

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 14 October 1992

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

### PETITIONS

#### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

A petition signed by 38 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ensure that the curfew at Adelaide Airport is maintained was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

#### OYSTER FARMING

A petition signed by 183 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reject applications for oyster farming leases adjacent to section 18 Hundred of Flinders on Proper Bay was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

#### CHILD ABUSE

A petition signed by 63 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase penalties for child sexual abuse offenders was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

A petition signed by 116 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to appoint a royal commission to investigate all aspects of the operation of the child protection function of the Department for Family and Community Services was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

#### WORKCOVER

The **Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. R.J. GREGORY**: During Question Time last Thursday the member for Adelaide stated in his question to the Minister of Health and Community Services that Orana's workers compensation premiums have more than doubled since the introduction of WorkCover. I am advised by WorkCover that Orana's levy for the 1991-92 financial year amounted to just over \$138 000. When compared to Orana's levy of \$58 666 for 1987-88, one could argue that on face value its

workers compensation premiums have more than doubled since the introduction of WorkCover. However, this is a misleading comparison as Orana paid for only nine months in 1987-88 as WorkCover did not commence until 30 September 1987 and Orana's employment level has increased significantly since 1987-88.

When adjustment is made for these two factors, the levy paid by Orana has increased by only 35 per cent between 1987-88 and 1991-92. Despite a decrease in the industry levy rate for four of the seven industry classes in which Orana has locations, the overall levy rate has increased due to the high cost of claims in the sheltered workshop industry. WorkCover has met with key members of the sheltered workshop operations industry to provide them with details of its claims experience and is assisting them to improve their performance and so reduce the industry levy rate.

#### GAWLER RIVER

The **Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety)**: I seek leave to make a further ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. R.J. GREGORY**: During Question Time yesterday the member for Victoria, and subsequently in the grievance debate the member for Goyder, criticised the Government in strong terms for allegedly failing to take action on a 1976 Engineering and Water Supply Department report on flood warning and flood mitigation in the Gawler River basin. As is so often the case with this Opposition, the facts are quite different. First, it is a fact—

The **Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE**: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister has been given leave to make a ministerial statement; he has not been given leave to debate the question as he is now doing.

The **SPEAKER**: I uphold the point of order. I ask the Minister to abide by the custom of the House and make the statement as clearly as possible and without debate.

The **Hon. R.J. GREGORY**: First, it is a fact that the South Para Reservoir was designed and constructed to maximise water storage and the radial gates were originally installed during 1960 for the purpose of further increasing water storage. Original operating procedures for the dam did not incorporate any provision for flood mitigation. However, following flood events in 1974, a study was conducted by the E&WS Department to assess the potential for improving the method of operating the gates to further reduce flooding.

This study, which resulted in the 1976 report referred to by the Opposition, found that a modified gate operation could be used to improve flood mitigation benefits without seriously compromising water supply requirements. The report recommended the installation of an extensive streamflow and rainfall monitoring system upstream of the South Para Reservoir to enable the proposed new mode of operation. It was also proposed that the monitoring system would need to be connected to some form of telemetry.

The report also recommended an extended streamflow and rainfall monitoring system in the North Para River catchment and areas downstream of the South Para Reservoir to assist with predicting floods at Gawler and

in the lower Gawler River. This part of the system was substantially installed and has assisted with issuing flood warnings during the recent flooding as well as flood events in previous years. A cornerstone of the operating procedures proposed in 1976 was the need to make releases from South Para ahead of an impending flood. It was recognised that there was some danger in doing this because it could exacerbate a flood coming down the North Para River and actually make things worse at and below Gawler.

In fact, a preliminary review of the latest flooding carried out by the E&WS Department clearly indicates that pre-releases would have made the flooding at Gawler and further downstream even worse than that which occurred. The 1976 report also recommended that operating procedures be refined in the longer term. This was because the report was based on computer models developed with limited data. That process of refinement took place in the mid 1980s with a further review using more data and culminated in a report in 1987. The 1987 report concluded that making pre-releases from the South Para Reservoir was not feasible because it could result in flows from the North Para and South Para Rivers coinciding at Gawler, which would increase flooding. This report and the results of subsequent investigations indicated that maximum benefits to the community would be achieved if gates were not used.

The 1987 report also concluded that the construction of the South Para Reservoir and its operation in the current manner has significantly mitigated the effects of floods in the Gawler River because it helps to prevent flood peaks on the North and South Para Rivers coinciding. It must also be appreciated that the South Para gates were not designed to be overtopped by flood waters. Operating the gates to try to reduce flooding would put the gates at risk of overtopping and their subsequent failure would result in large scale flooding. The gates are, of course, safe provided that they are operated within their design capabilities.

Finally, the 1987 report recommended that the gates be removed, a recommendation which the principal author of the 1976 report subsequently endorsed as recently as 1990. The fact is that the E&WS Department has implemented the joint recommendations of the two reports (1976 and 1987) with the aim of maximising the benefits to the community of South Australia. It is extremely disappointing that the Opposition should have chosen to portray the 1976 report as something over which no action was taken. Action was taken in relation to the important recommendations on streamflow and rainfall monitoring which still have benefits today. The question of flood mitigation using the radial gates at South Para was further examined after the 1976 report, as the report suggested should happen, and the conclusion was reached that the gates should not be used for this purpose. The Opposition should realise that nothing is set in—

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister is continuing to debate the question. He just said, 'The Opposition should realise,' and I believe that leave should be withdrawn.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Certainly, the rules are very clear and clean. However, the custom of the House does allow some leeway and it has for many years. As the

honourable member would know if she reflected back to when she was a Minister and made statements, some leeway is given.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! To cut out of a statement every single word that is not dead fact would be impossible. I will certainly try to ensure that ministerial statements are as clear and clean as possible, but it is impossible to stop every single word. I would ask the Minister to resume his statement.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Mitcham is out of order and, if the Opposition decides or chooses to prevent or deny leave to make ministerial statements, that is obviously its prerogative. However, from the Chair I would say that it does not seem to the Chair to be the wisest move. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** No document is a bible for all times. Views and opinions change, and change is required in the light of experience and new and better information. That is what has happened in relation to some aspects of the 1976 report.

#### LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** I bring up the minutes of evidence given before the Legislative Review Committee on regulations under the Medical Practitioners Act 1983 relating to registration fees, and the nineteenth report 1992 of the Legislative Review Committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

#### QUESTION TIME

##### FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** Contrary to his denials of last week, does the Minister of Health believe that South Australia's public hospitals are in crisis, given information provided to the Liberal Party that a Hallet Cove woman diagnosed with malignant breast cancer—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is very close to a repetition of a question asked last week.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I would ask the honourable member to be very careful that it is not a repeat of the question; it sounds very similar to a question asked last week, but I will check.

**Dr ARMITAGE:** For the Minister's edification, I repeat that this Hallet Cove woman was diagnosed with malignant breast cancer and she is fearing for her life after she was told only yesterday that a Flinders Medical Centre lifesaving operation planned for today to remove her breast was cancelled because no hospital bed was available, despite the availability of surgeons.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Adelaide will resume his seat. The member for Napier has a point of order, I presume.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Yes, Mr Speaker; I was listening intently and at no time did I hear the member

for Adelaide ask your concurrence and that of the House to explain his question.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I take the point of order. I was trying to look up the question of last week to determine whether it had been repeated. I was not sure whether the honourable member had finished his question; if he had, I would ask him to seek the leave of the House and the Chair to explain.

**Dr ARMITAGE:** Mr Speaker, I am only too delighted to ask your leave and that of the House to explain my question. With your leave, Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**Dr ARMITAGE:** Mr Speaker, may I have your leave to repeat the question?

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mount Gambier is out of order. As there is some doubt about the validity of the question, namely, that it may be a repeat of last week's question, I would ask the member for Adelaide to resume his seat while I check that question. If it is not considered to be a repeat of the question asked last week—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!—I will then allow the question to be asked again. If the question has been asked and is on the record, I will check whether it is a repeat, because at this stage I am not sure. I am having the record checked. As there is doubt from the other side as to what the question was, I think it is fair that it be asked again if it is valid. If not, I will not call the honourable member again. I will call a member from the Government side while I check the question. The member for Walsh.

#### PROPERTY SETTLEMENTS

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** Can the Treasurer advise whether property settlements in South Australia are being delayed because of new procedures introduced by the Commissioner of Stamps and whether these changes are unfairly targeting home owners?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I was quite surprised last week when I heard the Hon. Legh Davis in another place make some statements about some delays in property settlement because of the new procedures that have been introduced in an attempt to prevent avoidance of stamp duty. I seem to remember in this House the member for Mitcham and a number of other members making a great deal of fuss about the avoidance of stamp duty by certain parties when they were transferring property.

Members opposite were quite right to make a fuss, because any avoidance of stamp duty is to be deplored. However, immediately the Government moves to put better procedures in place to ensure that there is no further avoidance of stamp duty and that all stamp duty that is due is paid, what do we get? We get the Hon. Legh Davis complaining about additional procedures designed to prevent the very thing about which they were complaining.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I cannot pick any logic at all amongst members opposite, whether they are present Leaders, former Leaders or, in the case of the member for Kavel, a future Leader.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

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

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** What are the facts? It is true that mortgagees have been told to give five days notice before certification will be provided. However, in 80 per cent of cases, the turn-around time is only 48 hours. That does not seem to be a great deal of inconvenience for anyone. The Hon. Legh Davis went on to say that industry has been thrown into total confusion. Even allowing for the somewhat amateur theatricals of the Hon. Legh Davis, it is still a pretty sweeping statement. Again, what are the facts? There has been extensive consultation with the Australian Bankers Association and its members and various legal, accounting, land broking and real estate representatives.

They have all been briefed and they have all understood. In fact, we have had letters of commendation for the action we have taken and the way we have briefed industry. The Hon. Mr Davis said that several hundred settlements had to be cancelled because the Stamp Duty Office was not able to process the documents in time. That is absolutely incorrect. There have been numerous instances in the Stamp Duty Office where the correct documentation has not been prevented, where information that ought to be readily available to anyone, particularly professional people who are attempting to complete those transactions, was available. If they have not got them because they are incompetent, it is their fault; one should not blame the Stamp Duty Office.

According to the Hon. Legh Davis, it is an administrative nightmare for financial institutions. Again, as I said, there has been extensive consultation, compliments from the industry and, I believe, a very satisfactory result. It is true that much of the avoidance of stamp duty has been in the residential housing sector. Overwhelmingly, people buy their houses through appropriate professionals; by and large, they do not buy and sell houses off their own bat but require professional help. I was quite alarmed to learn from the Stamp Duty Office that it is this area that is creating a great deal of concern about avoidance. I will inform the House of the benefits of these new procedures, which I again stress were put in place to avoid the problem about which the Opposition complained. To date, we are collecting about \$50 000 per week more in stamp duty than we were prior to these procedures being put in place. So, about \$50 000 a week of avoidance was taking place.

Some people might be slightly inconvenienced, but they would be very few. I think that the taxpayers of this State and the Opposition ought to compliment the Government and the Stamp Duty Office for those additional procedures and for the additional revenue that is coming into the State Treasury, because that money belongs to everyone. If this Parliament passes a law that provides that stamp duty is payable on a particular transaction, no-one ought to complain about reasonable

compliance procedures that will ensure payment of the due amount.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Adelaide. Some questions are getting very close to repetition, and I ask members to be careful in the future about how they phrase their questions so that there is no repetition. The member for Adelaide.

### FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** Contrary to his denials last week, does the Minister of Health believe that South Australia's public hospitals are in crisis, in the light of information provided to the Liberal Party that a Hallett Cove woman diagnosed with malignant breast cancer fears for her life after she was told only yesterday that a life saving operation planned for today at the Flinders Medical Centre to remove her breast was cancelled because there was no hospital bed available despite the availability of surgeons?

This patient's malignant breast cancer was diagnosed three or four weeks ago by needle biopsy and, as I have indicated, a mastectomy operation was scheduled for today. Yesterday, the woman was told the operation had been cancelled because a bed was not available, and she said, 'It seems as if someone has to die before I get a bed, and it might be me.'

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** The member for Adelaide raises a very serious issue about the health care provided to an individual patient at the Flinders Medical Centre. Given the nature of that issue and the intensely personal matters that it raises for that patient, I would have thought it would be better if the honourable member had brought it to my attention earlier today as soon as he became aware of it so that I could act forthwith—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** —to see what could be done in this particular case. Obviously, in cases of emergency treatment and procedures, South Australia's public hospital system has a very good—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Adelaide is out of order. The Minister will resume his seat. There is an increasing tendency in this House for people to ask questions and then to comment while the answer is being given. Plenty of leeway is given to explain a question, and this practice of following it up while the Minister is responding will cease. The Minister.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** I would like the opportunity to deal effectively with this personal health tragedy in this family, because the public hospital system in this State has an excellent record of dealing with those cases where an emergency situation is presented. I would be very concerned if the management of an individual hospital in this State did not facilitate that process. Flinders has an excellent record of providing emergency medical care, so I believe there must be extraordinary circumstances surrounding this case. I ask the member for Adelaide to provide me with details of it so that I can have it examined forthwith and so that action can be taken to ensure that the best standard of medical care is provided. As I said, I am a little disappointed that the

honourable member did not raise this matter with me immediately upon his becoming aware of it so that I could have acted earlier.

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** This is an issue that relates to management of our individual hospital units, and quite clearly the Health Commission and I (as Minister of Health) are responsible for the overall allocation of funds in this respect. Flinders has not done that badly in respect of funds across the board. The allocation of funds for Flinders over the last three to four years has actually increased by some 2.4 per cent in real terms since the 1988-89 financial year, somewhat more than has been provided to the Royal Adelaide or the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, for example.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Coles is out of order.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** Flinders Medical Centre has an excellent record in this State of providing quality emergency care. It is provided with the funding necessary to maintain that care, and it is a matter for individual management to take responsibility for the allocation of that funding.

*Mr Such interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Fisher is out of order.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** It is clear that if action had been taken earlier today I could have taken the action much earlier and not been forced to wait until 2 o'clock this afternoon for an urgent matter to be taken up with the Health Commission.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** I am more than prepared to come into the House to debate the policy issue that this involves, but I am very concerned when individual circumstances are delayed so that they can be used in Question Time rather than being raised with me as Minister of Health so that I can act on them forthwith, and that is the most important aspect of this matter. If the member for Adelaide provides me with those details as a matter of urgency I will ensure the matter is investigated this afternoon.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** My question is also directed to the Minister of Health. In view of the fact that 300 elective operations were cancelled last month at Flinders Medical Centre, that 12 operations were cancelled yesterday and that all elective surgery at the hospital has been cancelled today, does the Minister maintain there is no crisis in the South Australian hospitals system, and what action is he taking to deal with this 'non-crisis' situation? Last night Flinders Medical Centre was so full that a day ward had to be opened to accommodate the 18 patients waiting to be admitted through the accident and emergency department. The hospital's acute beds are now 105 per cent occupied and one surgeon has described the hospital as being 'in diabolical strife'.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** Obviously the Opposition wishes to raise questions in relation to Flinders Medical

Centre, and I am quite prepared to discuss that. As I have indicated in my reply to the first question, the budget allocation provided to Flinders is actually quite reasonable in the context of the overall health management situation. The Flinders Medical Centre must take responsibility for the allocation of its own funds. It is quite able to use the funding provided to it by the commission and by the people of South Australia from their taxes in order to determine its own priorities.

Quite clearly, while there has been a substantial number of problems arising from the accident/emergency admissions at Flinders, if we look at the long-term position there has been a 12 per cent decline in casualty attendances at Flinders over the past three years, but in recent months that number has increased and work is being undertaken at the moment in order to determine why. But in overall terms the southern metropolitan Adelaide area has in fact received an increased share of the budget cake, from 20.64 per cent in 1991 to 21.77 per cent this financial year. Members would also be aware of the opening of the Noarlunga Hospital.

Flinders Medical Centre last year spent an estimated \$1 million of its recurrent budget allocation on equipment purchases over and above specific equipment funding provided by the commission. The sum provides it with a substantial buffer in this year in order to relieve budget pressures, and our other hospitals are acting responsibly within the budget context with which they have been provided in order to provide that very high standard of care which we are able to do. For example, Flinders Medical Centre must certainly take the credit for the first liver transplant operation which it undertook just recently. Obviously the funding provided is also a matter of priority allocation determination, and the hospital—

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

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

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** The hospital has been able to provide a very high standard of service. The matters of management of that hospital obviously need to be examined in relation to how it allocates those funds: I certainly am doing and intend to continue to do that, and the information provided today which I myself have from the commission is a very important part of that work.

## SHEEP

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Can the Minister of Primary Industries advise the House what is the current position regarding live sheep exports from South Australia to overseas markets? Can he also advise what work is being undertaken to increase our market share, especially in the Saudi area? It is my understanding that there may be a shortage of supplies from the major suppliers—countries such as New Zealand and some of the European countries.

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** In fact, there have been some very encouraging signs which could see a significant improvement in South Australia's live sheep trade. There have been some very positive developments and our trade could pick up immeasurably in the next six months. As members know, the live sheep trade to Saudi Arabia took a severe blow in 1989 when exports from

Australia were discontinued. At that time, of 7 million live sheep exported from Australia, some 50 per cent were imported by Saudi Arabia. South Australia's share at that time was something like 2.2 million sheep.

Although Saudi Arabia remains closed for the moment, the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation and the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industries are the bodies responsible for continuing negotiations at an international level. However, in the meantime, trade with other middle eastern countries has picked up and Kuwait has re-entered the market much sooner than was expected. Already this year South Australia has exported some 459 000 sheep to the Middle East and Algeria. Metro Meat is collecting a further 120 000 sheep in feedlot in preparation for another consignment due to be exported in November.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** Well, if one compares these figures with 1991 they are extremely favourable. There are extremely positive signs because in 1991 a total of only 478 000 sheep were exported from South Australia. South Australia is quite clearly in a prime position to meet any renewed commercial demand from Saudi Arabia. Another significant development is the move by the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation some time ago to relicence a major live sheep exporter, Al Mukairish Pty Ltd. Consequently, the signs for South Australian meat sheep producers are encouraging. I will be supporting them and doing everything I can to further improve our trade in the Middle East

## FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

**Mr SUCH (Fisher):** Will the Minister of Health and Community Services take urgent action to provide a bed at Flinders Medical Centre so that a 21-year-old female constituent of mine, who is suffering from an aggressive tumour, can continue to receive her chemotherapy treatment? I became aware of this issue at 1.50 p.m. today and immediately responded by contacting the father. The father is most concerned—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr SUCH:**—that due to funding cuts treatment scheduled for today was cancelled yesterday. The family has been told that no bed is available at Flinders Medical Centre to allow continuation of the treatment which is at a crucial stage.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** I continue to be amazed at this issue of individual cases obviously involving urgent medical care which are being placed before the House in this fashion. I do not think it is an appropriate way in which to bring these issues to public attention.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** It is quite clear that using individuals—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:**—with this kind of tragic situation—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** —is not the appropriate way to deal with the issues being raised. It is obvious that in this context, as Minister of Health, I will clearly take whatever steps I can to bring to the hospital's attention the needs that the honourable member has raised with me today. If he is prepared to provide the name and the details, again, I will have the matter taken up with the hospital management forthwith. If members wish to place these cases before me, I am certainly able to do that, but it is obviously very difficult for me to do that now because I am in the House. If the honourable member had contacted me about this before Question Time, I would have taken it up with the hospital management then.

I think it is very important that we look at some of the individual issues raised, for example, last week by the Opposition. We were told that a substantial amount of money had been transferred from the hospital into operating expenses and diverted from waiting list management. That has not been the case when I have had it investigated. It clearly shows that \$530 000 is not being diverted to general hospital expenses, as we were told last week, but is being used in the Flinders Medical Centre to provide facilities and services for its own patients rather than being used to contract out beds at the Repatriation Hospital.

The question that we had last week about the Department of Surgery at the Flinders Medical Centre was also somewhat alarmist and did not quite reflect the facts. The Department of Surgery at Flinders has been required to make a contribution of only \$180 000 for the centre's overall budget reduction target. This relatively small amount in the Department of Surgery can hardly be the cause, as we were told last week, of a reduction in hip replacement operations by five per week. Given that the cost of such operations is about \$5 000 to \$10 000 per procedure, a reduction of five per week would lead to savings of \$1 million to \$2 million a year. Clearly that is not \$180 000.

I hope that the Opposition will carefully validate its facts in relation to these matters before putting them before the public in this fashion and generating unnecessary alarm and concern about the standards of health care provided at one of our major teaching hospitals. That hospital has a fine reputation. I am very concerned that the Opposition is bringing it before the House in a manner which is calculated to lower public confidence in that system of health. I am very pleased that the member for Fisher has now provided me with details which I can take up.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that, without taking away from the importance of the issue, I would appreciate short answers. I also draw his attention to the facility for Ministers to make ministerial statements for a more full and detailed response where he believes that to be necessary.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR SALARIES

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** Will the Treasurer inform the House of the flow-on consequences to the

finances of this State from the decision by the new Victorian Premier, Mr Kennett, to offer Public Service department chiefs five-year contracts worth up to \$1.5 million each?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I was absolutely appalled—

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** —when I read in the paper that Mr Kennett, the new Premier of Victoria, a man who over the past 18 months or so has gone around saying, 'This State is bankrupt'—

**Mr Ingerson:** Who won?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Well, he did not tell them this. The Deputy Leader asks, 'Who won?'. I did not read anywhere prior to the election the capers that he was going to get up to. The consequences in respect of this flowing on to the rest of Australia are quite alarming. I could not believe it when I saw in *The Age* yesterday the salaries that were being paid to the heads of the Public Service in Victoria—\$250 000 a year basic and a bonus of \$50 000 a year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Custance is out of order, the member for Mitcham is out of order, the Deputy Leader is out of order, the member for Hayward is out of order and the member for Heysen is out of order. I have had to speak to several members today several times. The next time will attract a warning, and everybody knows what happens after that. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Thank you very much for your protection, Sir. I was absolutely appalled when I saw that \$300 000 a year salaries were being paid to the heads of the Public Service. That is about three times what is paid to Public Service heads in South Australia. It is a 300 per cent increase. Not only that, but Mr Kennett, I read in the paper, has appointed four more Ministers. I never heard about that before the election and neither did the people of Victoria. I can tell the House that in Victoria Ministers do not come cheap, as they do in this State. That is extraordinarily expensive, Sir: four new Ministers, increasing the ministry from 18 to 22. This is the State which, we heard from Mr Kennett, was bankrupt, and it goes on.

Mr Kennett said he had also created seven parliamentary secretary positions (and listen to this) to give MPs a career structure. As well as a career structure for MPs, each would get a 15 per cent salary increase. If this was not so serious, it would be laughable, but what happened is that, amongst the good administrators who work in the public sector, there is obviously a market. Greiner started it by paying \$200 000—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Hayward has a point of order.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Under Standing Order 98, the Minister must reply to the substance of the question. I ask you to rule on whether the Minister is replying to the substance of the question which he was asked by a member of his own Party.

**The SPEAKER:** I would ask the Minister to come back to the substance of the question and perhaps give due consideration to the time taken in responding.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I was coming to my point, Sir. The consequences for all State Governments are quite horrendous, including for this Government. This precisely relates to the question; when we are trying to attract administrators, obviously there is a market, from the approximately \$100 000 base that is being established in this State and generally throughout Australia up to \$200 000 in New South Wales now and up to \$300 000 now in Victoria, and every taxpayer in Australia will eventually have to pay those salaries to attract people at that level. I think that is appalling, and I think if that is what we can expect, should unfortunately a Liberal Government ever come into office in this State, it will be a direct and horrendous cost to the taxpayers of South Australia. I would ask the Opposition please to tell us whether these are the kinds of salaries they will pay to top public servants in this State if they come to office. Will it increase the ministry? If that is the case, I think the people of South Australia are entitled to hear it now, not after the election.

#### STATE BANK

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Does the Premier think that the State Bank's treatment of the Lovering family on Kangaroo Island has been fair and equitable and, if not, what action will he now take? Mr and Mrs Garry Lovering have written to me and taken out an advertisement in the *Islander* of last week which states:

As a result of a chain of events commencing with the appointment of a provisional liquidator we are satisfied that the State Bank of South Australia conspired—

and I hope the Premier is listening—

to produce a plan designed to place third parties and our family under extreme duress in order to recover family assets which were not their property and to which they had no entitlement. At a meeting with the representatives of the State Bank we were informed that if our children and any business interests associated with them did not provide guarantees to the bank for the funds advanced by the bank over two years ago they would grind us down with litigation in the courts and that they had the capability to do so . . . We were further informed that once all the additional guarantees had been provided and only then would they consider whether they sold us up or continued to support us.

Their continued harassment has caused all of the other financial institutions with whom we deal to freeze our accounts to the point where we now require unemployment benefits to survive.

On 5 March 1992 the Premier, as Minister of Agriculture, wrote to Mr Lovering and assured him that he would do all that he could to ensure that the financiers dealt with them fairly and equitably.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Mr Speaker—

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** What about the Premier—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Thank you, Sir. Of course, the State Bank Act has been allocated—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** —to me.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Mr Speaker, it is difficult to get a word in edgeways, but I will try. The first thing I want to say is that it gives me some concern that the Leader, obviously with the agreement of this family, has brought the financial affairs of this family into the public arena.

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** I did not—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I always deplore that, because I have never yet seen a satisfactory conclusion to one of these cases.

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** I read it from a paper.

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader is stretching the friendship.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I will ask the State Bank about this case. There will be some problems, because the bank is inhibited under the State Bank Act in disclosing information. In my experience I have found that there are always two sides—

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** —to these questions—always. I can remember that in 1976—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** That is right, long before the Leader knew anything about Kangaroo Island. I can remember being on Kangaroo Island with the Hon. Ted Chapman, and it is a great pity he is not here. He must be very disappointed but, with the Hon. Ted Chapman, we looked at about two dozen cases of Kangaroo Island farmers who were having some financial difficulties, and it was a predecessor of this Government that sorted out the financial problems for many of those farmers. We will try to do so again.

What the Government cannot do is to prop up every farmer, every deli owner or every steelworker in this State. I wish we could, but it is not possible for us to do so.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I will have this case researched and gain as much information as I am able to obtain, given the secrecy provisions of the State Bank Act and some of the legal questions involved. I will give as full a report as I can to the House. One thing I will guarantee: there are always two sides to these questions.

#### TOURISM COMMISSION

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Can the Minister of Tourism inform the House how the concept of a tourism commission in South Australia has been received by industry representatives? It has been put to me by travel agents in my electorate that the tourism industry, identified by A.D. Little as a crucial growth industry for South Australia, would benefit from greater industry involvement, especially in the area of marketing. However, it has also been put to me by other interested

parties that, unless industry is supportive of the idea, it will not get to first base.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am pleased that the member for Napier is closely in touch with travel agents in his electorate. I have been delighted with the response I have had in discussions on a range of tourism issues. While no decisions have been made on this issue, I have met with a wide range of groups from both the tourism industry and the broader industry sector, all of whom have reacted very positively to the concept of establishing a statutory corporation responsible for the marketing of South Australia as a tourism destination and directed by a board representing key players in the State's tourism industry.

Of course, the people I am talking to, including the advisory board, which comprises industry people who advise the Government on tourism matters, have said to me that it is absolutely vital if we are to have a commission at some stage that it be truly industry driven with the board not just having an advisory capacity but real teeth and able to set priorities and forward plans and to allocate resources accordingly.

**Mr Quirke:** Where does the Opposition Leader stand?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I do not know where he stands on many issues. We knew where his predecessors stood—both of them—although I did not agree with them, but read his lips and you will see there are no policies or guts and there is certainly no State patriotism. I think it is essential for South Australia's future that industry and Government work closely together in industry—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Members interject, yet last night the Leader of the Opposition compared himself to Ross Perot coming back from industry to save the State. Most of his colleagues think he has turned out to be a Dan Quayle.

Getting back to the subject, it is also essential to strengthen the links between regional development boards and regional tourism to ensure a strategic approach to regional development. So, I look forward to continuing discussions with the tourism industry.

## CASINO

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** My question is directed to the Premier. Why did the Lotteries Commission and the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust allow Genting to receive excessive payments from the Adelaide Casino, and what assurance can he give that Mr Bob Bakewell did not exert undue influence on the Government to secure Genting's role in the Casino? The report tabled yesterday shows that the annual \$3 million payment to Genting is grossly excessive for the services provided. Two Government agencies under the ministerial control of the Premier and Treasurer at the time—namely, the Lotteries Commission as the holder of the Casino licence and the Superannuation Fund Investment Trust as one-third owner of AITCO Pty Ltd, the operator of the Casino—were involved in agreeing the fee payable to Genting and, according to the Casino Supervisory Authority's report, urged the authority in 1985 to approve Genting's involvement in the Casino.

The authority approved the appointment of AITCO as operator of the Casino in March 1985, but Genting was able to anticipate this decision, as shown by documents lodged with Federal and State corporate affairs authorities in June and November 1984 that describe the business of Genting South Australia as 'casino operator'. Mr Bakewell became a director of Genting in June 1985, two months after his appointment to the board of the State Bank. At the State Bank Royal Commission, Mr Bakewell gave evidence of his ability to use the 'Public Service old boy network' to have access to the Government.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am not quite sure what the member for Mitcham is implying.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am not quite sure how I would be able to find that out, but I will examine the question—

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I beg your pardon?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will direct his response through the Chair.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I can assure members that at that time I had never met Mr Bakewell in my life, so he has certainly never had any influence, undue or otherwise, over me; and I am sure he would agree with that after yesterday. I will have the question examined and see if there is anything at all that I can find out as to what arrangements were made in 1985 or 1986. As far as I am aware, the process for choosing the operator of the Casino and everything that went on around it was very public and open without any suggestion of undue influence by anyone at any time. I stress that Adelaide is a small town, and if anyone went around this town exerting undue influence everyone would know about it within 24 hours. So, I find the possible implication behind the question a little hard to believe. Nevertheless, I will do the House the courtesy of examining it.

## OPEN LEARNING

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** My question is directed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. Will the Minister inform the House of the decision by the Australian Council of Ministers of Vocational Education, Employment and Training to locate the National Open Learning Technology Corporation in Adelaide?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in this whole area. I am delighted to inform the House that South Australia has now moved a step nearer to becoming the educational hub for South-East Asia following its successful bid to be the location. We have been successful in getting the location of the National Open Learning Technology Corporation in Adelaide. Indeed, I believe it will be in the honourable member's electorate, or very close to it. This national high technology centre will be located at Science Park and is expected to be open from early next year. Something like \$1.5 million will be injected initially, and the Federal Government will contribute over half of this amount with the States contributing proportionately to their population.

I guess members would want to know how we were so successful. First, the MFP Australia project, and indeed



the fact that we have the MFP located and headquartered here in South Australia, was one of the fundamental and overriding reasons why we were successful. The second reason was our strong representation for the innovative use of educational technologies, and these were very important.

I would like to pay tribute to my predecessor who was the Minister in this area, now the Minister of Business and Tourism in South Australia, who worked very hard with our colleagues from other States to ensure that we were actually successful in getting this centre. One of the objectives of the corporation will be to promote cost effective, high quality and equitable uses of education communications and related open learning techniques among all education and training sectors.

One of the other exciting things is that it will provide a brokerage function of project management expertise, for example, in fields such as the use of television delivery, computer assisted learning, course ware development and structural design. There is a range of very exciting initiatives to be involved in this corporation, and I understand that initially it will create up to 11 new jobs in South Australia, but the potential is unlimited for the way in which we can not only identify Adelaide as the education hub for South-East Asia and the Asian Pacific region specifically but also create greater employment and some exciting new technological advances in South Australia.

### CASINO

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** My question is directed to the Premier and not to the Deputy Premier. Will the Government ask the Casino Supervisory Authority to investigate the original appointment of Genting as technical adviser to the Casino? The authority's report tabled yesterday stated:

It is not our role at this stage to comment on the original appointment of Genting.

Genting's establishment in Adelaide in 1984 occurred about the same time as its consortium with Dallas Dempster was given the licence to manage the Burswood Casino. Evidence has been given to the Western Australia Inc. Royal Commission that this consortium received favoured treatment from the then Burke Government in obtaining the Perth casino licence. In 1985, Dempster gave a donation of \$400 000 to former Labor Premier Burke. On 4 December 1985, a week before the opening of the Adelaide Casino, again according to evidence given in the Western Australian Royal Commission, and I am sure without your knowledge, Mr Speaker, \$95 000 was paid by Mr Burke to the South Australian Labor Party.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Not being a gambler, I know very little about the Burswood Casino. However, I have the feeling that Genting is one of the operators of the casino, whereas that is certainly not the case here—AITCO is the operator. Again, I can only state that the procedure for allocating an operator to operate the casino on behalf of the licensee, which is the Lotteries Commission, was very open. I think it was conducted by a QC and a number of other people. I cannot recall all of

the details, but I will certainly get them. As regards paying funds to the Labor Party, I would know nothing about that. In my long and distinguished political career the highest donation anyone ever gave me was \$50.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Yes, very long. I think it was \$50 and there have been only one or two of those in my entire 19 years of running campaigns. When we talk about these figures I have some reservations. However, one thing I will guarantee: businesses in Australia have given far more to the Liberal Party than they have ever given to the Labor Party. If members opposite disagree with that, let them support the principle of full disclosure, because we will then see who gives what to whom. As I said, I can guarantee that business gives far more to the Liberal Party than it gives to the Labor Party.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Certainly not to me. I will have the question examined. Just listening to it there did not seem to me to be anything in particular I could respond to; it was a rather puerile attempt to connect our Casino in some way with Dallas Dempster or someone who appears to give political donations. It is a very long bow. I will do the House the courtesy of examining the question and, if there is anything to add to what I have already said, I will bring back a response.

### NORTH INGLE PRIMARY SCHOOL

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I direct my question to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. Is the refurbishment of North Ingle Primary School to commence soon, what is the schedule for the completion of that refurbishment and will the school continue? A school council member has contacted me with the disturbing information outlined in the question. I would very much like to put his and other minds at rest on this issue.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Perhaps I should start with the most significant and serious part of the honourable member's question; that is, is it the Government's and the department's intention to close the North Ingle Primary School? It is certainly not the intention to close the school, and the recent rumours regarding this are in fact unfounded. I say this against the backdrop of declining numbers within that school community. However, a number of other factors must be taken into account. Indeed, I have taken them into account, as has the department. First, there is a new housing development that should increase the numbers of children attending the school in the future. That is certainly a mitigating factor and has contributed to the decision that there is no plan to close down the school.

With respect to the other two parts of the question, I understand that in late 1991 there was a fire at the school and there have been negotiations which, to put it mildly, have been fairly protracted. This has led to a fairly long and drawn out process. However, discussions have taken place with SACON, the school principal, and the school chairperson. In fact, reconstruction of the school is taking place and is on track. The time line for completion of this project will remain at term two of 1993.

However, I think that the honourable member's question also raises a broader issue. It will be my intention to address the structural impediments which have contributed to the delay in responding to the honourable member's concern, which was to get the work done quickly and effectively. I shall certainly be addressing those structural impediments and wanting to make sure that this does not happen again at any school in South Australia.

### CASINO

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** My question is definitely to the Premier. Can he assure the House that no payment was made, either directly or indirectly, by Genting to the South Australian Labor Party, any other Labor Party election fund or any Labor Leader's election fund before, during or after negotiations for the Casino operator's licence in return for Genting's appointment as adviser to the Casino operator?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Leader.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Mr Speaker, I do not want to appear patronising to the Opposition but it is customary when any member of the House addresses a question on a particular issue—

**Mr S.J. Baker:** A Party issue.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** If it was a Party issue it would be out of order. I am treating it seriously. It is customary to address a question to the Minister to whom a particular Act has been committed. I should have thought that all members opposite would be aware of that. Since the new Leader of the Opposition has taken his place in this Chamber, it is fair to say that as regards procedures the Opposition has been an absolute shambles. Nevertheless, it is a question about the Casino Act, which is committed to the Treasurer. I will examine the question to see whether there is anything in it other than an attempt to get a cheap line in the paper. My suspicion is that that probably will not happen; the press is a bit more discriminating than the Opposition gives it credit for. Nevertheless, if there is a genuine question, I will have it examined and bring back a reply to the House.

### STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Can the Minister of Emergency Services explain the budget of the State Emergency Service? The member for Bright today made a press statement claiming that the SES is facing a severe funding problem. Therefore, can the Minister advise the House about the current situation?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I am delighted to respond to the question posed by the member for Albert Park and to set the record straight and correct. Again, we have one of these sleazy press releases by the member for Bright which attempts to alarm the public about the excellent services that are provided right in the middle of a State disaster. The timing of this leaves a lot to be desired. The member's timing on most things leaves a lot to be

desired, but on this issue alone I would have thought that it would be more appropriate to direct the question to me in circumstances where many people in the Two Wells area are suffering distress and anxiety. The member for Bright could not resist, so he has again concocted some calculations which suggest, to quote from his press release, 'serious financial plight for emergency services'.

Let me deal with it as the honourable member has set it out. In endeavouring to support it, he has concocted, he would argue, some facts. The first inaccuracy is that he has said that the SES budget in 1992-93 has been reduced by \$39 000. The honourable member is quite wrong.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I am happy to enlighten him. The State budgetary support for the SES has risen this year from \$995 000 to \$1.072 million. That is the State support. The overall budget for the SES, including Commonwealth receipts, has risen from \$1.342 million to \$1.521 million. In fact, the \$39 000 referred to by the honourable member is the amount unspent from last year's budget allocation as a result of staff vacancies and the non-flowthrough of expected wage increases. So, that is the first error. The second error is that the member for Bright claims that funds for equipment through the police budget have been cut from \$50 000 to \$25 000. Again, the honourable member is wrong. In fact, \$40 000 has been provided for normal equipment requirements and a further allocation of \$55 000 has been made for communication equipment. That means a total of \$95 000 for this year. The \$40 000 has been provided as part of a three-year program to meet SES requirements.

There is a third error in his press release. The member for Bright has claimed that the SES was forced to purchase 30 000 sandbags to deal with the flood situation in the Gawler area. He is wrong again: the extra sandbags required for that operation were provided by the Commonwealth Natural Disasters Organisation, and it is simply not true to say that further sandbags would not be supplied by the NDO in the event of future emergencies. In fact, the situation was that the sandbags were supplied and there was no suggestion that there would not be another supply or another service. In fact, the SES asked for 20 000, and 30 000 were supplied. The honourable member sits there trying to protest. I know what the honourable member is trying to do; he is trying to take the place of the member for Hanson. Let me say that I know the member for Hanson, and the member for Bright is no member for Hanson.

### WARDANG ISLAND

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** How does the Minister of Emergency Services justify his statement in this House yesterday that a substantial amount of the damage and vandalism on Wardang Island has been caused by non-Aboriginal people who have visited the island illegally and looted property? Information provided to me from within the Police Force shows that within the past six years there has been no report at any police station in South Australia from any person or any Government agency concerning any incidence of theft or criminal damage on Wardang Island. I am further informed that

most of the damage was caused by juvenile offenders taken to the island by the Department for Family and Community Services to work off court orders. Incidents have included cars being plunged off cliffs and property break-ins, but no prosecutions have occurred because FACS has declined to pursue the matter with the police. I am quite prepared to provide the Minister with the press reports to back this up.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I would be happy to see the evidence provided by the honourable member, and the suggestion that FACS has been involved and that the allegations are against juveniles involved in this program would have to be tested, quite frankly. I have had discussions with the Chairman of the Aboriginal Lands Trust and a number of other Aboriginal community members with whom I met last week, and they are very concerned about the member for Goyder's allegations about the vandalism that has occurred and the clear implication that that has been done by people of the Point Pearce community.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** You have had your chance; just sit there and shut up for a change. Just sit there and be quiet.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** The situation is clearly that I had information put to me by those community members that they had seen, on a couple of occasions—and on one occasion in particular—a very large vessel which a community member noticed while out fishing. That person noticed the vessel returning from Wardang Island and saw a fridge, a stove and an air-conditioner being thrown over the side of the boat as it passed that person's boat. They were non-Aboriginal people who were involved in that. Clearly, those people have seen it and that information was passed to me. The inference—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** —by the member for Goyder related to an attack on the community. Moreover, I say this: he did not have the courtesy to go out and approach the community to get its approval to go to the island. I am sure it would have done so. He went with an individual who had a self-interest in this whole event; he was interested in buying something. Because that individual was turned down, he ran off to the member for Goyder, who decided that he would go illegally over to Wardang Island; and then he started accusing the Aboriginal community. What an outrage the member for Goyder is! You are a disgrace and you should apologise to the community. The sooner you do it, the better.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

---

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** Today I wish to address the question of salaries paid to high flyers, and I want to address the hypocrisy of the Opposition, especially that of its spokesman on finance, the member for Mitcham. Over the weekend we had a clear misrepresentation of the State Bank's position. When the bank's balance sheets were tabled last week, the correct position regarding incomes of executives of the State Bank was quite clear from page 92 of the report.

On that page two columns are shown, one for the bank and one for the consolidated group, and it is quite clear from that table that the number of executives earning salaries in excess of \$100 000 has fallen throughout the group from 51 to 41. In spite of that, the Opposition spokesman on finance chose to misrepresent the position. He was on the radio yesterday and again this morning further misrepresenting that position. It is quite disgraceful behaviour by him.

The Opposition is showing hypocrisy in this matter because of the behaviour of its colleagues in other States and in Canberra. As the Treasurer pointed out today in answer to my question, the new Victorian Premier (Mr Kennett) has been involved in a quite outrageous exercise of increasing the salaries not just of executives in the Public Service but also of a number of people within his own Government Party.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. The noise in the Chamber is absolutely disgraceful: I can hardly hear the honourable member. I ask members to lower their voices or, if they wish to carry on negotiations, to do so outside. The honourable member.

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. As I said, the behaviour of Mr Kennett in Victoria is incredible, and the hypocrisy of Opposition members in this House in that regard is an outrage. In Victoria, salaries of up to \$300 000 a year are now being offered to top public servants. We should compare that with the salaries that the Commonwealth Government pays its top public servants. The head of the Prime Minister's Department and the head of the Treasury—the two most important bureaucratic positions in the country—have salaries of \$130 019. The officers in those positions would be two of the most senior public servants in the country. Their salary is undoubtedly adequate.

It is not necessary to pay the sorts of salaries that the Victorian Premier is paying. What is so outrageous is that these salaries are being paid specifically to the heads of those departments to sack thousands and thousands of Victorian public servants. The reason why they are given such high salaries is so that they can reduce to zero the salaries of many other Victorians. That is outrageous. It appears that, while the Liberal Party in this State, in Victoria and at the Commonwealth level wishes to pay double and triple the level of salaries to the top people in the Public Service in this country, its policy for ordinary workers is to pay them \$3 an hour: that was the proposal of the Leader of the Federal Opposition. It seems, apparently, that \$3 an hour is the wage for the unemployed or young people. That is their training rate—\$3 an hour. Yet it appears that for the top public servants in this country \$300 000 is what we have to pay. That is quite outrageous.

The behaviour of Victoria can lead only to a wage auction in the highest levels of the Public Service, and it will harm all of the States of Australia, including South Australia. This process was started by Mr Greiner in New South Wales, when he greatly increased the salary of his public servants. It has flowed to Victoria and no doubt it will flow to other States if the Liberals have their way. I think it is disgraceful that the Opposition spokesman on finance, the member for Mitcham, this morning should have claimed that he knew business colleagues who had to take a cut in their salaries.

I would like to read into the record what the increase in wages for top executives in this country in the private sector has been in the past year. There has been an increase of between 4 per cent and 6 per cent for top business and management people in Australia compared with the wage increases of ordinary workers of just 2.9 per cent.

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

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** When I raised the questions which led to the report of the Casino Supervisory Authority tabled yesterday, the Deputy Premier, in his typical fashion, questioned my motives. He can never accept that the Liberal Party acts in the public interest. Yesterday, his ministerial statement attempted to gloss over the very serious issues which my questions have now exposed. While the Deputy Premier claims that the report of the authority shows that nothing is wrong with the Casino, it in fact raises alarming questions about what has been going on since the Casino opened. Members need to recall that in May 1984 the Casino Supervisory Authority gave its approval for the Lotteries Commission to hold the Casino licence.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** In March 1985 the authority gave conditional approval for AITCO Pty Ltd to be the Casino operator. AITCO is one-third owned by SASFIT. In turn, the Lotteries Commission and AITCO were subject to the ministerial control of the Premier. Hence, we can see that the Government has been able to influence decisions taken by these two agencies in relation to their role with the Casino. At the time AITCO was appointed operator, it is clear that the Casino Supervisory Authority had very serious concerns about the proposed arrangements. In its first annual report tabled in this House in 1986, the authority states:

The authority made it clear that its approval of the appointment of the operator was not to be interpreted as an indication by the authority that it approves all of the terms and conditions of the reviewed TAMS agreement and that, in particular, the authority expresses no views on the proposed financial arrangements set out in the revised TAMS agreement dealing with the fees payable to the Genting company by AITCO Pty Ltd for management services and expenses.

The authority's report, tabled yesterday, sheds more light on the concerns of the authority in 1985. Obviously, the authority believes that Genting has received excessive payments for the services given to the Casino and that the length of this management agreement (effectively, 20 years) was unduly generous.

The benefit to Genting over that period is more than \$50 million—a very handsome earner indeed, given that

the authority has also questioned the value of Genting's services to the Casino and whether Genting is at all times commercially realistic. It has also found that the role of Mr Bakewell as Genting's South Australian resident was of no use whatsoever to the Casino.

This is an extraordinary state of affairs, given that Mr Bakewell was, I understand, on an annual fee of \$200 000 plus a very expensive motor vehicle. It is also interesting that Genting was able to anticipate its involvement in the Casino. Importantly, records lodged with Federal and State corporate affairs authorities in June and November 1984 described Genting South Australia's business as 'casino operator'. These records were lodged up to nine months before Genting's involvement in the Casino received grudging approval from the authority. They further show that, as a result of its role in the Casino, Genting turned around a net loss of more than \$500 000 at 31 December 1985 to a net profit of about \$400 000 12 months later.

Mr Bakewell became a director of Genting in June 1985, about two months after his appointment by this Government to the State Bank board. Mr Bakewell told the Royal Commission that he had access to the Government through the 'Public Service old boy network'.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** That's his own quote.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Yes. He is a person once described in this Parliament by the former Premier, the present member for Ross Smith, as 'probably the leading expert' in South Australia in economic development and 'a man with widespread contacts throughout the world'. You're not kidding! The Casino Supervisory Authority does not share this view.

I am concerned that this Government has had the opportunity to exercise significant influence upon decisions that have earned Genting a lot of money—a lot more money than its services apparently justified. This raises questions about Genting's original appointment with the Casino. The CSA emphasises that it has not investigated the matter at this stage. We believe the Government should ask the authority to do so. Genting became established in Adelaide at the same time as the consortium that it had with Dallas Dempster received a licence—

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

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** I would like to comment in the next five minutes on a matter that is very close to being a breach of parliamentary privilege, where a member of the public has, I believe, tried to interfere with members carrying out their duties and to intimidate members in the decision-making process. In another age, it would be almost serious enough for someone to be called before the House, but to suggest a measure along those lines would probably pander to the publicity seeking aspects of the individual concerned over what, in effect, could be described as a storm in a 'C' cup. Nevertheless, I cannot allow this threat to pass without any comment whatsoever. In the *Sunday Mail* of 11 October, Hackney Cellars owner, Mr Dennis Drogemuller, said:

About a dozen members of Parliament are known to have eaten at topless restaurants, mine and several others. Let me say we protect confidentiality of those who dine here, but protecting hypocrisy is another thing. Naming those who are involved is a last option . . . if push comes to shove and we see such people supporting the ban.

Earlier, an article in the *Advertiser* of 9 October stated:

'We don't want to play dirty but if it gets to the crunch we will name the politicians who have attended topless restaurants,' Mr Dennis Drogemuller said, 'but they won't be able to sit back on the fence on this one'.

In one sense, Mr Drogemuller has perhaps achieved his aim, because he has made up my mind for me. I had an open mind on this subject, but Mr Drogemuller has now made up my mind for me. If I cast my vote on this matter, it will be in exactly the opposite direction from whatever Mr Drogemuller wants, because I will not be subjected to threats of that nature.

I have never knowingly been in a topless or bottomless establishment at any time. It is very rare that you would find me in a bar as I am almost a teetotaler; however, I am aware of these establishments because I have kept abreast of them from television coverage. There must be something deficient in the sex lives of those people who need to frequent such places. It is sad to note that a proprietor said in the *Australian* of 7 October:

It's unfortunate that I have to advertise that I've got a pair of tits on show, but . . . that's the way I've got to make a living.

It is a sad reflection on today's society that this proprietor should imply that his business would go bust without this means of entertainment. I believe it is probably a little bit unhygienic to have these topless and bottomless establishments. Most consumers are concerned to find even a thumb in their soup let alone having to worry about other perspiring parts of the anatomy dangling in the food. It may well be so unhygienic that it gives another meaning to crab mornay.

However, I accept that women who want to have the right to dress up as B grade tarts should be able to do so if they want to, and that men should be able to seek their company in these establishments, but it is wrong if it is going to be a requirement of employment of someone who is not an entertainer that they should also have to be an entertainer. What the proprietors are seeking to do is provide entertainers at barmaid rates, and that was commented upon by an entertainer in this morning's *Advertiser*, who said:

In New York the bars employed entertainers and bar staff but did not combine the two as topless staff. In my opinion I think these girls are being exploited because the economy is bad.

That is the viewpoint I am now taking up. Previously I would have been prepared to tolerate these nude entertainers in cocktail bars, restaurants, and so on, but Mr Drogemuller has made up my mind. I will say this: if I am ever wavering on any particular issue I always respond in only one way to this sort of feeble attempt at coercion, and through you, Mr Acting Speaker, I say: Mr Drogemuller, you can explain to your fellow proprietors that you have lost my vote on this matter with your attempts to bully members of this Parliament.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** One way or another, everyone in this State is paying the State Bank debt. We are paying for incompetence; we are paying for negligence; we are paying for that extraordinary arrogance that ensured that a Government

continued to disregard the warnings of the Opposition in Parliament for the better part of two years. But after this afternoon at Question Time I say that it is entirely possible that some South Australian women may be paying this debt with their lives. I refer to women who are suffering from breast cancer and I refer particularly to the fact that a cancellation for a mastectomy operation occurred yesterday at the Flinders Medical Centre simply because not enough beds were available. There were not enough beds available because that hospital, contrary to the Minister's assertions in Parliament, has had its budget cut.

The actual cut is \$3.4 million in known cuts as of this date. The anticipated additional cut is \$3.7 million in terms of failure to be funded for wage increases, CPI increases, superannuation and other oncosts. We are looking in the face at deaths resulting from the Government's failure to control the State Bank, and we are looking at a health system which is deteriorating and in shambles because of that debt.

The cancellation of the mastectomy operation yesterday at Flinders Medical Centre was the first ever such cancellation of such surgery at that hospital. I say that in the knowledge that surgeons and staff at the hospital have moved heaven and earth to rearrange schedules in order to ensure that mastectomy patients are accommodated on the day their surgery is due. This has meant rescheduling other operations. Nevertheless, the staff are acutely conscious of the emotional torment and the anguish to the patient and her family when such surgery is scheduled and then has to be delayed.

In the case of the woman whose surgery was cancelled yesterday, I am told the staff spent the better part of an hour trying to console her. She is 70 years old and had been waiting for approximately four weeks since the diagnosis of breast cancer. During that time she, like any woman with such a diagnosis, has continually been feeling the tumour and is of the belief that it is increasing in size. Imagine her torment yesterday to be told that there was not a bed available and that the surgery would have to be deferred.

This is the living face of the State Bank debt; it may well be the dying people who result from the State Bank debt, and it is no use members opposite denying that this is occurring. It is no shred of use for the Minister to warn members of the Opposition against bringing individual cases to Parliament. What is the health system but a collection of individual cases who are requiring the services of health care provided by the State and by the private sector? It is made up of individual cases, and without those individual cases no attention will be paid to the dire things that are occurring in our hospitals.

There has been an increase of 32 per cent in breast cancer in this State in the past three years. I am quoting figures from the epidemiology division of the South Australian Health Commission, a report entitled 'Epidemiology of Cancer in South Australia'. Most of this increase took place in 1989-91, following a more modest increase of 9 per cent between 1977 and 1979. Last year 672 new cases of breast cancer were diagnosed in South Australia, and last year 232 women in this State died of breast cancer. One woman in 12 in South Australia can expect to experience some form of breast cancer. It is no use the Minister saying that we should

not bring to Parliament such cases as the case that occurred yesterday. He will soon discover that he cannot intervene in individual cases and begin queue jumping. He must provide the system with resources and he must do it now.

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** On 28 September, the lust of 13 wealthy and influential North Adelaide residents for an increase in the value of their real estate prevailed over the public interest. On that day Adelaide City Council voted, in a split decision, to close Barton Road, North Adelaide.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** This closure means that residents of the western suburbs, especially those in Ovingham, Bowden and Brompton, cannot conveniently travel to places in western North Adelaide that are important to them. These places include Calvary Hospital, the Mary Potter Hospice, the Red Cross, Helping Hand, Saint Dominic's Priory School, St Laurence's Church and the doctors and dentists whose consulting rooms abound in that area.

Council had closed the road unlawfully back in 1987. Only in May 1992 did it start the process for lawful closure under the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act. When I last spoke on this matter in the House I was summarising the arguments for closure put by the 13 people who addressed council on 7 September. At that meeting, Michael Abbott, QC, cast his by now famous group libel on the people of Hindmarsh, implying they had a greater propensity to crime than North Adelaide residents. Mr Geoffrey Goode referred to people from the west as 'near suburban interlopers' and said they should not be on the streets of North Adelaide unless they had 'a local interest'.

Dr Michael Hammerton, who owns real estate on Hill Street, addressed council using as his text an unauthorised and cowardly recording of a private conversation with Sister Christina Lloyd of Calvary Hospital. Sister Christina had written a letter to Adelaide City Council objecting to the closure of Barton Road because, she said, it was needed for obstetric emergencies involving transfers of babies and doctors between Calvary and Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Dr Hammerton sought to discredit Sister Christina as a selfish and stupid nun who would not know anything about emergencies. His account of the conversation is unlikely to bear any resemblance to the truth.

There are two other submissions from 7 September that I want to draw to the attention of the House. Mr W.J. McLurg, of Barton Terrace West, opened his submission by attacking the Australian Labor Party for spoiling, he said, the Australia to which he had migrated. Mr McLurg said his house on Barton Terrace West was the result of 20 years hard work and he was not going to have just anyone travelling along the street. What Mr McLurg ought to know is that in Australia people of any political persuasion, religious faith or social class are free to use public streets. Barton Terrace is not the Shankill Road.

Next, we heard from Mrs Angela Hoban. Mrs Hoban told us that she would rebut the claim that people from Hindmarsh who worshipped at St Laurence's were inconvenienced when attending Mass by the closure of Barton Road. She established her credentials for this task

by remarking that her husband was on the finance committee of St Laurence's parish. I waited for her rebuttal and I waited. In the end, Mrs Hoban gave us one sentence on the matter. The sentence was this:

This church has been deemed the most popular venue for marriage in Adelaide and its popularity has obviously not been affected by the Barton Road closure.

How do I explain to a society lady, such as Mrs Hoban, why hers is not a sufficient rebuttal? It is required of Catholics that they shall attend Mass each Sunday and on holy days of obligation unless detained by urgent necessity. Love of God will bring them to Mass on other days, even to daily Mass. Access to St Laurence's is not, as Mrs Hoban thinks, a once in a lifetime problem for the devoted people of Bowden, Ovingham and Brompton. In conclusion, I put it to you, Mr Speaker, that, if a bride or a groom failed to show at their wedding at St Laurence's because the 'no entry' signs at Barton Road had frustrated their path to the altar, the marriage had little hope of success to begin with.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** The issue I wish to raise today relates to the contempt that the current Government has for the Westminster system of Parliament in this State. For some months I have been endeavouring to obtain replies to several questions on notice. It is the only system that is available to the average member of Parliament who wishes to bring matters concerning his constituents to the attention of the Government; it is the only system that a member of Parliament can use in this democracy to obtain information; it is the only way a member of Parliament can encourage the Government to practice what it preaches, that is, open government and, of course, accountability.

This Government does neither of those two things. It is not interested in providing answers to 10 questions I have on the Notice Paper, some of them almost two years old. The questions relate to the State Bank and some of the activities of personnel who are now employed by the bank who were previously involved in Beneficial Finance Ltd. The burning question, and the question I have been endeavouring to have highlighted—even through the media—is question No. 82, which states:

Did the Government and/or the State Bank settle out of court with the Bank of New Zealand in relation to a dispute between that bank and the Remm group for \$70 million in or about March 1990 and, if so, why?

The date was not correct; it had been altered. The *Advertiser* of 30 May 1991 carried the following article:

The Bank of New Zealand has applied for the Federal Court to wind up the developer of the \$570 million Myer Centre in Rundle Mall. The Supreme Court in Adelaide has been told the directors of Remm Group Ltd were unable to say last year whether the company would be able to pay its debts as and when they fell due. The revelations came in a hearing involving lawyers for Remm Group Ltd and Allco Newsteel Pty Ltd—a major supplier to Remm during the centre's construction.

The hearing followed a dispute a year ago over steel supplies and an alleged breach of contract. Remm successfully obtained an injunction allowing it possession of the steel, but in return it undertook to pay any damages Allco suffered as a result of the injunction if these could be proved in court. Mr Francis Douglas QC, for Allco, said the Supreme Court accepted this undertaking on the basis the net assets for the Remm Group Pty Ltd were worth about \$60 million. But an audit by Mr Peter Robertson, a chartered accountant and partner in the firm Peat Marwick, had shown it was not possible to form an opinion on whether the Remm Group Ltd accounts gave a true and fair view of the

company's affairs as at 30 June 1990. This was only a month after Remm gave the undertaking arising from the injunction.

Mr Douglas said Remm Group Ltd directors said last year it was not possible to conclude whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that the company will be able to pay its debts as and when they fall due. He said the Bank of New Zealand had lodged an application with the Federal Court in Sydney on 21 May to wind up the Remm Group Ltd.

What actually happened was that the Bank of New Zealand, which was trying to force the Remm Group into liquidation, was paid out by the State Government. What we are unable to find out is whether the State Bank paid out the Bank of New Zealand or whether the State Bank or the South Australian Government Financing Authority paid it out. Whatever happened, I believe somewhere between \$70 million and \$100 million was paid to the Bank of New Zealand to settle the loans made by that bank to the Remm Group. The Bank of New Zealand has walked away with 100c in the dollar and we, the poor old taxpayers of South Australia—via the State Bank—have been stuck with a very poorly secured loan and very little prospect of its ever being repaid.

That underlies the whole story of why the Government will not answer that question on notice, nor the other nine I have on notice. I have discussed these issues with the State Bank and I have been told the answers were sent to the Premier's Department months ago. So, someone in the Premier's Department is withholding the answers to me as a member of this House. On behalf of my constituents I protest most strongly and ask that action be taken.

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

#### ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** Mr Speaker, I seek to move Notice of motion: committees/regulations No. 23 on the Notice Paper on behalf of my colleague, but I am not the lead speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Under the rules of the House, the honourable member has to be the lead speaker.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Under those circumstances, Sir, I will seek the consent of the House—

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I do not know whether it is a point of order or a point of clarification. The member for Davenport has said that he seeks to move the motion on behalf of the member for Mitcham. I do not doubt what the member for Davenport is saying—

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

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I suspect we have reached this matter on the Notice Paper without the member for Mitcham's knowing it.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the member for Napier putting forward the premise that not knowing we are up to a certain item on the Notice Paper is a breach of Standing Orders?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** You have put me in a bit of a spot, Sir. I do not know what you are saying. For the first time in my 15 years in this place an honourable member is seeking to move a motion put up by another member.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair has ruled that that is out of order. Clearly, the Standing Orders, which operate at the whim of members, of course, do not provide for anyone beyond the member who has—

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Under the circumstances, Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Let me clarify this. I may have misled the House slightly. The honourable member can move the motion, but he must be the lead speaker.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I understand that, Sir, and I draw your attention to the State of the House.

*A quorum having been formed.*

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on the member for Mitcham, I again draw the attention of members to the utter chaos that prevails every time we have private members' time. I indicate to all members that, if they have business on the Notice Paper and wish to deal with it, they should at least be in the Chamber, because this is the last time that I shall allow delaying tactics. The member for Mitcham.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** I move:

That this House requests that the Economic and Finance Committee review executive structures and executive salaries of statutory authorities to determine their appropriateness and, in particular, review the number of executives and their remuneration with the State Bank.

I appreciate your guidance on this matter, Sir. Given that there were 22 matters prior to this one, I presumed that there was going to be discussion on them, but that has not occurred. I am sure that members of the committee and of the Parliament will accept this as a reference to that committee. The word 'requests' can be substituted by the word 'reference' if there is any difficulty in accepting the motion in the form in which I have moved it.

As one who believes that there must be propriety in Government, I know that the people of South Australia have not been amused by the goings on within Government statutory authorities, with the concurrence of this Government. We have seen some disgraceful examples of people being overpaid and underworked and getting remuneration far in excess of their ability and level of responsibility. I should like to tender as evidence the amounts that were being paid to the former Managing Director of the State Bank, Mr Tim Marcus Clark. Members will be aware that prior to his departure, as a result of continued questions by the Opposition and his enforced retirement, he was receiving a remuneration package of about \$500 000 for causing and being part of the greatest financial disaster this State has ever seen, with the concurrence of the Government.

It was never appropriate that such salaries should be paid at any stage of the progress of the State Bank. It was never envisaged, and I do not think that any member could countenance, that any person running the State Bank would be worth \$500 000. No-one in this Parliament could condone such a salary, particularly when he was a major contributor to the large losses that the State Bank incurred and the debt that this State now faces. He is just one example of where the system went awfully astray, with the concurrence of this Government. I also bring to the attention of the House the position of the Chief Executive Officer of Beneficial Finance, who I understand—

**Mr Atkinson:** Any relation?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The member for Spence asks whether he is any relation. I regard him as one of the bad Bakers, but there are a lot of good Bakers around. That gentleman received \$400 000 a year for taking Beneficial Finance into its ultimate collapse and costing the State at least \$1 billion. We have seen two extraordinary salaries being paid to individuals who have not only not performed but have contributed to massive financial difficulties. I also quote the salary that was being paid to the General Manager of SGIC. He received a \$60 000 bonus for taking SGIC into a loss of \$81 million when we needed that institution to perform in a financially competent fashion to ensure that the taxpayers of South Australia did not pay the bills. However, we have started paying those bills. We now have bills of \$350 million as the first bail-out for SGIC; yet, despite that bail-out, SGIC is still \$89 million short of solvency according to the ISC guidelines.

They are but three examples in recent times where executives of statutory authorities of this State have received remuneration which I believe every South Australian would suggest is totally inappropriate. If anything, the individuals concerned, because of the losses that were sustained, if found to be culpable, should be in gaol today; and, if no culpability was involved, they should have had a salary cut rather than a salary increase. Of course, the more business that these statutory authorities did, the greater the salaries. This is pathetic, and it is patently an abuse of the system that is operating at this moment. I am not amused, as everybody else would not be amused, by the report of the State Bank for the past financial year. We note that the number of people in the bank at 30 June 1991 receiving over \$100 000 was 24. Of that number, three were receiving in excess of \$200 000. On 30 June 1992, we find that nine people in the bank were receiving over \$200 000 and in total 38 people were receiving over \$100 000.

I will remind members of what has happened in the past two years with regard to the State Bank. The State Bank has been in the so-called process of returning to its core business. The statement made by the Chairman of the board was, 'We are returning to core business by absorbing the off balance sheet companies, and those loss entities which were subsidiary companies, including Beneficial Finance, and about 76 other entities have been absorbed into the State Bank's balance sheet.' The explanation given by the Treasurer of this State, and condoned by other members on the Government side, suggested that, because the bank was consolidating and bringing in these entities, it was quite justified that the number of people within the good State Bank should have increased. How can this House possibly condone such action? Contrast this with a statement that I made on radio this morning, a statement that has been repeated by the member for Mitchell. He said that the salaries of executives have not changed but, if they have, they have gone up by an average of 4 to 6 per cent. All I can say in response to that is that the survey to which he refers must not take into account the full range of executives.

I have friends, as have other members, who have lost their jobs in the private sector because of the economic downturn. I have friends, for whom I have tremendous regard, who have had their salary packages slashed in order to survive the economic downturn. A friend of

mine—I shall not give his name—a person of exceptional qualities and competence who was doing very good business for his company, was sacked by the Melbourne office because it decided that the company should no longer have a South Australian profile. I can say that his 'voluntary retirement package', as they called it, was far lower than anything that has been paid out to some of these so-called high flyers who have caused tremendous damage to this State.

We cannot condone packages of the order of \$950 000, which was the approximate amount that Mr Marcus Clark was paid to disappear off the scene and cause the Premier and the Government of this State less embarrassment. I do not know how much Mr John Baker received when he was neatly shifted sideways; I do not know how much Mr Reichert was paid for being shifted sideways; and I do not know how much Mr Paddison is being paid, wherever he might be. They have been major contributors to the financial demise of this State. I do not mind taking up the issue and mentioning the people concerned, because it appears that the Government has allowed the very large bills to be paid to escape the embarrassment of those people sitting in those jobs. We have not seen them suffer, not in the way the State will suffer from the problems they have caused the State.

So, I believe there has to be scrutiny of the statutory authorities, and I think that everybody in this House would agree. It may well confirm that that level of salary is appropriate, although to my mind in this current situation the salaries being paid are far in excess of the salary that the same people would be able to secure out in private enterprise. Let us be quite sure about what the comparison should be, under the circumstances. Members would well recognise that many of the executives who have lost their job within private enterprise have been given a minute's notice. They have not had five year contracts upon which they can fall and receive compensation: they have been sacked with a minute's notice. Many of them have not had any reasonable level of compensation: they are out on the dole queues, as are many of the employees who have been affected by the Keating, Arnold and Bannon policies. So, there is some security within the statutory authorities that does not prevail in the private sector.

I believe it is absolutely important that this Parliament conduct a review—and I ask the Economic and Finance Committee to undertake such a review—to determine whether, with the levels of security that prevail and given the history of the packages that have been negotiated on the early retirement of these people, it is fair and just in terms of the authorities and eventually the taxpayers. If those people are being paid more and the authorities are making less profit, there is less profit return to the taxpayer as the shareholders in those enterprises. So, it is an important issue. I believe that we have to generate more faith within the community that the Government is actually operating in its best interests. I believe that the public feel that they have been taken for a big ride by the Government by its allowing these salaries to be paid under conditions that are very difficult and given performances that can only be classed as totally indifferent and, in some cases, totally destructive.

I move this motion in the belief that there is a role for the Economic and Finance Committee to take up. I



believe that some salaries need to be reviewed and that we should be looking at the levels of responsibility and security, the quality of delivery and whether the salaries are appropriate in the marketplace today because, as I said, they seem to me (and, I suggest, to 99.9 per cent of South Australians) to be far in excess of those which should be paid. Members have cited salaries in Parliament today; the member for Mitchell cited the salaries that are paid to the top public servants in Canberra—\$130 000 for two of the most powerful people in Australia who have tremendous responsibilities—while salary packages of \$500 000, \$400 000 and \$370 000 apply in areas of responsibility which I believe are far less onerous than those responsibilities heaped upon the individuals who were referred to in Parliament earlier today. So, I have pleasure in moving this motion.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I am the lead speaker for the Government in this debate. I can imagine that the member for Playford, as the newly appointed Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee, and the member for Mitchell, who has just recently been appointed to that committee, will obviously be sitting there with bated breath, trying to form some opinion about why their committee should review executive structures and executive salaries of statutory authorities to determine their appropriateness. In the 14 minutes that the member for Mitcham spoke, not once did he mention a statutory authority—not once. All he did was to use this motion as a vehicle to go on yet again, in his typical, tired way, about the State Bank. If we look at the second part of the motion (and my colleague the member for Spence is an expert in the English language), we see that it bears no resemblance to the main thrust. The motion refers to statutory authorities, and then it states 'and in particular, review the number of executives and their remuneration within the State Bank'.

The State Bank is not a statutory authority. If the member for Mitcham wants this House to endorse the Economic and Finance Committee's reviewing the structure of salaries and positions within statutory authorities, all well and good; full stop after those words. Then, if he wants to raise yet again the question of salaries within the State Bank, that deserves another motion. I do not know what the member for Playford as Chairman will do after this debate has been completed, although I hope that commonsense will prevail and that we will just kick it out the window, where it so rightly deserves to be. We cannot have the two issues together in one motion.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I was in trouble with you yesterday, Sir, because of the way I treated the member for Murray-Mallee, and I do not want to incur your wrath again but, if you, Mr Speaker, cast your mind back to what I said yesterday, I bet you will start to lean towards me and say, 'Well, by golly, that man was frustrated and tempted.'

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Napier will presume nothing.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** If there is a legitimate question in the member for Mitcham's mind about statutory authorities, if he believes that the Economic and Finance Committee should review their executive

structure and salaries, that is okay; I have no problem with that and I am sure no-one else in the House has a problem. However, one would think that, under the rules of debate—Erskine May and all of that—the member for Mitcham would then try to advance an argument as to why we should do it, but not once did I hear any evidence about statutory authorities.

It might well be that there is an argument to be put forward about statutory authorities, and I would like to listen to it, but I did not hear it in the 14 minutes for which the member for Mitcham addressed this House, Sir, and I am sure you did not. So why is the member for Mitcham using this motion today? He has used it because in Question Time he tried to say in effect that the Government had said that executive salaries and positions within the State Bank would not increase and then, very cleverly, he intended to expose the Government for allowing something to happen. The answer that the Treasurer gave was perfectly adequate and correct.

If you notice, Sir, it was shortly after that that the honourable member gave notice—a shabby trick. I do not mind tricks: I have been watching that lot over there playing tricks for 15 years, and it is when they get shabby that I get annoyed, and that was a typical shabby trick. If the member for Mitcham has some conflict regarding the way the State Bank is structuring its executive positions and the salaries paid, let him put it as a separate motion. Certainly, he should not confuse that with statutory authorities.

It may well be that the member for Mitcham is thinking, 'If I dress up this motion a little and include statutory authorities, perhaps I can win the support of the Government.' If that is the case, let him get some other hapless member from the other side who will follow me in this debate to say that, because the member for Mitcham cannot have it both ways. I would have thought that at least he would mention just one word, one sentence. I could have copped that, but there was nothing—not one word about statutory authorities.

Has the member for Mitcham any concern about statutory authorities? If he has, why does he not let us know? If he has no concerns (and he is not even nodding his head; he has a glazed look on his face at the moment), why does he put this matter on the Notice Paper for debate? I suspect that he has no concrete concerns about statutory authorities. I am not saying that the fact that the member for Mitcham might not have any concerns means that there might not be some. The member for Mitcham is famous for not seeing the forest for the trees. He has that problem in life and I hope that, with a bit of training and counselling, he will get over it.

However, if I want to be convinced as one member on this side, as one of the freer spirits who sit on this side of the House, I need more information. I look forward to the member for Mitcham's possibly briefing one of his colleagues, who can then give some indication about why we should include statutory authorities. Or perhaps another member could move an amendment to delete either the former or the latter matter. The member for Mitcham shakes his head, yet he has not given one indication about why members in this House should support him.

**Mr S.J. Baker:** What are you talking about?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** He interjects and asks what I am talking about. If the member for Mitcham went over his speech, he would find that he did not mention statutory authorities at any time.

**Mr S.J. Baker:** What do you think the State Bank is?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I find it hard to believe.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Although I know I should not answer interjections from my colleague, he asks how I can answer such a stupid question, and I must say that I am inclined to agree with him. The member for Mitcham should get his act together and seek the indulgence of the House and delete one or the other matter, in which case I might have a change of heart and support him. At the moment, I find it very hard to do that, and I urge the House not to support the motion.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** I do not know:

O wad some Pow'r the giftie gie us

To see oursels as others see us!

The member for Napier would find himself in a parlous situation, I am sure, wondering why on earth he had been speaking for the past eight minutes. It is unfortunate that much of what he had to say was not even rebuttal but rather diatribe addressed in no particular way to what he presumed the member for Mitcham might have been thinking if he had a brain that was as addled as his own.

The motives of the member for Mitcham are clearly explicit in the proposition yet, as I have known the member for Napier, being more often than not of devious inclination himself, he attributes the same inappropriate, in my judgment, assessment of what others are doing to them as he would do himself in the same circumstances. It was terrible twaddle that we have to hear when he gets caught in that groove: he becomes prolix and repetitious.

I wish to address the substantial part of the proposition relating to executive structures in the course of my remarks. The motion is quite clear in its form. It seeks to have a parliamentary committee comprising members from both sides of this House examining the structures and salaries of executive personnel and the way they work in the statutory authorities in which they are used. 'Statutory authorities' in the motion is not the proper noun but the common noun starting with little 's' and 'a'. That means any institution established by law—law being a statute.

The bank is established by law and, therefore, it is an authority established by statute. There are a number of other Government instrumentalities that are literally authorities established by statute, such as trusts, boards and authorities themselves, many of which meet infrequently and have duties of no great consequence. Yet I am sure others, meeting perhaps more frequently though with no great burden of time required, have nonetheless a very substantial burden of public responsibility, where the pitch and toss of their view of policy matters a great deal to the prosperity of thousands of South Australians. The Taxi Board is one.

Accordingly, it is quite appropriate for someone, somewhere, at some time to examine not only the salaries of the people who work for these instrumentalities but also the framework within which they function. We should be aiming for world's best practice: we do not

need to have unnecessary fat. Moreover, we do need to have adequate opportunity for the public to make submissions on matters of interest to any of those authorities, as well as providing for the public to obtain from them adequate and prompt response to any inquiry or proposition put by members of the public.

Therefore, the structures need to be examined to see how they are meeting the needs of the public interest which the authority was established to serve. Surely members opposite would agree with members on this side that the member for Mitcham has his ideas absolutely straight, well condensed and crystal clear in this proposition. It is not appropriate to allow any situation to continue where there is inadequate opportunity for consultation.

So, executive structures need to be reviewed just as thoroughly as the people who occupy the offices and the officers employed in those statutory authorities. It is our duty to see that justice is not only done but is seen to be done. Not only do we make the laws but it is our duty to review their impact. Part of the structure of the law is the statute that provides for the establishment of authorities germane to this proposition. It is our duty, not someone else's; therefore (of itself, this place is too cumbersome to handle it) there ought to be a committee of this place to undertake the examination. This is exactly what the member for Mitcham is seeking by way of this motion. He seeks not only to have those structures reviewed but also salaries to ensure that relativities prevail.

When I first came in here one of the things about which I felt very strongly, and still do, was that all such authorities established by statute should be subject to a sunset provision requiring them by motion of both Chambers of Parliament to be re-established after a given period. If the Parliament chooses not to pass such a motion, they would go into history—the sun would set on them. If we were to do that, I am sure that we would get much better performance from at least a significant proportion of our statutory authorities and the people who work in them. However, because we do not have such a provision, what we can do is make appropriate references from this Chamber to those committees that have been appointed. This is one such proposition, and I want to see it undertaken because I can find no other way to get to the bottom of the present mess.

One would expect in the fullness of time that the Ministry would examine what goes on in one department and one portfolio compared with others where similar functions occur, but that does not happen, because the Ministry is not about comparing the functioning of authorities within each of the portfolios for which individual Ministers are responsible. The Ministers do not do it, not because they are derelict in their duty but because they are not required to do so in any deliberately programmed fashion under any law. It never becomes possible to do it, because there is not sufficient time in the day, week, year or life of a Minister to undertake that kind of analysis. You cannot ask Sir Humphrey to do it, because Sir Humphrey will protect his own kind.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** I see that members opposite, unlike the member for Napier, acknowledge the good sense in making reference of this kind to the committee referred to in the motion if for no other reason than to ensure that

we have the world's best practice and that, therefore, as the saying goes, justice is not only done but is seen to be done.

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** The concluding remark of the member for Murray-Mallee that justice should not only be done but should be seen to be done is the crux of this issue. In essence, the proposal before us is that the Economic and Finance Committee should have a close look at the wage and salary packages and a number of other organisational aspects of statutory authorities in South Australia.

I say from the very beginning that I think some mischief has been done in respect of the restructuring of, in particular, the State Bank over the past 12 to 18 months. The responsible Minister (the Deputy Premier and Minister of Finance) made it clear in answers in the House yesterday that the number of large salary packages in the whole State Bank Group has been reduced and wound back over the past 12 to 18 months. I think the Minister of Finance has done an excellent job in that area. It is my view that in the days of Marcus Clark the amount of money being paid and the various other reported wage and salary packages were excessive. I see no problem with the recommendation before the House. I think it is appropriate that this be the first item referred to the Economic and Finance Committee. I could well be wrong, but I believe this is the first reference.

**Mr Ferguson:** The MFP was.

**Mr QUIRKE:** That was done, as I understand, by statute. This is the first one that has emanated in this form. I think it is appropriate that the people of South Australia have the cupboard laid open, so to speak, so that they can see for themselves the true position. I do not want to make many comments other than to say that I believe we should have a very close look at what is happening in our statutory authorities in South Australia, and that we should make a couple of telephone calls to find out what is happening in other States, because I understand that some of the wage and salary packages in other States are very much greater than those in South Australia.

I think it is appropriate that the committee look at this matter and that we expose it to public scrutiny. Consequently, I indicate support for the honourable member's proposal. I conclude by saying that, from my understanding of the Parliamentary Committees Act, upon the passage of this resolution the committee must give precedence to this matter. Obviously, we will get onto it at the earliest opportunity. The committee with its recast membership has, this morning, determined the next six weeks of work. Obviously, this will give us considerably more work, but I think it will be a useful and hopefully productive exercise.

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** I do not wish to detain the House long on this matter. I was very pleased to hear what the new Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee said. I support the member for Mitcham in his endeavour because of a very simple principle, and it is called the Westminster system. I believe that the man who sits where the Minister is currently sitting as Premier of South Australia is in charge of this State and bears the responsibility for running this State. We have seen with

the change of leadership and the rearrangement of the member for Ross Smith's responsibilities the price that a Premier of South Australia can pay when something goes wrong.

As my colleague the member for Mitcham pointed out, it is absolutely ridiculous that the Premier gets not very much money at all for all the responsibility he bears. Every time he or any of his Ministers or any member of this Parliament gets half a cent more, the whole of South Australia rises in unholy outrage about their earnings. Party politics aside, I know not one member of this House who does not more than earn their salary. They work very hard and do not often get the recognition they deserve; yet, when they get half a cent more they get bucketed.

*Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Davenport has very kindly offered me a pay rise. I hope this happens every day. Despite the criticism we come under, it has become apparent that over the past two or three years there are officers of statutory authorities and various agencies, sometimes under the auspices of not only the Premier but Ministers, who are being paid out of the public purse and who are earning at least five times more than the people who bear the responsibility.

Quite frankly, I think that is a ludicrous situation. I believe that when it comes to the public purse the person to whom this State should pay more than any other person is the Premier of South Australia. He bears the responsibility; he is elected by the people; he is elected to serve the people; and he answers to the people every four years. Under that system he and his Ministers should be the benchmark from which all other salaries from the public purse descend. It is ludicrous that we are paying servants of the public up to \$500 000 for serving the Premier, the Ministers and every member of this Parliament.

If those people are talented, and I am sure many of them are, and want to command those salaries, the private sector is the place to do it. In the private sector—so long as nobody gets their money fraudulently, rips anybody off, or takes advantage of other people in society—I believe you are entitled to earn whatever you want and whatever you can by dint of your own talent. But, I believe, the public purse is a different matter, and a different level of accountability is demanded.

We should, therefore, consider the member for Mitcham's motion and look at this matter most seriously. Perhaps it will mean that the Economic and Finance Committee will recommend that the Premier immediately be placed on \$500 000 a year and that the Ministers get \$400 000 a year—and, of course, the Speaker ranks with the Ministers—and that all backbenchers' salaries be increased. If that is the decision of the Economic and Finance Committee, so be it, but I am sick and tired of having to justify my salary—as every member of this House does, when we work very hard—and having other people earning considerably more and being responsible to Ministers. It is silly that a Minister earning relatively little is in charge of somebody earning five times more.

*Mr S.G. Evans: Earning or being paid?*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I prefer to hope that they earn it rather than just getting paid. Therefore, I commend the member

for Mitcham for his motion and intend to support it most vigorously.

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** I support the motion. However, first, I must comment on the attitude of the member for Mitcham in moving this motion. As I pointed out in the grievance debate earlier today, the member for Mitcham has, more than anyone else in this Parliament—probably more than anyone else in this State—distorted the situation as far as executive salaries in the State Bank are concerned. If there is confusion out there in the community it is because of his actions in deliberately distorting that position. Details of the number of executive salaries in the State Bank, which is principally the matter we are considering, were set out clearly in the records of the bank, which were tabled last week, and it was quite clear there had been a drop in the number. However, since there is this confusion, largely created by the member for Mitcham, then perhaps it is a good idea that the Economic and Finance Committee look at the matter and report on it. Certainly, it is an area that I believe we should examine.

The member for Mitcham also made the comment on radio today, as I heard it, that he did not believe there should be capping of executive salaries. On the Keith Conlon program he publicly dissociated himself from the suggestion made by the member for Hanson that there should be such a cap on executive salaries. I wonder what the member for Mitcham's position really is. Nevertheless, the whole topic of executive salaries is an important one which the Economic and Finance Committee can productively examine, and I welcome the motion.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I support the motion. I was delighted when various statutory authorities reported to Parliament this year and included in their reports the salary ranges that were paid to the executive officers concerned. Mind you, I was very surprised at the huge band of those employees in the State Bank who were receiving well in excess of \$100 000 per annum. As a former president of the union that looked after bank officers and who fought very hard for—and won—classification agreement in the late 1960s for private trading banks, I know it was very difficult to get such an agreement in the State Bank and Savings Bank of South Australia structures. But there was never the difference between the average branch manager, the average classified officer and chief executive officers; there was never that huge disparity that we have seen today.

I believe our State Bank has been taken for a ride, and I agree with other members in this Chamber that you cannot have a Premier on \$138 000 a year being expected to supervise officers in the middle and senior range of a bank that would never come anywhere near the class of the private or free enterprise banks whose officers are receiving salary packages ranging between \$200 000 and \$300 000. It annoys me to think that those salary packages went to some people who came from interstate; not even South Australian born people are the recipients but that is another issue.

I was amazed to find that in the South Australian Government Financing Authority which handles nearly \$23 billion and which pays around \$1.9 billion in interest

on its borrowings, with a huge portfolio of investments, not one member of the staff is paid in excess of \$110 000. So, whom are we kidding when we have to pay such huge salaries to officers in a bank that was previously not much better than a credit union or a building society—officers who never had the training or the qualifications of those in free enterprise banks. We have officers in Treasury with far more responsibility, far more detailed jobs, than some of these high fliers in the corporate sector.

I do not care what private enterprise pays these people; they have to live with their shareholders. However, the shareholders of the State Bank and of all the statutory authorities are the people of South Australia, the taxpayers, and we are their elected representatives and have a responsibility. I think that if we are going to bring some sense back into the economic situation in this country it is time we pegged the executive salary structure of the people concerned, be they in private enterprise or Government employment. This is the way to do it and by referring this issue to the Economic and Finance Committee, of which I am a member, I would be happy to look at the whole issue.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** I thank all members, except the member for Napier, for their contribution on this subject. I assure the House that my motivations are honest and that I want to see some clean up. Indeed, I would hope that we can get this matter cleaned up before we get into government, so that we then do not have to waste our time doing it; that we, as a Parliament, can come to some conclusions about levels of remuneration, given the lower levels of responsibility that do pertain in these circumstances, and given that private sector packages are not really comparable with the security that applies with contracts relating to Government and Government trading enterprises. This is an important area. The public are screaming for blood; they want to see some action taken to ensure that the money is being spent wisely, that we have competent people in the relative positions, that they are being remunerated according to their contributions and that we can have some confidence in our institutions in a way that will best serve the taxpayers of the State.

Again, I thank all members, except the member for Napier, and appreciate the acceptance of this brief by the Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee.

Motion carried.

#### PROBATE FEES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That the regulations under the Supreme Court Act 1935 relating to probate fees made on 2 July and laid on the table of this House on 6 August 1992 be disallowed.

(Continued from 7 October. Page 673.)

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** The Government opposes the proposition as put forward by the member for Eyre. I believe that the honourable member has moved this motion because he is not aware of the circumstances surrounding the increase in probate fees. It has been the policy of the Government that all fees be

increased by the Adelaide consumer price index every 12 months.

*Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** Yes, it is the policy and sometimes that policy is changed in certain circumstances. However, we have always had the support of the Opposition in respect of increasing fees in line with the consumer price index. The member for Eyre can be forgiven for believing that probate fees have been increased by more than the increase in the index. However, there is a reason for this. In the previous financial year the fee for lodging an originating application in the probate jurisdiction was the same as the originating proceedings issued out of the Supreme Court registry. As a result of administrative error the probate fee was not increased for three months after the Supreme Court fee was increased and the parity between them was broken. The anomaly has been rectified by increasing the lodgment fee from \$308 to \$318, which represents an increase of 20 per cent across the board, including the CPI. I repeat that that was as a result of a mistake. Had the fees been indexed as they would normally have been, we would not be facing this dilemma.

Probate fees are the fee structure in the Probate Division of the Supreme Court. Probate is concerned with ensuring that the estates of deceased people are dealt with in a manner desired by the deceased. I am sure that you, Sir, would want that to continue. Probate fees were instituted to recover the cost of running the probate registry and the fees are based on those costs and no more; there is no excess amount of money going into the Government coffers. The fees are designed to recover the costs associated with the running of the registry. Initially there were two fees: a small estate fee and a large estate fee. But, due to the nature of the probate system, many very large estates were, quite legitimately, passing through as small estates. We are all aware of how the professionals are able to do this. Joint properties, superannuation and proceeds from insurance policies are all examples of benefits that escaped the probate system.

Executors are not required to provide evidence of valuation of the estate, although they must submit the source of their valuation. It should be noted that small estates with unprofessionally drawn wills usually create more work for the probate registry than large estates with professional documentation. Very small estates, usually less than \$5 000—and that would probably relate to the estates of most of the people I represent—do not need to be processed by the probate registry. So, clearly, those people do not need to pay any fees.

In addition, the registrar has authority to remit fees in the case of hardship. So, the member for Eyre, who quite rightly expressed concern about the need for probate fees with respect to people in necessitous circumstances, may rest assured that the current law and the regulations that we are dealing with actually look after those people. It should also be pointed out that, where assistance has been granted by the Legal Services Commission, fees are remitted. So, I believe that the dispossessed people in our community are looked after by the regulations we are now considering, and that the increase in probate fees—which at first appears to be quite large—relates to something that should have taken place in the past to

correct several mistakes. I urge members to oppose the proposition for disallowance.

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

## EXPIATION FEES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That the regulations under the Summary Offences Act 1953 relating to traffic infringement notice expiation fees made on 25 June and laid on the table of this House on 6 August 1992 be disallowed.

(Continued from 7 October. Page 672.)

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** I oppose the motion to disallow these regulations as moved by the member for Eyre and either supported or hindered by the member for Goyder. The essence of the arguments put forward by those members opposite was deliberately to support people in our community who break the law. This comes from the so-called law and order Party. I hope those members ran that past the member for Bright. I am very surprised at the member for Eyre because I have heard many a law and order speech given by that honourable member advocating that the full letter of the law be used against all the hoods, bodgies and hooligans in our society, but when someone breaks the speed limit or some other traffic law that is okay, he wants to give them a warning. During the honourable member's contribution he raised many questions. He asked:

What instructions are given to the police in relation to the issuing of on-the-spot fines? Are they told by the Minister, the Government, the Commissioner of Police or other senior police officers that they are to issue as many on-the-spot fines as possible?

I can inform the House that the Commissioner of Police has advised this House, and this member in particular, that there are no instructions to officers that they must issue a stipulated number of notices. I can certainly guarantee that there is no instruction from the Government that quotas are to be set. I hope it does not come as a surprise to members opposite that, when the police do issue traffic infringement notices, they are actually doing their job; that is, apprehending people who break the law. Many other questions were put by the member for Eyre. He also said:

I want the Minister to tell this House how many notices were issued during the past financial year, how many it is estimated will be issued this year, and how much money will be raised. I reiterate: what instructions were given? Are police officers put on quotas? . . . We are entitled to know the answers.

Need I remind members that only a couple of weeks ago we went through the Estimates for the year. During the Estimates Committees we had the Minister of Emergency Services, the Police Commissioner and other senior members of the police establishment in this Chamber to be asked those very questions. Let me tell the House that only one question on traffic infringement notices was raised during the Estimates Committees, and that was by a Labor member—the member for Spence. Where was the Liberal Party when those officers and the Police Commissioner were available to answer questions?

If Opposition members want answers, allow me to furnish them with one or two. These are the facts. Traffic

infringement notices and the technological aids used by police officers to assist them are having the desired effect. The actual number of traffic infringement notices has not come up to the expected amount; in other words, more people are observing the speed limit, which shows that the system is working. In 1991 road deaths decreased by 18 per cent. That equates to a saving of 42 lives on the previous year. That means that 42 more people are walking around in this State as a direct result of those methods. Those initiatives introduced, policed and supported by the Government are not only paying for themselves but are resulting in enormous savings to our hospitals, the insurance industry and other costs borne by the general community. I should like to quote from a document as follows:

We recognise the real fears and concerns of residents living in streets on which high speed traffic and large volumes result in the degradation of the amenity and safety of the residents. We will take active steps to improve road safety on metropolitan residential streets, particularly where high traffic speeds and volumes occur and where accident numbers are high.

That is from the Liberal Party Road Safety Policy, which both the members for Eyre and for Goyder have contradicted in this House. It confounds but does not surprise me that the initiatives taken by this Government that apprehend law breakers, reduce the number of people breaking the law and save lives are criticised by Opposition members. I urge all members to oppose the motion.

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

#### ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker:

That the second report of the committee (acquisition and disposal of certain property by ETSA) be noted.

(Continued from 7 October. Page 678.)

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I support the motion. In doing so, I want to highlight two or three points made in the committee's report. The report's first recommendation states that the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act does not contain provisions dealing with standards of conduct, conflict of interest, loans to employees and office holders, duties of honesty, care and diligence, and that the Act should be amended to include such standards. I was grateful to find that the committee also clearly recognised and highlighted the fact that neither board members nor executive staff of ETSA acted in any way contrary to such standards in relation to the purchase of No. 1 Anzac Highway, Keswick, and also the back-to-back sale of 220 Greenhill Road, Eastwood. It is important to make that point. I believe other members have already done so. However, I should like to add my comments and make it clear that ETSA in no way acted in contravention of those standards.

The committee also found that the purchase of No. 1 Anzac Highway, Keswick for \$14.625 million was in ETSA's best interests because it was a valuable asset purchased at a very good price for ETSA. I do not think that anybody could criticise ETSA for doing that, because its charter is to do the best it can for the organisation for

which it works. Coupling the sale of 220 Greenhill Road, Eastwood in that back-to-back arrangement with settlement in August 1993 was also advantageous to ETSA at that time. That comment is made at page 31 of the report.

I should also like to highlight the fact that ETSA acted very responsibly with regard to the negotiations for the sale of 220 Greenhill Road. The committee is correct in saying that ETSA made a very good sale and achieved another building of great value at a very good price. I commend it for that. However, if the purchasers fail to proceed with the purchase in 1993, ETSA stands to lose not the \$5 million purchase price but the difference between \$5 million and whatever the building fetches. The Opposition has suggested that at \$5 million the building has been under-valued. If the Opposition is right—and I hope it is—ETSA will make money on that and achieve an even better result for the organisation for which it works. I certainly hope that the market improves and that the value of that building escalates over the next 12 months, because it would indeed be very profitable for ETSA if it did.

The other issue that I should like to raise relates to section 5.1 of the report, which deals with stamp duty. It was perhaps unfortunate that that matter was addressed in the report titled 'Inquiry into the acquisition by the Electricity Trust of South Australia of 1 Anzac Highway, Keswick, and the disposal of 220 Greenhill Road, Eastwood.' There is a perception, which has been highlighted by the media irresponsibly, as far as I am concerned, that links ETSA with the payment of stamp duty on the developer's mortgage nearly four years earlier. That issue had nothing whatsoever to do with ETSA. Unfortunately, because of the way that it was handled in the media, there was a perception that ETSA may have been at fault with regard to that stamp duty.

As far as I am concerned, ETSA should in no way have been tarred with that and in all aspects it acted responsibly. The sellers of the property were involved with the stamp duty issue, not ETSA. Unfortunately, it was linked to the title of that report which was detrimental to the interests of ETSA. I just wanted to make that quite clear. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion to note the report.

Motion carried.

#### MOUNT BARKER ROAD

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That this House calls on the Minister of Transport Development to advise the Parliament what immediate action the Government is going to take to alleviate significant problems on the Mount Barker Road between Cross Road and the commencement of the South Eastern Freeway due to hazardous driving conditions as a result of fuel spillages and considerable delays as a result of accidents and breakdowns involving heavy vehicles.

This is a very complex issue to which there is no easy solution. I want to go through some of my concerns and refer to some of the representations that I have received from constituents and others who use that stretch of road on a regular basis. It is essential that the Arnold Government says what action it will take to alleviate

some of these significant problems facing motorists on the Mount Barker Road.

Too often, the only direct route between Glen Osmond and Crafers is blocked by vehicle accidents, in many cases at peak travelling times for commuters from the Hills to Adelaide. Only a couple of days ago another heavy vehicle overturned, and that delayed traffic for some six hours and, if that were not bad enough, the major concern that came out of that accident was that an emergency vehicle and ambulance was trying to get through and was unable to do so. It has reached a stage where the matter is extremely serious; there will be loss of life, and it is imperative that urgent action be taken now to try to provide some alternatives to the problems that are being experienced.

At the outset, can I say that it would be crazy for anybody to suggest that all the problems associated with that stretch of road result from heavy vehicle use. There is a considerable amount of pressure to have heavy vehicles removed from that stretch of road, particularly during peak hours, and I would suggest that, if there is no other alternative, the Government might need to consider that alternative seriously. However, there are considerable practical problems in doing that. Most of the people who have contacted me have suggested that the heavy vehicles be taken off the road in a curfew between the hours of 5 p.m. and 6 p.m. I can imagine significant problems arising, and those members of the House who know that stretch of road and who know the Glen Osmond Road would recognise that that is already a considerable bottleneck. If heavy vehicles arrived at the bottom of the Mount Barker Road and were unable to continue on their journey because of the curfew, it would be an impossible situation if those vehicles were forced to park along the sides of Glen Osmond Road. It would be a major traffic concern if that were to happen.

In addition, it is all very well for people to say that the heavy vehicles should be removed between, for example, 5 p.m. and 6 p.m., but the problems that would be experienced by people who travelled on that road soon after 6 p.m. would be immense. Because of the time that vehicles need to leave the metropolitan area to arrive at a destination in the eastern States, particularly, most of those vehicles leave Adelaide at either late evening or early night. If those transports were held up for an hour and they all commenced to proceed up the Mount Barker Road at the same time, it would be a considerable difficulty for motorists who happened to be travelling through at that time. So, there are practical problems associated with that alternative.

One other alternative, which I have put to the previous Minister, the Hon. Frank Blevins, is that consideration be given to introducing no passing lanes for heavy vehicles during peak periods. Again, I realise that there are practical problems associated with that. If that were to happen, every heavy vehicle would be slowed down to the slowest vehicle, but it would avoid a number of the frustrations that are felt by motorists using the road, particularly those travelling from the city to the Hills in the evening. This is because one of the major frustrations occurs when one heavy vehicle attempts to pass another heavy vehicle and the two are in tandem and, while it might take only a matter of minutes, the considerable build-up of traffic as a result of that causes frustrations,

particularly when the number of vehicles on the road at that time is heavy. So, there are practical problems with those two alternatives.

Another alternative, which I believe the Government should consider seriously, is the construction of a highway either from Murray Bridge in a more direct access route to Gepps Cross or from Murray Bridge or that vicinity through to the southern districts. That would remove the heavy vehicles from the road, and it would also make access to their place of destination more direct. As members who use that road would know, one only needs to sit at the bottom of Mount Barker Road at its intersection with Glen Osmond Road and Cross Road to see how many heavy vehicles turn right to use the ring route around Portrush Road to head to the northern districts. So, that again is an alternative to the expenditure of some \$130 million, which is the cost that has been put on the realignment of the present road with the provision of tunnels to improve the situation.

Another point I wanted to make is that, as I said earlier, it is foolish to suggest that all accidents are caused by heavy vehicles. One only needs to travel on that road regularly to realise that there are a lot of problems with driving habits and speed. I often feel for the drivers of heavy vehicles, because no doubt they often have tortuous trips down because of the poor driving habits of drivers and the speed of other vehicles. I believe that it is necessary to have the road policed more than it is policed at the present time, not for revenue raising purposes but to ensure that people keep to the speed limit and do not take unnecessary chances. I would hope that people's driving skills and driving practices would be improved as a result.

A lot of concern is expressed at various times (and I have already expressed concern today) about turnovers—the number of accidents involving heavy vehicles. It should be pointed out that, nine times out of 10, these accidents occur outside peak hours, in any case. Quite often a semitrailer will turn over and spill its load well before the peak hour, usually in the early hours of the morning, but invariably motorists travelling on the road during peak hours will be delayed as a result of the time taken to clear the road. That is another issue that should be referred to.

Considerable improvements have been made to the Mount Barker Road over the past decade, and I commend all those people who have been persistent in their representations to former Ministers of Transport to ensure that that happened. I believe that the lighting of the Mount Barker Road has been a considerable improvement and that the New Jersey barriers installed on the Mount Barker Road have been a significant improvement as well, because they certainly have removed the previous opportunity for head-on collisions. Some of the more serious accidents that have occurred on that road prior to the installation of those barriers resulted from head-on collisions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Minister on the front bench refers to the problems for koalas associated with the installation of the barriers. I hope that the Minister and all members understand my attitude to the preservation of the environment, particularly the natural environment in South Australia. As to this issue, having

travelled that road for the past 50 years and three months, I have never seen a koala on that road. Certainly, I have never seen a blinking koala attempting to cross the road and cross the median strip and, if anything, with the conglomeration of signs warning motorists, particularly drivers of heavy vehicles, about the dangers associated with that road, it would be beneficial if the signs warning people about koalas were removed, because they only add to the number of signs. I do not believe those signs do anything to save koalas and they should be removed.

The matter of the Mount Barker Road is serious indeed. While I am particularly concerned about the current situation, my greatest concern is about what will happen in the future, because problems associated with the Mount Barker Road now are negligible compared with what they will be in a decade or so if no remedial action is taken straight away. The debate on the adequacy or otherwise of this infamous stretch of road unfortunately appears now to focus only on present circumstances which, after all, as I said, are bad enough, and it is essential that a commitment be made now for either funding to be expanded for a realignment or a major upgrade of the road or for consideration of some of the other viable alternatives to which I have referred.

I say that because of the lead time required for major work to be carried out, the significant increase in population in towns like Mount Barker and the number of people who are commuting from Murray Bridge, which is resulting in a significant increase in the number of users of that road. Future problems in respect of that road, if not addressed now, will be disastrous, and it is for that reason that I call on the Minister and the Government to say what immediate action they will take to alleviate the significant problems facing motorists on the Mount Barker Road.

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

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I thank the Government for allowing me to follow the member for Heysen, because it is not always the practice. I support many of the honourable member's comments, but I wish to add a further point or to disagree with recent comments in the newspaper. I refer to a link to the north of the freeway to provide access to the northern area at Gepps Cross.

In about the mid 1970s, two engineers, some environmentalists, other community minded people and I surveyed a path through the Hills from Penny's Hill Road at Hackham, over the Onkaparinga River, where it was originally planned to build a reservoir near the Velocette motor cycle track, skirting Kangarilla, Meadows, Macclesfield and on to join the freeway at Callington. The Highways Department was given a copy of that route and it did not condemn it. True, some great expense is involved in it but, if we are to look at another route, I believe it should be in the southern area to encourage more enterprise in the southern area and, at the same time, to divert much of the heavy traffic and private motorists who work in the southern area off the freeway at Callington, which is long before they get to Mount Barker or other more densely populated parts of the Hills. We need not take the route right to Callington: we could take it to just outside Mount Barker, but I believe the

ultimate would be to take it towards Chaney's Line at Callington. That would be a long-term goal.

I turn now to the Mount Barker Road as it connects Glen Osmond and the freeway. The Devil's Elbow was designed at a time when Mr Nath Hender was working with limited resources as the foreman on the road—and a great man he was. I have taken up the argument with the Highways Department (now the Department of Road Transport) that the Devil's Elbow is one of the major problems on the road. As to the curve immediately above Devil's Elbow, in both directions the road camber is wrong and tends to throw vehicles out of kilter. If there is a tendency for a load to shift, it will shift there.

If we were prepared to build up the Mount Barker Road from about the Old Mountain Hut and gradually increase the height of the road to the Devil's Elbow by about four metres, we could then take the curve at a wider sweep and eliminate the dangerous dip on the curve as one drives into the city on that road. The amount of money involved is not horrendous. That is one of the worst corners, although the corner above needs correction to its camber.

The Government acquired all the houses from the Toll Gate on the northern side of the Mount Barker Road that would be a problem in any redesign up as far as the Devil's Elbow and, in the main, demolished them. It kicked people out of those houses and paid huge sums for them over the past six years, but it has not made use of those acquisitions. I certainly have grave doubts about the concept of a tunnel. I know engineers have designed it and were worried about how it looked. They did not want excavation through the Hills because of environmental considerations, and they did not want a road above the ground in some areas because it is such a sensitive area.

However, we have to have a good road through the Hills and, if we upgrade the present Mount Barker Road in one or two areas and provide one or two passing lanes, I do not believe we have a major problem. I agree with the Minister's recent statement that there are not many accidents on that road in peak hours that are caused by semitrailers. Not all the accidents involving semitrailers are caused by them, either. For example, about nine years ago a semitrailer jackknifed on the Devil's Elbow. I was driving on the inside lane and a lady driving a red Mazda passed me on the inside lane. She could not hold the car and went to the outside of the lane in front of the semitrailer. The driver applied the brakes on the corner but had no hope and his truck jackknifed. That caused the hold up. As far as the media were concerned, the semitrailer was the problem, but it was not. The Minister is correct in saying that the number of road accidents involving commercial vehicles and causing hold-ups is not great when measured over a year. If we are talking about spending \$130 million, I think there is a better way to do it.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I do not know, but I am saying that that sort of money is astronomical when the road needs examining in only a few places—just like a strawberry patch. After you get above the climb to Devil's Elbow, the road levels out.

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



**Mr S.G. EVANS:** The estimate was \$130 million, but it will be a lot more now. Getting back to the strawberry patch, it would not be a difficult task to run a road across the valley through part of Wiley's property. They might not like me saying that, although I see them as friends.

**Mr Ferguson:** You don't care any more.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I do care. I have driven on the roads since I was a lad of 16 driving trucks with angel brakes—you prayed that you would get to the bottom.

**Mr Ferguson:** When was that?

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** It was 1946. The road has hardly been upgraded from the bullock days, and it can be upgraded without going to the huge expense of putting in a tunnel. I say to the environmentally conscious people that there is scenic beauty beside the freeway from Crafers on. It is a beautiful drive that is appreciated by many people from other parts of the world as they travel along that scenic route. We could do the same with the Mount Barker Road.

The Minister has rejected the idea of stopping heavy vehicles during peak hours. I agree with that, because where would you park the confounded things? Where would you park 200 semitrailers? They could not be parked unless you built a major parking area on this side of Mount Barker, but it would have to be farther out. If they had to go into the city, unload and reload the vehicle on the same day and get back on the track—the drivers might have had a break during the day and slept while someone loaded the vehicle—it would throw the whole time slot out. They could not do it because they would not be able to go out again during peak hour in the evening. They would have to sit at some parking space at somewhere like Gepps Cross. They could not sit on Port Road or Cross Road—one could imagine the outcry if we were responsible for that. So the Minister is correct, because the time slotting is difficult. Just imagine what 200 or 300 semitrailers roaring along at the one time would do to ordinary traffic!

**Mr Ferguson:** It would be good for the economy.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I do not think it would be good for the economy at all; in fact, I think it would cost money, because this massive amount of money would be tied up awaiting a few motorists who did not want to get out of bed half an hour earlier to get off the road to get work.

I think the road could be upgraded. A lot of motorists come down through my electorate because of the Mount Barker Road problem. In the long term we need to look at the southern route, upgrade the Mount Barker Road, have a few more police patrols to catch the idiots—I speed sometimes, so some people might think I am one of them—and when we have finished the survey, create some passing lanes on Upper Sturt Road, and that would drag a few of the people off the Mount Barker Road.

**Mr Ferguson:** Where do you stand on koalas?

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I agree that koalas should be enrolled as electors, but I have none in my electorate who are 18 years of age yet, so they cannot enrol.

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

**Mr HOLLOWAY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I move:

That this House—

- (a) supports the motor car industry in South Australia;
- (b) views with concern the statement by the Managing Director of Mitsubishi Motors that Mitsubishi would walk away from a \$100 million engine plant in South Australia if a Coalition Government imposed its zero tariff policy;
- (c) agrees that a zero tariff policy will destroy incentive to invest in the industry;
- (d) calls upon all members to support a call to the Coalition leaders to drop this anti-development policy and to support the retention of jobs in the industry; and
- (e) calls upon the Leader of the Opposition to jointly sign a letter of protest with the Premier.

I believe that this is one of the most serious items I have seen in the time I have been a member of this establishment. We are facing in South Australia the destruction of the motor car industry if the Fightback program proposed by the Federal Coalition ever comes to fruition—and I certainly hope that it does not. When I framed this motion, I stated that South Australia was likely to lose \$100 million. I am afraid that is far from the truth, because I have since had time to talk to motor industry leaders who tell me that each time they bring out a new model they invest \$100 million and that it takes eight years to develop. They are now planning new models eight years ahead, and if the decision is taken not to go ahead with those models we will be talking about millions and millions of dollars being lost from South Australia. These are not my words. If we have a look at what Mr Mike Quinn—

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** I will answer the member for Goyder's interjections later, because I expect him to support me in this proposition. His Leader has already indicated outside this place that he does not support zero tariffs; in fact, he has very great reservations about them. If zero tariffs come into this country there is no way we will be able to reach the A.D. Little target of increasing the gross State product in this State by 10 per cent per year every year from now until the end of the century.

I hope the Leader of the Opposition comes out of his bunk hole or wherever he is now and into this Chamber to support this proposition for the sake of South Australians, because South Australians will suffer—make no mistake about that. Every person in South Australia will suffer if the car industry goes under. I am referring not only to the motor car industry but to the motor car parts industry which, in itself, is probably as important. In fact, the whole of South Australia depends on the motor car industry to a certain extent, and if that industry goes under the industry base in this State will also go under. I am very anxious to hear from members opposite as to whether or not they will support this proposal, because it is vitally important to the future of everyone in South Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition does not support the Fightback program as far as zero tariffs are concerned. Everywhere but in this place he has stated that he does not support zero tariffs, but I put to members that this is the important place, this is where he should come in and say that he supports the people of South Australia and the manufacturing industry in this State, and that he is prepared to sign a letter to be sent to the Federal Leader

of the Opposition stating that he does not support zero tariffs.

What has Mr Dean Brown, the Leader of the Opposition, said? In the *Advertiser* of 30 May 1992, with reference to his plan for South Australia he said that he would be reluctant to commit to the abolition of tariffs by the year 2000. When asked whether this put him at odds with his Federal counterparts, he said:

Well, it may, but I'm talking about being realistic as to what can be achieved by an economy here in South Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition was prepared to say that to the *Advertiser*. Why will he not come in here and say it? Why will he not come in here and support the Australian Labor Party? Our Party is opposed to zero tariffs and is prepared to support the manufacturing industry in South Australia. I wonder whether the Opposition is split on this issue. I wonder whether the member for Murray-Mallee supports his Leader. He ought to get up after me and say whether he supports his Leader on what he said in the *Advertiser*. What about the statement in the *Advertiser* of 5 June? Asked if this was a revolt by some Liberal States against elements of Fightback, Mr Brown said:

I think it is a revolt by the States against what is happening in Canberra. I think a number of States realise that a more realistic approach on tariffs needs to be taken and if it does not then it is going to affect tens of thousands of jobs.

The Liberal Party is secretly saying that zero tariffs will affect tens of thousands of jobs in South Australia, and members opposite are not prepared to stand up in this place and support our efforts to save the motor car industry in South Australia.

I would like to give some credit to the member for Hanson for the realistic view that he has taken on tariffs. I would only hope that the rest of his Party fall behind him.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** I would hope that the member for Victoria, for example, would be prepared to come into this Chamber and say that Mr McLachlan is wrong.

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member to direct his remarks through the Chair, and I ask the member for Napier to resume his seat.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I am terribly sorry if I offended the Chair. That is the last thing I would want to do. I will definitely address the Chair. I refer to an interview on 5AN on 14 September 1992 between Keith Conlon and the member for Hanson as follows:

Becker: . . . I think that zero tariffs is not the right solution

Conlon: . . . but what does micro-economic reform mean?

Becker: [laugh] Well, there you are, it's an economic theory of using various means to right supposed wrongs. I don't believe in the thing myself.

Conlon: But that's a fundamental plank of the Fightback package.

Becker: Yeah, I know. I . . . I like . . . I'm a realist, I'm afraid.

Conlon: What about negligible tariffs under the Federal Coalition Government?

Becker: Well, it worries me . . . I'd just like them to reconsider that whole issue, because I don't think it's working in the best interests of South Australia.

How frank can you be? I give the member for Hanson credit for standing up to his own Party and saying that zero tariffs are wrong. What we would like to do is see the Leader of the Opposition stand up to his Federal

colleagues and start fighting for South Australia, having the courage to say that zero tariffs are wrong. He is saying it everywhere else but here. I quote from the *Advertiser* (page 1) of 14 September, as follows:

A spokesman for the State Opposition Leader, Mr Brown, said the issue was a Federal policy but State Liberal MPs were wholeheartedly behind the Fightback package.

That is a rather interesting proposition. On the one hand they say, 'We do not really support the zero tariffs but we are right behind the Fightback package', and the *Advertiser* of 14 September 1992 states, 'Mr Brown has not changed his position'. That is interesting in the light of what we have seen in here. Mr Brown has not changed his position, which was that tariffs should not be reduced until there had been some reforms in payroll tax, fuel excise and industrial policy. The Leader of the Opposition is prepared to rush to the *Advertiser* and say, 'I'm not going to be responsible for losing jobs in South Australia. I'm not the one who puts the motor car industry out of business. It's those big bad boys in Canberra that are doing it—Mr Hewson and Mr McLachlan. I'm not going to support that policy.' But why will he not come in here and say it? Why does he not rush out of his office (where he is cringing now and probably listening to this debate) into the Chamber—and we will give him all the time he would like—to support this motion? I would hope that we see the unanimous support of the Parliament in this issue.

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** I do not know what the honourable member for Goyder is muttering about. Where does he stand? Does he support his Leader? Do you support the Leader or do you support Mr McLachlan? Does the member for Goyder want to see thousands of jobs go in South Australia? Does he want to see millions of dollars of investment go down the drain?

I refer to the *Advertiser* on 25 September 1992 when the Federation of Automobile Products Manufacturers absolutely refuted claims by the Opposition industry spokesman, Mr Ian McLachlan, that Australian car makers would not be worse off under the Coalition's proposal for 5 per cent tariff protection. Mr McLachlan is running around the whole of Australia. I even saw a huge article in the *Advertiser* saying that the motor car manufacturers, the motor car parts manufacturers and the motor car industry generally in South Australia will be no worse off under this particular policy than if the tariffs were to remain. I have never heard anything so ridiculous, and it has been refuted by the leaders of the industry, even by the *Advertiser* editorial. I do not often agree with the *Advertiser*, but on this occasion I think I am forced to because its logic is so clear. It stated:

The Federal Opposition is right about the need to slash tariffs and other protection of Australian industry such as car manufacturing but it is wrong about the timing, the speed and the extent of the cuts. It is guilty of an inflexible theory driven zealotry that takes no account of the human cost its policies will inflict on thousands of Australians, particularly in the car making industry.

How true that is. That would inflict absolute misery on thousands of South Australians in the motor car industry and the motor parts industry. I can understand the Leader of the Opposition dancing on one foot and the other, dodging and weaving and trying to get out of supporting his Federal colleagues. He has not yet been game to

come in here and say that they were wrong. The *Advertiser* editorial of 1 September 1992 states:

The Coalition, as State Opposition Leader Mr Dean Brown points out, must re-evaluate its policy in the light of drastically changed circumstances. Dr Hewson and Mr McLachlan must get the message: Australia wants some lateral thinking.

It is very nice of the Leader of the Opposition to go to the *Advertiser* and say, 'I do not support zero tariffs? I do not support the Liberal Party in its tariffs policy; I do not support Fightback', but why is he not game enough to say that in this place—the Parliament of South Australia, the most important place—that he is not prepared to support Dr Hewson or Mr McLachlan in their propositions for the motor car industry? Is it because he is being leant upon by those people in Canberra who are suggesting to him that he can go so far and no further? There is very great silence from the other side. Mr McLachlan is referred to in the *Age* of 10 September 1992 as follows:

The Opposition industry spokesman admitted that it would be a tragedy if the Coalition's policy to cut car tariffs, together with other tariffs, down to between zero and 5 per cent turned out to be wrong.

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

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I do not know how members on the other side can stand up in this House and talk such drivel for 15 minutes, but we have seen another display today. We have seen the same display by Heckle and Jeckle on a number of occasions, and it adds nothing to the debate and the quality of Parliament. We see once again—

Mr FERGUSON: Mr Speaker, it hurts me to do this, but I must rise on a point of order. I understand that members in this House must be addressed by their electorate and their proper title.

The SPEAKER: That is absolutely correct. However, in referring to 'Heckle and Jeckle' the member for Mitcham did not identify any particular member.

Mr S.J. BAKER: For 15 minutes we have heard the rubbish, diatribe and typical statements that come out of Canberra from people who should know better on their side of politics and, in particular, from the Prime Minister of this country who denigrates the position he holds and the Parliament in which he performs. Let us be quite clear: this motion is garbage for a number of reasons. First, it takes a political stance. Where were members opposite when the Prime Minister was destroying this country? Where were members opposite when the Prime Minister had interest rates at an all time high? Where were they in supporting the State, the motor vehicle industry, the manufacturing industry, the tourism industry and every other industry in this State? Where were they when the Prime Minister was indulging himself in allowing unemployment to increase beyond 900 000 towards a million people? Where were ALP members of this Parliament when the ALP Prime Minister of this country was wreaking havoc?

Members might like to look at tariffs, but when they look at the policies that have been pursued over the past five years they should cringe and hide their heads. They should not even raise them to put up a motion of this pathetic nature. The first part of the motion asks the House to support the motor vehicle industry. That is not a

problem; of course it supports the motor vehicle industry. The motion also asks the House to view with concern a statement by the Managing Director of Mitsubishi Motors. Of course, we view with concern any statement by a senior officer of Mitsubishi that the company will not proceed with a \$100 million investment. But, of course, the motion is not quite correct because the Liberal Party has no such thing as a zero tariff policy. As members are well aware, the Fightback statement refers to a 5 per cent figure by the year 2001, and that is quite comparable with the tariff regime that is predicted by the Prime Minister. All members on the other side understand that proposition. They are into a scare campaign because they have nothing to offer this country, and neither do their Federal counterparts.

Let us look at the record. What has happened in the motor vehicle industry in the past few years? Ten years ago this State had 46 500 new motor vehicle registrations. If we look at the past financial year we see that there were 37 600 registrations—a fall of nearly 20 per cent. That is a 20 per cent decimation of our industry due to the policies pursued by the Arnold and Bannon Governments and the policies pursued in Canberra. Members opposite should not waste our time by putting up spurious arguments in areas in which they have little competence. I would view with concern any person who says that they have a potential investment of \$100 million in South Australia which will be affected by a particular policy. We have seen over the past three years a huge fall off—involving billions of dollars—in investments as a result of the Keating/Bannon/Arnold policies that have been implemented. So, members should not waste the time of this House. It is a 5 per cent policy; and it does relate to the year 2001.

Debate adjourned.

*At 5.45 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

## 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 Port Augusta and Islington railway workshops.

(Continued from 7 October. Page 690.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): It is with great pleasure that I support the motion moved by the member for Stuart. Her motion congratulates the State and Federal Governments on the funding initiatives for our rail system. In particular, the honourable member singles out refurbishment of the *Indian Pacific* passenger train and the upgrading of the Port Augusta and Islington railway workshops—both very important projects for the future of this State. So far three members of the Opposition have spoken to this motion. The member for Custance, who spoke first, supported it. We then had the member for Light and the member for Davenport, who spoke to the motion last week.

The only problem was that they spoke about almost everything other than the terms of the motion. We had the member for Light talking about ETSA at Port Augusta and whether or not we should have a different

route for the rail line to Melbourne—whether or not it should go via a different route through the Adelaide Hills. He complained about the fact that most of the money that the Federal Government provides for rail standardisation goes to Victoria. I would have thought that was not really surprising because the location of the border is such that most of the rail line is actually in Victoria rather than in South Australia. However, it really misses the point. The real benefit for South Australia from the rail standardisation project to Melbourne is from having a standard gauge contact with the rest of this country. The fact that Adelaide is connected to the standard gauge rail network is important rather than the actual location of the capital works. The member for Davenport spoke about the *Steam Ranger*. I certainly agree it is an important service, but it is hardly relevant to the motion.

Let us get back to the motion. There are two aspects: first, there is the *Indian Pacific*. Of course, it is one of the great rail journeys of the world. It is perhaps the most important rail passenger service in this country. If that rail service is to have a future it must be upgraded. The present carriages are 22 years old. If those carriages are to be upgraded to provide the sort of service that is necessary to attract custom into the future, they must be upgraded, and I certainly applaud the Federal Government for providing the funds for doing just that.

The member for Stuart's motion also refers to the railway workshops. Obviously, the Port Augusta rail workshop is very important to the member for Stuart, but so too is the Islington rail workshop for employment in Adelaide. If South Australia is to play a key role in the future of rail transport in this country, we must have rail workshops that are able to provide the level of work necessary to maintain our involvement. South Australia has traditionally been the centre of rail in this country through the location of Australian National, and it is important that we keep up that role. Another motion on the Notice Paper covers these areas, and I am sure there will be much more debate on this when that matter is before the House. The Commonwealth Government's providing funds for the rail workshops at Port Augusta and Islington, the standardisation project and the *Indian Pacific* is a very necessary contribution to the future of this State and one we should all applaud. I hope that this motion is supported unanimously by the House, and I urge all members to support it.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** In my judgment this motion does not clearly indicate to the House and the people of South Australia what the long-term effects of the Commonwealth Government's economic and rail policy will be. If this nation is to reach the industrial heights that it should, it must have an effective and adequate rail system across Australia. To have that, the people employed in it must know that they have a long-term future and that the rail system is designed to ensure that people who want to use it can do so with confidence.

In recent days I have had communication with the Federal Minister, and it appears we are to have two national rail systems. We are to have a National Rail Corporation and Australian National; yet we still do not know which organisation will run which particular sections of the business. Who will be responsible in this

State for the Leigh Creek to Port Augusta line? Who will be responsible for the line from Broken Hill to Port Pirie? Who will be responsible for the other services? At the end of the day, who will be responsible for the support services to ensure that the rail system has adequate and ongoing maintenance? We do not know.

It is about time that this Government, on behalf of the people of this State, made the strongest representations possible to its Commonwealth counterparts to ensure that we know what future rail has in South Australia, because none of us knows. Reading the corporate plan of intent by the National Rail Corporation, there is a fairly dismal outlook.

Last week the member for Stuart described me as having been involved in a diatribe, whatever that is supposed to mean. I put it to her clearly that I make no apology for sticking up for the people of South Australia on the rail industry, schools, hospitals and anything else. If the honourable member wishes to describe that as a diatribe, that is fine, because I do not. I believe it is my responsibility as long as I am in this House, and it will be a lot longer than the member for Stuart. I face the electorate with confidence; I am not a bit concerned about it.

*Mrs Hutchison interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The honourable member can squeak as much as she likes, but she has not yet told us and the Government has not had the courage to stand up and tell us what the future of rail is in South Australia. If we are not careful, the only rail lines left in South Australia will be Pichi Richi and the one to Victor Harbor. If the honourable member wants to talk about what the Liberal Party has done, I remind her that the McMahon Government provided the first money for the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway line. The Fraser Government put more money into the rail service than the Hawke Government. I ask the honourable member to deny that. Further, the Fraser Government approved the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line, and her Federal Leader, Prime Minister Hawke, cancelled it. He went on radio in the Iron Triangle (he had the Federal member Lloyd O'Neil sitting alongside him, because Mr O'Neil told me), and when asked, 'Will you honour the promise made by the Fraser Government to build the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line?', he replied, 'Yes.' Then, a few months later, he reneged on that promise.

**Mrs Hutchison:** Get your facts straight.

**Mr GUNN:** I have got the facts straight. Prime Minister Fraser made an arrangement with the then Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, Mr Everingham, to build the railway line in the interests of the people of this State and of the country. Let us not have any more of this nonsense from the member for Stuart. We still do not know whether there will be 300, 400 or 500 people employed in the next 18 months to two years in the railway workshops at Port Augusta. We still do not know what will be the future of the people at Tarcoola and Cook. It is all very well for the member for Ross Smith to give a little coaching to the member for Stuart—and she certainly needs it—because he, as Premier, had the opportunity to stand up to the Commonwealth in a similar vein to Sir Thomas Playford who stood up to the Commonwealth when he refused to sign the Nine Elms

agreement until the interests of South Australia were looked after.

I am in favour of having an adequate rail service and I have no problem with Governments being involved in injecting capital into it, because, if this country is to have a future, we must transport our goods. However, to have an effective system we need adequate maintenance. Therefore, it is not in the interests of South Australia or the nation as a whole to allow those railway workshops at Islington, Port Augusta and elsewhere to be run down. I believe that it is important that we have an effective passenger rail system in this country, in the interests not only of tourism but of people who enjoy rail travel.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

Mr GUNN: I look forward to the contribution by the honourable member who continually interjects but who has made little or no contribution to this debate. The honourable member had the audacity the other day to imply that I had not shown any interest in the rail industry. For as long as I have been a member of this place I have represented an electorate which has had a considerable involvement in the rail industry. I have seen what happens when people are misguided. I have seen what has happened at Peterborough where Australian National set out on a deliberate campaign to destroy the future of that town. In my view, the same tactics are being employed at Port Augusta. Certain assurances are given and a few steps are taken back and the same pattern goes on. I sincerely hope that it is not the same result. If it is, tremendous social and economic difficulties will be created there.

*Mr Holloway interjecting:*

Mr GUNN: If the honourable member wants to make a contribution, I welcome his participation in the debate. I have a clear conscience. I did not vote for the rail transfer agreement, because I knew there were holes in it. I knew what was going to happen to the people of Peterborough, and I warned them. We had Labor politicians running up there and telling them what great things they had done for them, but we have not seen them lately. One could fire a shotgun in the railway workshops there and not hit anyone. Their jobs have been destroyed and their future decimated.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr GUNN: It is all very well for members to interject, but I suggest that they look at the television news tonight to see what has happened to employment in this State. I suggest that, if the Labor Government wants to put more people out of work, it should continue down this path. I suggest to the new Premier and Government that it is about time that they stood up for South Australia. It is all very well for the member for Stuart to criticise me for raising these matters in the Parliament, but I am happy to be judged on my record of representation in this House and in the community. I have no problem with that whatsoever, because I have not sat mute behind a Government which has wrecked the finances of this State. The Opposition warned the Government, but nobody took any notice. Members opposite sat idle like puppets on a string, like Noddies, and did nothing. We cannot be blamed for the financial situation, and I am certainly not going to be blamed for sitting idly by without warning this Government and Parliament about the long-term effects of the decisions made by Australian National in

relation to the establishment of the National Rail Corporation.

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

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith):** Prior to the dinner adjournment we were subject to a kind of self-justification, I think one would put it, from the member for Eyre as to why he was prepared to, as I understood it, support this motion but support it in an extraordinarily qualified way. It was a kind of self-justification, because much of his speech tended to try to explain to the House and, I presume, to those who will receive a copy of his words of wisdom, that for all the time he has been a member (and it has been a very long time in that area; it is coming to an end, perhaps, and some would say it has been too long, but I think he has done a valiant job in covering the huge territory concerned) he has really always been a railway man at heart and has been a huge and valiant supporter of railways, railway workshops and their activities throughout his territory. I admire his self-disinterest in this; there is self-interest in terms of the railway services that are provided to his rural constituents but, on the other hand, I suspect that the railway workshop activities and various other aspects have probably worked against him in electoral terms, yet he tells us he is 100 per cent behind it and totally dedicated to it.

I do not wish to address the honourable member's broader remarks. I am delighted to find such a valiant supporter of the system there from a Party that prides itself on its policy of *laissez faire* and economic rationalism which would in fact do away with railways throughout the subsidised areas in which they operate, and it is great to see that the honourable member is prepared to reject that philosophy, and I hope he does so when he addresses the Fightback package and various other things that will wreak tremendous damage on his constituents. I do not wish to deal with that aspect of his remarks. I certainly wish to support the motion of the member for Stuart, because she has recognised that at last something positive is being done in this area of rail operations, railway workshops, the upgrading of the Indian Pacific and the promotion of railways in this country, specifically in South Australia, and I think it would be churlish to do otherwise. Really, what we should be urging is that the money be spent as rapidly and comprehensively as possible.

What has brought me to my feet were the remarks made by the honourable member about the Darwin/Alice Springs railway and this mythology that seems to be developing that on the one hand the Fraser Government was going to build the Darwin/Alice Springs railway and on the other hand that the Hawke Government killed it off. Both statements are absolutely wrong. For a start, when one looks at the record, one wonders where were the great railway developments of this country? Were they accomplished under conservative Governments of the Fraser type? Of course not—none of them at all. The Trans-Australian railway, the creation of Australian National, the building of the Adelaide/Alice Springs link, the commencement of the Darwin southward track were all done under Federal Labor Governments. King O'Malley historically claimed credit for the link across

the continent, and quite rightly. He claimed credit for many other things, but it was the Fisher Labor Government that actually got funds committed and the project started. It was during the First World War that the Fisher/Hughes Governments embarked upon the railway which eventually linked Adelaide and Alice Springs.

So, Australian National and the railway development at the Federal level was all done by Federal Labor Governments and enhanced by them progressively during the times they were in office. It was the Whitlam Government that conceived a massive national railway network that would unify the gauges around the country. It was even more significant that, as part of trying to put into effect that vision of a national rail network, which, if the investment had been made in the 1970s would be serving us very well today in the 1990s, the Labor Governments of Tasmania and South Australia—the only two Labor Governments in the country at that time at State level—collaborated and cooperated with the Federal Labor Government to try to create a national network.

It was the Liberal Governments of Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales and West Australia—the Parties that are supported by the member for Eyre, who proclaims his great love of the railway system and its development—which resisted that and stood in the way of it. It meant that all that massive capital expenditure that was to be undertaken by the Whitlam Government came to nothing. It is an outrageous chapter in our history and it is one where the political lines are very clearly drawn indeed. There is no question of it.

The Labor Governments of the day—and unfortunately there were only three in the country—cooperated in that national enterprise, and the Liberal Governments resisted and opposed it. What did they do? In the case of New South Wales and Victoria, particularly, they heaped vast amounts of debt on their populations. They heaped great inefficiencies which have, in fact, delayed the establishment of a national rail system today in the 1990s longer than it should have been delayed by refusing to accept that decision in the 1970s.

That is the first aspect of the myth that in some way Labor Governments are opposed to or frustrate these developments, and that Liberal Governments support them. They do not. It is true that the Fraser Government made a promise that it would build the Darwin-Alice Springs railway, but it hedged that undertaking with a number of conditions. It saw it as a national project, the fulfilment of an agreement signed way back in 1910 when a Labor Government in this State ceded the Northern Territory to the Federal Government, one of the conditions being that the Federal Government would build the Darwin-Alice Springs railway, which was beyond the capacity of the State's finances.

That promise has never been delivered and Malcolm Fraser claimed that he was going to deliver it, but he hedged it with a number of conditions and qualifications. I am pretty sure—and the evidence that was found within the bureaucracy when the Labor Government took power in 1983 supports this—that he had no intention of doing that. If he had been re-elected, there would have been all sorts of hedges, conditions and qualifications built around it and, at the end of the day, we would still have had no railway. Why do I say that? It is because in 1983 when the Hawke Labor Government took office and asked that

the material that had been developed around the Alice Springs-Darwin railway should be brought before it, that it should be allowed to make an assessment on this promise of Malcolm Fraser, it was told that all the evidence and all the work done indicated that it would not actually go ahead. That was the nod that we had—that it was not going to happen.

At that stage the Hawke Government could have abandoned the whole thing, but it did not. This is where I come to the nub of my complaints concerning the mythology that the member for Eyre was trying to promote that the Hawke Government killed the Darwin-Alice Springs railway. I say clearly and unequivocally that the Darwin-Alice Springs railway is not in operation now and was not built in the 1980s because of the stupidity and obduracy of the Everingham Country Liberal Party Government in Northern Territory. I know because I was there. The Hawke Government commissioned an inquiry and the then head of the New South Wales railway, the present ABC boss, David Hill, undertook that inquiry. It did not support the railway, but it was equivocal in its findings.

The Commonwealth made an offer and said, 'We are prepared to do this, despite those findings. We are prepared to put major investment into it and commit the project, provided the Northern Territory is prepared to make a contribution.' That was a contribution much less than the one made to Yulara and casinos in Alice Springs, Darwin and so on. What did the Northern Territory Government say? It said, 'Under no circumstances will we make any contribution.' I attended the meeting at which Bob Hawke (then Prime Minister) and Peter Morris (the Federal Transport Minister) put their offer on the table—the so-called 'Hawkey/Porky' meeting. We went out with Everingham and I said to him, 'This is your chance. Grab this. They don't expect you to, and they will be forced to commit.' They didn't.

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

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I want to thank all members who have spoken on this motion, particularly those who supported it, namely, the member for Culance; the member for Albert Park, whose interest in railways has been well documented in this House; the member for Mitchell, whom I thank for his remarks; and the qualified support from the member for Eyre, which the member for Ross Smith has already mentioned. I would also like to thank the member for Ross Smith for his contribution, which is fact, and that is more than was the case with the member for Eyre's contribution because, as the member for Ross Smith so rightly said, the whole thing was sabotaged by Everingham, the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory.

The Alice Springs-Darwin railway line has not been built because the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory refused to make a contribution which, in today's values, was a minimal one. Subsequently, as the member for Ross Smith said, he made contributions to such things as casinos and the Yulara development. Whilst I applaud those contributions, the value of the Alice Springs-Darwin railway line would have far exceeded them in terms of its value to this State and the nation of Australia in opening up those transport routes.

I want to make a couple of comments regarding some of the other speakers. First, the member for Light misrepresented what I said regarding the operation of the railway workshop in Port Augusta. No-one knows better than the workers in that workshop the value of productivity, of making themselves competitive on the national market. When it comes time for the National Rail Corporation's work to be tendered out, they will be there and they will be productive and competitive. What the member for Light misunderstood—and I am sure he did so genuinely—was the fact that I was talking about the Morris and Knudsen operation which went to Whyalla. There was a doubt that it would even come to South Australia, and the other alternative was Sydney. I was worried that it might go to Sydney, because there would have been no spin-off effect on the Port Augusta railway workshop, and we would get no value at all out of that operation.

So, I was very keen for it to go to Whyalla and, as the member for Ross Smith quite rightly says, we really need that extra operation in South Australia. So, I was not saying that they did not have to be productive. I totally support the fact that they do have to be productive, and I would say that Australian National has certainly shown that it values productivity. It has restructured its operation drastically in order to become productive. Once it had received its commercial charter, it realised it would have to do that or it would not be able to continue in operation. So, I hope I have put to rest the misunderstanding of the member for Light.

Other comments by the member for Light and the member for Davenport concerned railway operations in Port Adelaide, Gawler, Murray Bridge and Bordertown and the standardisation of the rail link between Adelaide and Melbourne. Following discussions with the Minister, I believe that negotiations are occurring with regard to that, and that it is hoped to get some sort of resolution to those problems.

It is not the case that nothing is being done. Things are being done and this Government has always indicated an interest in rail, as has the Federal Government. I have to say that the Federal Government is the only Government which has really given dollars in support of rail in this country, in the order of \$200 million plus. No other Government in this nation has given that sort of support to rail in the history of Australia. So, I would say that, whilst there was a lot of rhetoric in the member for Eyre's comments, there was very little substance and very little fact, as was rightly pointed out by the member for Ross Smith. As I said, I thank all members for their contributions and hope that the House will support the motion.

Motion carried.

#### FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health and Community Services):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** I thank the House for its indulgence; it will be a brief statement. This afternoon in question time a number of matters were raised in relation

to some operations and admissions which were to take place at the Flinders Medical Centre. I would like to report to the House in relation to my investigation of these issues.

In relation to the 70-year-old woman who was to be admitted for breast cancer treatment, that lady has now had her operation booked again for next week. The operation in fact was rebooked in consultation with her medical practitioner, and the medical practitioner has indicated that he does not believe that in these circumstances he is placing this individual in a life-threatening situation by the delay of her surgery for this period of time. This is a matter, of course, of medical priorities being determined by a medical practitioner and in this case, of course, the treating practitioner. Obviously, the matter is most unfortunate because of the stress and anxiety imposed on the individual concerned, and I am sure the hospital would acknowledge that.

In relation to the patient who was to be treated in respect of chemotherapy, that patient was in fact admitted during the course of the afternoon for treatment as a bed became available in the normal course of the hospital's management. In the past day or so the hospital opened a further eight beds because of the unforeseen demand in relation to accident and emergency patients. Those eight beds have been opened to respond to that demand, and, of course, that is a very sensible management practice on the part of the hospital, and is indeed exactly the practice which I believe should be implemented to respond to the peaks and troughs of demand which obviously will occur on an unpredictable basis in the health care system. The hospital is responsible for its own budget—

*Dr Armitage interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** They are able to allocate those funds in whatever way they see as best meeting the needs of the patient.

*Dr Armitage interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** Tomorrow morning I have arranged a meeting between Flinders medical staff, Noarlunga Hospital staff and South Australian Health Commission officers to discuss possible use of facilities at Noarlunga Hospital and a shared workload between Flinders and Noarlunga Hospitals because of the available capacity in Noarlunga. I believe it is very important that, if the capacity is available in the health system, particularly in a hospital as close to Flinders as Noarlunga is, any spare capacity should be used where it is appropriate in the judgment of the medical practitioners concerned. That meeting will take place tomorrow and I hope it will result in some additional resources becoming available. I thank the House for its indulgence.

#### TARIFF REDUCTIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Holloway:

That this House calls for a moratorium on tariff reductions, particularly for the motor vehicle and textile, clothing and footwear industries, until the national economy has recovered and it can be demonstrated that those industries are in a position to withstand any such reductions.

(Continued from 26 August. Page 400)

**Mr INGERSON:** What a hypocritical motion this is. Here we have a Government member, the member for

Mitchell, putting forward this motion when those two industries, the automotive component and textile clothing industries, have been destroyed by the Keating Government. Which Government has a tariff policy to reduce the tariff level in this country at a steady 2.5 per cent in relation to the automotive industry for the next eight years to the year 2000? Which Government has a policy to almost entirely decimate the textile and clothing industry today—not looking at some future potential policy?

This motion is anti the existing Keating Government, which Government members support and which former Premier Bannon supported at length at EPAC. Every member of the Labor Party that I have heard has argued that Keating has been one of the saviours of the economy of this country. This motion is an absolute nonsense when one sees that it has come from a member who has been so supportive of the economic theories and policies of the Keating Government. What a mob of hypocrites.

Let us look at what has happened under the Keating tariff regime. In this State, under that regime, we have had a loss of 38 000 jobs, and a loss of 21 000 jobs in the past two years in the manufacturing industry. Under whose policy? Under what policy? A policy of reduction in tariffs. But what other things were promised that have not happened? Where is the micro-economic reform promised by Keating Government? Where is the labour market reform that has occurred under this magic Keating Government package?

Where do we have enterprise bargaining? We do not have it in this State because we have to have the union movement involved. No private operation in this State can enter into an enterprise bargaining agreement unless a union is involved. Hundreds of small businesses have no union involvement and they cannot enter into enterprise bargains so that they can compete with a reducing tariff regime established by the Keating Government.

It is quite staggering that we are considering a motion such as this when the Keating Government wants to rip the guts out of industry by having a reduction in tariff policy and is not prepared to do any of the other essential things to ensure that such a policy makes any sense. Government members should look at the taxes and charges imposed on business in this State as well as this reduction in tariff policy.

Only last week we had a massive increase in the petrol tax in this State to the extent that we now have the highest single petrol tax charge in the country. What industries does that effect? It affects transportation in the motor vehicle industry and in the textile and clothing industry. All of the goods and services tied up with these two industries that this motion is attempting to protect are being pulled down by the taxes and charges of the State Government as well as the taxes and charges imposed by the Keating Government.

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

Mr INGERSON: As usual the member for Napier wants to take us off with his histrionics. He never wants to deal with today's issue. Today's issue is that the Keating Government and the Arnold/Bannon Labor Government are in power. This motion is totally contrary to the existing policy of the Federal Keating Government. Yet, ever since I have been in this place I have heard about the great economic policies of that Government and

the fact that it would be the great saviour of this country. Every now and then someone says it is a recession that we had to have. Of course, that idea was put out by that famous Prime Minister of ours. Every now and again someone says we are out of recession. Of course, the Prime Minister has to be reminded that his policies are the major reasons why these two industries—the motor vehicle industry and textile and clothing industry—are in trouble today. If we sat down and analysed all of the costs that the Keating and Bannon Governments have imposed on industry, the tariff issue pales into insignificance.

When one looks at taxes and charges in this State relating to industry, one sees that as a State we have the highest FID and BAD taxes in this nation. Yet we have this sort of nonsense motion put forward today. If this motion had said that industrial relations and enterprise bargaining were to be part of the proposal, and if it were to lead to a significant reduction in taxes and charges, to the removal of the petrol tax, which the Fightback package will do, and to communication and transportation improvements, the microeconomic reform which has been promised by the Keating Government might work. However, that cannot be achieved because the Government's union mates will not let them do this in South Australia.

As we have seen in the draft Industrial Relations Bill which has just been floated, unless the union movement is given that special privilege again, no enterprise bargaining agreements can be entered into in this State. The famous issue on which this Government is so entrenched is WorkCover. It represents the biggest single cost for businesses that are related to the textile and clothing and the motor vehicle industries.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr INGERSON: You do not like it over there when all these issues are brought up. You do not like hearing that the tariff issue is not the only issue and that all of these other issues are really what it is about—enterprise bargaining, reductions in taxes, charges and transport costs and the removal of payroll tax. What has this Government done about removing payroll tax and the petrol tax? The motion would be more sensible if it said that we should introduce the Fightback package tomorrow, because the Fightback package will remove the petrol tax, introduce and support enterprise bargaining and enable businesses to trade and be much freer in their negotiations between employers and employees.

We had an announcement today by the Clark footwear company which blamed the existing tariff regime for the loss of 108 jobs. The member for Napier may smile, but his support for the Keating Government has caused those 108 jobs to go today. Let us talk about today and not look into the magic future; let us talk about today and the issues that the Keating Government has created for this State and nation.

This motion is totally opposed to what all Government members believe. They support the Keating package which will remove 2.5 per cent every year in the motor vehicle industry and will bring the tariff regime in the textile and clothing industry down to 5 per cent. That regime will destroy industry in this State, and members opposite have been supporting it all along. This motion is a sham and should not be supported.



**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I have not heard for a long time such a selfish, uncaring response to such an important issue facing not only South Australia but the whole of Australia. Sadly, it is typical of the response that we would expect from the wealthy class in our society. It is typical of the response and attitudes that we get from that small elitist section which has been feather bedded from the cradle and will in all probability be feather bedded to the grave.

This motion is about the loss of jobs. I do not care, and I am sure that the honourable member who moved the motion does not care, whether this House apportions some blame to the Keating Government and some to the attitude of the industry in not being able to restructure or to meet the necessary requirements of micro-economic reform. We do not care about that. We care about families. This motion is about giving kids a chance, about giving them a brighter future. I do not care about the attitude of the Deputy Leader, who perhaps does not understand the problems of people who are faced with the prospect of losing their jobs.

When faced with that situation, they do not sit down and analyse, 'Is it the fault of the Government? Is it the fault of the employer? Is it my own fault? Is it the fault of consumers who continue to buy imported products rather than Australian produced goods?' They do not care about that. It seems that the member for Bragg is blinkered; it must be hard to get a silver spoon out of your mouth. Unfortunately, he has been so blinkered all the way through his life that he does not care about those people. However, we on this side of the Chamber care about people and we like to think that some members on the other side of the Chamber care equally about people.

This motion, which will not shatter the confidence of the Keating Government and which will not get the Keating Government to reconsider its tariff policies, is a message from the Parliament of South Australia that we worry about people. This Parliament, not the Labor Party, not the Liberal Party and not the National Party, worries about people. Through this private member's motion, we as members of Parliament are saying that we care about people's jobs and their future, which will be affected if there is no moratorium on tariff policy. If the member for Bragg wants to get his jollies by saying that he will not support the motion because it is the Prime Minister's fault, so be it. However, I like to think that some members on the other side, such as the member for Flinders and even the member for Victoria, care about people. The member for Victoria is a bit of a gung ho character but behind the rough exterior that he puts up for public consumption there is a person who cares about jobs. I might be totally wrong and I might be proved to be so.

Let us put the motion moved by the member for Mitchell in perspective. It does not talk about Labor Party policy or about Liberal Party policy: it keeps well away from that. In fact, the member for Mitchell's motion picks up a minority view, I gather, from within the Labor Federal Caucus that there should be a moratorium. The call by Federal members for a moratorium stems from those States that will be most affected by a reduction in tariff protection. The issue that we are debating tonight is also being debated in the Federal Caucus, and an effort is being made to impose some form of moratorium. Any

support that this Parliament can give should be given freely, not taken to a degree of point scoring against each other. That is not what we are on about. I thought that was what private members' motions were all about, that for the benefit of the people of South Australia we try to put forward a case to our Federal masters saying, 'Hang on, you are wrong' or 'You are taking your tariff policy too far.'

The member for Custance could stand up and equally support everything that I have said about jobs, because if there are no jobs in the city, the people in the country suffer just as badly and, *vice versa*, when the people in the country are suffering through some of those vicious subsidy wars that are taking place in the United States and Europe, equally, the country peoples' city cousins suffer. So, we are just not talking about some workers at Mitsubishi or GMH or those people who work in the footwear industry; we are talking about the whole community of South Australia, so it is for that reason that I chose to come into this debate. I think the Deputy Leader has done himself a great disservice by attacking this motion and trying to apportion blame back onto the Keating Government. I do not care a damn if it is the Keating Government's fault; all I am suggesting to this Parliament is that we support this very fine motion to send a strong message to the Federal Government and say, 'Hang on; you are going down this track too fast. Give us some breathing space until the economy recovers.' I think that is very little to ask, and it deserves the full support of this Parliament.

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** I had to listen very carefully to the contribution made by the member for Napier.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** It's the first time you ever have.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Well, I did not believe I could sit here and listen to someone who has got it so wrong. I can quote *ad nauseam* (and I am only allowed half an hour, so I will have to hurry through it): if we look at the facts about tariffs or the car industry in general, we will see that, in the three years from 1989 to May 1992, the car industry has gone down from employing 80 817 people in Australia to 66 023, so it has dropped some 16 000 or 17 000 people in that time—a drop of some 18 per cent. The tariff regime has been dropping steadily. As the member for Napier said, it is a bipartisan event and both Parties are saying they will bring down protections and tariffs in an orderly fashion. Both Parties are espousing the tariffs coming down at about the same rate, so those companies can adjust as they go along, but there has been a massive disruption to the car industry, as there has been in all other industries around Australia because of the economic policies of the Keating Government and the economically disastrous mismanagement of the Bannon Government and now the Arnold Government, which will probably be one of the shortest Governments in the history of South Australia, but that is an argument for another time.

To be so naive as to say that it is the tariffs we have to stop just shows how far out of touch they are, and I would like to know how long it is since the member for Napier sat down with his blue collar working mates as I go and sit down with them and and talk about their future

and where they are going, and tariffs never come up. It is the economic policies and the mismanagement of the Keating Government and the Arnold Government that they want to talk about. They want to talk about things like payroll tax, which is a terrible impediment to business, a far greater impediment to business than tariffs ever were. That burden around the neck of industry is something about which the blue collar workers whom I talk to say, 'Can't you help get rid of payroll tax?' I say, 'I will do my very best, but it is the Arnold Government that is there,' and then I go around to the petrol pumps in Adelaide and I talk to the blue collar workers there as they are filling up their cars.

They say, 'Can't you do something about the excise on fuel? It's killing us. Wouldn't it be lovely,' they say, 'if we could get rid of 20c a litre off our fuel in South Australia or Australia; that would save our jobs, and that would help when we took our wives and our children (who are unemployed) on holidays and took them for a little weekend entertainment down at the coast because there is nothing else to do and things are pretty gloomy at home.' They say, 'They are the sorts of things that would really help us.' It is those sorts of things that are affected. I talk to them again and they talk about the wholesale sales tax and ask, 'What is this GST? I hear it is 15 per cent.' I say, 'What do you feed your dog?' They say, 'I feed the dog pet food.' I say, 'The wholesale sales tax on pet food is 20 per cent.' They say, 'It couldn't be.' I say, 'But it is.' They say, 'What will you do to help?' I say, 'Listen to Dr Hewson and have a look at the Fightback package because that is a package—'

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I rise on a point of order. Dr Hewson's goods and services tax has nothing to do with this motion.

**The SPEAKER:** There has been fairly broad ranging debate on this motion and to build the case I think the Chair will allow some leeway. However, I would ask the member for Victoria to draw his remarks back to the motion before the Chair.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Mr Speaker, I thank you very much for your protection and support, and I bring you back to the motion because it talks about the national economy and how it can recover. The member for Napier said that we have to get rid of tariffs to get the national economy turned around; that we have to have a moratorium and stop tariff reduction. I point out that the tariff issue is infinitesimal in the national economy. Let us get back to the things that really do affect employment and the 86 000 South Australians who are out of work, or the 43 per cent of our youth who are out of work. I know the member for Napier and you, Mr Speaker, will sympathise with me because I have a daughter who is unemployed. I am cut to the quick. That is why I still remain in this House, because she cannot find a job. She is one of those 43 per cent who does not have a job.

When I talk to my fellow blue collar workers and sit on the wharves with them down at Port Adelaide—in fact I had a lengthy discussion with some of my friends down there after the grand final—every one of them to a person says, 'Can't we do something to get this economy kick-started?' Why do we put up with this socialism that we used to believe in for 10 years Federally and in the State, and all we are doing is losing jobs?' This motion is just a cover-up because tariffs are not the problem. The

business taxes and the impost on business are forcing businesses to the wall and forcing them to cut their labour and the employment of people around South Australia. That is why we have to make sure that everyone in a bipartisan way gets right behind Dr Hewson's Fightback package which will turn around the national economy and get things going. That will get people employed again.

I have to explain to the member for Napier and the mover of the motion, who has had the good sense to sit and listen to this because backbenchers do learn in time, especially private members' time, that the fundamental of Fightback and the fundamental principle to get employment and business going again is to take all the taxes off business inputs and lift it on those so business can get going again, employ people, create goods and services and get this country working and producing again. Of course, once you do that everyone knows that you have to broaden the tax base, and you only tax those people who consume—and that is called a goods and services tax. So, you do not pay any tax unless you consume something.

**Mr Venning:** Or you can afford it.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Or you can afford it. If you cannot afford it you do not consume. We are the only OECD country in the world that does not have a form of consumption tax. Why have we been lagging so far behind? One of the reasons is that the Prime Minister, who was the then Australian Treasurer, supported it to the hilt and said, 'We must have a consumption tax.' I admired him for that, and on many occasions I praised Mr Keating as Treasurer. But, as soon as the going got tough, the unions said, 'We do not want it,' and what did the Government do? It went to water, much like this Government in South Australia. The former Premier is just walking into the Chamber, and I would never denigrate the man before he got to his seat. However, he went to water just as he did in respect of WorkCover. He did not have the guts to get up and change it for the benefit of all South Australians, and that is why we have the highest WorkCover costs in Australia: because no-one was managing the show.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** It would help the economy if we could reduce WorkCover costs, because it is another business impost and cost. That is why the principle of Fightback is so magnificent, and I am sure that the two members opposite who are paying rapt attention would understand that, if we do lift these business input costs, we will get people employed and that is how we will help get my daughter a job. That is why, in South Australia, until that attitude changes and people are prepared to stand up and fight for what is good for Australia and South Australia, unemployment will stay at the level it is at and my daughter will not get a job.

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

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I have been disappointed by the attitude of the Opposition in respect of this debate. The two Opposition members who have spoken thus far have turned the debate into a Party-political dog fight. We were trying—

*Members interjecting:*

Mr FERGUSON: I do not think that they have understood the motion before the House, because it is quite different from the motion that we debated previously on tariffs. We are asking the Opposition to join with us in a bipartisan way in order to save manufacturing industry in South Australia. The captains of industry, the people who support the Liberal Party, the people who provide the Liberal Party with its ammunition come election time, are the very ones who are calling for a slow down in tariffs. They are putting an argument to us—

Mr Ingerson: They're also saying that Fightback—

Mr FERGUSON: No, they are not. If the honourable member who has just interjected considers that he is speaking for the whole of manufacturing industry in South Australia when they say that they want to introduce Fightback, then he is sadly mistaken. The captains of industry, the people who normally support the Liberal Party, those people who are left from the 'stop the job rot' fight in 1979, are the same people who are saying to us that tariff cutbacks should be slowed down because they cannot increase their efficiency as quickly as tariffs are being cut.

As I understand it, in essence the major Federal Parties agree about tariffs. The difference in their attitude is the timing as to when the tariffs are to be reduced, and that is the whole essence of the debate. In this motion we are asking that all Parties agree to go to the Federal Government and say, 'We want you to slow down on tariffs.' We are saying, 'We do not want you to stop or to change your policy or eventually to get all parties to agree that tariffs should be eliminated in due course. However, the rate of change should be slowed in order to give manufacturing industry in this State the opportunity to survive.'

I can assure the Deputy Leader, who continually tries to interrupt me, that not everybody on his side of politics agrees with the Fightback proposals to reduce to 5 per cent or zero tariffs, as the case may be. There are many people, and I include the member for Hanson in this category (because he has already told South Australia over the ABC that he thinks the Liberal Party is going the wrong way too quickly regarding tariffs) as well Federal Liberal members, including Mr Steele Hall, who believe that the policies that are being pursued by the coalition in respect of tariffs are going too far too fast.

Mr Steele Hall, who was a former Premier of this State and a former Leader of the Liberal Party, believes that there ought to be a rethink of tariffs by the Commonwealth Government. Not only do all industrialists not believe in the Fightback package but also even Opposition members do not believe in parts of it. They have been prepared to come out publicly and say so. So, this proposition is a plea for unity and a plea for an approach to the Federal Government to slow down the rate of change. I believe the leaders of industry when they say that the coalition's plans on tariffs will send them to the wall. Mr Bill Hemmell, in the *Business Review Weekly* of 22 August 1992, had the following to say about this proposition:

The Federal reductions in automotive tariffs will become an eight year demolition of local industry if the reform of the national economy does not keep pace with the tariff cuts, according to a car industry leader. The industry has been too heavily protected in the past—

and I might interpolate and say that everybody agrees with that—

but the withdrawal of assistance was running a long way ahead of the micro-economic reform which was needed to eliminate the need for it.

The argument has been put to us by members of the Opposition that micro-economic reform has not been going along as quickly as it should. But, whether or not it has, a leader in the motor manufacturing industry has put out a cry for help to say that, unless something is done about the tariff situation by the coalition, the motor car industry in Australia will not survive. These pronouncements are being made by people who do not normally support the Labor Party. They are being made by captains of industry who normally support, both morally and financially, the coalition and the Liberal Party in South Australia.

Mr D.S. Baker: How do you know that?

Mr FERGUSON: Because one only has to realise the huge donations that flow to the Liberal Party from the captains of industry. I do not have time in this debate, but I can produce the evidence, and I am prepared to name the people who are providing donations to the Liberal Party if the member for Light wishes. I have obtained that evidence through the library in Canberra. I have only two minutes of this speech to go, but in a later debate I will prove that what I am saying is true. The captains of industry who normally support the Liberal Party are the ones who tell us that they will not be able to survive in industry if the Coalition policy on tariffs goes ahead.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: That is not what I am saying; it is what Mr Bill Hemmell, a leader in the automotive industry, is saying. I believe there are one or two enlightened people on the other side, and even the Leader of the Liberal Party has been prepared to say outside this Chamber, but he has not had the courage to come in and support the proposition—

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The member for Henley Beach has done better in the past, but that was before he took a coaching lesson from the member for Ross Smith, who came in just before the honourable got to his feet to tell him how to do the job. I suggest to the member for Henley Beach that he take no further advice from someone who has a bank named after him—the Bannon Bank or the Bad Bank. The honourable member obviously took advice from the member for Ross Smith who led him into a trap. The comments of the member for Henley Beach were quite hypocritical. The motion before the House calls for a moratorium on tariff reductions, particularly for the motor vehicle, textile, clothing and footwear industries, until the national economy has recovered and it can be demonstrated that those industries are in a position to withstand any such reductions. What a grab bag.

The honourable member would do better in the American legislature where they stop the clock. They have a D-day when the budget for the nation must be concluded. If they cannot agree on what the budget should be at one second to midnight on the last day on which they can debate the issue, they stop the clock. In

the State of California, in the past few weeks they had 39½ days with a stopped clock while they sorted themselves out. That is what the member for Mitchell, the member for Henley Beach and any member who supports this issue want. They want to put it into the background. They do not want to know about it. What does their own Prime Minister say? This is not a Liberal person speaking on this issue but the Prime Minister of Australia—albeit for a short time only. The Prime Minister was in Adelaide last week, and an article in the *Advertiser* of 13 October headed 'Tariff cuts will go ahead—PM' states:

The Prime Minister Mr Keating will push ahead with plans to slash car tariffs—

granted, he is talking of 15 per cent, and we will not discuss that further—

despite a South Australian manufacturer's protests that his Government has not delivered on micro-economic reform.

In the Federal Parliament today the Prime Minister claimed that he has delivered on micro-economic reform, that he is doing it all the time and that things are better today than they were yesterday, last week or the week before. What hypocritical claptrap! Each and every person knows that the position is deteriorating, that it is not improving. What else did the news tell us this evening? It told us that a further 100 people in South Australia have lost their job because of the recession we had to have.

And, of course, the author of that statement was Paul Keating. He then turned round and said in the past 10 days, 'We are out of the recession: we have been out of it for a long time.' Quite obviously, people do not accept that. Members opposite want to stop the clock. They do not want people to have a mind of their own or to recognise the importance of getting on with life and putting Australia into a position from where it can compete on the open market. What else did the Prime Minister have to say when he was here? He was reported under the heading 'Jobless part of productivity binge' as saying that Australia's high unemployment was the result of a massive increase in the number of women looking for work.

Suddenly, the Prime Minister does not want women to work, yet he is out there wooing them on bended knee, saying, 'Yes, I'll look after you, as I will look after your family'. In the same way, the previous Prime Minister said, 'No child will live in poverty by the year 1990', and what a farce that was! What a farce this motion is. What a farce the Prime Minister is in relation to so many of his utterances, when he says, 'Stand still: don't do anything. Let's catch up with ourselves'.

Whilst members of the Labor Party adopt the attitude of standing still, more and more people are hurting out there. More and more children are going without food with which to go to school. More and more people are lining up in the Education Department looking for assistance to pay for books. More and more people out there are looking for assistance to keep a roof over their head. What is the Labor Party doing? It is increasing the costs.

Whether it be through the Housing Trust, through rates and taxes or through petrol tax (which is another debate we have had recently), at every turn the public of South Australia is adversely affected by the Federal or State

Labor Governments. At a luncheon in Adelaide on 3 October Mr Keating said that efforts to make industry more competitive would eventually cause unemployment to fall. Here is another stop the clock merchant. He did not have the courage to spell out how quickly people were going to be employed. What has happened to the large sums of money he has passed on to local government? Many local governing bodies, in the belief that they had money to spend on the well-being of the people they represent, are still waiting to be told that they can start using the money. They are still waiting to be told whether there will be employment for the people who were promised it.

Where is the work associated with the Better Cities program? There has been much talk about this, but where is the action? Where is the first sod being turned in relation to Better Cities in South Australia? The member for Napier is silent at present: it is unusual for him to be silent, I give him that, but he is aware that a large sum of money has been suggested for the Better Cities program at Elizabeth—but where is the evidence? Members opposite are long on words but short on action. I take the point once again that the motion the member for Mitchell has put to this House is nonsense.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** I thought it was quite good. It sounded all right to me.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** That would be understandable. I give the member for Mitchell more credit than to think that he would have gone to the member for Napier to write the motion. That is why there is at least a real grab bag rather than just one pitiful little point. Let me get back to the subject rather than dwell on the honourable member and his hobby horse—unleaded petrol and agricultural equipment in a miserable attempt to create what the member for Mitchell believed would be some concern to members of this place, he has moved a motion that has no purpose and no sense. I would invite all members—

*Mr Holloway interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Stopping the clock will get the honourable member nowhere, as I have already pointed out. I am pleased, Mr Speaker, that the member for Mitchell is trying to get a second bite at the cherry to clean up the mess he has put before the House. I will be voting against this measure, and I invite every other member of the House to vote against it at the same time.

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** I had not intended to enter this debate, but I feel compelled to after some of the comments made by the member for Light. I have to say that I am extremely surprised at these comments by the member for Light, because I would have expected better of him. I must refute some of his comments. One of the things he said was that the State and the nation was standing still under the Labor Government. I have to say that, under a Federal Liberal Government, if it came to office, the State would go backwards, because basically what members opposite are saying is, 'Let's not allow the car companies to operate, because we do not want a \$600 million investment in South Australia.' I am here to tell the member for Light that I want that \$600 million investment in South Australia, and the car companies are saying that that will be put at risk if a Liberal Coalition Government gets into power. I would

like to quote from an *Advertiser* article dated 1 October which stated:

The Opposition industry spokesman, Mr Ian McLachlan, said yesterday Australian car makers would not be worse off under the Coalition negligible tariff protection.

Mr Ian McLachlan is a farmer.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** And a millionaire. A multi-millionaire.

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** The honourable member qualifies his remark by saying 'multi-millionaire'. One of the problems is that he is not an industrial person in the sense of manufacturing industry, and he is presuming to tell the car manufacturers how to operate their businesses. I find that rather suspect of a gentleman (and I use the term loosely) like Mr McLachlan.

**The SPEAKER:** There is far too much background noise in the Chamber.

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** Another article in the *Advertiser* headed 'Collette's plea to Hewson' refers to a young, 16 year old girl, Collette Touloundjian, who wrote to the Leader of the Federal Coalition and explained exactly what his policies would do to the car industry in South Australia. I will cite part of that letter. In the article she said:

I don't want him [her father] to lose his job. . . he supports a family. If he goes out of work, he may not find another job because he is 45. The tariff policy is bad for everyone.

I am sure that the member for Light would say that we have to ensure that we are competitive and productive, and I agree with him. One of things that the car industry in this State has been doing is to become much more productive and much more competitive on national markets. I am not sure whether the honourable member attended the recent launch of the Mitsubishi Verada, the model for export. It looks like being a very good seller on international markets. Does the honourable member want to say that we do not want that in South Australia; we do not want that \$600 million investment; we do not want another make of car in eight years? Is he going to say that? He then has the audacity to tell this House that under the Labor Government the State and the nation have been standing still.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** The member for Kavel interjects and says we are going backwards. I can assure him that we would go backwards at a much faster rate under a Federal Coalition Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** We have the hyenas braying on the other side. I can tell members opposite that we will definitely go backwards under a Federal Coalition. I think that the member for Kavel will get his opportunity shortly. I am sure we will all listen to his contribution with bated breath, but perhaps that is for a later date. I would also like to add that within the Coalition ranks there is a great amount of dissension between the members as to this zero tariff policy. I am sure other members from this side have highlighted that fact, but perhaps it is well worth mentioning again. The member for Kavel likes to think he is the State's answer to the problems of small business, and I can assure the State he is not. An article in the *Advertiser* of 11 September 1992 under the heading 'Coalition MPs slam tariff cuts' states:

The Opposition's controversial tariff policy came under further pressure last night after two senior coalition MPs, including South Australian Liberal, Mr Steele Hall, publicly criticised it.

I would have thought that members opposite would be supporting their colleague; I am very surprised they are not. Mr Steele Hall was a very well-known Liberal in this State, and it is interesting that members opposite do not like what he is saying. Not only are members of the Liberal Party not approving the policy but the Australian Democrats have also announced that they would use their numbers in the Senate to block Opposition plans for uniform reductions in tariffs to negligible levels by the year 2000. So, all around us we have people saying, 'Do not do this.' But the Federal Coalition is saying, 'We are not listening to anyone.'

We also have the contribution of the Federal Opposition leader, Mr Hewson. Interestingly enough, the definition of 'hew' is to chop, to cut and quite a number of other verbs. That is an indication of what would happen under that particular Liberal Coalition. Yet, we have Mr Hewson saying, 'There is no way in the world I will change this policy. I do not care what it does to South Australia, Victoria or the nation as a whole. I know I am right, and I am not prepared to listen to anything that the car companies say, because they do not know what they are talking about. Mr McLachlan and I are the only ones who know what we are talking about.' Unfortunately, I prefer to listen to the car companies. I believe they know their business much better than does Mr McLachlan.

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

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** As my colleague the member for Napier interjects, the churches also know their business much better. That policy is being advocated by not only the Federal Coalition but by Opposition members who say that this is what we should be implementing. They do not care what happens to the State of South Australia. We can pedal backwards much faster, we do not worry about that; we will still support it—

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** The member for Kavel asks whether I admit that we are going backwards. I do not admit that we are going backwards. He interjected earlier that we were going backwards, but under a Federal coalition we would certainly go back much faster than is being indicated by the member for Light. I know that the member for Kavel is anxiously watching the clock, but I am afraid that he will not get much time.

**Mr OLSEN (Kavel):** The motion is about the national economy and the South Australian economy. By any measure what we have in South Australia and nationally is a deteriorating economy where small businesses are going broke and unemployment is escalating as a result of the Keating Labor Government's policies. The Fightback package has the abolition of seven taxes, one of which has already been abolished as a result of the Labor Government's picking up an initiative from the Fightback package. In addition, 95 per cent of Australians will be paying less personal income tax than they do now. Some 95 per cent of Australians will be paying a taxation rate of less than 30c in the dollar, and that means more take-home pay for these people, more in their pockets—

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I know that the member for Kavel has been on his feet for only one minute, but all we have heard so far is Dr Hewson's Fightback package, which is nothing to do with the motion.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest that the member for Napier should resume his seat. We have not even had a minute yet. All members are given leeway to build an argument. Anybody who takes a point of order in under a minute is really stretching things.

Debate adjourned.

*At 8.45 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

### COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION (UNIFORM PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer):** 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 1984 the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General adopted a uniform commercial arbitration Bill which has now, with minor variations, been enacted in all jurisdictions. The operation of the uniform legislation was subsequently examined by a working party established by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. This working party was primarily concerned with achieving nationally uniform arbitration laws as well as looking at some matters of substance, including the consideration of arbitral proceedings, the limitation of the right to legal representation and the holding of compulsory conferences.

The desirability of having uniform commercial arbitration laws is indisputable. Practitioners, especially those working in corporate environments are increasingly required to have a knowledge of the law of several jurisdictions. A uniform law facilitates the task of such practitioners and, in addition business interests benefit from operating in a legal environment which is not confused by a multiplicity of divergent rules regulating the same subject matter.

The substance of this Bill has also been approved by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General and corresponding legislation has so far been enacted in New South Wales, Queensland, the ACT and the Northern Territory.

Several of the amendments are purely for the sake of uniformity, for example, the amendments to sections 6, 17, 18, 19, 21, 32 and 54.

New section 4 (2) makes it clear that a reference to an 'arbitrator' in the Act extends to all arbitrators in a particular case if there is more than one. This is included for uniformity purposes as the Acts Interpretation Act probably makes the amendment unnecessary.

Section 20 of the South Australian Act has been taken as a model for the uniform legislation and while a new section 20 is to be inserted in the Act the changes are mainly drafting changes. Changes of substance are, first, to give an automatic right to legal representation where the amount in dispute exceeds \$20 000 or a prescribed amount. At present section 20 merely provides for an amount to be prescribed, and the prescribed amount is \$2 500. We can prescribe an amount of less than \$20 000. The working party chose \$20 000 as they considered a substantial amount was required to justify automatic legal representation and there was evidence that in practice it was uncommon for legal representatives to appear in disputes involving sums of less than \$20 000.

Parties will be able to be represented by a representative who is not a legal practitioner if all parties agree. This adds a further

category to the instances where parties may be represented by other than a legal practitioner.

Secondly, new provisions are included to make it clear that legal practitioners who are not admitted to practice in South Australia may represent parties in an arbitration. These are included because of the practice in arbitrations for companies and firms to be represented by 'in house' counsel who have legal training but may not be admitted. The provision will also cater for the situation where an arbitration agreement stipulates that parties can be represented by counsel of their choice and the choice is a foreign practitioner.

Section 26, dealing with the consolidation of proceedings, is re-enacted. Previously only the parties, by agreement, or the court, by order, could consolidate proceedings. It is now proposed that arbitrators or umpires may themselves make orders for the consolidation of arbitration proceedings. Different procedures as are prescribed according to whether the proceedings have the same or different type arbitrators or umpires. Procedural directions are also provided and the role of the court becomes one of review. The grounds on which consolidation can be ordered remain substantially the same and the parties to two or more arbitration proceedings remain free to agree on the consolidation of these proceedings. This amendment is intended to encourage speedy determination of consolidation applications without, in most cases, any delay in the arbitral proceedings.

Section 27 will make it clear that the rules of natural justice apply where an arbitrator has attempted to settle a dispute before proceeding to arbitration. The preferable view is that such an obligation is implied but this amendment puts it beyond doubt. The parties are however, able to agree that the arbitrator is not bound by the rules of natural justice. This would enable arbitrators, for example, to meet with the parties separately or to express tentative views on the merits of the case.

Section 27 will also provide for parties 'to contract in' to alternative dispute resolution mechanisms rather than 'contract out' as presently provided. Where an arbitration agreement is silent on the matter, and the parties do not agree to alternative dispute resolution mechanisms there will be no power vested in the arbitrator to compel attendance at a conference.

New subsections (2) and (3) are inserted in section 31. These subsections appeared in the original New South Wales and Western Australian Acts and are now included in the South Australian Act for the purposes of uniformity. The subsections provide for an award of interest on a debt where the debt is paid before the arbitral award is made.

Costs: The amendments made to subsection 34 relating to costs bring the South Australian drafting into line with the drafting in the other State and Territory Acts and make one substantive change. Section 34 (6) is deleted as a consequence of the change to section 27 (1) and in its place a provision is inserted which requires an arbitrator, when exercising the discretion to award costs, to take into account both the fact that an offer of compromise has been made and the terms of that offer.

Section 38 of the Act establishes rules governing the judicial review of awards. One of the main objectives of the uniform legislation was to minimise judicial supervision and review. Decisions in New South Wales and Victoria tend towards the courts adopting an enlarged scope for judicial review of arbitral awards, contrary to the original intention of the legislation. Accordingly section 38 (5) is expanded to specify the circumstances in which a court may exercise its discretion under section 38 (4) to grant an application for leave to appeal.

Section 46 is amended to re-express the grounds on which the court must be satisfied before exercising its powers following delay by a party. The court must be satisfied that the delay is inordinant and inexcusable and will present a real risk to a fair trial or to the interests of other parties.

Section 55 is recast. The provisions are in the uniform legislation in other jurisdictions. The working party considered the provisions should be retained (and included in the South Australian legislation).

I commend this Bill to members.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 removes various definitions that are no longer to be included in the South Australian legislation. New subsection (2) makes it clear that a reference to 'an arbitrator' in the Act

extends to all arbitrators in a particular case if there is more than one. This makes explicit in the Act what is probably achieved by the Acts Interpretation Act 1915, which provides that the singular includes the plural.

Clause 4 makes a change merely for uniformity purposes. In particular, it provides that the arbitration agreement is to be taken to envisage the appointment of a single arbitrator unless the agreement otherwise provides or the parties agree.

Clause 5 re-enacts section 11 for uniformity purposes.

Clause 6 amends section 17 to make it more consistent with the uniform model (although some variation is necessary due to local differences in the form of summons or subpoena that may be obtained in a particular jurisdiction).

Clauses 7 and 8 make changes of wording merely for uniformity purposes.

Clause 9 relates to representation. The existing section 20 has been used as the model for the uniform legislation, although some drafting changes have been made. Furthermore, it is noted that the relevant amount for the purposes of the provision is to be set at \$20 000, although this can be altered by regulation. A legal practitioner from outside the State is brought within the provisions, and is protected from any potential breach of the Legal Practitioners Act 1982.

Clause 10 makes a change of wording merely for uniformity purposes.

Clause 11 relates to the consolidation of proceedings (section 26) and the settlement of disputes by means other than arbitration (section 27). Whereas previously only the parties by agreement or the court by order could consolidate proceedings, it is now proposed that arbitrators or umpires may themselves make orders for the consolidation of arbitration proceedings. Different procedures are prescribed, according to whether the proceedings have the same or different arbitrators or umpires. Procedural directions are provided and the role of the court becomes one of review. The grounds on which consolidation can be ordered remain substantially as in the existing provision and the parties to two or more arbitration proceedings remain free to agree on consolidation of these proceedings.

In relation to section 27, the existing section provides that, unless agreed by the parties in writing, an arbitrator or umpire may order the parties to take such steps as the arbitrator or umpire thinks fit to achieve a settlement of a dispute, including attendance at a conference conducted by the arbitrator or umpire, either without proceeding to or while continuing with arbitration.

The new section provides for greater control by the parties in that they may seek settlement by mediation, conciliation or similar means or may authorise an arbitrator or umpire to act as a mediator, conciliator or other non-arbitral intermediary, whether or not involving a conference and whether before or after proceeding to or continuing with arbitration. It is also proposed that an arbitrator or umpire be expressly bound by the rules of natural justice when proceeding under the section unless the parties otherwise agree.

Clause 12 includes provisions that originally appeared in the New South Wales and Western Australian Acts. The provisions provide for an award of interest on a debt where the debt is paid before the arbitral award is made.

Clause 13 makes a change of wording merely for uniformity purposes.

Clause 14 relates to costs. Some changes relate to uniformity. Paragraph (c) deletes a provision which requires an arbitrator or umpire, when exercising the discretion to award costs, to take into account a refusal or failure to attend a conference ordered by the arbitrator or umpire. As section 27 of the Act as proposed to be amended will no longer confer power on the arbitrator or umpire to order attendance at a conference, the existing provision is inappropriate. In its place, a provision is to be inserted which requires an arbitrator or umpire, when exercising the discretion to award costs, to take into account both the fact that an offer of compromise has been made and the terms of that offer.

Clause 15 adds to the provision dealing with judicial review of awards by providing that the court must not grant leave to a party to appeal on a question of law, unless the court is satisfied that—

(a) there has been a manifest error of law on the face of the award;

or

(b) there is strong evidence that the arbitrator or umpire made an error of law and the determination of the question will add to the certainty of commercial law, in addition to being satisfied (under the current provisions) that determination of the question could substantially affect the rights of a party.

Clause 16 removes provisions that do not apply in the other jurisdictions.

Clause 17 makes changes of wording merely for uniformity purposes.

Clause 18 re-expresses the grounds on which the court must be satisfied before exercising its powers following delay by a party: the court must be satisfied that the delay is inordinate and inexcusable and will present a real risk to a fair trial or to the interests of other parties.

Clauses 19, 20 and 21 amend the South Australian Act to make it consistent with the legislation in the other States.

Clause 22 sets out various uniform transitional provisions that are necessary for the operation of the measure.

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

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC ACTUARY) BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Benefit Associations Act 1958, the Construction Industry Long Service Leave Act 1987, the Judges' Pensions Act 1971, the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974, the Police Superannuation Act 1990, the Superannuation Act 1988 and the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: 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 main purpose of this Bill is to remove from various Acts references to the Public Actuary.

The position of Public Actuary is a statutory position arising pursuant to section 36 of the Friendly Societies Act.

However, the Public Actuary is also referred to in a number of other statutes with a wide range of duties, some of a strict actuarial nature, some regulatory and some involving board or committee roles.

It has always been difficult to attract and retain qualified actuaries in the Public Service. The South Australian Treasury had three qualified actuaries in January 1990, two of whom qualified in the service in the previous four years, but now has only one.

On the other hand there are now six actuaries based in Adelaide whose consultancy services are accessible to the Government.

In the circumstances the Government proposes to abolish the statutory position of Public Actuary and amend the affected statutes to free-up the Government's existing actuarial resources and provide greater flexibility and efficiency in their use.

This Bill deals with all the affected statutes except the Friendly Societies Act. The required amendments to that Act are substantial and the opportunity is also being taken to make additional amendments that are considered necessary or desirable. As a consequence a separate Bill has been prepared in relation to the Friendly Societies Act.

The Bills provide for most of the functions currently performed by the Public Actuary to be handled, in general, in one of three ways:

- actuarial tasks will be required to be undertaken by a qualified actuary;
- regulatory tasks will be carried out by persons nominated or given delegated authority by responsible Ministers;
- board or committee memberships will be taken up by persons nominated by the responsible Ministers.

Each of the affected statutes is dealt with individually in the following comments.

#### Amendment of Benefit Associations Act 1958

The current Act places various administrative duties of a regulatory nature with the person holding or acting in the office of Public Actuary.

The Bill places these duties with the Minister (of Finance) but allows the Minister to delegate any of them to a specified officer in the Public Service of the State.

Because the investigations referred to in sections 8 and 9 of the Act are of an actuarial nature, these sections have been further amended to require that a report of an investigation carried out by a qualified actuary must be considered before any provisional recommendations are made.

Section 6 of the Act currently refers to returns being provided in a prescribed form. This is no longer considered appropriate and the references to the prescribed form have therefore been deleted by the Bill.

Prior to 1 January 1990 regulations existed under the Act in relation to the form for annual returns, funds of benefit associations, certification of fund liabilities, fund balances, trustees and fund investments. These regulations were allowed to expire on January 1990 under the automatic revocation program. They were not retained because the prescribed forms were considered inappropriate and unnecessary, and the other regulations were deemed invalid by the Crown Solicitor as being beyond the regulation-making power conferred in the Act.

It is considered desirable that similar conditions to some previously covered by the regulations be now incorporated into the body of the Act; in particular, the requirement that contributions collected by an association should either be held in a fund under the control of an approved trustee or invested in some other approved manner, that any such trust funds be held only in authorised trustee investments, and that the trust funds be maintained at appropriate levels as certified annually by a qualified actuary.

#### Amendment of Construction Industry Long Service Leave Act 1987

This Act currently requires the funds established under the Act to be investigated triennially by the Public Actuary.

The moneys in the funds are contributed by Construction Industry and Electrical and Metal Trades employers and the board managing the funds consists of equal numbers of employer and employee representatives and a presiding officer nominated by the Minister (of Labour). The board is serviced by officers of the Department of Labour but these administration costs are met from the funds.

It is considered appropriate that the actuarial reviews of the funds should be under the control of the board and carried out by a qualified actuary appointed by the board.

The amendment provides for this change.

#### Amendment of Judges' Pensions Act 1971

This Act currently requires that the amount of the annual adjustment of pensions shall be certified by the Public Actuary.

The calculation involved is a simple one using the Consumer Price Index figures published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and an actuarial certification is therefore considered unnecessary.

It should be noted that similar calculations under the Superannuation Act and the Police Superannuation Act do not require actuarial certification.

The amendment does not change the form or amount of the pension adjustment; it merely removes the requirement for actuarial certification of the adjustment.

#### Amendment of Motor Vehicles Act 1959

The Third Party Premiums Committee established pursuant to section 129 of this Act currently consists of eight persons appointed by the Governor upon the recommendation of the Minister (of Transport).

One of the eight persons is the Public Actuary.

The amendment proposes that the Public Actuary be replaced on the committee by a person nominated by the Minister.

#### Amendment of Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974

Sections 17 and 24 of this Act require certain rates of salary, needed in the determination of pension entitlements to be determined by the Public Actuary. Such determinations are an administrative matter and do not require actuarial input.

Section 35 of the Act requires that the amount of the annual adjustment of pensions shall be certified by the Public Actuary.

The simple calculation is the same as that under the Judges' Pensions Act referred to earlier and does not require actual expertise.

The amendments do not change the determinations or calculations; they merely remove the need for unnecessary actuarial involvement.

#### Amendment of Police Superannuation Act 1990

The first part of this section of the amendment deletes the subsection of this Act that refers to the positions of Public Actuary and Deputy Public Actuary which are being abolished.

Subsection 15 (4) of the Act currently requires three-yearly reports from the Public Actuary on the state and sufficiency of the Police Superannuation Fund and the operation of the scheme.

These reporting requirements are not consistent with those of the Superannuation Act which were amended in 1990 to require more appropriate actuarial reports on the cost of the scheme to the Government and the ability of the fund to meet liabilities.

The amendment provides that the same actuarial reports will be required in respect of the Police Superannuation Scheme.

It also removes the requirement that such reports must be made by the Public Actuary and requires that the Minister (of Finance) must obtain a report from a qualified actuary appointed by the Minister.

Appointment of the actuary by the Minister rather than by the board is considered appropriate because the report is required by the Government for costing, funding and budgeting purposes.

The only restriction on the appointment is that the actuary shall not be a member of the board. This is consistent with the current provision that the reporting actuary (the Public Actuary) is precluded from being a member of the board.

#### Amendment of Superannuation Act 1988

The amendment deletes the references in sections 8 and 13 of this Act to the positions of Public Actuary and Deputy Public Actuary which are being abolished.

It removes the requirement that the three-yearly actuarial reports on the scheme and the fund must be made by the Public Actuary and requires that the Minister (of Finance) must obtain a report from a qualified actuary appointed by the Minister.

As with the Police Superannuation Act it is considered appropriate that the appointment of the actuary be by the Minister rather than by the board since the report is required by the Government for costing, funding and budgeting purposes.

The current Act requires certain calculations relating to retirement benefits to be determined by the Public Actuary.

The amendment places this responsibility with the board which would in practice seek appropriate advice as necessary in relation to the determinations. The amendment also requires notifications in relation to these matters to be made to the board.

#### Amendment of Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986

The first schedule of this Act currently requires the Public Actuary to estimate, at three-yearly intervals, the extent of the corporation's liabilities with respect to the Mining and Quarrying Industries Fund which is a special account within the corporation.

All other actuarial work required in connection with the corporation's activities is carried out by actuarial consultants appointed by the corporation.

It is considered appropriate that the actuarial estimates required in connection with the Mining and Quarrying Industries Fund should also be provided by the corporation's actuaries and the amendment provides for this change.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:



PART 1  
PRELIMINARY

- Clause 1 is formal.  
Clause 2 provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation.  
Clause 3 is formal.

PART 2  
AMENDMENT OF BENEFIT ASSOCIATIONS  
ACT 1959

- Clause 4 amends section 4 to insert a definition of 'actuary' and to strike out the definition of 'Public Actuary'.  
Clause 5 inserts a new section 5a. The section provides that contributions made to a benefit association must be held in a fund under the control of a trustee or otherwise as approved by the Minister. If placed in a fund under the control of a trustee, contributions must be invested in accordance with the provisions of the Trustee Act 1936 and the value of the fund must be maintained at a level at least equal to the liabilities of the fund certified annually by an actuary.  
Clause 6 amends section 6 to provide that the annual return of a society and other requested information is to be forwarded to the Minister. References to a prescribed form are deleted.  
Clause 7 amends section 7 so that all investigatory functions are carried out by the Minister rather than by the Public Actuary.  
Clause 8 amends section 8 to provide that the Minister after considering an actuarial report may make provisional recommendations to a benefit association where it proves to have a deficiency of assets. Previously such recommendations were made by the Public Actuary.  
Clause 9 similarly amends section 9 to provide that the Minister may make provisional recommendations to a benefit association where satisfied that it has a surplus of assets.  
Clause 10 amends section 10 consequential to the amendments to sections 8 and 9.  
Clause 11 amends section 11 consequential to the amendments to sections 8 and 9.  
Clause 12 amends section 12 to provide that the Minister may prepare a report on the financial position of a benefit association for circulation to its members if that association fails to comply with a provisional recommendation of the Minister. Previously such a report was prepared by the Public Actuary.  
Clause 13 amends section 14 to provide that the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, is to vet any material which solicits contributions to a benefit association.  
Clause 14 inserts new section 14a which provides that the Minister may delegate his powers to a person assigned to a specified position in the Public Service.

PART 3  
AMENDMENT OF CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY  
LONG SERVICE LEAVE ACT 1987

- Clause 15 amends section 4 to insert a definition of 'actuary'.  
Clause 16 amends section 24 to provide that the investigatory functions previously carried out by Public Actuary are to be carried out by an actuary appointed by the board.

PART 4  
AMENDMENT OF JUDGES' PENSIONS ACT 1971

- Clause 17 amends section 14a to provide that the adjustment percentage in relation to judges' pensions is to be determined by the Minister without actuarial involvement.

PART 5  
AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES ACT 1959

- Clause 18 amends section 129 (2) (b) to replace reference to the Public Actuary in relation to membership of the committee appointed to inquire into insurance premiums with reference to a person nominated by the Minister.

PART 6  
AMENDMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY  
SUPERANNUATION ACT 1974

- Clause 19 amends section 17 to allow the South Australian Parliamentary Superannuation Board to determine the rate of additional salary payable to a member in respect of a prescribed office no longer existent at the date of the member's retirement. Previously this function was undertaken by the Public Actuary.  
Clause 20 amends section 24 in a manner similar to the amendment made to section 17.  
Clause 21 amends section 35 to provide for the adjustment percentage in relation to parliamentary pensions to be determined by the Minister without actuarial involvement.

PART 7  
AMENDMENT OF POLICE SUPERANNUATION  
ACT 1990

- Clause 22 inserts a definition of 'actuary' into section 4.  
Clause 23 strikes out section 7 (2) removing a prohibition on the appointment of the Public Actuary or Deputy Public Actuary as a member of the Police Superannuation Board.  
Clause 24 revokes the current section 15 (4) and substitutes subsections (4) and (4a) which provide that the Minister must obtain for each triennium a report in relation to the current and future cost of the superannuation scheme to the Government and the ability of the fund to meet its current and future liabilities from an actuary, not being a member of the board, appointed by the Minister. Previously, a similar report was prepared by the Public Actuary.

PART 8  
AMENDMENT OF SUPERANNUATION ACT 1988

- Clause 25 inserts in section 4 a definition of 'actuary'.  
Clause 26 amends section 8 to delete reference to the Public Actuary and Deputy Public Actuary in relation to restrictions on membership of the Superannuation Board.  
Clause 27 strikes out section 13 (2) removing a prohibition on the appointment of the Public Actuary or Deputy Public Actuary as members of the Investment Trust.  
Clause 28 revokes current section 21 (4) and substitutes subsections (4) and (4a) which provide that the Minister must obtain for each triennium a report in relation to the current and future cost of the superannuation scheme to the Government and the ability of the fund to meet its current and future liabilities from an actuary, not being a member of the board, appointed by the Minister. Previously, a similar report was prepared by the Public Actuary.  
Clause 29 amends section 34 to provide for the determination by the board of the value of additional contributions required of a contributor. Previously, such a determination was made by the Public Actuary.  
Clause 30 amends clause 9 of schedule 1 to provide that the board, rather than a Public Actuary, is to calculate reductions to pensions.

PART 9  
AMENDMENT OF WORKERS REHABILITATION  
AND COMPENSATION ACT 1986

- Clause 31 inserts in section 3 a definition of 'actuary'.  
Clause 32 amends clause 4 of the first schedule to transfer responsibility for triennially determining the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation's existing and prospective liabilities in relation to the Mining and Quarrying Industries Fund from the Public Actuary to an actuary appointed by the corporation.

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

**FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (MISCELLANEOUS)  
AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Friendly Societies Act 1992. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: 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 main purpose of this Bill is to remove the statutory requirement for there to be a Public Actuary. The position of Public Actuary is a statutory position arising pursuant to section 36 of the Friendly Societies Act. However, the Public Actuary is also referred to in a number of other statutes with a wide range of duties, some of a strict actuarial nature, some regulatory and some involving board or committee roles. It has always been difficult to attract and retain qualified actuaries in the Public Service. The South Australian Treasury had three qualified actuaries in January 1990, two of whom qualified in the service in the previous four years, but now has only one. On the other hand there are now six actuaries based in Adelaide whose consultancy services are accessible to the Government. In the circumstances the Government proposes to abolish the statutory position of Public Actuary and amend the affected statutes to free-up the Government's existing actuarial resources and provide greater flexibility and efficiency in their use. The Bill removes from the Friendly Societies Act all references to the Public Actuary. A separate Bill deals with the other statutes that contain references to the Public Actuary.

The Bills provide for most of the functions currently performed by the Public Actuary to be handled, in general, in one of three ways:

- actuarial tasks will be required to be undertaken by a qualified actuary;
- regulatory tasks will be carried out by persons nominated by or given delegated authority by the responsible Ministers;
- board or committee memberships will be taken up by persons nominated by the responsible Ministers.

The opportunity is also being taken to make additional amendments to the Friendly Societies Act that are considered necessary or desirable. The current Act sets out allowable forms of investment for friendly societies and also provides that other investments can be made with ministerial consent in 'shares, debentures or other securities'. The use of the term 'securities' precludes some investments that otherwise may be considered appropriate. The Bill replaces this term with 'forms of investment' to allow more flexibility in this area, but still subject to ministerial consent to each such investment.

Section 27 (2a) of the current Act allows societies to provide in their general laws for specified proportions of contributions paid by members to be transferred to the societies' management funds to meet the administration costs associated with fund membership. Since friendly society bond funds were first established in 1982 societies' registered general laws have also provided for other transfers to management funds to meet the ongoing administration costs associated with the funds. Such transfers are desirable and in practice are made in the course of day-to-day business or as part of the end-of-year accounting process. Members are aware of such transfers.

The Bill introduces a new section to overcome a concern that these latter types of transfers are *ultra vires* under the current legislation. As the practice has been carried on since 1982 by all societies that offer friendly society bonds, under general laws that have been approved by members, certified by the Crown Solicitor and registered by the Public Actuary, this amendment has been made retrospective so as to not invalidate transfers made in good faith and in accordance with approved, certified by the Crown Solicitor and registered by the Public Actuary, this amendment has been made retrospective so as not to invalidate transfers made in good faith and in accordance with approved, certified and registered general laws.

A report late last year from an investment body raised concerns about what would happen to friendly society bond moneys in the event of a society running into financial difficulties. Most bond fund registered rules contain the following, or similar, clauses: 'The Fund shall be kept separate and distinct from all other Funds of the Society and the assets of the Fund shall be kept separate and distinct from all other assets'. It is therefore reasonable to assume that bond fund members would believe that these funds and assets are 'quarantined' from other funds and assets of a society and that they could only be used in a wind-up situation for the benefit of the bond fund members. The Bill introduces a new section to reinforce this position.

Over recent years friendly societies have tried to tailor their products to meet the specific needs of their members. Some societies have expressed interest in providing benefits tailored to educational needs of members and this seems a reasonable and appropriate activity in which societies could participate. However the current South Australian Act does not refer to educational needs as a lawful object. The Bill extends the lawful objects of societies to include the provision of educational benefits. The current Act requires financial statements to be drawn up on a cash basis. Although such cash statements are appropriate for annual returns that must be sent to the regulator, accounts prepared for presentation to members and for publication are more appropriately prepared on an accruals basis in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards. In practice, accounts are currently presented substantially on an accruals basis and the departure from the requirements of the Act are concurred with and commented on by the auditor. The Bill amends the Act to allow accounts to be drawn up in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards.

Finally, it is considered appropriate and reasonable that the friendly society movement should contribute towards the cost of services provided by the Government in respect of the regulation of friendly societies. Such services have in the past been provided at no cost to the societies. The Bill provides for fees to be charged to societies to allow the Government to recover the costs of services provided.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 inserts a definition of 'actuary' in section 3. Clause 4 amends section 6 to provide that a society must notify the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, of a change of registered office. Clause 5 inserts a new paragraph IVA into section 7 (1) which provides that a society may maintain a fund for the object of education of members, their spouses, their children or grandchildren of any degree. Paragraph (b) amends section 7 (8) to provide that the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, may authorise a society to maintain a single fund for more than one purpose.

Clause 6 amends section 9a (9) to provide that the consent of the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, is required by a society to carry out a loan to its small loan fund from another fund. Clause 7 amends section 10 (3) to provide that the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, is to register the rules of a society. Paragraphs (b) to (e) make consequential amendments to section 10. Paragraph (f) removes the requirement that the Minister must act on the recommendation of the Public Actuary in allowing the committee of management, rather than a meeting of the society, to make or alter rules of the society. Clause 8 repeals section 10a of the Act. The section performed a transitional function which is now exhausted.

Clause 9 amends section 12 of the Act. Paragraph (a) amends subsection (1) (g) by removing the requirement that the Minister act on the recommendation of the Public Actuary in allowing a society to place funds in certain investments. Paragraph (b) further amends subsection (1) (g), replacing the term 'securities' with 'forms of investment' thus liberalising the types of investment that a society may make subject to the consent of the Minister. Paragraph (c) amends paragraph III of the proviso to subsection (1) to provide that any actuary, rather than the Public Actuary, may fix the surrender value of a member's life assurance. Paragraph (d) provides that the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, is to approve investment by a society in a building society. Paragraph (e) makes an amendment consequential on this amendment.

Clause 10 amends section 13 to remove a reference to securities. This amendment is consequential to that made by Clause 9 (b).

Clause 11 amends section 18 to provide that the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, may exempt officers of a society from the requirement that they take out insurances in relation to their handling of money. Clause 12 amends section 22a to provide that the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, may authorise a society to defer payments to members. Clause 13 amends section 27 (2) to provide that any actuary, rather than the Public Actuary, may make recommendations and reports to the Minister in relation to transfers by a society from a fund which assures sickness or death benefits. Paragraph (c) inserts new subsections (2b) and (2c). New subsection (2b) allows the rules of a society to specify that a proportion of a fund be paid to a management fund to defray the expense of maintaining a fund. Subsection (2c) provides that subsection (2b) operates retrospectively. Paragraph (d) amends section 27 (3) to provide that the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, may direct the restoration of sickness or death benefit funds that have been transferred contrary to the provisions of the section.

Clause 14 amends section 27a (1) so that any actuary, rather than the Public Actuary, may report a surplus of funds. On the receipt of such a report, the Minister may, without the need for further actuarial recommendation, consent to the application of such a surplus for the purposes set out in paragraphs I to VI. Paragraph VI is amended so that purposes other than those specified in paragraphs I to V must be approved by the Minister, rather than by the Public Actuary. Paragraph (d) makes a consequential amendment to subsection (3). Clause 15 inserts a new subsection (3) in section 28. The purpose of the amendment is specify that accounts for presentation to members may be prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards.

Clause 16 amends section 28a to allow the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, to require the appointment by a society of a qualified auditor. Paragraph (b) amends subsection (2) by updating an obsolete reference to the Companies Act. Clause 17 amends section 29 of the Act specifying that annual returns are to be sent to the Minister rather than the Public Actuary. The Minister is given the power to require a society to provide information other than that referred to in paragraphs (a) to (d). Paragraph (b) inserts a new subsection (2) which provides for the prescription of a fee payable by a society on providing the Minister with an annual return.

Clause 18 amends section 30 to provide that any actuary, rather than the Public Actuary, may carry out a quinquennial valuation. Paragraph (b) amends subsection (2) to provide that a society must send membership lists direct to the Minister. Paragraph (c) amends subsection (3) consequential to the amendment to subsection (1). Paragraph (d) strikes out subsection (4) for the same reason. Clause 19 amends section 30a to provide that the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, is to assess a quinquennial valuation and proposals following from it. Clause 20 amends section 33 consequential on the amendment to section 30. Clause 21 amends section 35 consequential on the amendment to section 29.

Clause 22 amends section 35a by transferring the Public Actuary's powers in relation to control of misleading advertisements by societies and foreign friendly societies to the Minister. Clause 23 repeals section 36 which requires the appointment of the Public Actuary. Clause 24 amends section 37 by striking out subsection (1) which sets out the duties of the position of Public Actuary abolished in clause 23. Paragraph (b) amends subsection (2) consequential on amendments to section 30. Clause 25 amends section 38 to provide that the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary with the approval of the Governor, may publish model forms and prepare statistics for use by societies.

Clause 26 amends section 39 to provide that the Minister and persons authorised by the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, may inspect certain documents. Clause 27 repeals section 40 (2) which places a duty on the now abolished position of Public Actuary. Clause 28 amends section 45 to provide that certain resolutions of a society must be registered by the Minister rather than by the Public Actuary. Clause 29 makes amendments to section 45a to provide for the dissolution of societies by the Minister rather than by the Public Actuary. Paragraph (d) replaces subsection (6), replacing obsolete references to the Companies Code with references to Part 5.7 of the Corporations Law. That Part deals with the winding up of bodies other than

companies. Any necessary modifications to the scheme of Part 5.7 as it applies to societies may be made by regulation.

Clause 30 inserts a new section 45ab after section 45a. The section makes it clear that various funds held by societies are to be kept separate on the winding up of a society. Clause 31 amends section 45b consequential on the amendments to sections 45a and 45f. Clause 32 amends section 45f to allow the Minister, rather than the Public Actuary, to investigate and wind up a society. Clause 33 amends section 45g to provide that a person acting to set aside the dissolution of a society must notify the Minister rather than the Public Actuary. Clause 34 inserts section 56a to provide for delegation of the Minister's powers to a member of the public service. A delegation may be conditional and is revocable by the Minister at will.

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

### BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS) (FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 13 October. Page 814.)

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Members will note that this clause provides a definition of 'unleaded petrol'. I am not a technician and I do not understand fully what the difference is, but I will take the word of the Government. During the second reading debate, the member for Light raised a very important issue, which did not receive a response from the Minister. It concerned the relativities between leaded and unleaded petrol. Members should appreciate that, because there is a difference of 0.15c per litre in the EPA levies on unleaded and leaded petrol, that should be reflected in the bowser price. However, no-one of whom I am aware has recognised a difference at the bowser so that unleaded petrol is cheaper than leaded petrol. Has the Minister investigated this matter or has he had a chance to look into it so he can explain to the Committee what is happening?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have no reason to believe that the oil companies are not complying with the law or that they will not comply with it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is not an adequate answer to a very important question. The community is becoming more environmentally conscious. We are attempting to change our habits. Indeed, we have differentiated with low alcohol beer. Some beverages with a very low alcohol content are not subject to any State taxation. There is some sense in the taxation system to change people's ways. A difference of only 0.15c per litre is not of great moment, yet I am told that in New Zealand unleaded petrol is about 4c per litre cheaper than leaded petrol. I think it is appropriate that whatever small gains are made are passed on to motorists. Will the Minister look at that matter?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will be watching it very closely. The oil companies can do one or two things, I suppose. They can stick to the letter of the law and have the differential at the bowser. That would be appreciated by the Government; that is the whole idea of the EPA part of the levy being lower on unleaded petrol than on leaded petrol—to encourage the changeover. I know that that is only a small amount per litre, but for a

tankful a week for a month or a year it all adds up, and I am sure the astute motorist would consider changing over his or her vehicle to one that used unleaded petrol if they could see there was a cost advantage. That would help the environment and, as the member for Mitcham has said, it is something that everybody in the House would applaud.

Alternatively, I suppose that, being oil companies, they can charge more for unleaded petrol than for leaded petrol and it may well be that they will choose to absorb the additional larger amount of levy that is on leaded petrol. Therefore, at some cost to themselves but, in the overall scheme of things a small cost to themselves, they would have the same price, and that would be to the advantage of those buying unleaded petrol, but it would not be to the advantage of the environment. However, there is nothing we could do to force them not to charge the full amount for leaded petrol if they choose to do so. Then, there is not a great deal that the Government could or would want to do about it; it really is a decision for the oil companies to make.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I would not want it to become apparent that for cheap political point-scoring the Government was using the differential that was introduced when this Bill was laid down in this place on 27 August. A very clear indication was given by the Minister in the second reading speech that there was to be a distinct advantage for people who were conscious of an endeavour required in the environmental field. If the Government is to give more than lip service to this issue (and I would be interested to read precisely what the Minister said in answer to my colleague, the member for Mitcham tomorrow), I would suggest quite positively that the Parliament and certainly the community would expect the Government to make some endeavour to monitor this situation, not on a daily or weekly basis but to identify that the responsible move that the Government took, which was applauded by members on this side at the time, as it was by the community, is in fact returning some benefit to the community through their pockets, albeit that it is only very small. Because, if the effort is not made clearly to identify that the intent is in fact the practice, then any further statement made by the Government in this area—not specifically this matter but this general area—will be for nought. The Government would not be able to stand up and clearly identify that it had taken an action and expected a result as a consequence.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Light for his support for the principle that the Government is implementing, and also all other members opposite who have supported the principle of this differential. I would draw that to the attention of the oil companies. As I stated in my previous response to the member for Mitcham, it is not a question of people who use unleaded petrol being disadvantaged. There is no possibility of that; the law prevents it.

I am not quite sure what the Government would do if the oil companies chose to give a similar advantage to those who buy leaded petrol, unless we were to bring in, if that is legally possible—and I am not sure that it is, and I am also not suggesting we do it—some kind of price control on petrol. I am quite sure that members opposite are not advocating that, although some of

us—the member for Flinders, the member for Stuart, myself and a few others—might think that the oil companies have probably asked for it because of the way they treat rural motorists. Nevertheless that is not something that the Government is considering, certainly not at this stage, anyway.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Minister suggested that the oil companies might decide to absorb the additional cost and alluded to the fact that the cost of fuel at the bowser will be at the unleaded price rather than at the super price. I suggest it is—

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I understood that the Minister indicated that the leaded petrol might be sold at the unleaded price by virtue of the oil companies absorbing the additional sum. I suggest that the public, and I believe many members of Parliament, would be a bit sceptical of that being so. Therefore, it is just as important to make sure at some stage, or at certain stages within the next few months, that in actual fact the benefit is flowing, albeit against the interests of the oil companies. Otherwise any other attempt to obtain funds for a specific purpose such as this in the environmental field will be for nought in the future.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Fees.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Has the Minister discussed with local government whether the petrol tax will fund such items as stormwater drainage and septic tank effluent disposal to which the Government contributes at the moment?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I personally have not. I think a committee is actually discussing these issues with local government and has been doing so for some time. I am a little disappointed that a lot more progress has not been made. I am not sure of the details of those discussions, but I did supply a list to the LGA (which I understood was being provided to the Opposition) of some of the items on the table for discussion which might be handed over to local government with the funding that that particular program would attract. I hope that those discussions come to fruition very quickly.

The Government has done its bit in putting this legislation before the Parliament and hopefully through the Parliament, so the funds are there. It only requires the working out of what State Government functions will go to local government, with the funding to execute them. We are not asking local government to do anything additional, certainly not at this stage. We just want some straight swaps of the responsibilities and the funds will go with it. It is something for which the Government has been asking for many years, and properly so in my view.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I gather from the Minister's answer that no details have been arrived at at this stage. I know that the State Government contributes to a long list of items. On the list there is pensioner rate concessions of \$14.8 million that is paid by the State Government to assist pensioners and unemployed people who are required to pay rates. If people fulfil the criteria, the local councils concerned receive a subsidy, which of course has been eroded over time but which nevertheless provides some assistance. As to the declared price, I have received interesting information from interstate about that. The wholesaler in New South Wales pays \$10 a month

plus 15.96 per cent of declared value of motor spirit, with 26.44 per cent of diesel fuel sold for road purposes only. In Victoria we have \$50 a month plus 11 per cent of the value of motor spirit, with 11 per cent of diesel fuel sold for road purposes only. In Western Australia it is \$600 plus 5.87c per litre of motor spirit and 7.45c per litre of diesel fuel sold for road purposes only.

I will not go through each amount, but it is interesting that the declared price becomes critical in this process. Victoria has a higher declared price and New South Wales a lower declared price but with a higher percentage prevailing. What guarantee does the Parliament have that the declared price is not going to be shifted, because there is still the provision in the Act that the declared price, despite being indexed, can be changed by regulation? Secondly, how will the Fightback package and the 19c per litre coming off motor fuel affect the declared price? Members will recall clearly that Fightback has two components on fuel. One is the 19c per litre, which is the Federal excise, and the second item in the package is the approximately \$360 million which is to compensate States for any loss of revenue, because there would be a natural fall in the wholesale or declared price as it no longer has a Federal component in it. Can the Minister provide information about both those items?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The answer to the first question is that it would be by regulation, so that Parliament would have the opportunity to debate it in the normal manner. The second question is hypothetical. I do not believe that Australia would be so foolish as to vote for any Party that had such nonsense as Fightback in its platform, so I do not think it is a problem with which we will ever have to deal. I am still waiting—and the whole of Australia is still waiting—for the Federal Liberal Party's policy on road charges. We have heard nothing of that yet. All the articles I have read show that the price of petrol will not decline at all and, more importantly, the price of natural gas will increase considerably. I do not expect that we will ever have to deal with it.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Is the Minister saying that a decline in petrol price of 19c per litre would not assist production in Australia?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I do not believe we will see a decline of 19c a litre. Road charges have to come into it somewhere and the Federal Opposition has not managed to deal with that yet. Particularly, if one talks to the road transport industry, it continually asks what the Opposition is going to do about road charges, how they will be paid for, and it gets no answer.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 and title passed.

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

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

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (21)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins (Teller), G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, M.J. Evans, D.M. Ferguson, R.J. Gregory, T.R. Groom, K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

Noes (21)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker (Teller), H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown, J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—J.H.C. Klunder and S.M. Lenehan.  
Noes—D.C. Kotz and R.B. Such.

**The SPEAKER:** There being 21 Ayes and 21 Noes, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

#### STATE LOTTERIES (SOCCER POOLS AND OTHER) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 August. Page 474.)

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** The Opposition supports this Bill, which is in two parts: the first relates to the soccer football pools and the second to utilising money in the unclaimed dividends fund to finance the 1994 Adelaide Festival of Arts. We have some reservations about the proposed changes to the Bill, to which I will refer later. In the last session, the Government introduced a Bill to repeal the Soccer Football Pools Act 1981. Contingent upon that occurring, amendments were moved to allow the Lotteries Commission to run soccer pools and other special sports lotteries for the benefit of the recreation and sport fund, which currently has a deficit of over \$2 million.

Further amendments included allowing the full cost of running the soccer and sports lotteries to be deducted from receipts rather than being paid for from commission revenue and waiving the minimum 60 per cent pay-out requirement. Members should appreciate that if the soccer pools are brought under lotteries a contingency will be placed upon them to the effect that prize money should represent at least 60 per cent of all revenue collected. Soccer pools do not enjoy the same volume of trade and patronage as a number of other forms of gambling run by the Lotteries Commission.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** They are not working very well. The Minister reminds the Parliament that he actually crossed the floor in 1981 to support the soccer pools when the Act was introduced by the Hon. Michael Wilson.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I am reminded by the member for Mount Gambier that the present Treasurer kicked an own goal. The soccer pools have not lived up to the potential perceived at that time—they never became a very important source of gaming revenue—and they have certainly not lived up to their responsibility to finance the recreation and sport fund run by the Government. The other point is that because of the malaise of the soccer pools the Lotteries Commission actually had to finance the cost of running the pools. It said that that was in order to keep the prize money up to a reasonable rate.

This is the Bill which was introduced during the last session and which we see in part here tonight, and it

provided for the establishment of a bank account for the commission outside the Treasury. It provided for the adoption of acceptable accounting standards by the commission; for a tightening of control of agents, including a right to sue; and it contained amendments to allow more stringent requirements relating to the conduct of Club Keno. I should like briefly to look at those last two issues. Examples have been reported in the press of the agency system being abused by those who would wish to defraud the system.

According to the reports that have been provided to us by the Lotteries Commission, under existing rules and regulations the commission has insufficient capacity to pursue the individuals concerned. So, the amendments beef up the Act in that regard. Of course, there have been various stories. The member for Davenport, for example, has talked about the extent to which certain abuses take place within the agency system and about people not receiving the full prize money on their tickets. Those stories become more frequent when we talk about Club Keno.

The Bill that was presented last session tidied up a number of areas of concern. It made it possible for the commission to operate more effectively; to comply with accounting standards; to run a bank account outside the Treasury; and it made it more practical to have all the oversight and all the moneys collected from sports lotteries to be handled efficiently and effectively by the Lotteries Commission without a separate Act applying conditions.

The Opposition had agreed to support that Bill. We felt quite relaxed about it. We intended to support it last session, and now, in this session, we reiterate our support. However, a new set of amendments has been attached to the Bill relating to the distribution of unclaimed lottery prizes other than to the prize pools. For example, members would know that a special X-Lotto, which has been quite lucrative to the Lotteries Commission, now operates on Monday nights. Moneys have been utilised from the unclaimed pools to finance that lottery.

The proposition before us is that 50 per cent of the unclaimed dividends in any one year shall accrue to the Adelaide Festival of Arts. To put this into some sort of perspective, the promise made by the Government is that it will provide \$2.5 million to support the 1994 Festival of Arts. The Government has made a quick calculation and has come to the conclusion that, if the unclaimed pools continue to provide about \$3 million to the total pool in unclaimed moneys, the Adelaide Festival of Arts will have that \$2.5 million available to it by March 1994.

In 1991-92, \$3 million in prizes was unclaimed, and as at 30 June 1992 the cumulative total available for distribution was some \$9 million. The Government proposes that 50 per cent of the \$9 million fund as at 30 June 1992 be transferred to the Hospitals Fund. So, we will have \$4.5 million transferred to the Hospitals Fund; 50 per cent of the yearly unclaimed moneys, which the Government has estimated at \$1.6 million per annum, is to be transferred to a special deposit account for the benefit of the Adelaide Festival of Arts. There is a further amendment in the paper making it an offence to have unauthorised access to the commission's computer system. That, of course, is supported by the Opposition.

I can say that support for this measure is tempered. We recognise that unclaimed prize moneys generally are paid into Consolidated Revenue as a matter of principle. As the profits from lotteries is dedicated to the Hospitals Fund there is precedent for other services also to be paid into the fund. I know that many members in areas where they have had difficulty maintaining hospital services feel rightly aggrieved that the moneys that they need are not being made available, and some have actually drawn the conclusion that this money that is going to the Festival of Arts would be better spent in country hospitals.

Of course, they have a very important point in that regard. It is important to understand the trauma that is experienced in many country areas, whose hospitals are closing down because of insufficient moneys; others are being forced by the Health Commission to reduce their services continually until they can provide very little, if any, service whatsoever. That process of attrition has been applied by the Health Commission. It has not assisted the communities concerned and, in fact, has contributed to the difficulties faced by rural people. So, in principle, a number of my colleagues would say that we should not be putting any moneys from the Lotteries Fund, be they unclaimed moneys or the normal proceeds that are due to Government, into another area such as the Adelaide Festival of Arts.

There have been claims that the unclaimed moneys are really due to the people who play the game: if the unclaimed moneys come from X-Lotto, they should be recycled through the X-Lotto system; and that is already happening to a certain degree. Those who play Club Keno and do not claim their prizes should benefit from any surpluses that are created because the dividends have been unclaimed. The same prevails in relation to the scratch tickets: somehow any unclaimed money should be recycled. There are also concerns that not enough attempts are made by the Lotteries Commission to ensure that the unclaimed moneys are kept to a minimum. In that regard, I have some sympathy for the argument that, whilst the amount of unclaimed money accounts only for 2 per cent of the total revenue, there probably can be improvement.

I know that the Lotteries Commission has introduced a number of new devices which will assist that process. For example, X-Lotto players can register their names and addresses so that, when they have their tickets processed, if they fail to front up at the lotteries counter with their winning tickets, the Lotteries Commission, after a certain period, will ensure that the prize money is theirs. I would encourage all people who are regular players of X-Lotto to do just that. An optical reading machine can now be used with scratch tickets whereby people with poor eyesight can ask a counter attendant to push the ticket through the machine and check it. So, some improvements have taken place and that should continue.

I raise some doubt about whether the Adelaide Festival will receive \$2.5 million from this measure, and I will be asking the Minister how that will work. I believe the prediction of \$1.6 million representing half of the unclaimed moneys for 1992-93 is quite optimistic given the recession. I think people are far more careful with their money these days; they pay a lot more attention to their tickets than ever before. The unclaimed moneys may well drop below the \$3 million collected last year. For

every \$100 000 that it falls below \$3.2 million, as estimated, \$50 000 less will be applied to the Adelaide Festival. I hope the Minister is prepared to answer a question on that matter.

As I said at the outset, the Opposition will support this Bill. It is not total support, as members would appreciate—it is a matter of weighing up the positives and negatives of the approach. We do not believe in principle that we should dedicate moneys from taxation to particular purposes. So, we have some difficulty. However, we note that the Bill contains a discretion on the part of Government to review that situation, and it certainly will be reviewed following the next election. So, the Bill itself does not lock future Governments into a similar sort of arrangement. With that understanding and with the reservations that have already been expressed, the Opposition supports the Bill.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I rise briefly to speak against the Bill, or at least a major part of it. I have no objection to the previous amendments passed last session, particularly in relation to repealing the 1981 soccer pools legislation and allowing the Lotteries Commission to run soccer pools and other special sports lotteries for the benefit of the Recreation and Sport Fund, which is currently deficit funded by over \$2 million. I have no objection to that at all. A new set of amendments has been added to allow for the distribution of unclaimed lottery prizes other than to prize pools. In 1991-92, \$3 million in prizes was unclaimed, and on 30 June 1992 this had grown to \$9 million—a very sizeable amount of money. I have some difficulty in realising that \$9 million has been allowed to accrue like this because I think greater effort should be put into finding the rightful owners. Alternatively, when people buy these tickets they should be told that, if they pay a small fee, they can be registered as subscribers whereby if they overlook a ticket they will still receive their rightful winnings. We should not allow such a large sum of other people's money—\$9 million—to accrue like this.

I have no objection to the Government's proposal that 50 per cent of the \$9 million in unclaimed prize money be transferred to the Hospital Fund. However, I ask the question: what will happen to the other 50 per cent? I gather it will go into general revenue, which means it will be lost. Thereafter, 50 per cent of the unclaimed moneys—estimated to be \$1.6 million per annum—will be transferred to a special deposit account for the Adelaide Festival. This is where I have a difficulty. I have nothing at all against the Festival of Arts, and nor would the electors of Custance.

We all know how difficult things are with country hospitals. Health generally in South Australia is going through difficult times, so the money should be wholly earmarked for health. Originally all the proceeds from lotteries were to go to the Hospitals Fund. I can see no difference with this. I am not picking on the Adelaide Festival of Arts—I am a regular attender—but because the Government wishes not to fund the Festival of Arts from general revenue but to fill that gap through this measure does not make this measure correct.

Country people are very angry about some of these unclaimed lottery prize moneys bypassing hospitals and going instead to the Festival of Arts. This is yet another

example of the Labor Government trying to please everyone all the time at the expense of a vital health service. The former Premier, many weeks ago in the budget speech, announced that the unclaimed prize money would be allocated between the Hospitals Fund and the Festival of Arts. However, no percentages were given. I know how important the Festival of Arts is for tourism in South Australia and the arts in general, but when it comes down to the line surely the funds to keep our hospital doors open are the most important.

Last financial year the Lotteries Commission allocated \$82.9 million in gaming proceeds to the Hospitals Fund. I often wonder where we would be without that money. This is and always has been a very welcome source of funding for our cash strapped hospitals. However, the money proposed for the Festival of Arts could mean the difference between closing or retaining hospitals. The Blyth Hospital issue is very much alive at the moment. The Minister has said that he will give us a decision within a week on the future of the Blyth Hospital. One can understand why rural communities are very touchy when they read that unclaimed lottery money is to be given to the Festival of Arts. People in country areas get up-tight, annoyed and frustrated when that happens.

In effect, the money goes back to the Consolidated Account and then it is cut from somewhere else, and who knows where. How many rural residents can enjoy the Festival of Arts as their city counterparts do, particularly in these difficult times? How many enjoy an intensive health service which city people enjoy? I have been very vocal on the issue, as is well known, and my opposition has been consistent. That is because I am very upset about it, as are many people in my electorate. Surely social justice principles must apply here, as once again country people are ignored.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I do not support the Bill. I go along with those of my colleagues who would like to see it in, knowing that later, if a Government of the day wants not to allocate the money to the Festival of Arts, it can make sure that does not occur. I am a patron of two performing arts groups and of a musical group and I am a member of another musical group. In the past I was President of the local branch of the Arts Council for nine years. My interest is as much in that area as in any other. In many of the performances which are put on now, the backstage people doing the props and working behind the scenes are getting as much in salaries and wages as some of the performers. That is one of the reasons why we cannot bring some of the big performances to this State. They cannot be justified because of their cost and our small population. It is just not a financial proposition.

I want to talk about some of the principles involved in this matter. I hope that the Minister will accept some of my comments on lotteries and raffles. I also hope that some of his departmental officers will look at how they are operated and will consider the unfairnesses and disadvantages to some people. If private enterprise operators operated like some of them do, in my view they would be sued. I will start with the small lotteries that are conducted at local football clubs, for example. If the club uses a barrel that has the capacity to hold only the number of tickets sold and the last of the tickets are sold

on the night of the draw, which happens sometimes although it may not be according to regulations, the smart alecs buy the balance of the tickets because, once they are dropped into the barrel on top of the other tickets, and the barrel is full, the tickets will not mix when the barrel is turned. They will mix only if the number of tickets in the barrel is well below full capacity. If the person who draws the winning ticket is in the know and does not mix them up, and just takes the ticket from near the top, that increases the chances of winning for the people who bought the last tickets.

I believe that the law should state that marbles showing the numbers nought to nine must be used. If you sell 100 or fewer tickets, you have only to draw three barrels. The number is put back each time it is drawn. In that way there can be no skulduggery. Some of the bigger charitable raffles do that, but some do not. I am sure that the Minister has been at functions where that has occurred, as I have. I have been on committees where that has occurred and I learnt very early in my life that that is what happens. It is a different thing if the tickets are thrown into a hat because it is not quite so easy to draw one from the top. People present yell out for them to be mixed up.

Another concern I have involves the scratch tickets issued by the Lotteries Commission. The Lotteries Commission holds a huge number of unclaimed prizes. The amount runs into millions of dollars, as members will note from the figures that have been mentioned this evening. For the sake of security and to avoid forgery, the Lotteries Commission changes the design or the caricatures on scratch tickets on a regular basis. People with failing eyesight have difficulty reading the very small printing and, therefore, they do not know exactly whether or not they have won a prize. I would like to see a bigger ticket and the adoption of the simple principle of win or lose. We do not need all the fancy gimmicks of kings, queens, aces, donkeys, monkeys, goats and three of a kind. All we need is win or lose. With modern printing, numbers or some other form of imprint could be used to stop people forging tickets.

Many people miss out on prizes, and the Lotteries Commission knows that. Is the commission prepared to tell us how many people claim prizes won from scratch tickets as against the number of tickets sold and how much money people lose with respect to unclaimed winnings?

That money ends up going into a pool. Under this Bill, that money will go to the arts, but I believe it should be put back into prize money. The same gambler might not get his money back, but he has a chance of getting it. Once it goes into the arts, he has no chance of getting it. The Lotteries Commission should consider that.

With respect to X-Lotto, people can register their name with the Lotteries Commission, so if they win and do not claim their prize, within three months the Lotteries Commission will send them a cheque pointing out that they have overlooked claiming their prize. There is a huge amount of money in that field. The Lotteries Commission can tell us; we could have been told in the second reading explanation the number of people who register their name but never claim. It is as simple as ABC. The commission could tell us how much was involved last year. But we are not told. We should not

have to ask for it: it should be automatic. We have to watch these sorts of things in the area of gambling.

I actually phoned the person at the Lotteries Commission (I will not name them) and I said that, if the Government goes on with this proposition, the Lotteries Commission should make sure that everybody who buys a X-Lotto ticket registers their name and address, and by that method they will not be cheated of their winnings: they will receive them. It might be a bit more work for the Lotteries Commission, but at least it is on the system and people have a chance of getting their money. Some people have said to me that if we do that there might be some gamblers who do not want their name recorded. Why? Is it because of the cash system in society; if they get a winning ticket and do not have their name recorded, they can use the system to avoid tax and get a tax-free benefit? If that is one of their excuses, I say that is one of the reasons why we should make that the case.

We must attempt to make it easier for the individual to be guaranteed their prize money. If we do not, I hope as many gamblers as possible avoid the Lotteries Commission if the winnings are to go to the Festival of Arts and away from those people who legitimately should have the money, who are still in the system and who should have the chance of winning from gambling, because the money came from gambling. I think it is unprincipled to follow the path of this Bill. The reason is that the arts (and I admit that I support that area, in a way) are a fancy cow. If it cannot stand on its own two feet, the Government should help it, but it is helping it through other people's money, not through the overall taxation area. We have people on both sides of Parliament saying that gambling is bad, that it destroys people, that we are encouraging them to spend money and that they will lose their homes and so on. That is what we are told.

On the other hand, we are saying as a Parliament we know that is bad; we think it is terrible, but people can make their own decision to do it and, if they win, we do not want to do everything in our power to make sure they get their winnings. In fact, we will go the other way: we will try to make it difficult for them to get their winnings by having scratch tickets they can hardly read, and then we will get more into the arts through this devious method. That is the truth of it; there is no doubt about that. For those who believe that it is imperative that we have the arts in the community regardless of the cost, it sounds a good argument, but times are tough. If Governments cannot find the money in a legitimate way, they should not use this sort of tactic. I think it is a bad tactic because, in the end, as the member for Custance points out, hospitals need it and there are many other areas that need it.

There are young sporting people who want help, but do they get it? Most probably we will run a lottery to help the sports and, if somebody does not claim their winnings, we will put that money into the arts. It will not end up going back to the sports. That is what is happening in this case. There are special clauses to provide for the running of lotteries for sport but, if Little Athletics wants a few bob, it does not get it. We can go right through the system. There are people in my area and every other member's electorate who have adult children or siblings who cannot look after themselves,



and in most cases the wife has had to look after them since they were a baby. They have now reached the stage where the mother cannot lift them and do the things that are necessary to give them reasonable care and attention.

Can they get help in the home? No way. I have tried to have a home set aside for nine people in my area. Homes for the disabled in that category with special provisions were built in the new Housing Trust development at Blackwood, but what happened? The Government said, 'Sorry, haven't got the money for them.' One such case is a woman whose daughter is nearly 20 years old. The husband goes to work and, except for a bit of respite in the city every week or fortnight, for five or six days on a regular basis that woman has to look after her loved one. As she is getting older, she has fears about who will look after her daughter if she passes away. Yet we take this money—the gamblers' money—and give it to the Festival of Arts. Have we really thought it through? Of course we have not. I hope that the people in the Lotteries Commission will do everything in their power, even if it means a bit more work and cost, or the lowering of the prize money, to see that the legitimate winners get their money, not somebody who is performing ballet in a theatre and who has made no contribution to the fund at all.

I will not be calling for a division or anything like that, because the majority of people see this as a good thing. I do not. I think that, once we start this principle, there is no end to it, because future Governments—and I will not be here then—will say that the precedent has been set: the Arnold Government started it and the majority of politicians supported it. I hope people look at the principle involved. In particular, I hope that the public, if something is not done about making sure the winners get their money more regularly, ignore the Lotteries Commission so that there will not be as much money there for people to snaffle.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** In the first instance, it has always been my view that gambling is wrong. So long as it is lawful, I have no problem with people engaging in it: I am not a holy Joe in that respect. In the second instance, I find it extremely difficult to cop this lot in the fashion and rationale in which it is presented. The distribution of unclaimed winnings in this way is quite wrong. Mr Speaker, it tempts the Minister and Sir Humphrey to conspire to use even more drastically flawed systems of determining who won what and more dramatically inadequate methods of advising the people who won it that they did win, thereby enabling them to be cheated out of their winnings.

The law provides how the draw will be made and how the winners will be advised: we regularly publish a lot of numbers, which most old people cannot even read, in an obscure place in the newspaper which they cannot afford. It is not only stake money they have to put up, but they have to find the money to buy the newspaper and get somebody to read it for them. That is half the problem now. Individual names, as suggested by the member for Davenport, ought to be required. If people do not want their own name to be used, they can use a nominee company, if they are 'thingy' about having their name disclosed publicly, whether or not they win.

I sincerely believe that it will eventually result in the use of even more drastically flawed systems of publishing the result which makes it even more difficult for people who did win to discover that they won, so that the Minister and Sir Humphrey in the future can accumulate even more unclaimed money, quite corruptly—and this money is acquired for this purpose corruptly. It was never bet by those people who took the punt in the belief that it should ultimately go to the arts if they fail to claim it. It is corrupt, and there is no question about that.

The worst aspect of it is that it will then tempt others amongst the ranks of Sir Humphrey and the Minister to devise or divine (I do not care how one puts it) who will benefit from the political patronage. Why should the slush fund go to the arts? Who said the arts needed it? Who said it was the most meritorious cause to which the money ought to be put? Where is the morality in that decision, given that it is obtained in a deliberately deceitful way? Why should we accept the decision of Sir Humphrey and the Minister as to where it ought to be allocated?

Clearly, they are not people to be trusted with that kind of decision, yet once the Minister and Sir Humphrey have conspired to do that, I am sure that the Government of the day, through its Party or Caucus meeting, call it what one may, will win the day and that is where the dough will go. The Government will teach other people to do things just as corruptly and they will say, 'It is equally justified if the Government can do that.' The legislation, such as I see it, stinks for all those reasons. I will not be calling divide.

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

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

Motion carried.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank members who have contributed to the debate. Clearly, there is agreement on most of the matters in the Bill that have been outlined by the member for Mitcham in respect of varied matters. There is a clear division of opinion whether the funds in question, the unclaimed winnings, ought to go to the Festival of Arts and the Government has been persuaded by the debate, the debate both here tonight and the debate since this announcement was made. We are not willing, and I believe the Festival of Arts would not want funds to be hypothecated to it that were not gratefully given to it by the Parliament. As it is clear that they are not, I am circulating amendments—

**Mr S.J. Baker:** What are you doing?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am doing exactly what you want, and I am circulating amendments that ensure that the unclaimed moneys go to the Hospitals Fund.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** That is right. That is exactly what the member for Custance and the member for Murray-Mallee clearly stated. The Government has some sympathy for that view. I want to state clearly that the next Festival of Arts will not suffer because of this decision. The announcement has been made that the \$2.5 million allocated to fund the 1994 Festival of Arts is under absolutely no threat. That amount will still be made

available. That is an increase of about \$300 000. That will be funded from consolidated revenue: it will not be funded by hypothecating the unclaimed prize money from lotteries.

I do thank honourable members opposite who have contributed. They have reflected the two different views that are in the community and they have reflected those views well and responsibly. Members on this side of have had similar representation, and there is a job to be done by the arts community to persuade a lot more people as to the merits of their industry and in particular the merits of the Festival of Arts. It involves not just the members for Custance or Murray-Mallee but in some metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas which are represented by Labor members considerable representation has been made by constituents about the measure that is before us.

In moving these amendments, I am not in any way suggesting that the support given by the member for Mitcham was wrong and that all the weight of the argument was on the side of the members for Murray-Mallee and Custance; that is not the case. It is quite a divisive issue in the community. Therefore, the Government does not intend to allow the division in the community to continue, and the effect of my amendments will ensure that the unclaimed prize money goes to the Hospitals Fund.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Powers and functions of the commission.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** In relation to the amending provisions in this clause concerning employment and appointment of individuals, how many examples of fraudulent action on behalf of agents has occurred and been reported to the Lotteries Commission, for example, in the past year?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I cannot, but I will get those details and advise the House or the other place, should the Bill get to the other place. Even if not, I will personally advise the member for Mitcham.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'The Lotteries Fund and application of proceeds of the commission.'

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I move:

Page 2—

Line 25—Leave out 'paragraphs' and substitute 'paragraph'.

Lines 29 to 30—Leave out paragraph (ca).

Line 36—Leave out 'subsections' and substitute 'subsection'.

Page 3, lines 1 to 6—Leave out subsections (5) and (6).

The amendments have the effect of ensuring that the unclaimed prize moneys go to the Hospitals Fund and not to the Festival of Arts, for the reasons that I stated in my response to the second reading.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I find this quite extraordinary. I do not understand what has happened within the Government ranks. This amendment would never have emanated from this side of the Parliament. The Liberal Party in Government would never have contemplated hypothecating funds for this purpose. So, we had to consider how we would deal with the situation, presuming that if we failed to pass the amendment somehow the Adelaide Festival of Arts would not have a flow of funds to allow it to function properly in 1994.

The Minister would be well aware that we said we would review the situation and, if there was an election earlier, we would meet that commitment. We would approve the measure on the basis that it would be reviewed, because like the Minister we have reservations about dedicating lumps of money from the taxation stream for particular purposes.

So, we did not have an easy task. Members on my side put forward a very strong point of view. It was not a simple decision. We had to weigh up the pros and cons, and members from rural areas in particular quite rightly expressed extreme reservations about the principle involved in this change. So, whilst I feel quite relaxed about the fact that the Minister is removing these special provisions from the Bill and is now saying that there is an absolute guarantee that the Festival of Arts will receive sufficient funds, I wonder why we went through the process that we have just been through only to see this provision removed from the Bill. I can only assume that the Minister has had some personal reservations about this process.

I know that the Minister has expressed previously to the House reservations about the principle of hypothecation. I can only assume that he initially voted against it, but was beaten by his Cabinet colleagues or that, alternatively, some of his colleagues have had a change of heart with the change of leadership. It is an interesting situation when one of the major initiatives taken by the Government to ensure funding of a particular item such as the Adelaide Festival of Arts, and when that policy has been professed and is well known, is suddenly removed. However, as I indicated earlier, I am relaxed.

Amendments carried.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I will not ask how, and indeed how often, the money will flow from the Lotteries Commission, but will the Minister explain to the Committee the funding provisions for the Adelaide Festival of Arts?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** As I said in my response to the second reading, there will be an allocation from Consolidated Revenue, and the precise amount will be \$2.5 million which, from memory, is \$300 000 greater than the allocation for the last festival.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** There is no provision in the budget for that to occur. How will the Government provide sufficient initial funding for the festival? A number of contracts must be signed and moneys paid over in the early stages to secure artists and make certain bookings. How will that amount of money that is required perhaps 12 months or more before the festival be forthcoming?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** There is no problem. The Public Finance and Audit Act permits the Government to provide funds to the festival in this financial year, if required. The next festival is in 1994, so the bulk, if not all, of the funds will be required in the next financial year, not this year.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** My last question is just to clarify what has happened to the Bill as a result. One presumes now that the unclaimed moneys will remain untouched, remembering that 50 per cent of the \$9 million will go into the Hospitals Fund, but now that we do not have 50 per cent of moneys going to the Adelaide Festival of Arts—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** It's all in the Hospitals Fund.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** That is not quite true. According to my understanding of the Act, there will be a build-up of another \$2.5 million, say, in this financial year. The 50 per cent of the funding is up for that \$9 million already in the fund. Now that we do not need to put 50 per cent to the Adelaide Festival of Arts, that presumes that the full \$2.5 million to \$3 million of unpaid moneys will remain in the fund.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** As I said, half the money in that fund will remain in the fund to be used for prizes, and the other half will now go into the Hospitals Fund as opposed to going to the Festival of Arts.

**Mr LEWIS:** It is a pleasant surprise in some respects to find the amendments we have now agreed to—

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** No, I am honest enough with myself and the rest of the world to acknowledge that these amendments were well and truly drafted before I was in the Chamber.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Not at all, tempting though it may be. Hypothecation of the kind that has been suggested by the measure as it was before amendment is not something that I like, anyway. It is not really honest. If the money that goes into these respective buckets is not more than the Government will allocate from its resources as a percentage of the whole, it simply tops up the bucket. The money might as well go into General Revenue: it makes not one iota of difference, ultimately, to the amount of money that goes into these programs.

You and I both know that. To claim that there is some greater moral virtue in allocating funds from any one or other activity in which Government engages to gain money and to make it seem therefore more acceptable to people who protest against it is deceitful in the extreme. I have said that previously and I do not resile from it. It does not bring us into good odour with that group of people who think about things and who, therefore, are not as inclined to defend us when a group of different temperament and disposition attacks us as members of Parliament for having no moral rectitude or integrity, according to the lights of the people criticising us.

We lose it both ways: we lose the support of people whose opinion would be trusted and who would otherwise defend us, and we therefore suffer when we are attacked. We would be better off if we were simply honest about it, put it all in the general revenue and let the public know honestly how we chose to spend it for

what we consider to be the best interests of the public, or in the public interest which is the term that goes with the conventional wisdom.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Not at all. I would be quite happy to but it would waste time because the Government would not support it.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** In future I will. In every instance when a measure like this comes before the House I will move against any deceitful and sugar coating kind of proposal to put it to this fund or that fund—the Geranium Breeders Society Welfare Fund, or the Festival of Arts, or whatever else it is that is the flavour of the month. That is daffy; it does not help anybody to come to a clearer understanding of what Government is all about. It really is so far out of fashion it is not funny. It is about time we stopped it.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 7 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Offences.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Has the Minister any evidence to present as to unwanted interference into the Lotteries Commission computers by any means?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I have absolutely no knowledge of any unwanted influence or interference at all. If the member for Mitcham could give me a clue so that I could follow it through I would be like a bloodhound down that track.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** We are all aware of hackers in the system, and I was wondering whether the Minister had any information that he could provide as to any attempts that have been made to hack the Lotteries Commission computers in any shape or form?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Certainly my information goes back only two years. The advice I have is of personal knowledge over the past two years and there has certainly been none in that time. It is a legitimate question and I will ask the board and those serving on the board longer if there has been any report to the board as regards hacking.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## ADJOURNMENT

At 10.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 15 October at 10.30 a.m.