a charge of an offence to subclause (1) to prove that the defendant was not, at the time of the alleged offence aware of his or her interest in the matter.

Subclause (3) requires a disclosure under the clause to be recorded in the minutes of the trust.

Clause 9 sets out the functions and powers of the trust.

One of the functions of the trust is, in consultation with the Country Arts boards, to develop and keep under review, guidelines for the performance by the boards of functions and powers delegated by the trust (see subclause (1) (g)).

The trust will have the power to develop and manage Statewide touring programs and, in the first instance, the priority will be to establish the Performing Arts Touring Unit. Subclause (2) (e) will enable the trust to initially manage the Performing Arts Touring Unit and allows other art form programs to be developed and to tour in the future.

Clause 10 subjects the trust to the general direction and control of the Minister.

Clause 11 empowers the trust to establish committees (which may, but need not, consist of or include trustees and whose functions and procedures will be as determined by the trust) to advise or assist the trust or perform any of its functions or powers.

Clause 12 empowers the trust to delegate any of its functions or powers (except the power of delegation) under the measure to a trustee, a committee established by the trust, a Country Arts board, a particular person or body or the person for the time being occupying a particular office or position.

A delegation must be by instrument in writing, may be conditional or unconditional, does not take away the power of the trust to act in any matter and may be revoked by the trust at will.

Clause 13 empowers the trust to employ, on terms and conditions fixed by the trust, such persons as it considers necessary or desirable for the proper performance of the functions and powers conferred on the trust and the Country Arts boards under the measure.

Clause 14 deals with the powers of the trust to borrow money. This provision is identical to section 13 of the Cultural Trusts Act.

Subclause (1) empowers the trust, with the consent of the Treasurer, to borrow money at interest from any person upon such security (if any) by way of mortgage or charge of any assets of the trust as the trust may think fit to grant.

Subclause (2) empowers the Treasurer, on such terms and conditions as the Treasurer thinks fit, to guarantee the repayment of any money (together with interest) borrowed by the trust under this provision.

Subclause (3) provides for any money to be paid in satisfaction of such a guarantee to be paid out of the Consolidated Account.

Clause 15 empowers the trust to invest by way of deposit with the Treasurer or in any other manner approved by the Treasurer any money of the trust not immediately required by the trust. This provision is identical to section 13a of the Cultural Trusts Act.

Clause 16 deals with gifts. This provision is identical to section 14 of the Cultural Trusts Act.

Subclause (1) empowers the trust to accept—

- grants, conveyances, transfers and leases of land whether from the Crown or any instrumentality of the Crown or any other person;
  - rights to the use, control, management or occupation of land;
- and

- gifts of personal property of any kind to be used or applied by it for the purposes of the measure.

Subclause (2) exempts from stamp duty any instrument by which land or an interest in or a right over land is granted or assured to, or vested in, the trust or any contract or instrument executed by the trust for the purposes of disposing of any property. The reason for this provision is that the trust is predominantly State Government funded and exists to support funded programs in accordance with Government policy.

Clause 17 deals with the trust's budget. This provision is identical to section 14a of the Cultural Trusts Act.

Subclause (1) requires the trust, as soon as practicable after the commencement of the measure, to submit to the Minister a budget showing estimates of its receipts and payments over the balance of the financial year within which the budget is presented and thereafter, before the commencement of each succeeding financial year, to submit to the Minister a budget showing estimates of its receipts and payments for that succeeding financial year.

Subclause (2) empowers the Minister to approve, with or without amendment, a budget submitted under this clause.

Subclause (3) prohibits the trust from making, without the consent of the Minister, any expenditure not authorised by an approved budget.

Subclause (4) defines the term 'approved budget'.

Clause 18 deals with the trust's accounts. This provision is identical to section 14b of the Cultural Trusts Act.

Subclause (1) requires the trust to keep proper accounts of its financial affairs.

Subclause (2) requires the Auditor-General to audit the accounts at least once in each year and empowers him or her to do so at any time.

Clause 19 deals with the trust's annual report. This provision is almost identical to section 14c of the Cultural Trusts Act.

Subclause (1) requires the trust to submit to the Minister, on or before 30 September in each year, a report on its activities during the 12 months that ended on the preceding 30 June.

Subclause (2) requires the report to incorporate the audited statement of accounts for the trust in relation to the relevant period.

Subclause (3) requires the Minister to cause a copy of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament within 12 sitting days of receiving the report.

Clause 20 provides for the establishment of Country Arts Boards.

Subclause (1) establishes five Country Arts Boards.

Subclause (2) provides that each Country Arts Board is established in relation to a part of the State defined by proclamation. In the first instance it is likely that the regions will remain consistent with the existing definition by proclamation of the four cultural trusts. The area of the Central Region Country Arts Board will be defined by reference to the area currently serviced by the Central Region Cultural Authority.

Subclause (3) empowers the Governor, by proclamation, to define a part of the State in relation to which a Country Arts Board is established.

Subclause (4) empowers the Governor, by subsequent proclamation, to vary or revoke a proclamation under subclause (3).

Subclause (5) provides that a Country Arts Board is a body corporate and has full legal capacity to exercise all the powers that are capable of being exercised by a body corporate.

Subclause (6) provides that the trust is an instrumentality of the Crown and hold its property on behalf of the Crown.

Subclause (7) provides that where an apparently genuine document purports to bear the common seal of a Country Arts Board, it will be presumed in any legal proceedings, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that the common seal of the board was duly affixed to that document.

Clause 21 deals with the membership of Country Arts Boards.

Subclause (1) provides that a Country Arts Board is to consist of eight members appointed by the Minister:

- one will be appointed by the Minister to be the presiding member of the board;
- one will be a person nominated jointly by the municipal or district councils whose areas are in the part of the State in relation to which the board is established;

The regions have many municipal or district councils. Some of the councils have formed regional associations. Should all councils agree to the person to be nominated, then that person will be appointed by the Minister. However, if the councils are unable to agree on one nomination, each council will nominate a person and the Minister will select one person from those nominated;

- six will be persons nominated by local residents and persons of a prescribed class in accordance with procedures prescribed by the regulations.

Subclause (2) requires a person to be a local resident to be eligible for nomination as a member of a Country Arts Board.

Subclause (3) requires at least two members of each Country Arts Board to be women and two to be men.

Clause 22 sets out the term and conditions of office of members of Country Arts Boards.

Subclause (1) provides for a member to be appointed for a maximum term, specified by the Minister in the instrument of appointment—

- in the case of the presiding member—of three years;

• in any other case—of two years.

Subclause (2) provides for a member to be eligible for reappointment but limits the period for which a person can hold office as a member to six consecutive years.

Subclause (3) entitles a member to such allowances and expenses as the Minister may determine.

Subclause (4) empowers the Minister to remove a member from office for misconduct or for mental or physical incapacity, or failure, to carry out satisfactorily the duties of his or her office.

Subclause (5) provides that the office of a member becomes vacant if the member dies, completes a term of office and is not reappointed, resigns by written notice addressed to the Minister, ceases to be a local resident or is removed from office by the Minister under subclause (4).

Subclause (6) provides for the appointment by the Minister of a member on the office of a member becoming vacant.

Subclause (7) limits the term of office of a member appointed to fill a casual vacancy to the balance of the term of his or her predecessor.

Clause 23 prescribes the procedures of Country Arts Boards.

Subclause (1) provides for meetings of a Country Arts Board to be chaired by the presiding member, or in his or her absence, by a member chosen by those present.

Subclause (2) specifies the number of members of a Country Arts Board required to constitute a quorum of the board and prohibits any business being transacted at a meeting of the board unless a quorum is present.

Subclause (3) provides that subject to a quorum being present, a Country Arts Board can act notwithstanding vacancies in its membership.

Subclause (4) entitles each member at a meeting to one vote on a matter arising for decision at the meeting and gives the member presiding at the meeting a casting vote in the event of an equality of votes.

Subclause (5) provides for a decision carried by a majority of members present and voting at a meeting to constitute a decision of the board.

Subclause (6) requires a Country Arts Board to keep accurate minutes of its proceedings at meetings.

Subclause (7) provides for the procedure for the calling of meetings of a Country Arts Board and for the conduct of business of meetings to be determined by the board.

Clause 24 deals with conflicts of interest.

Subclause (1) requires a member of a Country Arts Board who has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in a matter decided or under consideration by the board to disclose the nature of the interest to the board, to abstain from taking part in any discussion by the board relating to the matter, to not vote in relation to the matter and to be absent from the meeting room when any such discussion or voting is taking place. The maximum penalty for non-compliance is a division 6 fine (\$4 000) or division 6 imprisonment (one year).

Subclause (2) provides that it is a defence to charge of an offence to subclause (1) to prove that the defendant was not, at the time of the alleged offence, aware of his or her interest in the matter.

Subclause (3) requires a disclosure under the clause to be recorded in the minutes of the board.

Clause 25 deals with the functions and powers of Country Arts Board.

Subclause (1) provides for a Country Arts Board to have such functions and powers as are delegated to it by the trust under clause 12 or prescribed under the measure.

Subclause (2) requires a Country Arts Board, in performing any such delegated functions or powers, to comply with any guidelines formulated by the trust under clause 9 (1) (g).

Subclause (3) ensures that where a Country Arts Board acquires works of art under the measure the board will not be subject to any control or direction by the trust concerning the disposal of care, control or management of such property.

Clause 26 empowers a Country Arts Board to establish committees (which may, but need not, consist of or include members of the board and whose functions and procedures will be as determined by the board) to advise or assist the board or perform any of its functions or powers.

Clause 27 empowers the trust to delegate any of its functions or powers (except the power of delegation) under the measure to a committee established by the Board.

A delegation must be by instrument in writing, may be conditional or unconditional, does not take away the power of the board to act in any matter and may be revoked by the board at will.

Clause 28 deals with a Country Arts Board's budget.

Subclause (1) requires a Country Arts Board, as soon as practicable after the commencement of the measure, to submit to the trust a budget

showing estimates of its receipts and payments over the balance of the financial year within which the budget is presented and thereafter, before the commencement of each succeeding financial year, to submit to the trust a budget showing estimates of its receipts and payments for that succeeding financial year.

Subclause (2) empowers the trust to approve, with or without amendment, a budget submitted under this clause.

Subclause (3) prohibits a Country Arts Board from making, without the consent of the Minister, any expenditure not authorised by an approved budget.

Subclause (4) defines the term 'approved budget'.

Clause 29 protects certain persons from personal liability.

Subclause (1) provides that no personal liability attaches to—

- a member of the trust;
- a member of the trust's staff;
- a member of a Country Arts Board;

or

- any person to whom the trust has delegated functions or powers under clause 12,

for an honest act or omission in the exercise or discharge, or purported exercise or discharge, of a power, function or duty under the measure.

Subclause (2) provides that a liability that would, but for subclause (1), lie against a person mentioned in that provision lies instead against the Crown.

Clause 30 empowers the Governor to make regulations.

The schedule contains repealing and transitional provisions.

Clause 1 repeals the Cultural Trusts Act 1976.

Clause 2 deals with the property and rights and liabilities of the Cultural Trusts and other bodies.

Subclause (1) transfers to, and vests in, the South Australian Country Arts Trust, all real and personal property (other than works of art—see notes below on subclauses (5) and (6)) and rights and liabilities of the existing Cultural Trusts, the Central Regional Cultural Authority Incorporated and the Regional Cultural Authority Incorporated.

Subclause (2) makes the transfer of the land comprised in Certificate of Title Register Book Volume 3941 Folio 150 (the building at 97 South Terrace, Adelaide) subject to the prior written consent of the Arts Council of South Australia Incorporated. This property previously belonged to the Arts Council before it was transferred in 1988 to the Regional Cultural Council Incorporated.

Subclause (3) requires the Registrar-General, on application by the trust, to register the trust as the proprietor of interests in land vested in the trust by the measure.

Subclause (4) provides that no registration fee is payable in respect of an application under subclause (3).

Subclause (5) transfers to, and vests in the Country Arts Boards all works of art owned, immediately before the repeal of the Cultural Trusts Act 1976, by the Cultural Trusts, the Central Regional Cultural Authority Incorporated and the Regional Cultural Authority Incorporated.

Subclause (6) ensures that the boards will not be subject to any control or direction by the trust concerning the disposal or care, control or management of any works of art vested in them by subclause (5) and empowers the boards to sell or otherwise dispose of them.

Clause 3 provides for all employees of those bodies to become employees of the South Australian Country Arts Trust without loss of continuity of service or accrued or accruing benefits in respect of employment.

The table sets out in relation to each Cultural Trust and other regional bodies, which Country Arts Board is the equivalent new local body.

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

## APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 September. Page 530.)

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** This evening I want briefly to recap on the State budget, to refer for a few moments to the Auditor-General's Report and then, if time permits, I might discuss protection in Australia and what it is costing Australians generally. First, regarding



the State budget, there was no doubt about it: a headline in the *Advertiser* stated it was a black day for South Australia. In the past 10 years, South Australia has suffered its greatest plunge into deficit that this State has ever known—from \$2.6 billion to \$7.3 billion of actual State debt. That occurred during those years when we were promised flair and light. I know where the 'flare' is; the State has blown up but there is no light for the future. It is only fitting that the Treasurer of South Australia should take the only honourable way out and resign as Treasurer of this State, because no-one could not ultimately take the blame for what has happened in South Australia.

However, it is like changing the chairs on the deck of the *Titanic*; it is no good trying to blame the Treasurer because he happened to hold that position in a Westminster system of government and absolving those who are left. They made up the Cabinet; they were the people who made the decisions about the direction in which South Australia went. The Premier and Treasurer only enunciated those decisions and guided South Australia in the direction he wanted to take it, with his Party behind him. Unfortunately, it was a downhill slide, and the next generation of South Australians will have to pay for those indiscretions and the complete financial incompetence whereby the greatest financial disaster in Australia's history has been perpetrated on the taxpayers of South Australia. I do not know whether you understand that, Madam Acting Speaker. It is the greatest financial disaster in Australia's history.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Here we have these members opposite, including the member for Henley Beach, who will be here for only a short time, who are part of it and who ask, 'What is our problem?' Our problem is that not only have you bankrupted South Australia but you have mortgaged the future of our children, who cannot get a job but who will, for another generation at least, be paying for those misdemeanours.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** On a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, the member for Victoria is referring to me as 'you'. My title is the member for Napier.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison):** I would ask the member for Victoria to refer to members by their electorate.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I was not referring to the member for Napier as 'you'; I was referring to the Government. I will refer to members opposite in future as 'the Government', but I will include the member for Napier in that, because he was in it up to his neck. He was a Minister during many of those 10 years of this Labor Government, and he was in it right up to his neck.

Where are we going in South Australia? We have \$7.6 billion worth of debt. The recurrent interest rate on that is approximately \$900 million. When we look at the hollow logs to see where it is hidden, we see that it is not the 45c in every dollar that we thought was going towards interest payments. Once the budget papers are looked at in detail, as brilliantly enunciated by the Leader, it is discovered that more than 60c in each dollar goes towards interest rates to prop up this budget.

**Mr Venning:** Sixty three cents.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Sixty three cents, as the honourable member says. That is a scandal. As the Leader said, any other institution in Australia would be bankrupt if that were its interest bill. But what does the Government of South Australia do? It decides to find a scapegoat: it gets rid of the Treasurer and brings in a new team. It is only a reshuffle. I just hope that the people of South Australia understand that it is this Government that did the illegal, sleazy, underhand deals concerning the \$2 million interest rate subsidy before the last election, and the present Premier was in that right up to his neck, although he tried to say that he missed the Cabinet meeting or he did not hear. Again we have a reference to that Cabinet table about which we hear so often; it was so long that some members at the other end could not understand what was going on or could not hear.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** The honourable member says that the member for Napier has buried his head in a book. He will have plenty of time to do that after the next election when Mr Groom takes over the seat. No doubt he will act very well on behalf of his constituents.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** On a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, the member for Victoria is reflecting on me as a member of this Parliament.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** In what way did the member for Victoria reflect?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Totally out of keeping with the current budget debate, he reflected on my future and my integrity as a member of this Parliament.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. The member for Victoria.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** If I inadvertently reflected on the member for Napier, it would not have been half as much as the electors in the District of Napier will reflect on the honourable member at the next election. However, be that as it may—

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** On a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, I am not being picky, but the member for Victoria is continuing to reflect on me. Just in case you were engrossed in conversation with the Sergeant-at-Arms, Madam Acting Speaker, I point out that the member for Victoria said that the electors of Napier would reflect on me at the next election. It is common knowledge that I will not stand in that next election, so really that is a reflection on me as an individual member.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I ask the member for Victoria to return to the Bill.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I certainly will, because the budget is the most important thing for South Australians and its future generations. As I was saying, I just hope that, when we come to the next election, the South Australian public remember the sleazy, underhand deals, such as the \$2 million deal to keep down interest rates. When that comes out in the royal commission and when the Commissioner hands down his report, I just hope that the public understand the deceit in that regard and how they were hoodwinked.

I just hope they understand that they were conned before the last election with the promise of free buses for school children. Soon after the election, that promise was withdrawn, and I just hope that people understand that that was just an electoral ploy to buy a few more votes to



try to hoodwink the people of South Australia into thinking that things were in good shape when, even at that stage—in 1985—we were on the skids financially and it was being covered up. I just hope that the public of South Australia remember that, as well as the shonky new home scheme that was commenced before the 1985 election. All of a sudden, between Christmas and the New Year, the criteria were rewritten. The Government was to spend about \$20 million on it but, at the end of six months, the hapless Minister of Housing and Construction had to tell the House that only 13 people had taken up the offer because it was impossible to get the help.

This deceit that has gone on in South Australia for the past 10 years is now coming out into the public arena. I look forward to the Royal Commissioner's report. It matters not that there has been a sacrificial lamb to try to apportion the blame, because the evidence is fairly clear that the former Premier of this State misled not only this House but also the people of South Australia. So, we have a budget which is impossible to balance, and I say that in all sincerity. There is no provision for an increase in salaries and wages. That has been forgotten. Members opposite love to rewrite the budget every year so that we cannot make comparisons, but now it is becoming very obvious. If we deal with deceitful people for long enough, we know where to look and what holes to look in. I compliment the Leader on his speech to the House when he tore the budget to pieces, line by line. He exposed to the public of South Australia exactly what a disgraceful document it is, and backed up that *Advertiser* headline 'South Australia's blackest day'.

**Mr Brindal:** It is a house of cards budget.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Exactly; I agree with the honorable member, and the house is falling down. The Government bleats, 'We must have capital expenditure from our Federal colleagues.' The Minister for unemployment has said, 'We want more capital expenditure.' Other Ministers have said, 'We must have more capital expenditure in South Australia. We will go to our Federal colleagues to get help. Let's have a bipartisan approach with our Federal colleagues.' But what did they do? Last year they cut capital expenditure by 30 per cent and wanted the Federal Government to bail them out. This year it is just as bad.

**Mr Ferguson:** We wanted to balance the budget.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** If members opposite wanted to balance the budget, they would have gone to the people when they had the opportunity, that is, when we introduced legislation as a Bill of special importance. If members opposite had supported that, we could have gone to the people, who would have elected a Government with the ability to balance the budget and run South Australia properly. The member for Henley Beach is a man of considerable personal wealth and has quite a bit of expertise in the financial area. It grieves me that he will probably be kept out of the Ministry once again, because he has some ability. It appears that the Independent members will have to have a chance. He must be sitting there with a very sad heart as he sees these people fritter away South Australia's future. I know when he contributes to debates in the House they are the speeches of a man who is sad of heart and who knows he cannot put his heart into it. Indeed, I think I saw him

flicking through the Leader of the Opposition's speech the other day and saying, 'Well, this all adds up.'

I can understand his frustration; he sits there and grins through it all, but anyone with any financial knowledge must feel dismayed and, as the member for Light suggested the other day, he is only grinning because it is wind. I do not accept that: I think he is wincing about what is going on in South Australia. This budget will not last the distance. There will be a mini-budget next year when the Government understands that this document cannot last 12 months. It will be blown out of the water.

Forget the third and fourth bail-outs of the State Bank—they were inevitable—and we told the Government that would happen. All the predictions were that that would happen and it has. There will be a mini-budget early in the new year, probably with the reshuffling that is going on, and, although I do not know how that will pan out, I guess that the Deputy Speaker is girding his loins and looking for a ministerial position.

I might say that members on this side of the House would be pleased about that because he has the ability to hold a ministerial position, as has Terry Groom, who has been overlooked for so long. He has the financial expertise and the intelligence to try to tell some of the Cabinet where this budget is going wrong and how to turn it around. That will be interesting for next year. I want to pass on—

*The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** It is only to pass on momentarily, and I will pass on like you will be passed over. That will be interesting to see. The Auditor-General's Report is probably the most important document that this Parliament receives, because at least it is impartial and not a document like the budget that is full of deceit and innuendo. The Auditor-General's Report once again comes down with scathing criticisms of the Government. The report highlights, as the Leader highlighted in his speech, our true financial position. It highlights the true financial position of the bank and it enunciates the bail-outs and outlines how, as we went along, we had to alter the indenture documents.

The Auditor-General's Report highlights SGIC and what has been going on there. It highlights the burden that will be placed on the South Australian taxpayers through SAFA's carrying the responsibility of 333 Collins Street. It highlights the \$36 million that had to be pumped into SGIC because of the illegal third party deals and the topping up of other accounts. It highlights that well, although it is denied by the Government, I might say. The matter of particular interest to me is something I have been talking about ever since I came into this Parliament, that is, the Woods and Forests Department.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I have not got onto Scrimber, I can advise members opposite, which is a \$60 million blunder. Financially, it was the biggest disaster in any State at the time for that 12 months. That \$60 million paled into insignificance and is forgotten now because we have had the State Bank and SGIC. True, South Australia has many firsts, one involving three of the biggest financial collapses in Australia's history, all in the one little State under a Labor Administration. That is indeed a big first for South Australia. The Woods and Forests Department again has had queries put on its accounts by the Auditor-

General in respect of accounting standard AAS10, and the real value of standing timber. I refer to the report because in respect of forestry operations the Auditor-General, under 'Significant features', says that the department, after recording a loss of \$3.8 million, last year recorded a profit. The report states:

This result includes a net decrement of \$19.5 million in the value of growing timber. Last year the increment was \$66.2 million.

**Mr Brindal:** The timber shrunk.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** The honourable member says the timber shrunk. Perhaps we did not have rain in the South-East last year. The Auditor-General claims that it is illegal, improper and against all the best accounting standards to put forest increment in the profit and loss account; it is a capital item and should be included in the balance sheet, and private companies do that. However, the Auditor-General has now said that the Government cannot value that growing timber at retail timber sale prices, as it has done in the past: it has to put another notional value on it. So, for the first time since the Government has been pulling this con over the Parliament, it has been forced to put a forest decrement of \$19 million on growing timber. It would be unique in any forest timber growing operation, to say that \$19 million out of last year's \$66 million involves shrinkage of timber, but that is how this operation goes.

The Auditor-General states that the timber products operations again made a loss of \$13.2 million. It has been losing money every year, but the hapless Minister of Forests will not do anything about it. He has had the disastrous operation that they bought in New Zealand which lost about \$20 million, where the Minister signed a contract without even the proper accounting investigations being done; it was based on unaudited accounts. No other fiscal fool would do that but a member of this Government. Fancy signing a contract on unaudited accounts. We then have the Scrimber operation where again the hapless Minister lost \$60 million of taxpayers' money on a dream and then said, 'It was not my fault; it was management's fault.'

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** That is exactly right. That is what the Premier has been saying about the \$3.1 billion lost by the State Bank: 'It is not my fault; it was someone else's fault.' This Government has been a disaster for the past 10 years and this is just being brought out into the public arena. There is only one way to fix the problem. I have said it before and I say it again—resign and go to the people!

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

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** It is always a real pleasure to follow the member for Victoria because there is no getting away from the fact that he is a successful and self-made businessman, a multi-millionaire in his own right. He did not have to get ahead in the world on his daddy's coat tails and, when he starts talking about money matters, I listen. However, I cannot say the same about the other members of the Opposition who have been speaking in this budget debate. All we have had is a series of speeches by members opposite detailing the problems as they see them that South Australia faces in these recessionary times.

I accept that times are tough and I will even go so far as to say that there have been decisions made that perhaps should not have been made. Again, if one looks at the Westminster system—and we are all students of the Westminster system—we expect solutions from the alternative Government. We have had a series of speeches made in this House and in another place, through the media, in the *Advertiser* and especially through Sergeant Wiley, to say that this Government should resign and go to the people. But one would expect in the major economic statement made by the new Leader of the Opposition that we would have that blueprint spelled out. I do not mean the specifics.

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Madam Acting Deputy Speaker, I understood that the matter under debate was the Government's budget and not the Opposition's policy. I ask you to rule on relevance.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison):** I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member is entitled to refer to Opposition speeches.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I will go through the speech that the Leader of the Opposition made to this House. It is good to see the little bodyguard, the member for Hayward, who is always there to suck up to people on the Opposition benches in more senior positions than his own in order to ingratiate himself with them. However, I digress. One would expect from the Leader of the Opposition the blueprint of where the Liberal Party intends to go if, perchance, the member for Hartley, the member for Elizabeth or the Speaker decide to switch allegiance and vote this Government out of office.

Members on this side of the Chamber have been ridiculed because we keep saying, 'What is your policy?' However, in response to an interjection from my colleague the member for Henley Beach, the Leader outlined what a Liberal Government would do to, in his words, reverse the mess that this State is in. If we look at this speech superficially, it reads very impressively indeed. I remind members that it is part of the Leader's policy to produce 4 per cent growth per year for the next four years.

**Mr Ferguson:** To the year 2000.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I stand corrected—to the year 2000. Yet, already today the Liberal Party opposite has endorsed zero tariff protection for the South Australian car industry. That would result in about 100 000 jobs in this State being lost, the majority in the southern and northern suburbs. That policy will produce 4 per cent growth; it will produce about 5 per cent zero growth. The key plank for the Opposition is 4 per cent growth per year to the year 2000.

Let us look at what the Leader said in his response to this Government's budget. These are the seven points that have been pushed around all over the place. The first priority is economic development and the creation of real jobs. You do not get economic development and the creation of real jobs by exposing the South Australian car industry to competition from overseas. It is not just competition for new cars but incentives for secondhand cars that they propose. Whilst they are doing that, they attack the very able leaders in the automotive industry.

The second point in the Leader's seven point plan is to establish a competitive edge for South Australian industry

with Government leading by example by reducing the taxes and charges it imposes on new businesses. You do not have to be blind Freddie to know that, regardless of which political Party is in power in this State, our taxation base is so small that it would be impossible to achieve 4 per cent growth and encourage business and, at the same time, reduce the tax base—it just could not happen. The member for Victoria knows that, but I doubt very much whether the rest of the members opposite know that—but that is exactly what it is all about.

They then talk about changing WorkCover. With one simple statement they have frightened literally thousands of workers who might be prepared to listen to what the Liberal Party has to offer in relation to WorkCover; but no information is forthcoming, just 'We will change WorkCover'. They then talk about deregulation in South Australia. The Minister on the front bench has, over the past five years, led the charge to deregulate in this State. Every time there has been any attempt to deregulate, members opposite have all cried like stuck pigs and opposed it in this House and in the other place, and we have ended up with little or no deregulation. They wanted to protect potatoes, bread, eggs and many other things; yet, deregulation is an important part of their seven point plan to produce 4 per cent growth.

If we listened to what the Opposition is saying, we would have about a 7 per cent reduction in growth in the car industry. The weak, the poor, those who have no chance of defending themselves, are under attack because the Opposition would give away the delivery of essential Government services, take them out of the public sector and give them to the private sector. This State leads the country in the area of community health; in fact, one could even argue that it leads the world. We have given to members of the community, the people who can ill afford it, the ability to receive assistance through the community health sector.

You would remember, Madam Acting Speaker, through your involvement in the health centre in your own electorate, the days when the poor, the needy and the disadvantaged had none of that. All they had was their local doctor, who not only charged through the nose but sent them down the path of taking anti-depressants and sedatives and just dosed them all up. One of the greatest break-throughs in community health was giving those people, in the main women, the ability to go to community health centres and receive expert advice from doctors or health professionals and, therefore, the ability to lead a better life. The member for Custance scoffs. I do not really think he knows why he is scoffing.

Mr VENNING: On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker, I did not utter a word.

The ACTING SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr VENNING: I have been misrepresented, Madam Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member for Napier.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr BRINDAL: My point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, is that it is correct in this House to refer to

people by their electorate or their correct title. The honourable member opposite has referred to you by several titles and I think he has got them all wrong.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not uphold that point of order because, for the information of the member for Hayward, I think every member in the House has referred to me wrongly this evening. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. As I was saying, community services will be taken away from any form of Government initiative and given to the private sector. The private sector does not have a record of giving rather than receiving; so that would make those people—as I have said, in the main women—captives of the private health sector. You, Madam Acting Speaker, would know exactly what it is all about through your involvement. They then talk about scrapping industrial legislation.

I can only equate that to the line the Victorian Opposition has taken as part of its election strategy. It is part of the Federal Opposition's policy, and that is a blueprint of what has been enacted in New Zealand. The industrial agreements that exist in this State at the moment have given us one of the best industrial relations records in this country—and that will be thrown out of the window. The trade union movement will not accept that lying down. It will obviously confront a Liberal Government in this State if it dares to go down that path. Again, what will that do to industrial growth?

Having said all that, the Opposition is going to go down another path. It will sell off the State Bank. One can argue that possibly this Government will sell off the State Bank. The Opposition does not say when it will do it, and it will not say what it will do to safeguard the employees and the investment that the Government, through its indemnity, has been forced to make to hive off the non-performing loans. It is very vague about that. It will remove unnecessary licensing regulations and charges against small businesses. How much will that cost the taxpayer? I do not mind if the Liberal Party is going to do any of things I have mentioned, as long as it spells out to the public exactly how much it will cost and how much it will affect the people in the community and how it relates to that mythical 4 per cent growth rate that the Leader of the Opposition has said will be a panacea for this State.

The Opposition will relaunch the MFP. If that is all it needs to do, my advice to the Minister on the front bench is to go out there tomorrow and relaunch it. Yet, what have we heard? The member for Coles has been the biggest critic of the MFP since the idea was first mooted a few years ago. She has been the most vigorous critic. She has never been prepared to say anything good about the multifunction polis. Yet, her Leader will relaunch it! Perhaps when the launch takes place the member for Coles will have retired and it will not create any problem for that member.

The Opposition is going to make Adelaide a focal point for high technology research and development to attract new technology industries. That is simply a string of words; it is pure rhetoric. There is nothing to back it up. Already Technology Park, the MFP and the Science Park in the south have made us the leader in this country in new technology. Already in the area of optics we are leading the nation. So, what else is there? The Opposition

should not just give us a string of seven or eight words and say that that is what it will do. We want to hear exactly what that means and what incentives will be given for those kinds of industries. What inducements or tax incentives will be offered to attract new industries to this State? There is nothing—just this bland statement of what the Opposition will do with our 4 per cent growth rate. Finally, members opposite are going to reform our education system so that it recognises excellence and insists on standards of literacy and numeracy.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The member for Mitcham says, 'Hear, hear.' I have no problem with that whatsoever. That is what we should all be striving for regardless of our political persuasion. Yet, we hear members opposite criticise our education system as it exists now. They are already saying that hundreds of million of dollars will have to be put into the education system as it exists now, according to them, to bring it up to the basic level. So, how much will it cost in additional salaries, resources and new capital works to create that excellence and a high standard of literacy and numeracy?

Again, I would like to hear some simple costings. How much will all of that cost the taxpayer? I suggest that this major seven point plan has been done in a typical Liberal way, on the back of a lunch wrapper, and no-one has bothered to identify the implications for this State given the tax base we have. The Liberal Party has always been very good on promises and very short on substance. It conned the South Australian community once before in respect of winning an election and it paid the price. I refer to the Liberal Party's promise to abolish gift duties and death duties. Members opposite made that rash promise and no-one was more surprised than they were when they actually won the election and had to deliver.

Looking at the benches opposite I see that there is only one member on the other side who was a Minister at that time—and a very good one I may add—and I refer to the member for Coles. The member for Coles knows exactly what I am saying. That rash promise in the 1979 election cost the Liberal Government dearly in the way that it restricted capital growth. The Liberal Government had to take money out of the capital line to pay for recurrent expenditure. It was a simple mistake but it cost it dearly. One could say it cost the Liberal Party the 1982 election. That was just one silly promise. We have seven here now and if the public of South Australia falls for that five-card trick they are bigger fools than I thought they were.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** This is the fifteenth budget that I have debated since my election to Parliament and I certainly hope it is the last. I hope it is the last because I have announced my intention to retire at the next election and, as far as South Australia is concerned, that election cannot come soon enough. South Australians have laboured far too long under a Government that is without principle, without competence and without any ability whatsoever—as we now see as a result of this budget—to govern and manage the State.

If I were to use the vernacular, I would say this budget is a 'shocker'. It is introduced in a situation where we have unprecedented levels of unemployment. What does the budget do? It provides for unprecedented levels of

expenditure and taxation, and it tries unsuccessfully to deal with unprecedented levels of debt and unprecedented levels of borrowing—and all this against a background where the State itself has lost confidence. The people of South Australia no longer have confidence in the Government, and I venture to say that the people of other States and overseas no longer have confidence in South Australia. Therefore, if South Australia were a patient, one would say the State is very sick and the prognosis is not good.

Let us look at the figures. We have a current real debt of more than \$8 billion. In relation to that I refer to the Auditor-General's Report (page v), which states that the debt in 1988 was \$2.5 billion. From that state of net indebtedness we have gone to what the budget papers describe as a net indebtedness of \$7.2 billion, but, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out in his analysis of the budget, it did not include \$450 million for the State Bank's losses last year and the \$317 million budget deficit. When that is added to the other liabilities of the State, we have total liabilities of \$14 billion, which is absolutely unprecedented. The repayments on those borrowings mean that we are now paying 63c in every tax dollar in interest repayments. That amount is so shocking that it becomes almost incomprehensible to taxpayers who are already paying personal income tax to the Federal Government on every dollar before they can pay a dollar in State tax. They then learn that, of every dollar of their State taxes, 63c is going in interest repayments.

**Mr S.G. Evans:** And nothing off the capital.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Nothing off the capital whatsoever. It is simply a repayment of interest. We are borrowing to make repayments on borrowings. No South Australian receives any benefit whatsoever from that. It does not provide any services or infrastructure.

**Mr S.G. Evans:** No jobs.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** It does not provide any jobs. It is a downward spiral that is leading us to a state where we are literally bankrupt. Were it not for borrowings and the prospect that one day possibly a Federal Government may see fit in the national interest to haul a proportion of this State's population from the brink—and we are on the brink now, if not almost over it—I see no reasonable hope in the next two decades of South Australia pulling out of this downward spiral.

We have a declining revenue base and economy, even though the budget has squeezed an extra 10 per cent in tax revenue from that declining base. It is worth pointing out that that continued squeezing of taxation from a declining business base is counterproductive because it is driving people out of South Australia. Some of my constituents publicly announced their decision to move their businesses to Queensland when the bank debit tax was announced. They could not tolerate a doubling and a tripling of a tax which was having a serious effect on them. I am thinking of those in the fuel distribution business. They were withdrawing substantial sums from their bank accounts every month to pay Federal fuel tax, so they were paying a tax on a tax on a tax. They decided that they could no longer tolerate living in this State and they have moved to Queensland. This tax level on small businesses is compounded by WorkCover,

which has the highest premiums in Australia. In fact, if the premiums are not clipped back in the next 12 months, will see the bankruptcy and ruin of even greater numbers of businesses.

The Auditor-General addresses some of these matters in his report. I commend the initial pages of the report particularly to every Minister in the Cabinet because, on reading particularly the sections on public sector financial reporting, they may come to some conclusions about the enormity of what the Government has done over the past 10 years under the leadership of a man who has brought the State to ruin and who admitted, when he resigned last week that, whilst he was, on the one hand, blaming the directors of the State Bank and other unnamed people for his demise, possibly in a Freudian slip, broke into Latin and announced *mea culpa*. We know that means 'I am to blame.' Indeed, he is to blame for a dereliction of duty in the way that he administered his responsibilities as Treasurer. The Auditor-General, in making the distinction between recurrent and capital operations, states:

Summary of the Consolidated Account for the year ended 30 June 1992 shows that the Consolidated Account is made up of two sections, commonly referred to as the 'Recurrent Account' and the 'Capital Account'.

It seems extraordinary that the Auditor-General should need to draw this statement to the attention of the Parliament. It is an obvious accounting statement, yet it has been ignored by the Government. The Auditor-General says:

The distinction between these two accounts is of long standing in matters of public finance and recognises the principle that borrowings should be applied towards the provision of economic infrastructure and community facilities and that recurrent expenditures (i.e. the day-to-day costs of running Government) should be met from recurrent receipts. In essence, this principle determines that future generations make a contribution to the costs of facilities from which they will benefit.

In short, it is okay to borrow for capital works and to repay that sum well into the future because the people who benefit from those schools, hospitals and roads have some responsibility to pay for their construction. This Government is not doing that. It has reduced the capital expenditure considerably and it is using borrowed capital to finance the recurrent operations of the State—our schools, hospitals, transport system, law and order, justice, community welfare and our environmental protection.

*Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:*

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As the member for Davenport says, all of those services are running down despite the fact that we are spending more on them—5 per cent more per capita than people in other States spend on the same services. Therefore, we have to ask about the competence and efficiency of this Government's administration. At the same time, the Government is running us deep into debt without anything to show for it for future generations.

One of the most interesting parts of those early pages of the Auditor-General's Report is the section headed 'Contingent Liabilities', on page 6, where the Auditor-General says:

During the year an audit review was performed of guarantees and indemnities provided by the Treasurer.

This is the next truly shocking indictment of this Government. The Auditor-General says:

The results of the review, reported to the Under Treasurer in July 1992, indicated that an accurate and complete picture of the totality of the Treasurer's guarantees and indemnities was not available.

I do not know how many years it is since many of my colleagues and I have been calling for a frank statement of the extent of the Government's guarantees. Three years ago, when I was economic spokesperson for the Liberal Party, I stood in roughly this spot and pleaded with the Premier to let us know the extent of the State Bank's guarantees. I asked him to let us know whether the guarantees extended to cover only the savings and loans of South Australian depositors with the bank or whether they covered the vast adventuring and buccaneering that was going on in the international money market with loans and borrowings that were expanding three times in the space of 12 months and which were greater than the loans and borrowings overseas of any other State Bank in this country, notwithstanding that we had the second smallest State Bank in Australia.

Not a word was said. The Premier never answered. He was the custodian of those guarantees for the State Bank, for the State Government Insurance Corporation, for SAFA and for a whole range of other Government authorities, yet he did not know the extent of the guarantees. Not only that, but he still does not. Almost two years after the collapse of the State Bank and the propping up of the State Bank to the extent of \$3.2 billion the Treasurer still does not know the extent of the liability for all the guarantees that the Government holds. I describe that as negligence of an unconscionable order.

The Auditor-General states that Treasurer's Instruction No. 1002 requires that all departments and statutory authorities maintain a register of guarantees and indemnity and by 31 July each year advise Treasury of each contingent liability. One wonders what the date of Treasurer's Instruction No. 1002 is. I assume it is some time in the past 12 months, but the fact that we do not know is probably one of the most serious problems facing Parliament. We simply do not know the extent of our liabilities, nor, according to the Auditor-General, do we accurately know the position of the Consolidated Account.

Mr S.G. Evans: We have a right to know.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: We have a right to know, and the Government has an obligation to tell us, otherwise what is the purpose of Government?

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I know; obviously, the Government does not know.

*The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:*

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The member for Light reminds me that the former Premier's signature is on every guarantee, yet he was not ready to take responsibility for his own name and his own constitutional responsibility to be the custodian of those guarantees. The other matter to which I want to refer in the time available, because it is very relevant to these guarantees, is the management of statutory authorities and the duties of directors. The Auditor-General quotes a number of authorities on company law when he is pointing out the ethical obligations of directors. Again, it is an indictment of the Government that these things have to be said by the Auditor-General after 10 years of Labor being in charge of the Treasury benches. We are actually

having to be told by a statutory officer of this Parliament how the directors of our statutory authorities should conduct themselves in an ethical sense. That simply indicates that we have come to a state in South Australia where, under this Labor administration, nobody knows what it is any more to be honest or competent; they have completely lost their capacity for any kind of ethical consideration or proper approach to responsibility or duty. Let me quote the Auditor-General as follows:

In understanding company law, the categorisation of the fiduciary duties of directors can be summarised in the following way: they owe a duty to act *hone fide* in the interests of the company; to exercise powers for their proper purpose; to retain their discretionary powers; to avoid conflicts of interest; and to exercise care and diligence.

With respect to the latter two obligations—to avoid conflicts of interest and to exercise care and diligence—it is perfectly reasonable to say that the former Premier did not even attempt to exercise any control whatever over the directors of the two principal statutory authorities (the State Bank and the State Government Insurance Commission) in respect of exercising care and diligence nor, in the case of SGIC, did he attempt to require that conflicts of interest be dealt with properly and that, where they were not dealt with properly, action be taken forthwith to ensure that directors were dismissed. That has still not happened.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Who do you think ought to be behind bars?

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** It is a good question; it is not only Alan Bond who should be behind bars. If the people in charge of this State had been in charge of a company in private enterprise, they would not be on the front benches now; they would be in gaol, and a lot of people in this State wish they were in gaol, because it is very difficult to envisage any kind of restitution that could ever be given by any political Party to the people it has defrauded and impoverished in the way this Government has. When will the Government face that fact that it has brought the State to economic ruin? It has completely abandoned its responsibility to future generations and it has brought down a budget that is unprecedented in terms of the debt it is inflicting on future generations of South Australians. I conclude by pointing out that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The honourable member says 'Judge'; it is time this Government was judged. Why will the Government not go to the people to ensure that it can be judged, because in a democracy the only, the ultimate and the final judge will be the people of South Australia. The Government is nervous; its members are trying as hard as they can to drown out any proper analysis of a budget that deserves to be condemned on every conceivable count. My colleagues and I can see nothing in this document that offers any hope for the future of South Australia. What we do see are criticisms, either implied or explicit, by the statutory officer of this Parliament, the Auditor-General, regarding the way this State has been run. It has not been run: it has simply been allowed to degenerate into a shambles, and every member opposite should be ashamed of it. The sooner we go to the people, the better.

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** Unfortunately, we just heard a speech that was not about the budget: it was a walk through the Auditor-General's Report. That is probably one of the most unprepared speeches that I have heard from the member for Coles, and it is probably because the member for Coles is now reaching the sunset of her career that she did not take her usual care. I am one of those on this side of the House who believe that the member for Coles should have been the Leader of the Party opposite, but she was not given the opportunity at the appropriate time. Mind you, her support for Mr Olsen would make an interesting chapter in a book that is yet to be printed. I believe that members opposite did not take the opportunity to select the best person on that side as their Leader.

Nonetheless, what we have heard so far has been not an analysis of the budget but a walk through the Auditor-General's Report, and anyone could do that. Anyone can do it; the Auditor-General's Report comes up every year. It is critical of Department of Environment and Planning from time to time, that criticism is noted and appropriate rectification takes place. It is not the reason for anyone to go into hysterics in the way we have heard in the past few minutes. I have been totally disappointed in the Opposition's answer to the budget. This is the opportunity once a year for the Opposition to put forward its policy—

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** I know. The Deputy Leader says, 'No it doesn't,' and he is absolutely right. The Opposition has never taken the opportunity in the time that I have been in this House to put forward a proper alternative to the budget. All we have heard over the past decade is carping criticism from one member opposite after another, with no hint of what they would do if they were in power or of what their policies would be.

This tactic on their part has failed for over a decade, and I suggest that it will continue to fail. In the 1989 election, it was topped by the Leader of the Opposition walking through the tombstones, and there was nothing more appropriate than the advertisement which appeared on television and which was supposed to promote the Liberal Party: indeed, it did the opposite, because the general public had become used to the continual carping and whinegging that went on day after day, year after year. That policy is now being followed by the new Leader, the Hon. Dean Brown.

One suggestion that has been made by a constant stream of members opposite is that the tax burden is reducing incentive in this State. Nothing could be further from the truth. One only has to go to an independent authority to test whether that is true. I refer to the KPMG Peat Marwick South Australian Business Climate Studies report, which states:

Nevertheless, in terms of State Government imposts at least, South Australia is a low tax State. The perception and the reality do not gel, however. Payroll tax is seen as particularly pernicious, yet, only Queensland charges lower rates than South Australia. The payroll tax burden is also somewhat lower in South Australia because of the State's lower average wage rates.

If State taxes and charges are a major business concern, this is more a reflection of the business climate than what caused it. Entrepreneurial endeavour will not be impeded by minor difference in payroll thresholds or in FID rates.

That is a report of an independent study by KPMG Peat Marwick outlining its thoughts on State taxation. In his



reply to the budget, the Leader of the Opposition went on for page after page with carping criticism.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

Mr FERGUSON: The Minister on the front bench is absolutely right when he says that the Liberal Party has no policy. One has to look through pages and pages of the Leader's speech before one comes to any reference to policy—to a guide for the general public. Before I refer to that situation, I raise a matter that was also raised by the member for Napier, that is, the Liberal Party's policy on zero tariffs.

It is an absolute disgrace that any Party that believes it will one day become a majority Party in this House takes up a policy that will destroy probably 100 000 South Australian jobs. The reduction of tariffs will make overseas competitors so much more attractive to the buyers in this State. This is not my opinion; it is not the opinion of the Labor Party; it is the opinion of those people who are in industry, those who normally support the Liberal Party. It is the opinion of those who contribute to the funds of the Liberal Party. These are the people who are talking about the Liberal Party's policy on tariffs. An article in this morning's *Advertiser*, referring to the Managing Director of Mitsubishi, states:

Managing Director Mr Mike Quinn warned yesterday Mitsubishi would walk away from a \$100 million engine plant expansion and would not proceed with a new Magna model under the Coalition plan.

Not one member of the Opposition has opposed the Hewson zero tariff proposals. In the final analysis, given the policies of the present Government, tariffs will be reduced considerably in any event. I understand that, on average, it will cost only \$1 000 more per car to maintain the tariffs that we will have eventually in Australia. After all, I believe that Australians consider it is worth paying \$1 000 extra for a motor car if it keeps 100 000 jobs in South Australia. The number would probably be double in Victoria. If the other bits and pieces that are available throughout the rest of Australia are added, we are talking about hundreds of thousands of jobs, yet the Liberal Party will destroy jobs in this country. It will destroy not only jobs but investment.

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

Mr FERGUSON: I do not understand how the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader can stand in this House and say that they will increase the gross State product in South Australia by 4 per cent a year in every year until the year 2000 while, at the same time, they destroy 100 000 jobs. They would have to put into every backyard in South Australia 100 sheep to provide work with crutching and fencing—

*The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:* I know all about that.

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Napier knows all about that. They would have to do that to make up the difference. If we had all that wool in South Australia, how would we sell it? How would we increase our agricultural production sufficiently to take up the slack, not only of all the jobs that will be lost but of the growth that is necessary to maintain our present standard of living? Members opposite have been complaining bitterly—and you, Sir, would know this, because you have had to sit there and listen to them—about the reduction of our standard of living. One member opposite made comparisons with where we were 20 years ago, in the 1960s, when allegedly we had the second highest

standard of living in the world. In order to maintain our present standards, of which the Opposition is critical, its plan for dealing with this situation is to destroy the motor car industry in South Australia.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

Mr FERGUSON: Indeed; I agree with the Minister on the front bench. The State Bank situation would pale into insignificance against a disaster such as that. How can these greedy members opposite, who think they can line their own pockets and increase their own personal wealth by attacking manufacturing industry in South Australia, think they can win with a policy like that?

The total investment that would be destroyed, if zero tariffs were introduced in South Australia, in one car plant alone would be over \$600 million. If we were to add General Motors-Holden's to the Mitsubishi organisation, it would not be beyond the bounds of possibility for us to be talking about \$1 200 million of investment going down the drain in the next four years. They are the sorts of policies that the people of South Australia are expected to swallow.

I will refer very briefly to the meagre positive contribution made by the Leader of the Opposition. Many of these points have been made by the member for Napier. It is pure arrogance to put forward a set of words and then call them a policy. For example, the fifth object of the Liberal Party refers to smaller and more efficient government so that taxes and charges can be kept lower. I would like to see in black and white what that policy actually is. South Australia is one of the lowest tax States in Australia and KPMG Peat Marwick confirms that. We are one of the lowest tax States in Australia and from that lowest tax State the Leader of the Opposition is going to take away taxes and make them even smaller. The third objective is:

The Liberal Party direction involves delivering essential Government services to the community to improve the quality of life. The key services being education, training, health, community security and public transport. This will include facilitating services which broaden community culture.

What a Herculean task. On the one hand, he reduces taxes, even though we are in a low tax State but, on the other hand, he promises to increase community services. I would dearly like to know how he will do that.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

Mr FERGUSON: I agree that it is an insult to people's intelligence. I do not call these objectives policies: I call them platitudinous words, absolute waffle. How could a Party put up a set of objectives like this that no-one can believe? If people believe in this they would believe in Peter Pan. The Opposition has not produced policy papers to back up how it is going to govern.

The Leader of the Opposition has promised that he is going to get at the workers in South Australia. He has told us that he will do it in two ways. First, he is going to reduce the benefits under WorkCover. It is as plain as the nose on one's face that that is what he is going to say, and every person who works for a living in South Australia ought to take note of what the Liberal Party is promising if it gets into office. It will not only reduce WorkCover but it will attack the industrial conditions of South Australian workers.

We know that the Liberal Party is going to do that, because already the conservative National Government in New Zealand has done that extremely successfully and



there are whole areas in New Zealand that are absolutely poverty stricken, yet the New Zealand Government boasts that its production costs are 25 per cent lower than they are in Australia. Of course they are 25 per cent lower than they are in Australia, because the wages in some instances are only about half of what they are in Australia.

We know that the Leader of the Opposition in Victoria, Mr Kennett, has promised that as Premier of Victoria he would get rid of weekend penalty rates. What does the South Australian Police Force think about getting rid of weekend penalty rates—and their secretary is a Liberal candidate? But how do members expect our police to go out on Saturday and Sunday, during evenings and in the early morning without providing them with penalty rates? That is what the Liberal Party is promising if it gets into power in this State. Also, in some instances it is going to abolish awards and agreements in this State and it will leave those workers, particularly in the service industries and particularly women, in a most vulnerable position.

**Mr Ingerson:** That is the greatest drivel I have ever heard.

**Mr FERGUSON:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition interjects, but if Opposition members do not agree with what I am saying, let them produce a policy. Let us see it in black and white. Let them tell us exactly what they are going to do. The people of South Australia ought to know before they go to the polls just exactly what they are in for, particularly in relation to industrial relations. There are some very fine words, such as:

The second Liberal objective is to establish a competitive edge for South Australian industry.

What does 'a competitive edge' actually mean? Put that down in black and white and tell us how the Liberal Party is going to do it and, more importantly, tell us how it is going to finance it. If the Liberal Party is going to reduce taxes it will have precious little money to be able to put into industry to give South Australia that competitive edge. It is all rhetoric. It looks all very nice in words, but what does it mean? Let us see a few policy papers.

As to the State Bank, we have heard them carping and groaning about the State Bank, but I pose the question once more: what would the Liberals have done about the State Bank? Would they have supported the State Bank or not?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I rise to give my reply to the budget for the 1992 year. The thing that concerns me about the presentation from the member for Henley Beach is that he once again did what he does this every time he gets up to speak. He waxes and wanes, he pushes and shoves and bullies—and does all the things that have been traditional in his role in the workplace for many years, instead of sitting down and listening and looking at the contribution that we are making to the budget debate. It is clearly our role to say what this budget is all about and not to put down at this time the direction in terms of financing that this State should take. It is our role to support the budget if there is

some sense in it and to criticise the budget if there is no sense in it.

The principal reason for the Opposition's spending so much time on criticising the budget is that it is an insult to the people of South Australia that the previous Bannon Government (now the Arnold Government) has put forward a budget—presented, I noticed in the last sentence, by the Deputy Premier, who is congratulated for his work—that shows that this Government really does not care at all about financial management. I am glad to see that some members opposite are leaving the House because they usually jibe and make irrelevant comments. It is nice to know that I will not have to put up with that sort of nonsense.

One of the major concerns of this particular budget is its financing arrangements. As the Deputy Premier would know, borrowings are required purely and simply to balance the budget. They are not borrowings that have any value in terms of expenditure but are purely to balance the budget. In 1991-92, the borrowings amounted to \$470 million, and in this budget we have another extraordinary sum of \$317 million. That money is borrowed through SAFA, of course. However, when we look further into that matter, we find that this financing authority which acts on behalf of all State departments already contributed \$400 million in 1991-92, and under this budget it is expected to place some \$410 million into general revenue.

What concerns me about those two figures is that, with the significant drop in interest rates, one must ask: how can the South Australian Financing Authority contribute more money to this budget than it contributed in the last financial year? It seems to me that the only way it can contribute that significant sum of money is by taking money out of its reserves or by the authority itself continuing to borrow. So, behind the budget deficit is this major concern of where the South Australian Financing Authority will get the money to make its interest contribution to the State budget.

Many members on this side of the House have referred to the fourth bail-out of the State Bank. As we all know, we are now looking towards a \$3.1 billion contribution from State Treasury or the South Australian Financing Authority towards the bail-out of the State Bank, the most monumental financial disaster this State has seen. In the budget papers we see that of the \$850 million that has been allowed for only \$300 million has, in fact, been provided in actual dollars to the bank at this stage. So, an extra \$500 million in cash will have to be found if these estimates come true. That, of itself, is a monumental disaster for South Australia, one which my kids and future generations will have to pay for.

At dinner tonight I was asked by a group of people what the State debt really means to each of them. It means that in the next ten years this Government, or a future Liberal Government, will be required either to make significant savings in its expenditure or to increase taxation, to pay for the disaster or to attempt to reduce some of the significant services that we currently have. It is a tragedy for this State and for any incoming Government, whether a continuing Labor Government, and let us hope that that does not occur, or for us as a Liberal Government. It is an absolute disaster in terms of the future of this State.

As well as the bail-out of the State Bank, we have the second bail-out of SGIC. A further \$314 million has been included in the budget to cater for the mismanagement by SGIC. That sum brings the total of the bail-outs of SGIC to \$350 million. If you say these figures quickly, they do not mean anything, and when you go into the community and talk to the average family—the average mother, father and child—they cannot comprehend this massive disaster that the former Premier (the member for Ross Smith) and the existing Cabinet have created for our children and grandchildren. The massive increase in State taxation as an attempt in some small way—and I will explain what I mean by that—to overcome this problem created by the State Bank and SGIC disasters has added to the difficulty of the business community in this State to grow and to create more jobs. As many members would know, the only way in which we can improve the opportunities for our State is to give businesses the opportunity to grow.

In addition, businesses in this State have had lumped on them the BAD tax, which has been doubled and which will take another \$12 million out of the business community. The petrol tax has gone up by 3½ cents a litre—another \$43 million out of the community. The flow-on effects of that 3 cents a litre, right through the community, in costs of goods and services will be massive. The \$43 million take by the Government is incidental compared to the significant flow-on cost of that right through the community, at a time when Queensland and New South Wales are progressing, and in this State we are continuing, through Government policy, to fall further behind the eight-ball. The petrol tax in itself will have a greater single anti-economic effect in this State than any of the decisions made by the State Bank.

**Mr Holloway:** What would you have done?

**Mr INGERSON:** First of all, we would not have had the disaster that you have got here.

**Mr Holloway:** You would have had hindsight?

**Mr INGERSON:** We do not have to talk about hindsight because three years ago we said in this Parliament that you had a problem with the State Bank, and every single week after that we asked questions in this place. If the member for Ross Smith, your Premier, had been in charge of any business in this State he would have been sacked one year after that questioning started, yet we, as a State, had to put up with two years of blunders, and I will get to that mismanagement a little later in my presentation.

Payroll tax will bring in another \$10 million and stamp duty another \$36 million. People who wish to smoke are now being slugged again because they wish to smoke, another \$37 million. Those of us who do not choose to smoke in this State do not have to pay this ridiculous tax. Land tax, another \$78 million, is yet another disaster for small business.

This Government has no comprehension of what it is doing to small business, the only generator of employment in this State and in this country. Big businesses in this country and in this State are being forced by Labor policies to reduce staff. The only hope we have in this country is for small business to succeed. This tax base is another example of the non-understanding of the Labor Government of the effect it has on small business.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** We have this red herring of tariffs thrown in. Anyone would think that a policy eight years out was a major disaster for South Australia in 1992. Let us talk about the real problems—the disaster that you have created for our State in 1992. No fewer than 38 000 people have lost their jobs in this State—21 000 in manufacturing—under your Government. We have not been in power to have any effect. Do not talk about theory; talk about the real world; talk about the disasters of workers compensation. Let us have a look at the small businesses out there where the biggest single individual cost is workers compensation.

**Mr De Laine:** Rubbish!

**Mr INGERSON:** It is not rubbish. The only thing the member for Price has ever done is destroy small business. Let us talk about creating wealth in real business. The reality is that we have to create wealth and the only way we will do it is if we create opportunity for small business in this State. Madam Deputy Speaker, the State debt has increased from \$2 billion in 1982, when little Johnny-come-lately came in to \$7.3 billion today. Today in Question Time we heard how little Johnny-come-lately actually paid back some of—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to refer to members by their seat or by their title.

**Mr INGERSON:** The reality is that the member for Ross Smith, in his previous role as Premier, took the State debt from \$2 billion in 1982 to \$7.3 billion in 1992. He cannot walk away from that. That is why the member for Ross Smith is not the Premier today. He had to recognise that he had mucked up our State. It is his fault that we got into this mess and no-one, whether it be the manager of the State, a small business or a large business, can walk away from that responsibility. Responsibility is involved in financial management. The member for Ross Smith, as the manager of our State, did not bother to listen to this Parliament, to the community, or anyone else. Then, three years after he was told there was a problem, he started to worry about it and suddenly threw in the towel.

The public of this State have had enough of bad management. They are fed up with the way that our State has been managed. People should understand that one cannot spend more than one earns: that is a fundamental fact of life. Members have people coming into their office on a daily basis and all of us on both sides of the Parliament give them the advice that if they spend more than they earn they are in trouble. That has been the situation with this Government ever since I have been in this place: spend, borrow, never repay and continue spending and borrowing. It is all right, the next Government or someone else will pick up the bill. We have this disaster today because no-one sat down and listened when the community in South Australia knew what was going on. It was not only the Liberal Opposition who knew what was going on: Government members would have heard from the community what was going on in our State. No-one listened, and that is the reason we have the disaster we have today.

Let us look at a couple of the other disasters. An amount of \$3 487 million has accrued in superannuation

debt, involving \$3 billion of unfunded liability. There is \$560 million of unfunded liability in long service leave payments. Any member opposite who saw a private company, small or large, that had any lack of provision for those situations would ensure that it was run to the wall. They would use union power to ensure that those provisions were made. Yet, their own Government has not cared about some \$3.9 billion of such liability. The Government workers compensation unfunded liability has gone from \$78 million last year to \$150 million—that is in one year and it is this Government's own workers compensation scheme. The Auditor-General said in his report that he did not even know the figures as at 31 August, but he hopes the Government will tell us. Members opposite, as union members, would not allow a business to survive under those circumstances. Yet, their own Government does not care about the rules.

Members opposite ought to wake up and go and see their union mates in the Government and insist that the same things they demand of the private sector stand up in the Government sector. That \$150 million of unfunded liability in workers compensation is an absolute disgrace. It was a \$62 million blowout last year, with \$10 million being paid out in stress claims, yet we as an Opposition put to this Parliament a proposition that would reduce the number of stress claims, and members opposite all laughed about it. Of the \$15 million last year, 25 per cent of the whole payout was on stress claims, because members opposite did not have the guts to admit that this was the biggest single rort in workers compensation.

That occurred last year, and members opposite laugh about it. It is an absolute disgrace that this Government should be allowed to stay in office. I find it absolutely incredible that in the education line there is another \$2 million in workers compensation.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I have listened with a great deal of attention to the contributions made by members on each side. Of course, one expects a fair amount of rhetoric in these debates, and I certainly was not disappointed. I must concede that members on this side are guilty of doing the same thing from time to time. When I hear members opposite talking about dishonesty, my mind flashes back to the period from 1979 to 1982 when the Liberals were in power.

I recall this particularly because, having heard the contribution yesterday of the Leader of the Opposition when he was talking about dishonesty, it reminded me of a report that was commissioned and paid for by the then Tonkin Government. This was the Cawthorne report, and it was paid for by taxpayers' dollars. But would the Leader of the Opposition, the then Minister of Labour, release that report? No way! This was because it was very critical of industrial relations under the Tonkin Government. Yet now we have the member for Coles standing up here with her vindictive approach—

Mr Brindal: That's not fair!

Mr HAMILTON: The honourable member may interject. For many years I have had great respect for the member for Coles. I have never agreed with her political views but, of late, I must say that I have never seen an honourable member so hell-bent on vindictiveness as I

have seen from the member for Coles in her attacks on the former Premier in this State. I remind members opposite that they were the ones calling for a royal commission. They were the ones who wanted the Auditor-General's Report, yet they have tried, hanged and quartered the member for Ross Smith before a decision has been handed down by either of those bodies.

It may well be that those findings will be adverse, but I make the point that members opposite are not prepared to wait for those reports to be brought down. They want to place all the blame on one person. They are not prepared to talk about some of their mates in the bank, whom they do not criticise about what took place in that bank. No fear! One asks the question—why?

Why, one asks the question, will they not offer criticism to their mates in the bank? I will not be so insensitive to some of those people out there, nor will I prejudice the report of the Auditor-General. I want to place another matter on record because of the hypocrisy of the Leader of the Opposition when he talks about honesty in Government, yet he would not release the Cawthorne report. We know why.

Mr Ingerson: How much did it cost?

Mr HAMILTON: How much did it cost? That is the inane and stupid interjection from the Deputy Leader. It is not the cost but the principle that counts, and that dill knows what I am talking about; it is the principle that counts.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, we are all being subjected to some noise pollution; I believe the honourable member could lower his tone so we can all sit in the Parliament comfortably.

Mr HAMILTON: Isn't it marvellous? That infantile little child who has taken his place in Parliament can dish it out like Paddy's dog, but he cannot cop it. He is like a big kid, spoilt for many years, and would not know what it is like to struggle but wants to slink out of the Chamber. It is no wonder he has little respect, even on his own side of Parliament. I was talking about the Cawthorne report, and of course members opposite do not like this, because it really hurts. The Deputy Leader, who would know a lot about knives and the delivering of numbers, would be well aware that Leader is one of those people who, when he talks about dishonesty, is himself dishonest—proven and tried in this Parliament and found to be dishonest.

I will quote from *Hansard*. I have a long memory, as that untried person who ran against me in 1982 well recalls. On 23 September 1982 the Hon. Jack Wright asked the then Minister (Hon. Dean Brown) when the Cawthorne report would be released, and the Hon. Dean Brown said:

He put out a discussion paper . . . Finally, after that exhaustive consultation over a 15-month period, he made the recommendations to me.

He would not release it and we all know why; it was because it was so damning and critical. The reason I raise this issue is that, as we all know, when Jack Wright became Deputy Premier he released that report and it was critical of Liberal policy in terms of industrial relations.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

Mr HAMILTON: I hear a squeaky voice opposite and I just shut my mind to it, because I do not want to listen to the stupidity of it. Members on this side of the House know the situation, and the member for Henley Beach

and others have touched upon it. Members opposite are hell-bent on destroying the trade union movement because—and this is not unlike their silvertailed mates in New Zealand and the Thatcherites in the United Kingdom—they want to take away that protection for workers. The only protection workers really have in some respects is to be able to band together to stop the onslaught of those unscrupulous employers who will screw the workers to the wall at every opportunity. This approach still exists in many parts of the world, as we all know. Members opposite talk about the competitiveness of this country.

Rarely do we hear them talk about the obsolete equipment that we still see in many factories. Rarely do we hear about the participation of employees in management decisions. As I related to the Parliament only recently, a consultant, who has just returned from the Barcelona Olympics, said that he was surprised and very encouraged by workers' participation with management in Spain. That is what we need here, not management and the bosses against the workers. That is nonsense. The workers can and do contribute and, given encouragement, they will work hard to protect their own industry.

With regard to the protection of industry, we have heard in recent days what we can expect under a Conservative Government. We have not heard one beep from members opposite about the motor car industry. They should be parochial about protecting workers in this State, particularly in the motor car industry, where tens of thousands of jobs will be lost under the Hewson plan. Why? Because the Liberal and National Parties' plans for a total removal of tariffs on imported vehicles will decimate the industry. They care not. The member for Henley Beach—I will not go over the same ground—illustrated the impact that would have on the industry. Suffice to say, however, South Australia supplies more than one third of Australian motor vehicle production, and our share is growing. Direct employment in the industry is about 14 000, but this actively generates a further 40 000 jobs in our economy, a total of 54 000.

Mr McKee: They want to kill it off.

Mr HAMILTON: They want to kill it off, as my colleague states. They do not recognise what the car component industry is doing for the economy of this State. Opposition members are not particularly concerned about those issues. They walk around, toe the line and do what their mates in Canberra tell them to do. Indeed, as the Minister attested to, some employers in this State have a hell of a lot to answer for.

Another matter in the industrial arena relates to safety. I will remind the House as often and as long as I can that last year one in every eight workers in this State was injured at work. Members should think about it: one in every eight. If they were injuries on the road, there would be one hell of an outcry. The Opposition talks about WorkCover, but do they talk about employers and their responsibilities on the shop floor? We hear very little. One in eight is a damn disgrace.

We hear the Deputy Leader of the Opposition bleating and crying about WorkCover, but did he mention in his contribution anything about the tragedy and trauma of people being killed or severely injured or maimed at work and the cost to workers? Yet the Opposition wants

to reduce the pay to workers, injured through no fault of their own, to about 70 per cent after a two-year review. Would any member want a child or member of his or her family to have their wages reduced so dramatically after sustaining an injury which was no fault of their own? Of course not. Not one of us in this place would accept that proposition.

Despite that, last year one in eight workers was injured in South Australia. If that happened on the roads we would have the *Advertiser* reporting that. Where is this great bastion of reporting getting to the masses in South Australia? Does it run stories on the front page about a national disgrace because about one in every eight workers was injured on the job last year? Nothing! As a proud union official I, like many others, had to take on even members of the Labor Party when workers were injured on the job. I do not care what Government is in power: if there is a problem it must be addressed. We have seen it: we have seen workmates who have been chopped up and who then had to go and see their wives and members of their family. I have been through that grind.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Well, you see, that is the compassion of that idiot, infantile person opposite who reflects quite clearly his compassion for the workers in the community. They do not like it; that is the reason why. I keep reminding them because they are the ones who say that they are concerned for the workers. Their silvertail mates in Canberra drive around in big red Ferraris and want to be associated with the workers so that they can try to get their votes. However, when the crunch comes we know what they, like their mates in New Zealand and the Thatcherites in the UK, want to do to workingclass conditions: they want to decimate them. Is it any wonder that in Victoria a quantum leap has occurred in the polls for the Labor Party because of those advertisements that are reminding the workers in that State what they can expect if they ever elect a Liberal Government in that State. They will know, and that is why they bleat and cry about those advertisements, which are very effective and which remind workers that they will have no rights under a conservative Government.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Oh, go back to sleep, you idiot. The other thing is that we hear a lot from members opposite. The mouth from Mitcham constantly interjects and rarely makes a decent contribution in the House. Is it any wonder that he was unloaded by his mates—and he will probably get shunted further down the track later on, too. We hear members opposite talk quite a lot about payroll tax in South Australia. Of course, they do not like this, and that is why I will read it into *Hansard*. In relation to the South Australian business climate study, KPMG Peat Marwick is quoted as saying:

Nevertheless, in terms of State Government imposts at least, South Australia is a low tax State. The perception and the reality do not gel, however. Payroll tax is seen as particularly pernicious, yet only Queensland charges lower rates than South Australia. The payroll tax burden is also somewhat lower in South Australia because of the State's lower average wage rates.

Do members opposite ever talk about those issues? They feed lies and innuendos out there in the community. I want to draw to the attention of the House the issue of

youth wages—and we should not forget it—that members opposite want to bring in for workers.

**Mr McKee:** The three bucks.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Yes, the \$3, and the other \$3.50 an hour. They do not want to talk about that; they do not want to expose their policies. Members on this side of the House have been trying to hear about the policies of members opposite. Let them stand up to scrutiny. They do not want their policies to be exposed; they want to hold them off as long as they can, because they know that, as they found out in Victoria, when their policies are exposed, when they are put under the microscope, the workers will suddenly realise that their conditions are under threat. Of course, youth workers are the ones who will be hurt, and hurt badly. Indeed, one of the other sections in the community that will be hurt, of course, will be the women. The conservatives are not prepared to expose their policies to public scrutiny.

One of the last issues which I want to raise and which I will probably have to develop a little later is the sudden turn-around by the Liberal candidate, Mr Steve Condous, in relation to the Myer REMM development. In 1988 he was all gung ho, all for it. He had his photograph in the *Advertiser*, standing alongside the model of this great development and, by association, wanted to say, 'Great for South Australia', but suddenly he turns away. And, surprise, surprise, the *Advertiser* in 1988, developing confidence, this great bastion of truth in South Australia, is also praising the Myer REMM development, but suddenly has now turned off like the candidate for that electorate.

That is no different from the stand of members opposite and the *Advertiser* in relation to poker machines. They are the greatest gyraters you have ever seen in your life. They would certainly do justice to any circus, and that is probably appropriate, because they are a circus, considering the way in which they carry on in this place. They want to shout down members who want to make a contribution. They are not prepared to cop it. They dish it out like Paddy's dog. If they were on the sporting arena, they would not last one round or a kilometre. I will wind up on that issue. As I said, I would have liked a lot more time to develop many of these issues.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** Unfortunately, the mouth opposite had his contribution, made a hell of a mess of it, and still wants to have another chip at it, as does the mouth from Mitcham.

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** I am pleased to be following the member for Albert Park. It always makes my job much easier. I actually respect some of the things that he says. I respect his integrity, but sometimes I really wonder whether he believes some of the things he says. I hope that the honourable member is wrong when he says that one in every eight workers is injured every year, because if that is correct it is an appalling statistic.

**Mr Hamilton:** You can check with the Trades and Labor Council.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Well, I accept his word, but it is an absolutely appalling statistic. I do not know one member on this side of the House who would derive any pleasure or delight from that, or do other than agree with the member for Albert Park that, if one in eight workers is

injured, that is a disgraceful thing that should not be allowed to occur. However, that is separate in many ways from the debate about WorkCover. Surely the member for Albert Park will agree that it is better that we have efficient practices, well trained workers and good conditions so that people are not injured than to have a scheme to pay for everyone who is injured.

I do not believe for one minute that any modern State cannot have a WorkCover scheme. We must cover people who are injured in the course of their duties, but surely the argument for WorkCover is not that so many people are injured. The first argument for every responsible employer, every responsible trade union official and every responsible member of Parliament—

**Mr S.G. Evans:** And every responsible employee!

**Mr BRINDAL:** —and every responsible employee should be this: that we should make the workplace as safe, happy and productive as possible. Then, as the member for Albert Park berates the bosses, they will be happy because their productivity and profits will increase, their workers will be happy, and there will not be a cost in human terms.

In speaking about the budget, one of the things that has intrigued me is that we have been in this Chamber for the past few days debating this State's budget which has been brought down by the Government. As my colleague the Deputy Leader has rightly said, whilst members of this side have attempted rationally and constructively to criticise the budget, I have yet to hear a member opposite who has in any way defended it or spoken for the budget. All I have heard—and I have listened very carefully—are attacks on the Opposition and its policies.

One could almost be excused for thinking that the current rationale of the Government goes something like this: 'Look, we know that we have mucked it up; we know that we cannot run the State; we know that we have all these errors to our credit, but look at the other lot: they could not do it any better. Why get rid of us? They will be worse.' That is no way for a Government to act. If it is good enough to be in government, if it can condone or argue for what went wrong, let it argue, but let us not have Government members coming in here one after the other saying, 'Look at the Opposition. It would only be worse than we are.' It is not good for the Opposition, and it is certainly not good for this State.

We want an election and we want it as soon as we can possibly have it. But, until the day of that election, there is an elected Government in this State, and that elected Government has one responsibility, namely, to govern South Australia in the best interests of South Australia as it perceives it. Not one person on this side of the House, so long as members opposite are in government, would deny them that right. I challenge the Government to start doing that instead of constantly interjecting, 'What is your policy?'

Our policies do not matter. They matter on the day of the next election to the people of South Australia; that is when and to whom our policies matter. Until that time, all that matters in this Chamber is this Government's ability to govern, the ideas and thoughts of Caucus and Government Ministers, and the Bills that they introduce. What we might do or might like to do is totally irrelevant to the Government of this State until we become that Government. As soon as this Government realises that it

is the Government and stops acting like the Opposition, the better this State might be. I mean that sincerely because, until it calls an election, we have this Government, and I am sure that not one member of the Opposition either on the front or back benches would want to see this State's condition deteriorate any further. If we have a Government that is paralysed, is so worried about the next election that it will do nothing, it is not to the good of South Australia. I am sure that not one of us on this side of the House wants to take government in that circumstance.

One of the most remarkable things about this budget is that it was delivered by one Premier and we are not yet sure whether another Premier will support it. He has yet to utter a word on the budget in the House. If media reports are to be believed, he is quoted as saying that the budget might not be set in concrete; when he has had a chance to look at it, he might change it. How can this Parliament seriously debate and consider a budget which the Premier of the day has said he might change. It is either the budget of this Government and this Government accepts it as the budget or the Government should bring in another budget. Let us not have two bob each way. I am accused of that, and I plead guilty to it because I am a member of the Opposition, but I am not trying to run this State. This Government should decide what it wants to do; it should do it and stick to it.

As has been said more than capably by many of my colleagues, this State is facing the biggest financial crisis in its history—a crisis of unprecedented dimensions. As I sat here and listened to the second reading explanation, I can honestly say that all I felt was a sense of loss and frustration. I think enough of many Government members to hope that, no matter what they might say in scoring debating points in this Chamber, they feel the same way. I felt absolute frustration and a deep sense of loss for what might have been as I heard the Premier come out with figures that pile upon themselves to the point where I challenge anyone in this State to comprehend what they mean. As those figures piled up, all I could think of was the schools, the hospitals, the police, the road networks and the transportation systems that this State might have had but will never have now because that money is gone. It is not really a matter of apportioning blame, as I would like to admit in this House that I am to blame and that every member on the Opposition benches is perhaps to blame.

I have heard the Deputy Leader and my friend the member for Mitcham say, 'We questioned for three years,' and that is true. But perhaps we did not question hard enough; perhaps we were not incisive enough; perhaps we could have gone to other forums. We cannot totally escape blame, because we are elected to sit here and question the Government. In that we did not get this through to members opposite quickly enough, perhaps we have some of the blame. But, if we do have some of the blame, how much more does the member for Spence have or the member for Gilles have, because they have one privilege that neither I nor any other member on this side of the House has, and that privilege is their being part of the Government committee room and the Government Caucus, and having the private ear of Ministers. I put to you, Sir, that, if members of the Government had been doing their job, they might well

have said nothing in public but they should at least have listened to the questions—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:**—and they should at least have been questioning their Ministers, and in particular their Premier. The member for Spence interjects, 'All the loans had been made in February 1990. All the bungles had occurred.' I am not quite sure whether that means that he did query the Government as to what was going on with the State Bank. I hope he did not because, if he did, he enjoyed a unique position of privilege and power in the Government, because the new Premier tells us that he sat in Cabinet and knew nothing about anything that was going on. We are criticised for criticising the former Premier (the member for Ross Smith), yet we have not made the sorts of criticisms that his new Premier has made of him.

What sort of criticism of a person is it for the new Premier to say, 'He did this, he did that and he did something else, all without the knowledge of his Cabinet.' I do not know whether the member for Ross Smith thought he was Tsar of all the Russias or Pharaoh of Egypt but, if we listen to the new Premier, we hear that he carried on like a complete despot and autocrat. That is on the public record and that was said by the new Premier. So, let not members on the Government benches berate us for our criticisms of their former Premier when his own members are so willing to dump him so quickly.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr De Laine):** Order!

**Mr BRINDAL:** As I said, we all share some responsibility for what has gone wrong in South Australia, but some of us can honestly expect to share more of that responsibility than others. I believe that the member for Spence is one of them. He did have the ear of Ministers; he did have the privilege of the Government committee room. If I were him, I would not be sitting there laughing, cackling and making inane interjections, because I take my responsibility in this House seriously even if he does not.

We are asked constantly by way of interjection what we would do. I think there are a few answers that we should give the Government to help it with this budget. The first thing that I hope any Liberal Government would do is to reintroduce honesty in government, because I think that, if there is a characteristic of the past 10 years, it has been a loss of honesty in government. The Ministers come in each day and there is prevarication, evasion and equivocation. We never get direct answers to questions or the whole truth: we get part visions some of the time if we are lucky, and that seems to have pervaded even the Public Service.

I have been very privileged to be elected by this Parliament to the Economic and Finance Committee, but I have been disappointed to note that in the two reports since I have been a member of that committee both have had sections alluding to conflicts of interest and the proper conduct of officers and people associated with those various organisations. I do not think that that is good enough and it is not the standard that we would expect from servants who are working for the Government. The Government has changed Leaders in this House. We had a Premier whom I described some weeks ago as having an albatross around his neck. He



was scuttled and pushed from the ship rather unceremoniously—

*Members interjecting:*

Mr BRINDAL:—and the member for Spence and others have chosen his successor, whom one of his colleagues has described as an amiable armadillo. I do not think that is a good description of the new Premier, but I put to the House that the Government has swapped a Premier with an albatross around for a Premier with a porpoise around his neck.

Mr Atkinson: A porpoise?

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, the member for Spence hears correctly, because the Marineland fiasco, amongst other things, will come back to haunt the new Premier and probably in the end it will strangle him as effectively as the member for Ross Smith was strangled by the albatross as he fell from the ship. Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector of England, said:

The State, in choosing men to serve it, takes no notice of their opinions. If they be willing faithfully to serve it, that satisfies.

That is the great objection of the Opposition to this Government and to many of the things that have happened under it. The Government does many things, but they do not seem willing to serve the State. If we have any faith or belief at all in the Westminster system, then it is a belief in a system that elects us to the service of the people.

If we are not here to serve the people, then we should not be here at all. I realise that there are many good things that go with the privilege of being a member of Parliament, and I suspect it is easy to be carried away with one's own importance, but if we are going to be members of Parliament we have to try not to be carried away and we have to try to remember at all times that the only purpose in our being here is the purpose of serving the people of South Australia. Menzies described the life of a parliamentarian as the highest form of public service, and I hope that members opposite at least take note of that because I know that members on this side of the House believe it.

I want to conclude with a quote again from Oliver Cromwell, and a quote that I do not believe is used lightly in any Parliament. Cromwell used it in the long Parliament against Pym and it was reiterated by Churchill against Chamberlain. This quote is aptly directed towards the Government of South Australia at this time and it goes like this:

It is not fit that you should sit here any longer. [You have tarried in this place too long for any good that you might have done. In the name of God, go]. You shall now give place to better men.

Those words are as applicable to this State and to this Parliament today as they were when Churchill told Chamberlain to go at the advent of the Second World War. This State is in serious trouble, and it will not start to recover until we have a new Parliament and a new Premier. I am sorry, Sir, that during the course of this speech I have been distracted by the babble of members who are not concerned about good Government. I trust that in the next Parliament we will see some more responsible actions from members who may remain here as members of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction): I move:

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

Motion carried.

#### TOBACCO PRODUCTS (LICENSING) (FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): This budget should be withdrawn. That is something that members of the Government have heard said quite frequently during this debate, and for very good reason because it imposes an unacceptable burden on South Australian citizens. It offers no hope or new direction and ignores the recommendations of the Arthur D. Little report.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

Mr MATTHEW: Already, as I rise to my feet, the member for Spence starts to bleat from the back benches, as he has done incessantly throughout this debate. I suggest that the member for Spence, if he has something to say about this disgraceful budget document, does so within the Caucus, disowns his Party and says so through his vote on the floor of this Parliament. This disgraceful budget document has placed our State in a predicament in which it has never been placed before. The Arthur D. Little report recommends in the strongest possible terms that taxes must be reduced, the State debt must be stabilised and the public sector must be strategically driven. Nothing like that is proposed in this budget document—nothing at all.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Spence continues to interject. I repeat: if he has objections about this document, why did he not express them in the Caucus and why has he not expressed them on the floor of this Parliament? The budget document, which the member for Spence now says is a terrific document, forecasts that fewer than 2 000 new jobs will be created in South Australia.

Mr Meier: That's abysmal.

Mr MATTHEW: As my colleague says, it is abysmal. One only has to compare that with Western Australia, which only the day before brought down a budget that was designed to create 20 000 new jobs while at the same time ensuring there were no increased taxes for business. It is a pity that this Government did not try to be a bit more competitive within its own nation. There is no doubt when one looks at the opening page of the Arthur D. Little report that our State is in a poor situation. The opening page is entitled 'South Australia's economy is poorly structured and vulnerable.' That page



in itself gives a loud message to our State that something needs to be done. The opening paragraphs of that important document state:

South Australia for many years has enjoyed a high standard of living, an enviable lifestyle and a relaxed pace of life. Today all of those are under threat. Unemployment is running at levels which society cannot sustain without encountering severe social difficulties. The unemployment situation could get worse. It is time to ask whether this is simply the product of the current recession or whether there is a more fundamental cause for South Australia's difficulties.

The answer to this question is not difficult to find. The problem is not the current recession: it is much deeper and more fundamental. The receding economic tide of the recession is simply revealing the structural weaknesses just underneath the surface of the economy. This report is about redressing those weaknesses and restructuring the South Australian economy in order to restore economic prosperity and with it to enable South Australia to maintain its high standard of living and its enviable lifestyle.

If no other document does, this independent report commissioned by this Government, undertaken by the Arthur D. Little organisation, highlights South Australia's predicament, highlights the solutions, and this Government has not heeded that report. This Government has failed to act, and it is no wonder the member for Spence has now decided to be silent because the facts speak for themselves.

It is also important to look at some of the words of the consultants who were involved in the Arthur D. Little report when they stated:

Until now, the Bannon Government has not seen the need to implement an industrial policy that fundamentally addresses the economic restructuring . . . by and large, the policy has been one of 'shooting any bird that flies past', rather than planning for the future economic well-being of the State—which gives thought to both attracting strategic industries as well as to nurturing and fostering local business.

The simple facts are that, over the past two years, South Australia has lost more than 38 000 full jobs, including some 21 000 jobs in the manufacturing sector. That is the record of this Government. That is the record it was faced with when preparing this budget and it is that record that has surprisingly failed to influence any change in direction by this Government through this budget document. This document provided an opportunity to recognise the problems of the past, to admit them and to change direction, but that has not occurred, and one needs only to look at the situation in which our State now finds itself.

In this financial year our State faces a current real debt of more than \$8 billion. The budget records the State debt as \$7.3 billion, as members are well aware, but it does not include the raising of funds needed to cover the \$450 million of the State Bank's losses last year and this year's \$317 million budget deficit. In all, we are looking at a current real debt of more than \$8 billion.

By borrowing the equivalent of almost all of this year's interest bill of \$978 million and adding to the State debt, we have seen total liabilities of more than \$14 billion. We are looking at a declining revenue base, even though the budget has squeezed an increase of 10 per cent out of taxation, at a tax level on small business that is so high that these businesses will continue to close by necessity or move to other States. Assets are said to be worth \$24 billion, but many of these assets, such as roads and water pipes, are difficult, if not impossible, to liquidate by sale. To top it all off, a staggering 63c in every taxation dollar

will go toward paying the debts created by this year's State budget, and I challenge the member for Spence, or any other member of this Government, to stand up in this Parliament and defend how any Government can put forward a budget that provides that 63c of every taxation dollar will go toward paying the State debt in the budget.

**Mr Meier:** That only pays the interest on the loan.

**Mr MATTHEW:** As my colleague has pointed out, that only pays the interest. This Government has made no attempt to do anything about the principal amount of that debt, and is it any wonder that the member for Spence now hangs his head in shame because if I was part of that Government I would do the same. In this Parliament today the new Premier referred to the situation that his Government faced when it was elected in 1982. I, too, would like to refer to that situation because in 1982, at the end of the Tonkin regime, we did indeed have a very different situation.

The facts remain that if we had retained our 1982 share of national full-time jobs there would be work for an additional 24 400 South Australians today, but instead full-time employment, as I have said, has reduced by some 38 000 over the past two years. If the new Premier wants to criticise 1982 in this Parliament, I suggest he look more closely at those figures: 24 400 more South Australians would be in full-time work today if we had simply been able to retain our 1982 share of national full-time jobs.

If South Australia had retained its 1982 share of the national population there would be an additional 66 300 people living here today helping to generate and sustain our now ailing economy. Our loss of national population share is equivalent to losing the populations of our three largest provincial cities—Whyalla, Mount Gambier and Port Augusta. Those people have deserted this State in droves under this Government—totally disillusioned with the declining living standards that have been forced upon them, certainly through a decade of Labor and certainly through at least 22 out of the past 28 years under this Labor maladministration. Those people have indicated that they have had enough. At the end of all that, reshuffling the front bench of this Government will not do anything while this budget remains in place to change direction, just as reshuffling the deck chairs on the *Titanic* would have done nothing to change its fate. There is no doubt this Government is heading for the same sort of disaster.

It is also interesting to look at the person who is our new Premier—a gentleman who was the president of the Vietnam moratorium campaign in 1970. I note that he was arrested during major moratorium demonstrations in September 1970. At that time he was quoted in the *Sunday Mail* as saying that a revolution was coming and that parliamentary democracy would be overturned. He said:

The way lies with popular support and civil disobedience. If people refuse to work in industry and withdraw their support for society's institutions then capitalism must fall. There is nothing else it can do.

That is the man who has now been elected by this Government as Premier of this State—a man who has advocated publicly the bringing down of the capitalist system; a man who through that action would completely destroy employment in this State. That is the person who is supposed to return our State to economic prosperity. I am sure that South Australians would be encouraged by

those statements made by the man who today purports to be our Premier.

It is also interesting to reflect on the closing remarks made by the previous Premier in his budget speech when he said:

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the contribution of the Minister of Finance, the Hon. Mr Frank Blevins, to the development of this budget.

Well, if the budget document which we are debating tonight, which is before us and which is causing so much misery in this State was the architectural product of the new Deputy Premier there can be no further hope through this new revamped front bench unless this budget document is withdrawn. If there is any shred of integrity left in this Government there is no choice but for it to withdraw this document and revamp the direction of this State.

I now turn to the neglect of the southern suburbs. My colleagues tonight, and in particular my colleague the member for Fisher, have time and time again since our election to this Parliament stood to condemn the disgraceful spending record that this Government has demonstrated in the State budget. Yet again, this Government has imposed another dreadful situation upon southern residents to the extent that the south has missed out yet again, despite having the previous Deputy Premier and also the Minister for Environment and Planning as supposed representatives. I have previously noted that that Minister is not only the member for Mawson but is now the candidate for Reynell, having not had the courage to stand for the seat of Mawson again at the next State election. As I unravel this debacle members will well understand.

Let us look at some comparative funding. One only needs to look at roads, where a total of some \$74 million is allocated to major roadworks, with just \$13.7 million allocated to the south. In contrast, \$31.2 million was allocated to the north. If we look at education we see that there was a total of \$40 million allocated to major capital expenditure, of which just \$9 million has been allocated to southern projects compared to approximately \$21 million for northern projects. There was, however, one pleasing glimmer of hope for education in that moneys for which I have been lobbying for some time for the completion of the Hallett Cove East Primary School, upgrading of Seaview High and also the commencement of construction of Woodcroft Primary School have actually been allocated.

They form the bulk of southern education spending. It is a pity that more members on the Government side were not prepared to lobby for that funding. Only \$8.7 million was allocated for expenditure on recreation and sport projects, of which the south gets absolutely nothing. Not one cent has gone from this budget into southern suburbs sporting facilities. When one looks at health, once again the south has been penalised, with only a paltry \$539 000 being allocated for works, compared to \$4.8 million for northern suburbs.

And the Flinders Medical Centre was ignored completely. At this point it is interesting to reflect on the pressures that face the Flinders Medical Centre in its 1991-92 budget. I note that that institution was forced by this State Government's cuts to reduce its own budget by \$750 000, despite having to pay out a further \$770 000 on the Booz Allen and Hamilton consultancy, an impost

that was forced upon it by the South Australian Health Commission. What that actually meant was that during 1991-92 that hospital was forced yet again to close more beds. A further 11 beds had to be closed on top of those that the centre was forced to close during the 1990-91 financial year.

Now that the burden in this State budget has been imposed to a further extent, we can possibly look forward to still more bed closures in that hospital which, with its staff, is trying desperately hard to cover the growing demand for health facilities and care in the southern suburbs. Whilst looking at north-south funding, I should like also to look briefly at the latest available report released by the Southern Region of Councils. In his report, the Chairman, talking about the 1990-91 financial year, states:

1990-91 will go down as the year in which tangible support from State and Federal Governments became increasingly scarce. The close and active cooperation of the five councils at elected and executive levels has enabled the region to meet the challenges caused by limited resources and to continue to provide a high level of support to member councils and their residents. As one of the fastest growing regions in the State, the decrease in Government funding has exacerbated the problems associated with fulfilling the needs of the expanding population for new infrastructure and increased community services.

As an example, in the area of public health, the new hospital at Noarlunga was largely non-functional and was, therefore, unable to assist Flinders Medical Centre to maintain existing services with constrained funding . . . North-south road access continues as a major focus, as the need for a true third arterial road becomes critical to the region's development.

That was the report of the collective southern councils as a consequence of the poor budget initiatives and lack of recognition and funding by this State Government. In the time that remains, I wish to turn very briefly to some matters affecting my shadow portfolios. Today in this Parliament I raised a very serious issue, which related to the police firearms register and the problems being experienced by that department in retaining the details of gun owners.

In February 1983 an analysis of police computing requirements was undertaken. Almost 10 years ago, at the start of the term of this Government, that report, by independent consultants, recognised fundamental problems with the police firearms register and recommended that a major new system be developed in order that the Police Department would know who owned firearms and which firearms they owned, and could ensure that licences for firearms were renewed.

In this Parliament today, 10 years after that report and after successive Auditor-General's statements since 1989, this Government still has failed to address that problem, and the Minister of Emergency Services simply replied that he would talk about the problem to the Police Commissioner. That problem has been in existence for the entire term of that Minister's period in office, yet he has failed to act, and it would seem from his statement in the House today that he knew nothing about it. It would seem that the Minister, yet again, has failed to read his documents.

I should like to refer briefly to State Services. I note that the State Print organisation within that department has once again incurred a loss. On this occasion it has lost \$1.4 million, a massive increase on last year's unacceptable loss of \$500 000. But this has happened at a time when the income of State Print was \$26.2 million.

What sort of Minister would allow a \$26 million capital turnover to turn into a \$1.4 million loss?

If nothing else, that is indicative of the incompetence of this Government and its failure to be able to turn a simple enterprise into a profitable venture. Quite clearly, the possibility of turning that operation over to private enterprise, which that could make it profitable, needs to be investigated closely. I note once again that the Central Linen Service has returned a loss on this occasion of \$633 000—once again, one more indication of the problems being faced by this Government, with its inability to manage an enterprise at any level within Government. I note also that the Auditor-General's Report refers to poor audit testing of that service, which in turn is reflected in its ultimate loss. This budget document is a disgraceful document. It is an unacceptable impost on South Australians and I urge the Government to withdraw it.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr De Laine):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Newland.

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** In the decade stretching from 1981 to 1990, Labor Governments have successfully managed to redistribute the comparative wealth of our nation from those who toil longest and hardest (the average working people and their families) to those whose share of that wealth is already 40 per cent greater than that of the average person. The ever widening gap between those who have and those who have not is clearly identified in a paper that was presented at the National Social Justice and Economy Conference held in Adelaide in February this year.

The bottom 40 per cent of Australian families have seen their income severely diminished from 7.6 per cent of total wealth to 6.1 per cent of total wealth, whereas the top 20 per cent have remarkably increased their share from 48 per cent to 51.7 per cent. To put the income and wealth distribution into a world-wide comparative perspective, a survey that was taken of 18 western economies showed that Australia had the most unequal wealth distribution, with the most dubious of distinctions, recording that we had the third highest poverty rating. At the same time, we had the third highest in affluence.

The decade from 1981 to 1990 gave Labor Governments the opportunity to implement their policies of socialist reform (and, I hasten to add, socialist policies that are diametrically opposed to Liberal philosophies), to improve the standard of average living conditions for the majority of Australian citizens and to use the budgets of the office of Government to implement those policies, directing improvements to all areas of our economy to favour the men, women and children who make up our Australian population. Every budget presented throughout that decade of Labor Government has led this State further down what can only be described as a treadmill of perpetuating disasters.

This budget, presented by the paradoxical nexus of David supported by Goliath, is a further disaster designed not to slay the Goliath of Government but most definitely to slay any hope of economic recovery for this State. When a Labor Government, which purports to be the ally and defender of the average working person, unashamedly and actively deprives the average working

person of their hard-earned incomes to provide the rich and wealthy with even greater wealth, then surely there is no doubt that this Labor Government has failed not only South Australians but its own followers and creed.

This budget rates with an equal lack of credibility with the previous nine budgets. In the previous 10 budgets presented by this Government \$3.3 billion more has been spent than the income received to fund them. This 1992-93 budget follows the same pattern with a \$600 million gap between spending and revenue. The pattern of this budget highlights once again that ineptitude and financial mismanagement sits comfortably on the heads of a Cabinet of Ministers unable to interpret the problems of the State and deal credibly with them. This is a Government whose only answer to economic crisis is to spend more, tax more and shackle this State with massive debts by borrowing more.

The legacy of a decade of Labor budgets has left us with 86 000 people unemployed and a youth unemployment rate of 38 per cent for 15 to 19-year-olds which, in individual numbers, equates to 11 300 young people with no hope, no jobs and no optimism for future change under this Labor budget. The decade of Labor budgets has left us with 9 000 people on hospital waiting lists and an increasing aged population in South Australia placing more demands on health services. The waiting lists will continue to escalate. With a Government that cannot provide the necessary services at this time, what hope is there for the future?

Removing the availability of institutionalised care for people with disabilities has meant greater burdens being placed on families, and in particular these burdens are placed upon women and in many cases elderly men, but this Government cannot provide the necessary health services, and that includes domiciliary care services. Labor budgets have increased the numbers of people on public housing waiting lists, and there are now 44 000 people on the South Australian Housing Trust waiting list. Labor budgets, with their increased taxes and charges, have forced the average working person into the bankruptcy court. In 1990-91, 1 169 non-business bankruptcies were recorded. These are not business people, not the owners of businesses or the maligned employers, but individual citizens of this great State. That is an increase in personal bankruptcies since June 1986 of 148 per cent.

What of the Labor Government's legacy to small business? In that same period 484 small businesses went bankrupt. I can assure the House that 484 small business people and their families did not feel one shred of sympathy to hear that the 10-year Premier who orchestrated their demise had in fact resigned. This budget makes one major statement. The South Australian Government is effectively bankrupt, and not one member of this Government can martyr themselves by the pyrotechnics approach of burning themselves on the funeral pyre of the State Bank debt. This was a team effort from the Labor Cabinet—a team effort visibly enacted by their arrogance and financial mismanagement.

Just look at the mismanagement. This budget will require the Government to borrow another \$317 million to fund the difference between payments and receipts this financial year. This budget will require the Government to borrow a further \$450 million to fund the losses

incurred by the State Bank last year and possibly a further \$100 million to fund further bad bank losses this year. The budget papers suggest that the \$450 million loss not provided for may be deducted from the good bank's capital. Providing fully for the bank and funding this year's deficit will take the State Bank debt to \$8 000 million—the figure I predicted in my Address in Reply contribution. This does not include public sector superannuation liabilities, which increased by another \$303 million last financial year to almost \$3 500 million. Long service leave liabilities are up another \$90 million to \$560 million at June this year.

The \$150 million unfunded liability of Government workers compensation on top of the currently reported \$135 million in WorkCover shows again a yawning gap between accounts payable and accounts receivable. This means total public sector liabilities are approaching \$13 billion at June this year, and that is a rise of almost 20 per cent in one year. This budget is funded by an injection of more than \$700 million from SAFA. SAFA is left to wear a further \$64.7 million conversion of Woods and Forest debt to equity. The SAFA contribution will include \$95 million taken from ETSA, creatively described by the Government in its budget papers as a return on the Government's \$110 million capital in ETSA.

Figures in the budget papers show that the public sector is expected to consume 22.9 per cent of our gross State product this financial year. In all other States, the public sector take of GST is less than 18 per cent. Under Labor, South Australia has been devoting more and more of its gross State product to the public sector, at the same time that GST has been declining. The budget papers imply a GST of \$28 billion this financial year. This means a real reduction of \$3.2 billion since 1990 despite inflation, which is almost a 10 per cent decline and could certainly mean another State Bank debacle. It also means the Government is spending more, taxing more and most definitely borrowing more.

Will this Government change the direction of its policy; will it pull the budget and look at something more on a practical line? I believe the answer to both of those questions is a definite 'No'. Under no policy change, the starting point for next year's deficit will be the \$300 million plus additional interest on the higher debt, plus other unfunded expenditure such as any further support for the State Bank which must be found in lieu of the one-off contributions from SAFA this year. Another inevitable factor in next year's budget will be the failure to allow for any wage and salary increases in 1992-93. There is no provision in this budget, even though the Government is estimating growth in average weekly earnings in 1992-93 of 2.8 per cent.

The cost to the budget in a full year would be more than \$45 million. The attempts in recent days by senior Ministers to develop sympathy for the former Premier demonstrate an utter and blatant contempt for the taxpayer. With such attitudes, it is no wonder that we have yet another budget before us that transfers the burden of this Government's appalling financial administration onto taxpayers.

The real increase in State taxation in this budget amounts to 10.4 per cent, or almost \$114 million. This is despite a 10 per cent increase in Commonwealth payments to South Australia. Translated into jobs, this growth in taxation means that the Government, by taking this money out of the economy for its own purposes, is denying business the resources to create more than 3 000 jobs.

When this Government came to office, State taxation was the equivalent of \$7.22 per week for every man, woman and child in South Australia. It was at the lowest level of all States. That figure is now \$20.69 per week. This level of taxation is being imposed, as I have pointed out, on a contracting tax base relative to the other States. The 10.4 per cent increase in State taxes flies in the face of the Arthur D. Little recommendations to reduce taxes and help generate private sector jobs.

This budget does nothing at all to contain taxation by holding down recurrent spending. In fact, in the area of recurrent spending, the Consolidated Account increases in real terms by \$89 million when account is taken of the \$45 million less that the Government says it will cost in 1992-93 to fund the borrowings on the State Bank bailout because of reduced interest rates, and the \$39 million reduction in salaries which flows from reduced public sector employment. Continuing real increases in recurrent spending are being achieved at the expense of spending on capital works to fund infrastructure for the future.

This budget is another Labor Government disgrace. It does not approach any of the problems that are realistic to the people of South Australia. It is a disgrace to have this budget presented by the former Premier. It is an even greater disgrace that the new Premier has not considered removing the budget as it stands and presenting a budget that does take into account the realistic needs of the people of this State.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10.34 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 10 September at 10.30 a.m.