

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday 6 November 1992

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS

JUVENILE JUSTICE

A petition signed by 79 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to consider proposals to change the juvenile justice system was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

TIME ZONE

A petition signed by 21 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to introduce eastern standard time in South Australia was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 31, 35, 38, 46, 47, 130, 134, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 145, 146, 149, 165, 167, 171, 193, 196, 199, 203 and 212.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Department of the Premier and Cabinet—Report, 1991-92.

By the Minister of State Services (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

State Services Department—Report, 1991-92.

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: Last week the Leader of the Opposition made allegations that since December 1990 the Government has had information of rorts and abuse of WorkCover by building industry union officials on the Remm site. Since that time there have also been allegations of shonky practices and secret deals made between WorkCover and the Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation. From the day the WorkCover scheme was established the Opposition has

squirreled away, attacking the scheme in any way it could. I am sorry, but it has got this one wrong.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister is given leave to make a statement—he is not given leave to abuse the Opposition in the course of making that statement.

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

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I now have the information to fully answer these allegations and incriminations of the WorkCover Corporation and its board. There were only two written and signed agreements between the Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation and WorkCover. These were: on 5 September 1989, being an agreement on how average weekly earnings would be calculated for workers in the building industry; and on 21 December 1990, being an overall agreement reflecting the present policies of the corporation with respect to the medical authority used by Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation members in 1989 and early 1990. Neither of these agreements contravene WorkCover's legislation and are in keeping with board policy.

All other 'agreements' appear to have evolved as operating practices which were terminated when identified by WorkCover management in mid-1990. They did not affect the Remm site special project from August 1990. The Opposition has also voiced concern that Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation members were paid benefits to which they were not entitled. There is no evidence that this occurred. It should be pointed out that the procedures WorkCover adopted at the Remm site from August 1990 were such as to allow only legitimate claims to come forward.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The intense investigation of each claim, and the very visible presence, meant that all workers were very aware of the scrutiny of the claims. Indeed, Remm Group, in its legal appeal against the corporation's imposing a supplementary levy on it, complained at the additional costs associated with the corporation's investigations. In other words, the employer complained about the intensity of the investigation of claims. As far as fraud is concerned, there were ongoing investigations of claims including joint investigations with other agencies. No fraud convictions arose from this work, but the corporation reports that 25 claims were either withdrawn or the worker returned to work as a result of the fraud investigations.

Site workers were not offered interim benefits if the corporation believed the claim would be rejected or if the worker was back at work within four weeks of injury. Workers were told that, if their claim was rejected, recovery action would be taken. There are currently nine Remm site workers repaying the corporation. Because of the close scrutiny of claims up front, very few fraudulent claims were received or accepted. The next time that the Opposition has a scandal on WorkCover, I would suggest that it puts up or shuts up.

QUESTION TIME

JOBSKILLS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier make representations to his Federal colleagues to stop long-term unemployed South Australians being forced to join unions before they can benefit from Jobskills work experience and training? The Federal Government's Jobskills scheme is available to those who are over the age of 21 and who have been unemployed for 12 months or more. Under the scheme the Commonwealth pays a \$280 a week gross training wage for six months provided the work experience with an approved employer involves on and off the job training for at least 25 per cent of the time.

I have documentary evidence, which I can provide to the Premier, that the scheme is being used effectively to force unemployed South Australians to pay to join a union before they can be considered for retraining under the scheme. If any unemployed person will not agree to join the relevant union, he or she cannot be helped by Jobskills, and if he or she feels that they have to join because of their desperate position they must pay union dues that they cannot even afford.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader has indicated that he will provide me with some alleged documentary evidence. I would certainly want to see that evidence before determining any course of action. We should remember what happens in a situation like this. The rates of pay that will apply in this situation are those that have been negotiated by unions on behalf of all those who will be involved; they are the ones who have gone to all that work to represent their best interests. What I see happening here—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader in South Australia has now decided where his interests lie with respect to the kind of approach that his colleague in Victoria has been following. He has been taking a very quiet approach, not wanting to get himself too involved with what is happening in Victoria. But now—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —we see the first sign that he, too, wants to start on a path of union bashing and of trying to create an image whereby he can take any opportunity to attack unions in this State as well. I want to say that, if that is the case, it is pretty clear that South Australians should be watching very closely what his colleague has been doing across the border by a total abuse of every single system that will ultimately lead to a breakdown of good industrial relations in this country.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If that is the way the Leader wants to start playing it, I suggest that South Australians be very clearly warned about that.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order. The member for Henley Beach.

STATE BANK

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I direct my question to the Treasurer. What consequences to the future of the State Bank are likely to be derived from the departure of the State Bank Chairman, Nobby Clark? Will this in any way affect the bank or the progress made to ensure that the bank has a positive future?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: First, in answering, I want to put on record the appreciation that this Government has for the work that was done by Nobby Clark in very difficult circumstances over the past two years or so. I think that most people in the House, irrespective of whether they are on this side or the other side, would want to join me in thanking Mr Clark for his efforts. It was made clear by Mr Clark when he came to South Australia that, as somebody who was newly retired, it was with a great deal of reluctance that he took on another job, particularly one as difficult as this and one in another State, and it was only through the persuasive powers of the member for Ross Smith that we were fortunate in acquiring the services of Mr Clark for the period that we have. So, I choose to believe that most people in the House would want to join me in thanking Mr Clark.

The work that Mr Clark has done will stay with South Australia for many years. What Mr Clark was able to do—with not much assistance at all from members opposite, and Mr Clark did have something to say about that, but I am trying not to get into that, at least at this stage—first and foremost, I believe, was to bring confidence back into the State Bank of South Australia to demonstrate that the State Bank was capable of being a very viable and very profitable regional bank. There is no doubt that at that time there were some doubts about whether the bank could continue in its present form. The doubts were very real and for very good reasons, but Mr Clark ensured that that initial confidence was there, that the bank did bring itself back to its core activities, that a new management team was put in place and that new and more conservative banking procedures were adopted. I believe that the new Chair (we will be announcing a new Chair of the bank very soon)—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In my view, the new board is an excellent board; it has a great deal of expertise across a broad range of interests, and that is particularly to be applauded. So, I have no fears that the departure of Nobby Clark will affect the bank in any way. I think what he has done is to cement in new procedures and a new confidence, and everyone in South Australia can be proud of that and can be assured that the work will continue.

WATERSIDE WORKERS FEDERATION

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): My question is directed to the Premier. What discussions has the Government had with the ACTU and the Waterside Workers Federation (WWF) about giving the WWF coverage of all Department of Marine and Harbors port workers in South Australia? Will he give the House an assurance that he will not allow the WWF to increase its membership through gaining such a monopoly on union coverage, which would force up port costs in South Australia?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The ACTU supported an application by the Waterside Workers Federation for a section 118 action under the Industrial Relations Act which was to bring about one union on the waterfront. Speaking with some experience, I point out that it is far easier to negotiate with one union than with a multitude of unions. I agree with the policy of the Australian Council of Trade Unions regarding this move towards a single union on the waterfront. There has been enormous reform taking place. Reform in the South Australian ports is such that it is leading that in the rest of the States. We have a better structure and cost structure, and that means it is better for the shippers, exporters and importers in South Australia into the future. We are very pleased to have those discussions to ensure a rational, proper transfer of membership to the appropriate union that will be representing the interests of the workers on the waterfront.

STATE BANK

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): Does the Treasurer agree with the former Chairman of the State Bank, Nobby Clark, that the Opposition has done the bank and the people of South Australia a disservice?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader is out of order.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Goyder is out of order for the second time. The Treasurer.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Had I said what Mr Clark had said, obviously there would have been a degree, however uncalled for, of scepticism about the validity of that statement. However—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —the comments that were made by Nobby Clark, I believe, deserve wider reporting. I think they did have some coverage in certain sections of the media, but I was disappointed with the coverage in other sections of the media where they were ignored. One would think that Mr Clark had made no mention of the Opposition, but he had, and I am about to tell the House and perhaps those members of the media

who missed the press conference and therefore did not report it fully.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. We are here for a special sitting of Parliament, but that does not mean that special rules apply. We have a set of Standing Orders to which this House has agreed, and they will be applied. Interjections are out of order. I have had to raise my voice several times this morning already. I do not intend to continue doing so. The Standing Orders prevail, even though it is a special sitting. The honourable Treasurer.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Sir. As I was saying, I believe that the remarks of Mr Clark deserve wider coverage. At some stages during the events of the past almost two years now, the Opposition, through its former Leader (the member for Victoria) has said that, at all stages, it has acted responsibly. Well, Mr Clark gives the lie to that statement, and I just want to quote a couple of statements made by Mr Clark in relation to, for example, the question of fire sales, which seems to occupy the minds of the member for Coles and the member for Mitcham and, indeed, the Leader. Mr Clark, in reply to a reporter's question about these alleged fire sales, said:

It's a nonsense. I can't understand why they [the Opposition] continue with this sort of statement, given that they have been fully briefed by the bank. They have just chosen to ignore or disbelieve what we have told them.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Victoria said that Mr Nobby Clark lied to him. All I can suggest is that that is an absolutely disgraceful slur—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Victoria does not take notice of the Standing Orders, he may have the opportunity to be outside the Parliament much sooner than he anticipates.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is quite an unwarranted slur on a great Australian, and I think in retrospect the member for Victoria probably regrets having said that. The point that Mr Clark was making is that the Opposition had been briefed; it chose to ignore those briefings, and that is a great pity. Mr Clark was asked quite directly by a journalist whether he thought the Opposition was doing the bank a disservice, and this was his response:

I believe so. There have been several instances where the Opposition has done the people of South Australia and the bank a great disservice in my view. What we tried to do is put value back into this institution, and what we have had is a lot of innuendo and statement that typically have not assisted the process.

Nobody objects to the Opposition's quite properly taking up questions of the bank. What Nobby Clark is pointing out, and what we have tried to point out over the past two years, is that it is irresponsible to do it in a way that damages both the bank and, therefore, the economy of South Australia. I hope that from now on the Opposition will desist.

GOVERNMENT ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): What further steps has the Premier taken to extract from his Ministers a list of achievements by the Labor Government over the past 10 years, given that his first attempt received no response at all? If he is able to compile such a list, will it be launched on top of the State Bank centre, outside the Flinders Medical Centre, in an empty classroom at Goodwood high or perhaps on the Marineland site? I have a copy of a memo sent to all Government press secretaries by the media liaison officer, Paul Willoughby. It pleads for details of major achievements in all portfolio areas since 1982, following failure to get much response from his previous request. As a result, the memo states that the comprehensive document, originally planned, is no longer possible. The memo, dated 4 October, states:

However, the event is almost upon us and we cannot ignore it, because the Libs certainly will not.

The memo continues:

So with a more Stalinist approach, I want details of major achievements in all portfolio areas since the Government's election in 1982 provided to me by the close of business of Friday (6 October).

Further, the memo states:

If you can liaise with the press secretary in your former area and revive their work, fine. If you need to shake up a few bureaucrats, fine, Too. Just get it here.

End of memo; end of message.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We have had a ministerial reshuffle which, of course, takes some time. The reality is that I always knew that we would have a problem with something such as this, because the achievements are so many that the work required to list them all in the timeframe that has been given makes it very difficult indeed. I would not mind betting that we are not actually able to achieve anything by next Tuesday, which is actually the tenth anniversary of this Labor Government, because of that: having so many things to detail. If that is the most serious level of questioning we can get from the members of the Opposition, then it really is an indication of the triviality which is inherent in everything they do and in everything they believe.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

HOUSING TRUST TENANTS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations urgently review the South Australian Housing Trust policy with respect to domestic violence? Recently a constituent sought my assistance after she and her family had been threatened. Her estranged husband had made threats against her life, and eventually he was apprehended by police at the former matrimonial home. He was in possession of a firearm which allegedly had been discharged twice in the backyard.

The former matrimonial home was a South Australian Housing Trust property, and both my constituent and I

asked that the locks be changed immediately. Housing Trust officers explained that they would review the situation and offer options, including possible transfers to other properties for the woman concerned.

As the tenancy was in the husband's name, despite what had happened, Housing Trust officers refused to change locks and said that if they did the keys would be given to the husband. My constituent wanted the locks changed and wanted the tenancy so that all other legal means could come into force. Also, she was forced to flee her home with only a few clothes, and she wishes to return to get more in the knowledge that, if no locks have been forced, it may be entered safely. She also would like to stay in this home because of her children's schooling. Trust officials have argued that her husband is the tenant, that he has the rights and that transferring the tenancy will be very difficult.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I will be pleased to obtain information from the Housing Trust about the case to which the honourable member refers and also to have the general policy in this area further considered. The Housing Trust takes advice from a number of authorities with respect—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: —to these domestic violence situations. First, obviously the police are involved in many of these cases and give advice on matters. The Department of Family and Community Services is also often involved.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Find out what your new policy is.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen is out of order for the second time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: There are often complex family arrangements in many of these situations, with considerable mobility in those occupying trust premises, and that further makes it difficult to arrive at the most appropriate solution. Further, court orders often exist relating to custody and access arrangements and to who may or may not have access to the property and children from time to time. All those matters have to be taken into account by the Housing Trust, so it will need detailed consideration of each and every one of the situations. Those circumstances need to be monitored, often on an hourly basis, let alone on a daily, weekly or monthly basis. It is a difficult situation for officers of the Housing Trust to administer, and in the main an excellent job is done by officers in very difficult circumstances, as many other agencies can be involved in very emotional and sometimes dangerous situations, as in the case to which the honourable member has just referred. I will be pleased to look further at the matter.

WORKCOVER

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety say how many agreements between WorkCover and the Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation were terminated in mid-1990 and whether any of those agreements contravened the WorkCover legislation?

Today's ministerial statement refers to agreements between WorkCover and the former BLF involving 'operating practices'. The statement does not make clear whether those agreements were written or unwritten or whether they contravene existing legislation.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question. The ministerial statement referred to operating practices that grew and to a form that was used although the management of WorkCover had no knowledge of it. The matter was brought to its attention in June or July of 1990 as a result of correspondence with Combined Resources Management. As a result of that matter being brought to the attention of WorkCover management, the practice ceased and the agreements entered into were those referred to in my ministerial statement.

I have been advised that a search of documents available to WorkCover has indicated that there was no agreement, that the practice as it was happening at the time referred to by Combined Resources Management had evolved when SGIC was operating the agency on behalf of WorkCover. That continued when those 200-odd people transferred from SGIC to WorkCover in about April.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): My question is also to the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety. Can the Minister inform the House whether a worker injured on the Remm site played professional soccer for \$200 a game while receiving workers compensation benefits? With your leave, Sir, and the concurrence of the House I would explain that that question is asked in the context of there having been several allegations of rorts of the WorkCover scheme over the past week.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Walsh for his question. I have noticed with some concern the report in the *Advertiser* recently with respect to alleged soccer playing. My advice is that there was a person who was working on the Remm site who did make a claim but that after an independent medical opinion had been sought and he had been diagnosed it was found that the claimant's injury was not an injury that could have resulted from work. It was actually a rheumatic condition. As a result of that diagnosis the claim was withdrawn and the corporation was to recover expenses, and he was ordered to repay that amount of money to the corporation.

There have been a lot of allegations about rorts on the Remm site and indeed rorts by people when they make claims on WorkCover. In this House I have repeatedly asked members opposite to give me details of those alleged rorts so that they can be investigated. When the select committee was established every member in this Parliament was written to asking them to provide the committee with details of any information in this respect. I am not aware of anybody referring any rorts to the select committee. I am not aware of any member of Parliament actually providing information on rorts to myself or to the WorkCover organisation. I am of the

view that these rorts exist in their minds only and are not fact.

There were some 5 000 people working on the Remm site over the period of the construction, and when one remembers that they were working six and seven days a week and working between 10 and 15 hours a day, in those conditions people get very tired. One is reminded of a number of deaths that occurred in the South-East, when workers were driving to a drilling rig. They had finished a shift of 12 hours, had had 12 hours rest and were going back, and the driver of the vehicle had had very little rest and they were involved in a collision in which six lives were lost. The Coroner pointed out that these long, tedious hours of work affect the concentration of workers. On the Remm site there were long hours of work, leading up to that sort of thing.

I would make the following compliment to WorkCover. They put in a management union. They investigated every claim very thoroughly. There were 25 claims that people did not proceed with once they knew that that was happening. I want to refer to the actions of the fraud branch within WorkCover. I have been advised that from 1 January this year to 22 October this year there have been 18 prosecutions brought before the courts. Ten of those matters have been finalised. Fourteen matters are continuing. There have been five returns to work, and that is attributed to fraud investigations. There have been 15 claims withdrawn, again based on fraud investigations. The savings, based on prosecutions only, are \$2 million. Then there is the matter of nominated savings, which are incomplete due to a number of prosecutions having not been finalised. Further, the fraud unit personnel within WorkCover are also looking at medical investigations. They are of the view that \$1.1 million is being saved in ongoing costs. So what we can say is that in that period of time, of not quite 11 months, that fraud unit has saved WorkCover something like \$3.1 million. All I can say to members opposite is that if they could come up with one case of a rort I would like to see it. But I do not think they can find one. It is just in their imagination.

INC SCHEME

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services. What were the reasons behind the Government's decision to reduce by up to \$82.20 a week the remuneration to parents looking after teenagers and children who are disturbed or at risk under the INC scheme, what are the savings the Government will make and how many fewer children does the Minister anticipate will now be cared for under the scheme?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The interjection in relation to social justice is, of course, very germane. Members will appreciate the importance of the INC scheme to families supporting children in need of care. Clearly, it is very important that we target that assistance to those families and— children who are most in need and who have the greatest requirement for the funds. The changes to the scheme—which I am quite happy to provide to the member for Heysen in detail by way of written

response—will allow us to target that assistance much more appropriately.

The scheme will now be adjusted to take into account the needs of children at different age groups and the different development levels of the children, and the assistance will be targeted to those children who, because of their age group differences, have a greater requirement for funds. Members will realise that the requirement for assistance to children varies considerably over the course of childhood years and into teen age, and the amount of money that needs to be directed to those families must be adjusted. Also, adjustments will be made to the scheme in relation to payment for private education expenses to equal that across all parents and to ensure adequate equity in the scheme. While some parents may receive less in that context, I believe that the revisions to the scheme are soundly based in social justice criteria, and I am quite happy to provide the details of that to the honourable member.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Treasurer advise whether concerns that have been expressed in the banking industry and among bank customers regarding the GST are justified? Concern has been expressed to me by a number of my constituents regarding their savings bank accounts. They are questioning whether the GST would affect their savings in any way.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, is it possible for a Minister to answer on behalf of an industry? There appears to be no element of Government administration in terms of responsibility.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think I understand the point of order. My thoughts would be that the Treasurer is responsible for expenses within this State. Some banking regulations are under our control, and I think that there would be a responsibility to this House for aspects of the effect of some policy.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I should have thought that the member for Coles, more than any other member, would have noted that the Government did have a responsibility in the banking area which, perhaps, with hindsight we would rather not have. Given the number of questions and the publicity over the past couple of years, I should have thought that the member for Coles would notice. The State Bank, like all other banks in Australia, is desperately worried about the impact of a GST in the event of a Coalition Parties win at the next Federal election—which, I may add, is appearing less likely. Nevertheless, the banking industry is very concerned.

Estimates have been made that up to three-quarters of a billion dollars worth of extra charges will be imposed on the banking industry by this GST, if it ever comes into place, and the banks are quite alarmed about this. Not that the banks will lose, apart from all the additional paperwork in which they will be involved by being tax collectors in the same way as the local deli or any other business operation, but the three-quarters of a million dollars worth of charges will be passed on to the customer.

Mrs KOTZ: On a point of order, I am having difficulty hearing the Treasurer give his hypothetical misinterpretation of the GST.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order does not need explanation. However, let me make a point of order to members here: part of the reason we cannot hear is the noise coming from the background on both sides of the House.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was having difficulty in being heard, and I thank the member for Newland for her consideration.

Mrs Kotz: My pleasure.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you. As I was saying, the whole of the banking industry is extremely concerned about this, as should be every customer of a bank in Australia, because these additional charges will be passed on to them. The banking industry is having negotiations with the Federal Liberal Party to see whether an exemption can be made for that industry. My suspicion is that it will do no more good than have the churches, which have tried to get modifications to these proposals in order to assist people in the community who are less well off, or the tourism industry, which has stated quite clearly that the GST will knock it around in a most dreadful way.

I conclude on a quote from Mr Clark, who said in the interview to which I referred a little while ago—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It was a very informative interview; I will send you a transcript—it was wonderful. Mr Clark said:

The most sensitive nerve in Australia is the hip pocket nerve. We've seen that people, especially in times of low inflation and low wages inflation, are just not prepared to cop too much of a change in the cost or prices of things.

He said that not only in relation to the banking industry but in more general terms. I can only say, 'Hear, hear!' to what Mr Clark has had to say, and I hope members opposite, in particular the member for Kavel, will take up with their Federal counterparts some of the financial consequences on ordinary Australians and some of the political consequences on themselves in going ahead with something that clearly Australia does not want and does not need.

HOSPITALS, PUBLIC

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Is the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services satisfied with public hospital procedures, which allowed a woman to have breast cancer positively diagnosed on 27 October and then to wait until 12 November (three weeks later) before she can be scheduled to have her breast removed, and what will he do to improve the situation which has increased the anxiety and trauma for the woman concerned?

This woman, whose name I shall provide to the Minister, had a mammogram performed on 23 October and a breast biopsy carried out the following day. She was told the result (a malignancy) on 27 October. She saw the surgeon two days later and was told that a mastectomy was required. Her next visit to the surgeon will be on 12 November when she will be told when the

operation will occur. As the Minister knows only too well, that may well be some time in the future. Surgeons in private practice have told me that this is an outrageous treatment regime, which increases anxiety and which would never be allowed in private practice where the operation would occur within days of diagnosis not one month.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: Obviously, I will look at the case raised by the member for Adelaide if he provides me with the information as he has said he will. I cannot respond to individual cases today in the way he seeks, but I share his concern and anger over any delay in dealing with a case such as this. The medical management systems of our hospitals must respond adequately to the demands that are placed on them. We have the resources and the capacity to have the finest health system in the world in this State, and the way in which that is managed in our individual hospitals and by individual surgeons, who are responsible, is the critical factor in determining the response to patients. I agree with the honourable member's assessment of the need for that to happen, and he can be assured that as Minister of Health, Family and Community Services that kind of delivery of health services is my first priority and that of this Government.

STATE BANK

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Is it a fact that the Government is intending to appoint financial advisers to look at options to offload the State Bank of South Australia? I have received an inquiry at my electorate office following speculation in the Sydney media, hence my question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It was drawn to my attention that there was a speculative piece in the *Sydney Morning Herald* stating that the South Australian Government was looking for an adviser to assist it in selling the State Bank of South Australia. May I say that that is not the case. For those people who were concerned about the press report, which I assume would include some members opposite, I am very pleased to be able to put that speculation totally to rest. The Government has employed advisers from time to time to assist us with the State Bank, and the names are very well known to members opposite. J.P. Morgan is one such adviser, B.T. Corporate Finance is obviously another, and from time to time we will continue to use advisers where appropriate.

I notice there was some speculation at the press conference given by the retiring Chairman of the State Bank, Nobby Clark, about the value of the bank, and I think the question was whether the bank was worth \$3.5 billion. Mr Clark responded that he did not think it was worth that much. There is no doubt that we are getting close to the time when a sensible assessment can be made of the value of the State Bank. Since the GAMD operation has been established and the bank is well on the way to contracting to its core operation, there will be a stage in the not too distant future where we can make a realistic assessment of what the bank is worth.

The Government's policy has been stated over many months in this regard: that at some stage Governments will have to decide whether they wish to continue with a

Government guaranteed bank, and Mr Clark also made some comments about that matter. I have some sympathy with one comment he made, namely, that no other Government would want to go through what this Government has gone through with regard to guaranteeing the State Bank. I think I could only say, 'Hear, hear!' to that.

There is no intention of selling the bank, but obviously we will from time to time make assessments of the bank's value now that its affairs are in much greater order. I say to the member for Albert Park, and anybody else who was concerned about the speculative piece, that there was nothing in the speculation whatsoever.

VICTORIAN ECONOMY

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Will the Treasurer confirm that the South Australian Government knew as early as March 1992 that the Kimer Labor Government was borrowing on the Euro dollar market, despite objections from South Australia through the Loan Council based on the fact that Victoria was jumping the queue for access to borrowings of Euro dollars?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: My information is that there has been absolutely no correspondence or contact between the South Australian Government and the Federal Government in this area. My information from the Treasury officials who took this up with the head of Federal Treasury earlier this week—and confirmed by the Federal Treasury officials—is that the South Australian Government had no knowledge whatsoever of these matters occurring in Victoria, there was no correspondence, and they have no idea where the speculation came from. That is what I am advised by our Treasury and it is confirmed by the head of the Federal Treasury.

Mr D.S. Baker: Did you believe them?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have no reason to believe that the Under Treasurer in South Australia or the head of Federal Treasury is telling lies. I cannot see any purpose in their doing that. It just seems to me that those kinds of remarks are quite uncalled for.

IRANIAN TRADE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Minister of Primary Industries explain the benefits of South Australia's being chosen to provide agricultural research advice and training to the Iranian Ministry of Construction Jihad?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I can confirm that South Australia has been selected as the Australian State to provide and coordinate agricultural research advice and training for the Iranian Ministry of Construction, Jihad.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: It is a significant development and South Australia has done particularly well. It shows the benefit of interchanges between countries and, in particular, initiatives that are taken by State Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: It highlights the advantages that South Australia has as a State. In May last year the South Australian Government was the first Australian State Government to go into Iran since the 1979 revolution, and that was as a consequence of a delegation led by the now Premier when he was the then Minister of Agriculture. It was an enormous initiative, one that no other Australian State had seen, and the delegation resulted in Minister Forouzesh visiting South Australia in August. The Minister was clearly impressed by South Australia's capabilities in agricultural research and training. His Ministry, which has a staff of about 70 000 people, is responsible for rural rehabilitation and development throughout Iran.

As a consequence of South Australia's being selected as the Australian State to coordinate agricultural research and research advice, it has opened the way for sales of agricultural products and equipment worth many millions of dollars to South Australia. Joint ministerial conferences have been taking place in Teheran and elsewhere in the Middle East during the last week and will continue into next week, and our success has formed part of a total Australian delegation at talks that were headed by the Federal Minister for Trade and Overseas Development, John Kerin.

Iran is clearly one of Australia's largest markets in the Middle East region. The Iran market offers tremendous potential for Australian exporters and, in particular, in this regard, South Australia. A \$750 million line of credit to Iran has been offered by Australia and that signifies, as a nation, our commitment to the market in the Middle East.

About 80 Australian businessmen travelled to the talks, and that in itself reveals a realisation by the Australian business community of the excellent opportunities available. It is a significant coup for South Australia. It displays the benefits of communication and initiative at State Government level, because it will be worth many millions of dollars to South Australia.

To conclude, business does need to break the recession mentality and, with the Iranian market being very much open to South Australian businesses, I am sure that our commercial activities, our agricultural products and machinery, and our industry in South Australia will benefit enormously by this decision.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the Minister that he does have access to ministerial statements. The member for Mitcham.

VICTORIAN ECONOMY

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Will the Treasurer review his answer to my previous question in the light of some correspondence that I have from the Director-General of the Department of Treasury in Victoria? In a letter that I have, dated 30 March 1992, from Mr Bob Smith, Director-General of the Victorian Treasury, to Mr A.S. Cole, Secretary to the Treasury, Canberra, Mr Smith states:

Victoria, on behalf of the Victorian Public Authorities Finance Agency, attempted to negotiate a queue position for access to the market. South Australia, although it appeared to have no immediate plans to access the market, objected to a further issue

by Victoria. South Australia was ahead of Victoria and this, as well as its objection, was communicated to the Victorian Public Authorities Finance Agency at officer level by Treasury. The following morning, South Australia informed Victoria that, despite their objection and position in the queue, the Victorian Public Authorities Finance Agency had issued in the market. This was subsequently confirmed by Treasury and it appears that there was an unfortunate lack of communication at officer level within the Victorian Public Authorities Finance Agency.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I shall certainly do as requested by the member for Mitcham, but I can only repeat that the question of the so-called Victorian loans affair and the allegations that the Victorian Government did something untoward as regards the Loan Council is being

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—handled by the Federal Treasurer in a very competent manner. It is essentially a matter—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is essentially a matter between the Federal and Victorian Governments. There has now been some speculation that in some way the South Australian Government knew something about that. I took that up with the Under Treasurer and I asked clearly, 'Did we know anything about it, because there has been some speculation about it?' As late as yesterday afternoon (so it is fresh advice I have received), the answer remains 'No'. On the previous day—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On the previous day the Under Treasurer was in Canberra speaking with the head of Federal Treasury, and the Under Treasurer advises me that he took up this question with the head of Federal Treasury and said, 'There is some speculation that South Australia knew that Victoria was exceeding its global limits and that somehow we were involved.'

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I hope the member for Coles will just calm down while I repeat my previous answer. The head of Federal Treasury confirmed with the South Australian Under Treasurer that South Australia could not have had any knowledge of the Victorian position.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is the advice I have had and it is the advice that I am passing on to the Parliament. If the Under Treasurer has any particular advice, then of course I will pass that on to the Parliament, but that is the advice that I have had as late as about 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GRAND PRIX

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister of Tourism inform the House, given the recent criticism of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix,

whether the tourism benefits of the Grand Prix to the State still massively outweigh any negatives? Many constituents have telephoned me this morning complaining bitterly about last night's *7.30 Report*, and it has been put to me by Ethel Parkinson that the program is yet another example of the annual Grand Prix bashing by a small, whingeing and noisy minority.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Of course, the Grand Prix has massive benefits for tourism in this State. A study of the 1990 Grand Prix estimated the event had a net economic impact of about \$32 million, and that is a huge injection into the State's economy and certainly one that cannot be ignored when assessing the benefits of hosting a major international sporting event such as this.

The Grand Prix alone is one of South Australia's best tourism advertisements. It attracts up to 45 000 interstate and international visitors each year, many of whom take the opportunity to explore Adelaide and South Australia way beyond the track. Of course, Tourism South Australia uses the Grand Prix as a promotion to bring people here—business people, industry leaders, people from the travel industry, travel writers and so on—not only to experience the buzz of the Grand Prix and to promote that in the future but also to discover some of South Australia's many other attractions. Conservatively, the event has attracted 280 000 tourists since the first Grand Prix in 1985, which highlights its importance to the industry.

The Grand Prix creates about 2 500 short-term jobs and hundreds of others in industries servicing the event. I would not be too concerned about the *7.30 Report*. I do not have anything against the *7.30 Report* or its journalists from interstate, but I understand that, when the Presiding Member of the Economic and Finance Committee, who was approached to be interviewed for this program (and he was certainly happy to do so), would not take the program's anti-Grand Prix line, he was not contacted again. But do not be concerned. I looked at the ratings this morning, and last night the program was beaten by *E Street and Family Matters* and the night before by *Hey Dad and Jake and the Fatman* and, of course, on Tuesday night the *Home Video Show* got about double its ratings, so they could run the test pattern and get about the same result.

FRINGE BENEFITS TAX

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Treasurer advise the House of the Government's estimate of the cost it will face as a result of the Federal Government's decision to charge fringe benefits tax on car parking benefits from 1 April 1993? Given the Prime Minister's statement on the *7.30 Report* in September that he could not see a reason for compensating the States, has the Government sought and obtained an assurance from its Federal colleagues that there will be full compensation for this additional impost?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am almost certain that there will not be full compensation from the Federal Government: there never is. I think we can take that as read. I answered this question some months ago, but I will see whether there is an update. I know that the legislation has now gone into the Parliament and there

are some suggestions that it is significantly different from some of the earlier statements made by the Federal Government. I think, from memory, that the earlier question was from the member for Adelaide, suggesting that the Adelaide High School and a couple of other schools would have some problems. That proved not to be the case.

The Federal Government advised us that the public educational institutions would not be included. I know that a couple of the private schools, Annesley and Pulteney, believed that they would be up for \$20 000 or \$30 000. I cannot confirm that, because I have not seen the legislation that is going through the Parliament (nor, more interestingly, what comes out of the Parliament) that the various institutions have to deal with. Once the legislation is through and we know absolutely what we are up for, a precise figure will be calculated and I will be very happy at that time to let the member for Newland have a copy of that figure. I doubt whether I shall be happy at the time, but, when the calculation has been done, I will let the member for Newland have the figure.

SCHOOLS, FOCUS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training outline the objectives of the focus schools program and explain how it is intended to improve learning outcomes for students with high intellectual potential?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. There are about 46 focus schools offering special programs throughout South Australia. In literacy, from R to 10, there are 10 priority project schools; in science and technology from R to 7 there are a further 10 schools; in mathematics, R to 7, there are 10 schools; in physics there are three schools; in mathematics, junior secondary, there are six schools; and for students with high intellectual potential, R to 7, there are seven schools.

Focus schools are established to develop high quality teacher practices, curriculum materials and student activities in the particular area of study. Schools are given access to additional resources which are used to develop quality programs. Teachers in other schools also have access to these programs through a variety of methods. These methods include teacher visitation for observation of how it is achieved; staff development programs in other schools; publication through the 'Windows on Practice' series; and the publication of curriculum resource materials.

Schools are selected for inclusion in the program through application and a selection process based on established criteria. Identified schools cover both metropolitan and country locations. I point out that, while we have about 46 schools in total, this has meant that not all geographic areas and districts can be represented in all programs. However, I believe it is an important start in terms of offering special help to those students who are gifted and of encouraging areas such as the sciences, technology and specific subjects, such as physics, across the State. It is interesting to note that at the recent Oliphant Awards, in which I had the privilege of participating with Sir Mark Oliphant, a number of our

schools, which have been focus schools in science and technology, were actually winning awards; and it was particularly heartening to see the number of primary schools within our State system which are now starting to reap the benefits of these special focus school programs.

WATER QUALITY

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is to the Treasurer. Has the Government provided audit certificates indicating that special grants given by the Commonwealth to South Australia specifically for water quality improvement were used only for that purpose, and will the Treasurer release the relevant documents and correspondence confirming that? In the proceedings of Senate Estimates Committee B on 22 September 1992, it was claimed that more than \$100 million had been received by South Australia through advances from the Federal Minister of Finance in the form of grants to improve water quality. It was further stated that in normal circumstances the Commonwealth required audit certificates from State Governments which verify that the Commonwealth moneys have been used for the purposes identified.

However, in the South Australian Estimates Committee on 12 September 1990, the South Australian Government admitted that 'although the Commonwealth has provided that money under the heading of "water quality", it was understood by the Commonwealth and by the State that it was to be provided to the State for the State to use in any shape or form that it might choose.' Some Commonwealth sources believe that if South Australia gave the Commonwealth audit certificates in respect of the \$100 million or more involved, stating that the money was used for improving water quality, the State may have committed a fraud against the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am sure that we have not defrauded the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Government would not be too easy to

defraud. I know little or nothing of this matter, so I will have to get a report on it. However, the amounts mentioned seem to me to be far less than the amounts that have been expended in this State on water quality. Unfortunately, we are forced to pay an awful lot of money to bring our water up to an acceptable standard. I cannot see why amounts as small as this have not been more than exceeded by the funds that we expend. However, I will have some discussions with my officials and perhaps some of my ministerial colleagues to find the precise answer for the member for Coles.

The SPEAKER: Order! In view of the nature of this special sitting, and after consultation with the Leaders of the House on business, it is not my intention to propose that the House note grievances today.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

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

That the Legislative Review Committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the House on Tuesday 10 November.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 20 (clause 4) Leave out 'in the schedule' and insert 'in Schedule A'.

No. 2. Page 1, line 22 (clause 4) Leave out 'in the schedule' and insert 'in Schedule A'.

No. 3. Leave out the Schedule and insert new Schedule A as follows:

SCHEDULE A

Amounts proposed to be expended from the Consolidated Account during the financial year ending 30 June 1993

Purpose of Appropriation	Estimated Payments
Estimates 1992-93	\$
Legislative Council.....	2 511 000
House of Assembly.....	4 864 000
Joint Parliamentary Service.....	6 761 000
State Governor's Establishment.....	1 276 000
Premier and Cabinet.....	10 880 000
Industry, Trade and Technology.....	23 959 000
Premier and Minister of Economic Development, Miscellaneous.....	76 699 000
Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs.....	1 707 000
Treasury.....	15 430 000
Deputy Premier and Treasurer, Miscellaneous.....	656 143 000
Mines and Energy.....	20 867 000
Attorney-General's.....	23615000
Court Services.....	31 017 000
Electoral.....	2 161 000
Attorney-General and Minister for Crime Prevention, Miscellaneous.....	15 988 000
Office of Public Sector Reform.....	1 150 000
Office of Planning and Urban Development.....	27 814 000
South Australian Housing Trust.....	39 948 000
Recreation and Sport.....	17 430 000
Road Transport.....	8 100 000
State Transport Authority.....	152 487 000
Marine and Harbors.....	8 435 000
Office of Transport Policy and Planning.....	5 321 000
Environment and Land Management.....	1 309 000
Auditor-General's.....	8 540 000
Minister of Environment and Land Management, Miscellaneous.....	1 081 000
Police.....	273 236 000
Minister of Emergency Services, Miscellaneous.....	18 265 000
Office of Aboriginal Affairs.....	3 109 000
Education.....	916107 000
Employment and Technical and Further Education.....	174 817 000
Children's Services Office.....	54 374 000
Minister of Education, Employment and Training, Miscellaneous.....	224 874 000
Engineering and Water Supply.....	1 260 000
Housing and Construction.....	36 052 000
Minister of Public Infrastructure, Miscellaneous.....	8 836 000
Labour.....	36 040 000
Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety, Miscellaneous.....	225 000
Correctional Services.....	81 724 000
Arts and Cultural Heritage.....	68 185 000
Public and Consumer Affairs.....	4 811 000
Minister of Consumer Affairs, Miscellaneous.....	20 000
Office of Business and Regional Development.....	1 085 000
Minister of Business and Regional Development, Miscellaneous.....	3 038 000
Tourism South Australia.....	16 725 000
Minister of Tourism, Miscellaneous.....	7 355 000
State Services.....	7 639 000
Minister of State Services, Miscellaneous.....	1 500 000
South Australian Health Commission.....	789 100 000
Family and Community Services.....	165 734 000
Primary Industries.....	55 812 000
South Australian Research and Development Institute.....	2 500 000
Minister of Primary Industries and Minister Assisting the Premier on Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, Miscellaneous.....	2 527 000
Premier and Minister of State Development, Miscellaneous.....	1 016 000
Treasurer, Miscellaneous.....	192 096 000
Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, Miscellaneous.....	1 451 000
Agriculture.....	12 629 000
Minister of Agriculture, Miscellaneous.....	885 000
Fisheries.....	4 905 000
Minister of Education, Miscellaneous.....	46 578 000
Minister of Consumer Affairs and Minister of Small Business, Miscellaneous.....	297 000
Minister of Housing and Construction and Minister of Public Works, Miscellaneous.....	1 280 000
Environment and Planning.....	25 591 000
Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous.....	361 000

Purpose of Appropriation	Estimated Payments
Estimates 1992-93	
Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous.....	\$ 197 000
Lands.....	2 000 000
Minister of Lands, Miscellaneous.....	108 000
Minister of Labour and Minister of Occupational Health and Safety, Miscellaneous.....	636 000
Minister of Employment and Further Education, Minister of Youth Affairs, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Minister Assisting the Minister of Ethnic Affairs, Miscellaneous.....	93 008 000
Total	4 503 481 000

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

That the time allotted for consideration of the message from the Legislative Council on the Appropriation Bill be until 6 p.m. today.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—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, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

Noes (22)—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.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.
Motion thus carried.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice, namely, that during consideration of the Committee of the whole House on the Bill, all Ministers are required to attend in their places.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I oppose the motion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was hoping that today we would not be overly political, but I will just make the comment that we are here today unnecessarily, and I think in a manner that reflects absolutely no credit on members opposite. We are here principally because members opposite refused to suspend Standing Orders, and I would have thought that members opposite would not have the face, the cheek or the nerve—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —today to look for cooperation on a suspension. I think there is a little bit of whimsy involved in this motion, but I indicate that, despite my opposition to the motion, all Ministers are present and available. They are eager—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —to participate in debate today, which we all expect to be relevant.

However, to suggest that Ministers would not be able to leave the Chamber briefly (which would be the effect of carrying such a motion) is patently ridiculous. Therefore, I oppose the motion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Under Standing Orders there can be only one speaker for and one speaker against. The member for Mitcham can reply, but there can be only two speakers.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): First, I wish to refute the Treasurer's allegation that anything improper has been done by this Opposition in this place, because what we have done is to maintain the proper stance of this House, as the Minister would well understand. We refused to allow recision of the third reading of the Bill because it would have overturned 135 years of parliamentary history in this State. More importantly, though, on the issue of whether Ministers should be available to respond, the suspension is a safeguard because, importantly, I am unaware as to whether Standing Orders will now allow us to question each Minister. If the Treasurer is telling the House that every Minister will be available for questions and shall answer those questions, that is all the Opposition is seeking. However, if the Treasurer is saying that he is refusing the motion and that we are not allowed to question Ministers, we have put ourselves in grave difficulty.

I think it is important that this motion is agreed to and that we do ensure that all Ministers are available to answer questions and have to answer the questions that are put quite rightly by the Opposition. This Parliament has to be accountable to the people and to itself. That requires that we debate a completely new schedule, even though the Government would wish to advise otherwise. The motion that was just before the House was to consider a new schedule; that is quite clear. That schedule is new to this House. It should be debated and questioned on that principle alone—that it is a new schedule. Even though the Treasurer may say, 'Look, there are only 13 items that are different on this schedule,' if we count both sides of the ledger, there are 26 items. That is not good enough. I ask the House to approve the motion.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to. There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—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.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Noes (23)—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, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments be agreed to.

On 22 October, I moved that the vote on the third reading of the Appropriation Bill be rescinded. The aim of the motion was to bring the Bill back before the House to substitute a new schedule which reflected the changed ministerial and Public Service arrangements introduced earlier in the month. The motion was lost for want of an absolute majority. The Appropriation Bill has now been returned to the House by the Legislative Council with a suggestion that the proposed new schedule replace the schedule contained in the Bill passed by this House some weeks ago.

When there are changes of allocations of appropriations between agencies, it is usually possible, pursuant to sections 13 and 14 of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987, for the Governor to reallocate appropriations between departments and purposes during the course of a financial year. The advice that the Government has received on this occasion, however, is that there may be some problems in doing this if the original appropriations passed by the House do not relate to administrative units and ministries as they were at the time the appropriations were passed.

While the Public Finance and Audit Act could have been used, had these ministerial rearrangements occurred after the passage of the Appropriation Act, it is not appropriate to follow this course when the changes to ministries and to administrative arrangements occur before passage of the Act. The Government, therefore, takes the view that the best course of action is for the House to accept the suggestion from the Legislative Council and replace the out-dated schedule with one that reflects the new arrangements instituted by the incoming Premier, the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

The House should note that in making this suggestion the Council is exercising its powers under section 62 of the Constitution Act. Members have had available to them for some considerable time information which sets out in detail the proposed changes to the appropriations passed by the House several weeks ago. In summary, where new ministries or agencies have been created, it is necessary to provide appropriation authority to enable them to carry out their functions from early October until the end of the financial year. Where particular functions have been transferred from one ministry or agency to another, it is necessary to reflect these transfers in the amounts appropriated to each ministry or agency. Where ministries or agencies have been abolished, it is necessary

to provide appropriation authority for the functions which they have undertaken from the beginning of the financial year until early October. It is important for members to understand that these changes do not authorise the Government to undertake new initiatives which have not been subject to the processes of the House.

During the Estimates Committees process, members raised many questions about the proposed expenditures which the Appropriation Bill was designed to authorise. All those expenditures remain and all the explanations given in response to the questions still remain valid. It is the Government's expectation that the changed arrangements will give greater impetus to programs already under way, for example, public sector reform, but the changes represent a new way of approaching these tasks rather than the introduction of new programs.

The proposed new schedule to the Bill is divided into two parts. Above the line are those agencies and ministries which continue in existence, plus new agencies and ministries which do not appear on the schedule in the original Bill. Below the line are those agencies and ministries which have now been abolished but for which expenditure authority is needed from the beginning of the financial year until early October. Dealing first with items above the line, it would be apparent that many of the proposed appropriations are unchanged. Examples are the appropriations for the Legislative Council, the House of Assembly, the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology and the Treasury Department. The funds provided for these purposes will enable those agencies to carry out their functions for the whole of the 1992-93 financial year. Some of the proposed—

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a point of order. The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: Would you invite the Government Whip not to converse with strangers in the gallery from the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: I have not noticed the Government Whip doing that, but I feel sure he will comply with the Standing Orders. In fact, I will make sure that he complies with the Standing Orders.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Some of the proposed appropriations are new; for example, the Department of Primary Industries, the Office of Aboriginal Affairs and the new ministries. The funds provided for these purposes represent the amounts necessary for those agencies and ministries to carry out their functions from early October until the end of the financial year. There are also three appropriations above the line, which have been reduced slightly. These are the appropriations for the Department of Premier and Cabinet, the Department of Housing and Construction and the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. The funds provided for these agencies represent the amounts necessary for them to carry out their ongoing functions for the whole of the financial year, plus the amounts necessary to meet the costs incurred up until early October, in carrying out the functions now transferred to other agencies.

Below the line are those agencies and ministries which have been abolished. The funds provided for these purposes represent the amounts necessary to pay for the functions carried out by those agencies and ministries

from the beginning of the financial year until early October. The balance of the funds originally provided for these purposes have been transferred to other agencies or ministries to finance the ongoing functions for the rest of the financial year. The total estimated net payments for which the Government is seeking the authority of the House is exactly the same as the total for which authority has already been given. The programs that the Government proposes to carry out are the same programs that the House has already considered and approved.

The new scheme proposed by the Legislative Council merely reflects the changes in administrative arrangements instituted at the beginning of October to provide for the continuing implementation of the program. The Government believes that the House should agree to the suggestion from the Legislative Council. This will permit the Government to conduct the affairs of the State in the manner in which it now prefers.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I wish to make an opening statement to provide background to the Liberal Party's approach to this unprecedented sitting of the House today. We are concerned that this new schedule still does not legally implement in all cases the Government's new administrative arrangements. For example, we have identified cases in which Acts are committed to one Minister but the spending necessary to administer those Acts is committed to another Minister. I will give some examples in a moment.

This budget has been before Parliament for more than two months but we believe that the Government has still not got it right. No responsible Opposition would give a blank cheque to such incompetence and indifference to the correct parliamentary procedure. Honourable members will recall that the budget was introduced by the member for Ross Smith, then the Premier, on 27 August, nine weeks ago. More than eight weeks ago the member for Ross Smith was replaced as Premier. His successor immediately began to make statements promising an overhaul of the bureaucracy. On 3 September he said that there would be a major Cabinet reshuffle and 'reform of the Public Service to build greater effectiveness and responsibility to the people of South Australia'.

However, the Government still allowed the budget in its original form to proceed through the processes of this House. In September we had the second reading debate and then the Estimates Committees. On 30 September the Premier announced his new ministry. There was a further debate during the Estimates Committees in this House on 7 and 8 October. The Government had still made no allowance in the Government legislation for that new departmental structure. It allowed the budget to be received in the Legislative Council on 14 October, still without any changes to reflect the new structure. It was not until late in the evening of 21 October—and this is 21 October, for a budget introduced in August—that the Government suddenly came to this House and asked it to consider a new budget schedule. It wanted this House to rescind the third reading of the budget legislation—action unprecedented in the 135 years of responsible Government in South Australia.

The Liberal Party, of course, was not prepared to do this, because we are not willing to have Parliament treated with contempt. The budget had been before this

House for two weeks of normal sittings and for the two weeks of the Estimates Committees, but at the very last minute the Government tried to rush through this House adjustments affecting more than \$1 billion in finance, or almost 25 per cent of the proposed spending on Consolidated Account. The Government did not want to give this House any opportunity to question the restructuring reflected in the new schedule.

The Liberal Party believed that some of these changes were flawed and could result in the budget legislation being passed with errors in it. Our analysis justifies our concerns and we will be raising very specific questions on those concerns here today. Those questions have as their starting point the departmental restructuring that was put in place from the end of September.

As necessary background to our questions, I now turn to what the Government has claimed the restructuring will achieve. In particular I shall deal with the statement made by the Premier on 30 September in which he announced his new ministry. His press statement was headlined 'Economic development key aim of new ministry', and promised 'a sharper focus on economic development'. However, the reality is that under this Premier economic policy in South Australia is becalmed in a sea of Government incompetence, while our economy continues to sink in recession under the weight of ever increasing taxes and charges and the failure to implement basic reforms such as WorkCover.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I was hoping that we would be able to get through this without too much difficulty—but clearly not. The question before the Chair is the schedule. It is not, I would argue, relevant to be making the quotes that the Leader has. He is now debating the issue; this is not the matter that is before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order. The question before the Chair concerns the Legislative Council's suggested amendments to the schedule and I would ask the Leader to come back to the proposition that is in front of us.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Chairman, could I point out to you that I listened very carefully to what the Treasurer said in his statement, and he went back and covered exactly the same time frame and the same material that I am now touching on. I listened very carefully, because I knew that the Treasurer was trying to stymie this debate. I knew he was trying to put very definite circles around what could be raised here. But he himself has set the example here today by going right back and talking about the original budget.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Leader to take his seat, please. The question before the Chair is the suggested amendments from the Legislative Council. It is my ruling that this is what the Chamber will debate, and I ask the honourable Leader to come back to the proposition before the Chair.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I do not think I have departed from it, and I certainly will not, and I take up the point immediately—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair is not going to be in a position to accept continuous insults.

The Hon. Dean Brown: I've got every right to defend myself, Sir. That is not an insult to the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will repeat what I have just said: the Chair is not going to be in a position to take continuous insults. I have given a ruling and the matter is now in the hands of the Committee.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I seek some clarification, Mr Chairman: are you saying that we cannot question or comment on the history associated with the schedule and the reason why figures have changed? Is that your ruling, Sir, as Chairman of Committees?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the member for Mitcham has a point of order, he should make it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am asking for a point of clarification—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the member for Mitcham has a point of order, let him make it. I am not here to answer questions.

Mr D.S. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, you have made a ruling that you will not have continuous insults directed at you. Can you define what they are, or are we not allowed to ask what you consider to be a continuous insult?

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Victoria will resume his seat. I have no intention of explaining, and the Standing Orders do not require me to do so. If the honourable member wants to make a point of order, I will take it. The honourable Leader. The honourable Leader will resume his seat. The member for Coles has a point of order.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My point of order, Mr Chairman, is that it is my recollection that you invited the Leader and the Treasurer to make a statement prior to the House going into Committee. The Treasurer made his statement; the Leader is now making his statement. The Treasurer's statement ranged over a number of points, and the Leader's statement is doing the same. It seems to me that it would be quite inequitable if the Leader were not permitted to make his statement in accordance with Standing Orders in the way in which he chooses.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are no statements. If the member for Coles wishes to raise a point of order under the Standing Orders, she should do so and I will rule on it. As far as the debate is concerned, there are no such things as statements. This matter is to be dealt with in the ordinary course of debate, and that is what we are proceeding with. The member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: In that case, Mr Chairman, in considering the Committee stage of a budget, this House is accustomed to certain Standing Orders prevailing. I seek your ruling as to whether the Standing Orders that prevail in the Committee stage of Estimates Committees are applicable to this debate which is, in effect, consideration of a schedule relating to an Estimates Committee. Which Standing Orders prevail in this circumstance?

The CHAIRMAN: The Standing Orders prevail; the Standing Orders have always prevailed. The honourable member asked me for a ruling, and I have given it. My ruling is that we are considering the suggested amendments that have come from the Legislative Council. That is the matter to be debated here, and that is my ruling. If any member of the House wishes to take the matter further, it is in their hands. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Chairman, why did you allow the Treasurer to make the statement—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. That is not a point of order. If the honourable member has a point of order, I will respond to it. I have no intention of answering irrelevant questions. The Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I am speaking to the motion before the House. On 24 June 1992, it was announced in response to the interim Arthur D. Little study that the Government committed itself immediately to spending \$40 million to boost and modernise industry. However, Treasury papers prepared for this Committee show that, more than four months after that announcement, none of that money has yet been spent. There is still confusion over where the money will be spent and who will be responsible for allocating it.

In the Estimates Committee, the Premier said that these funds had only been notationally allocated. More than four months after the original commitment and more than two months after the introduction of this budget, industry is none the wiser. Associated with this commitment is the establishment of the Economic Development Board. More than six weeks ago, during the Estimates Committee, the Premier said that key decisions on the appointment and role of the Economic Development Board would be made within a few weeks.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On a point of order, Mr Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Leader will resume his seat. The Minister.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Members are wasting their own time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The question is one of relevance. I do not believe that the Arthur D. Little report or the Economic Development Board, etc. are the matters that are before the Committee. The Committee is dealing purely with the schedule, and I request that you rule accordingly, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Will the member for Mitcham please be seated and wait until I have finished what I am saying. I uphold the point of order, and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to come back to the subject before the Chair, that is, that the suggested amendments from the Legislative Council regarding the schedule be agreed to. The member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In talking to the schedule, we are referring to items that are listed on the schedule, as the Treasurer well understands. We are also talking to—and I will make it quite clear—a number of ministerial lines that have changed, and that is why this House is sitting.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to sit down.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will be more specific.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to sit down. This is not a second reading debate. If the honourable member wants to make a point of order, he should make it. Does the honourable member want to make a further point of order?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, I will make a point of order. The issue of the Economic Development Board is clearly within the purview of this Committee, because—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat.

Mr S.J. BAKER: —it is actually one of the items mentioned under the schedule.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. In my opinion, this is not a matter for argument. What we have before us are the suggested amendments from the Legislative Council. I ask members to direct their speech to that proposition that is in front of us. I uphold the point of order, and I ask the Leader to contain himself to the proposition in front of us. The honourable Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman; I will continue to do so. The Treasury papers—that is, the details of the schedule we are talking about—show that only 2.6 per cent of the budgeted allocation for the MFP has been spent in the first four months of this financial year.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I take a point of order, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable Leader will resume his seat. There is a point of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have raised the question of relevance. It appears to me that the Leader is trying to engage in debate, which was more appropriate for the Estimates Committees. The schedule before us merely—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. Dean Brown: You can't even face the truth.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is merely a suggested amendment allocating certain funds to certain other Ministers, ministries or administrative units. It has nothing at all to do with whether or not the amount allocated to the MFP has been spent.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Will the member for Coles please sit down until I am finished. The purposes of the expenditure contained in all programs and summarised in the original schedule have been fully examined in the Estimates Committees. The changes that have led to the suggested amended schedule relate not to the purpose of the expenditure but to the new ministerial and departmental arrangements as to responsibility for the expenditure. Questions related to these changes in responsibility are therefore in order, but questions related to the purpose of the expenditure are not in order, and I rule in that way. The member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, in accordance with the ruling that you have just given, it is my understanding that the MFP, which has been questioned by the Treasurer as being part of the schedule, was under the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and is now under the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology. Therefore, it is related

to changes in the schedule and reference to it is perfectly legitimate in accordance with the Standing Orders.

The CHAIRMAN: I agree in part with the honourable member.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Just one moment. I have been asked to rule on a proposition. In part, I agree with the honourable member's proposition. Questions that relate to responsibilities of the changes are therefore in order, but all references to the MFP or indeed any other section are not in order. The questions that the Committee should be examining are changes in the responsibilities of the various Ministers in terms of this schedule. That is the ruling I am giving. If members wish to make a point of that, it is in their hands. The question is in the hands of the Committee.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. Given that I understood you to concede that I had a point of order that was justified, why should the Leader not be permitted to make reference to the MFP when it is clearly part of the schedule: the sum of \$23.9 million under the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology, which Ministry has assumed responsibility as part of the rearrangement of the Ministries?

The CHAIRMAN: I am not going to allow my position as Chairman to become an Aunt Sally. If the honourable member wishes to take a point of order, she may do so, and if she disputes my ruling the matter is in her hands. I am not going to accept references to the MFP, as I thought I indicated in relation to the original question. The questions I am willing to accept concerning the MFP relate to those changes in responsibility so far as the various Ministries are concerned. The honourable member rightly said that there were changes in Ministries and, therefore, questions can be raised as to those responsibilities but, as to a general statement on the MFP, I rule that out of order. The member for Adelaide.

Dr ARMITAGE: Mr Chairman, I rise on a point of order. You have made a point several times of saying that we are debating changes. Before me I have a suggestion of amendments, but no changes are mentioned. There are estimated payments within the budget lines but there are no changes.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The member for Adelaide will resume his seat. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a further point of order, Mr Chairman. The schedule refers to 'amounts proposed to be expended from the Consolidated Account during the financial year ending 30 June 1993': I seek your ruling on whether members are allowed to refer to those amounts in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN: I repeat what I said earlier: this debate refers to changes to the amended schedule—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! You are wasting your own time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have not finished. The Leader will resume his seat. I am answering the point of order raised by the member for Goyder, and I repeat the ruling I have given: questions related to changes in responsibility are in order but questions related to the

purpose of expenditure are not in order. That is the way I rule and, if members wish to disagree with that, the matter is in their hands. The Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I understand the motion is that schedule A before us be agreed to and I do not think that there is any dispute about that, is there?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: So, we are now—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. If he wants to clarify the situation, let us clarify it. The question before the Chair, which was moved by the Minister, came in this form when the Minister moved 'that the suggested amendments of the Legislative Council be agreed to'. That is the matter we should be discussing.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I appreciate your guidance on this matter and I assure you that I will stick to schedule A, which has been circulated today. It deals with allocations of finance for various Ministries and departmental functions. I will stick rigidly to that. In doing so, I would like to talk about the implementation of the planning review for which there is money allocated under schedule A, because that planning review is also floundering. The Premier stated—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Chairman—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader will resume his seat.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Chairman, again, I draw your attention to the question of relevance. Whether or not the planning review is floundering is not the issue before the Committee. The only issue is the allocations that were in the original schedule and the changes and reallocations of those amounts to other Ministries and administrative units. I would suggest that whether or not the planning review is floundering is not relevant.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair, and the question we have already discussed, should be related to changes in responsibility. That matter is in order, but questions related to the purpose of the expenditure are not in order. The member for Victoria.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Does that mean that your ruling—

The CHAIRMAN: I am not giving meanings to my rulings.

Mr D.S. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, does your ruling mean—

The CHAIRMAN: I am not giving meanings to anything.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Are we allowed to question dollars or not, Mr Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will resume his seat. I am not answering questions. This is not the time for questioning of the Chairman. I have given a ruling. If the member for Victoria disagrees with that ruling, the matter is in his hands. The Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I seek clarification of a point of order, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: No, I am not giving clarification.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: You just said—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member resumes his seat, I will explain the position once more. Will the honourable member please sit down. This is not

going to be question time for the Chairman. I have given a ruling. That ruling stands and the matter is in your hands. I do not intend to answer questions. If you have a point of order, I will take that point of order, but it is not question time for the Chairman. The honourable Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I ask that during the lunch break you read again what the Minister said in his statement to the House so that when we come back after lunch you have some idea of the wide range that the Minister covered in his statement and at least allow some fairness in terms of the extent to which I can cover the same sort of territory that the Minister covered in his statement.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the Leader to resume his seat. I repeat and I will continue to repeat from now until 6 o'clock if necessary: I have given a ruling and that ruling stands. No matter what happens at lunch-time or any other time, a ruling has been given, and that ruling stands. If the Leader disagrees with that ruling, the matter is in his hands. The member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER: On a further point of order, Mr Chairman, as we are being asked—and this is from the Legislative Council—to insert certain details in schedule A, my understanding would be that, therefore, we are allowed to refer to anything in schedule A, and we cannot debate this unless we are referring to actual monetary amounts identified in schedule A, whether they are previous or new amounts.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept the member for Goyder's proposition. Some items in the schedule have changed and some have not changed. Questions relating to those changes—

Mr MEIER: Mr Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I will repeat once more, and I want to make this crystal clear to members: questions related to those changes and responsibilities are in order, but questions relating to the purpose of expenditure are not in order. That is my ruling. If the member for Goyder is not happy with that ruling, the matter is in his hands. The Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I will continue to discuss schedule A. The Premier, in his statement on 30 September, said that his new departmental structure, which is what we are talking about, would oversee implementation—

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Prior to the lunch break, I was saying that the Premier, in his statement of 30 September, said that his new departmental structure would 'oversee the implementation of the Arthur D. Little reform process and coordinate a group of ministries with more targeted economic functions'. We are talking about the restructuring of Government, and that is exactly what this schedule relates to. I point out that nothing whatsoever is happening. The only initiative has been the legislation for eastern standard time, and that was not included in the Arthur D. Little recommendations.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman, again on the question of relevance. The schedule merely contains the changes that have occurred since the previous schedule passed through the

House. It has nothing to do with eastern standard time, for example.

The CHAIRMAN: At the moment I do not uphold the point of order because I accept that the Leader was referring to the schedule. However, I ask the Leader to make sure that he keeps to the matter before the Committee. The honourable Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman, I appreciate that. I will stick to the schedule. The Premier, on 30 September, announced that an Office of Public Sector Reform—that deals specifically with the schedule—would be established to drive ‘a shake-up of the Public Service to make Government more responsive to community needs and demands’. That is nothing more than a PR flim-flam. All that has been done to create this office is to amalgamate—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. The Minister has a point of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Again, PR flim-flam is not relevant to what is before the Committee. Again I state that what is before the Committee is a suggested amendment showing the structures of the new departments and ministries; it has nothing to do with debating any issue, whether PR flim-flam or not.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order and ask the Leader to stick to the proposition before the Committee. In order to make sure that everybody knows, I will read it once more. The proposition is ‘That the suggested amendments of the Legislative Council be agreed to’, and I ask the Leader to confine his remarks to that matter. The honourable Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Chairman, I highlight the fact that I am talking about schedule A and that I am talking about the Office of Public Sector Reform, which I understand this schedule is all about. I get the distinct impression that the Treasurer, as the Minister responsible, does not understand what schedule A is about. It is about the restructuring of Government. It appears that the Treasurer is either scared of the truth about how bad this restructuring of Government is and how bad—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will please sit down. The Minister has a point of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Again, it is on the question of relevance. The comments and the debate that have just occurred are utterly irrelevant to the suggested amendments that are before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the Leader of the Opposition to stick to the proposition that we have before us. The honourable Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. As I was saying, I am talking about this Government’s restructuring. All that has been done to create the Office of Public Sector Reform is to amalgamate spending originally allocated to the GARG process and part of the Office of Cabinet and Government Management Board. Almost 40 per cent of these budget allocations had already been spent before the portfolio changes. This Government has lagged behind all other States in this public sector reform.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Leader to resume his seat. The Minister has a point of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thought for a minute that the Leader had got the message. The early part of his statement was, in my view, absolutely—

An honourable member: What is the point of order?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Relevance.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The comments and debate on whether this Government is lagging behind another Government or anything else are irrelevant to the motion before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order. Once more, I request the Leader of the Opposition to stick to the question before the Committee. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The creation of the Office of Public Sector Reform that I was talking about is no more than a shabby attempt to suggest that positive action has been taken when in fact it adds up to nothing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader will please sit down. The Minister has a point of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Chairman, I again draw your attention to the question of relevance. Clearly, whether this Government is involved in a shabby attempt or not is very interesting but not relevant to the debate. The question—

The Hon. Dean Brown: I was highlighting the schedule.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The question about where the funding is under the schedule for the Office of Public Sector Reform is relevant. I assume that this is the preamble to a question, and if we ever get to a question I am sure that members on this side will be only too pleased to state where those funds are.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order. I will repeat what I said before lunch, in case anybody has forgotten. The changes that have led to the suggested amended schedule relate not to the purpose of the expenditure but to the new ministerial and departmental arrangements and responsibility for the expenditure. Questions relating to those changes in responsibilities are therefore in order, but questions relating to the purpose of the expenditure are not. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I was about to refer to the Office of Business and Regional Development, which comes under the Minister of Business and Regional Development. There is a line in schedule A, as I have pointed out on previous occasions, to cover this item. It is a very similar story with this office. The Premier said that this office ‘would complement his role as Minister of Economic Development by dealing with industry and business matters on a State-wide basis’. However, apart from the existing activities of the Small Business Corporation, the Minister of Business and Regional Development is having added to his responsibilities only some of the spending for the Information Utility, the Business Regulation and Review Office and the administration of some grants from the old Department of Industry, Trade and Technology. These moves have no relevance at all to the need to foster the decentralisation of industry.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Leader to resume his seat. The Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On a point of order, there was absolutely no relevance to the motion before the Committee in the last two sentences read by the Leader.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not uphold the point of order at this stage. I believe the Leader was referring to the changes in responsibilities and he was in order. The honourable Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman; I appreciate your protection. The third so-called major office created under the restructuring is the Office of Planning and Urban Development. This is to be under the control of the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. It is here where there are major legal problems. This office has had allocated to it all remaining spending previously allocated to the Department of Environment and Planning.

I note in passing that, in the first three months of this financial year, almost 50 per cent of the allocation for these programs has been spent, suggesting the potential for significant overruns. This is one point that we wish to explore further today if the Minister will let us. This spending is for programs such as the Botanic Gardens, conservation policy, costal management, the State Herbarium, flora, fauna and park management, pollution management, landscaping and garden management, native vegetation, State heritage and pastoral management. However, in the *Government Gazette* of 1 October, responsibility for the Acts under which this spending can occur was committed not to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations but to the Minister of Environment and Land Management. In fact, the Minister of Environment and Land Management has been allocated only the following programs from the former Department of Environment and Planning: the Adelaide Zoo, the Monarto operations, war concessions and grants for and zone ecology in the Outback Areas Community Development Trust. We have this new Minister to cover the environment, and all he has been given is the Adelaide Zoo, Monarto and war concessions.

Mr S.J. Baker: The zoo fits.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The zoo fits, does it?

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I would suggest that there has been some break-outs from it. All the relevant policy areas and administration that one would have expected to go to the new Minister of Environment and Land Management has gone off to another Minister. Therefore, quite clearly, this so-called new Minister of Environment and Land Management is such in name only. He has been allocated no spending resources to administer the Acts for which he is responsible—no funding whatsoever to administer the Acts allocated to him by this Government.

This is the sort of embarrassment that the Treasurer has been trying to hide for the past two hours in this place. This is the sort of embarrassment that was involved in members opposite not wanting a full debate on this schedule. The Government has allocated the Acts to one Minister and the finance to another. This is the chaos, Minister, that you have now brought the whole of the budget to—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, in relation to relevance, this matter seems to be developing into a general debate. I also seek your ruling as to whether this is the preamble to a question.

The CHAIRMAN: I will repeat what I said earlier: questions related to those changes in responsibilities are in order but questions related to the purposes of the expenditure are not. I have been listening very carefully to the Leader of the Opposition, and I believe that at this stage he is relating his remarks to the responsibilities of the Minister and, therefore, I do not uphold the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I was talking about the Minister of Environment and Land Management and the allocation of the funds and trying to match that up with the legal responsibilities of that portfolio. There is no doubt there has now been a major bungle with some very serious legal implications resulting from that. The budgeted expenditure exceeds about \$27 million for the remainder of this financial year. How can the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations authorise spending under programs assigned to him when the Acts of this Parliament, which those programs implement, are committed to another Minister? There are other cases where Acts are assigned to one Minister but the spending for them is given to quite another Minister. For example, more than \$3.6 million in Grand Prix spending has been reallocated from the Premier to the Deputy Premier, but the Grand Prix Act remains committed to the Premier.

The proclamation of Acts to Ministers on 1 October also appears to have omitted giving the Treasurer, as Minister of Mineral Resources, responsibility for the Cooper Basin Ratification Act and the Stony Point indenture. His predecessor, the Minister of Mines and Energy, had responsibility for both these Acts. Another oversight in this proclamation is the Government Management and Employment Act. If the Attorney-General's role, as Minister of Public Sector Reform, is to count for anything whatsoever, it would be logical to give him responsibility for the Government Management and Employment Act. But the Government has not done so.

On 8 October, the *Government Gazette* proclaimed the transfer of all positions in the disability services unit at the Health Commission to the Department for Family and Community Services. However, the new budget schedule, schedule A (which we are debating at present), does not reflect this major change. I refer to another problem in respect of the Intellectually Disabled Services Council, which has been transferred from the Health Commission to the Family and Community Services Department (FACS). However, in the past week, it has been switched back again from FACS to the Health Commission.

On 8 October, there was also a proclamation for the transfer of all positions in the disability advisers unit of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to the Department for Family and Community Services. Again, the new schedule does not take this into account. The budgets of the Health Commission, FACS and the Premier's Department have not been adjusted to reflect these changes. In the case of the disability services unit,

it administers spending of almost \$80 million. The Deputy Premier also has the portfolio of Minister of Mineral Resources; however, no such portfolio is identified in the new schedule. I ask the Minister to explain that. You are the Minister responsible; you are the Treasurer; you are the Minister of Mineral Resources; but you have not allocated any money—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point order, Mr Chairman, I ask you to draw to the attention of the member opposite the fact that he should not refer to members opposite as 'you' but as members opposite.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order and ask the Leader of the Opposition to refer to members by their correct title.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This afternoon we are expecting an explanation from the Treasurer. He is responsible for this budget, and for new schedule A. We would like a clear explanation as to why the Minister of Mineral Resources has not been allocated any expenditure, even though he has that responsibility. There is a portfolio of Mines and Energy in the new schedule, but this portfolio was abolished by proclamation on 1 October. So, the schedule we have before us is clearly flawed. The Government is asking us to put through this re-drafted schedule, which it has now had several weeks to prepare and look at in detail. It is putting through a line for the Minister of Mines and Energy, but that portfolio was abolished over four weeks ago. That is how ill-conceived this move by the Government is.

Let me pick up some of the other points, so I can highlight to the Minister responsible the problems associated with Schedule A. Further confusion reigns in the area because responsibility for ETSA and the Pipelines Authority has remained with the Minister of Public Infrastructure, while the Deputy Premier has responsibility for the Government's energy policy. While the Deputy Premier is responsible for mineral exploration, it was the Minister of Public Infrastructure who went to the United States for 11 days this month to promote the upgraded exploration effort by the Department of Mineral Resources.

A proclamation on 8 October transferred all positions in the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Primary Industries. However, the Government has also announced that some positions in the Department of Agriculture are to be reallocated to the South Australian Research and Development Institute, which was established by another proclamation on 8 October. I just highlight that on 8 October we transferred all positions from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Primary Industries. On exactly the same day it was announced that some of those positions would be transferred from the Department of Agriculture and/or the Department of Primary Industries—because timing here is crucial, within a few seconds—across to the South Australian Research and Development Institute. It is almost like a chess game with public servants being moved every few seconds. It is no wonder there is absolute confusion within the Public Service as to where people sit.

This institute, to which I have been referring, is to be funded through reallocation of \$2.5 million from the former Department of Agriculture, but there is no information to show which departmental programs are to

be cut to provide for this spending. In other words, all this money has been allocated to the Department of Primary Industries and positions have been transferred across to this new institute, but we have not been told from where the funds will come for the new institute and which programs will be cut in the new Department of Primary Industries.

The Hon. Ms Levy, who is now the Minister for the Status of Women, has also been given responsibility for interstate relations, but there is no spending under the new budget schedule for these arrangements. So, we have a Minister for the Status of Women with no money allocated. I wonder whether that is the sort of priority that the Premier will give to women over the next 12 months until the election, if the Government lasts that long. It certainly will not last any longer than that. The Hon. Ms Levy tried to explain yesterday that, whilst she had ministerial responsibility for women's issues, the administrative arrangements remained with the Premier's Department. What happens if administrative mistakes are made? Which Minister will be held accountable—the Minister in the other place or the Premier in this place? Of which Minister do we ask questions? In fact, is there—and let us find out this afternoon—a Minister for the Status of Women, or is it really the Premier?

This afternoon I have given the House more than enough evidence to shoot holes in this schedule A that we have before us. In fact, I have demonstrated what a farce this Government has created with its so-called new departmental structure. I return to the Premier's words in his statement of 30 September when he said:

My Government accepts that it must provide a strong lead in charting a new direction for this State. The new ministerial arrangements will do that in a dramatic and decisive way. The following day, when outlining the self-styled super ministries, he said:

They will lead to cut-backs in levels of bureaucracy and they herald a leaner, more efficient Public Service.

The Premier has been deluding himself while attempting to deceive the whole of South Australia. There is no improvement in efficiency in this new structure. New schedule A proposes to spend the same amount of money as the Government was spending before. I stress: there has been no saving in the new structure of the Government whatsoever for the taxpayers of South Australia. Members should look at the bottom line of schedule A. It is exactly the same as the original allocation passed by this Parliament. All the Government is attempting to do is to have a little shuffle of money around, with no benefit and no gain whatsoever for the people of this State. There is no evidence of benefits to the taxpayers through reduced costs or improved services. Instead, it has been a recipe for confusion, chaos and, worse, possible illegal budget appropriations. The so-called super Ministers are not working. I point out that they have been referred to in the Public Service as the 'seven dwarfs', and now 'Superman' himself has become 'Snow White'.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman, in respect of the question of relevance. I thought the Leader was getting somewhere close to it when he said that this was merely about the

shuffling of money. He is absolutely correct—that is all it is. Any debate is—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to come back to the debate.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. In fact, I was talking about the seven super ministries which have been called within the Public Service the seven dwarfs, and I pointed out also that they now refer to Superman as Snow White. I point out that confusion reigns within the Public Service. The Premier's promises have been nothing more than fairy tales. The Premier has tried, quite unsuccessfully, to divorce Labor from its past. It is appropriate that we are having this debate on the tenth anniversary of this Government's election to office, for it exposes everything that is wrong with the Labor Government of South Australia. It is a tired Government, out of touch with the—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —needs of South Australians—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. There is a point of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Again, Sir, my point of order relates to the question of relevance. Comments about the Government are not appropriate in this debate.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order and ask the Leader of the Opposition to come back to the debate.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is a Government which refuses to—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Leader to come back to the debate that is before the Chair.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I accept that, and point out that I am talking about schedule A. This Government refuses to be accountable for the action it has taken under schedule A. We have tried to drag the Government into this budget examination today so that Parliament can fulfil its duty to scrutinise all Government spending. The Premier has learned nothing from the debacles of the State Bank, SGIC—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —and other mismanagement during—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —Labor's decade of disaster.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Leader to come back to the debate that is before the Chair. I ask him not to continue when I start to speak.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I apologise; I thought the Minister was trying to jump to his feet, but I looked across and did not see him there. The Premier is now attempting to create the perception of a new Government, with new ideas and a new direction for South Australia. The reality is that things are going from bad to worse. We have seen the shambles of the State Bank—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to come back to the debate that is before the Chair. I repeat once more, because people tend to forget and seem to be drifting off: the proposition before the Chair is that the suggested amendments of the Legislative Council be agreed to. That is the proposition

before the Chair, and I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to speak to that proposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There is one other point I need to raise in closing these opening remarks on the schedule, and that is the legality under which we are currently considering the schedule that is before us. I point out that the Attorney-General, on 21 October this year, sent a letter to the Leader of the Liberal Party in another place and expressed his views as to the potential legality of a recommendation from the other place that these budget schedules should be amended. I read to the House what was contained in that letter of 21 October:

It would seem that the position is at best unclear and that it is at least arguable that the Council does not have the power to suggest an amendment. I understand from the Clerk of the Council that the power to suggest an amendment has not been used for more than 50 years. It would also seem that whatever procedure is adopted the practical result remains that the proposed variation will need to be considered in the Assembly before being finally passed by the Council.

This is a serious matter, because we are asked to consider new schedule A on the recommendation of another place, yet the Attorney-General of this State has presented a letter of October, just a couple of weeks ago, which states that in his view at least, as expressed in this letter—which is obviously why he expressed the view there—the legality of doing so is at least unclear and certainly very questionable. I question, therefore, whether or not we should even be here today considering this schedule based on the recommendation of another place. I ask the Government to try to justify that point. I know that subsequent to that, and having found that they could not get the motion through the Lower House to change that schedule, members opposite had to change their tactics. I understand that they raced off and tried to scratch up legal opinions that would put up a point of view counter to what our own Attorney-General of this State laid down on 21 October. This is a valid issue, which this House should also consider this afternoon.

I come back to the key point—the fundamental point—before us, and it is this: the Government, on a series of occasions, has by proclamation, which has the authority of law, allocated certain sections of government to one Minister and now it is trying to put through a schedule that would allocate the spending money, the appropriation money, to another Minister. It highlights the chaos that this Government is in. This afternoon, Treasurer, we will go through, example by example, ministry by ministry, and highlight where this Government has not thought through the consequences of its restructuring. That is why the whole of the Public Service is talking about the chaos and the disaster that has occurred with this restructuring. It is a disaster that simply carries on the decade of disasters that this Labor Government has laid before us.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My first question is directed to the Treasurer. On what date did the Government first realise it had made a gross error in changing ministries during the passage of the budget, and that precipitated this new budget schedule, and who first brought the matter to the Government's attention?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I argue that that is not the matter before the Committee.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is what I am arguing and the Chair will determine, not you.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If I had given instructions, he has not obeyed them very well, has he?

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Four:two. I argue that the only matters that are relevant are the changes made to the schedule that was passed in this House and the one that is before us by way of suggested amendment from the Legislative Council. I am happy to explain to the Committee where the new allocations have gone. I do not believe it would be proper to get into any other debate.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My next question is directed to the Premier, given that we will not get anything out of the Treasurer today—never have, never will. I refer to the schedule where changes have been made to the Premier and Cabinet line, allocations being made to the Office of Public Sector Reform as a result. I refer to the Premier's statement of 1 October:

That in announcing changes to the public sector, the Premier said the move 'heralds a leaner, more efficient public sector'.

Will the Premier say what target does the Government have for reducing the number of public sector positions during this financial year? I ask this in the context of the fact that, whilst the Premier retains responsibility for overall policy, part of his responsibilities have now been diverted to the Office of Public Sector Reform. This Parliament would now like to know what his targets are?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I do not see the relevance of the question to the matters that are before us in terms of this schedule. The matter of public sector questions and programs has been discussed in the Estimates Committees and as to Government—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —policy on these matters, that can be questioned in the normal Question Time in this place. It is not relevant to this matter now, which merely relates to the schedule.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will ask my next question and hope that I do get an answer. It relates to another line and the transfer of the Grand Prix to the Treasurer's responsibility. Will the Treasurer explain why the responsibility for the funding was transferred to the Treasurer, but the responsibility for the Act still remains with the Premier? I ask the Premier this question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: You are very kind, but inaccurate.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is correct that the funding for the Grand Prix has been transferred to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, as the Premier is no longer the Treasurer. It is as simple as that.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is an interesting answer. The Treasurer said that, because the former Treasurer is no longer the Treasurer and he is now the Treasurer, funding is his responsibility, but I asked about the responsibility under the legislation governing the Grand Prix. It still remains the responsibility of the Premier. If we follow the logic of the line that has just been given by the Treasurer, everything would be under the Treasurer's

line: there would be no other lines in the budget. The Premier still controls the Act; he is still responsible for the Act governing the Grand Prix. Will the Premier explain to this Parliament why the Premier still controls the Act whilst the Treasurer controls the funding? I point out to members of this House, unless they misunderstand, that in almost all cases, except where mistakes have been made, as in this schedule and in the gazetted changes that have taken place, the Minister under whose line a particular item falls is normally the Minister responsible for the Act governing that item?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I can give a short answer in another way. It is considered by the Government to be appropriate that the Treasurer has the funding for the Grand Prix.

Mr S.J. Baker: He has the funding for everything.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will take one question at a time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is the point. If there are arguments about whether the Government thinks it is appropriate, that is why we have elections. The Government has considered it appropriate that the line be under the Treasurer—end of story. The fact that responsibility for funding in some cases is under Ministers and indeed departments other than the Minister to which the Act is committed is not unusual.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Under the Act, the Premier has certain responsibilities for making directions. Is it intended that the Premier will continue to make those directions whilst the Treasurer provides the money?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have nothing further to add. I will repeat what I have already said: the fact that the Premier feels it is appropriate that the funding for the Grand Prix be under a Treasurer's line is a policy decision.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There is nothing the slightest bit unusual about it.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I cannot accept that, Mr Chairman. The Act of Parliament gives the authority for certain expenditures to the Premier, yet the money sits with the Treasurer (the Deputy Premier). One would therefore assume that, if there has been no appropriation for the Premier by this Parliament under that particular Act, although he has the authorisation to spend money, he cannot spend it, because no appropriation has been made. Regardless of how much money comes under the Treasury line, no allocation and no authority exists for the Premier to make any expenditure. I think what we are doing today is trying to plaster up a fundamental bungle by this Government whereby it has put the money with one Minister and the authority under the Act, by proclamation, with another Minister. Now the Government is trying to make out that no problem is being encountered when we all know there is.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It might be appropriate for me to ask the Minister: who signs the authorisation requiring expenditure, or do both Ministers have to get together in a phone booth and sign it?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In the spirit of being helpful, I repeat: there is nothing particularly unusual in a Minister having an Act allocated to him—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the member for Murray-Mallee wishes to ask a question, I will give him all the necessary scope; in the meantime, I ask him to be quiet while the question is being answered. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—whilst the administration of all or even part of that Act is conducted by another agency. For example, for many years I have had responsibility for the Casino, which was allocated to me as Minister of Finance, but the administration of the Casino was with the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, who did not report to me at all but, I think, to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Small Business. There was nothing untoward about it at all.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I highlight to the Committee that, under the rationale put forward by the Treasurer a moment ago, funds can be appropriated under the Treasurer with the Act being dedicated to the Premier (a different Minister). We might as well amend schedule A and have one line whereby all funds are allocated to the Treasurer and leave it at that. Why are we going through this complex procedure with all these different lines and officers if, under the rationale put forward by the Treasurer a moment ago, a Minister can have responsibility in one area with just one line covering all expenditure for the whole of Government under the Treasurer? The Treasurer seems to forget that I happened to sit in Government for three years and that I know the procedures of Government. The facts are that the Minister who has the authority to sign must have funds allocated to him if he is to commit any expenditure, and we see here a number of examples where that has not occurred.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If there was a question in that, rather than a statement, I can only repeat that this is nothing unusual. I am sure that, if I had the time—I could make the time available or donate someone else's time—I could go through the years between 1979 and 1982 and detail to the House at a later stage where Acts were committed to particular Ministers but where the administration of those Acts in certain areas was allocated to other people. There is nothing unusual in it at all.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Leader asks, 'Why are we debating this schedule?' I have answered that question previously but, as the Leader has asked me the question again, I will go through it again. We are debating this schedule basically for two reasons. The first and I suppose the most substantial reason is that the former Premier resigned during the passage of the Appropriation Bill through the Parliament. Had he resigned a little earlier or a little later, we would not be having this debate today.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Not this debate; there are still plenty of debates to be had, but we would not be having this debate, because the changes that are now being made by way of suggested amendment of the Legislative Council would have been unnecessary had the former Premier resigned later and the new Premier not

decided to have an extensive Cabinet reshuffle and a change of administrative arrangements. Those arrangements and the funding for them would have been reflected in the original schedule had the former Premier resigned earlier and the present Premier still decided to do what he did or, if the Appropriation Bill had been through the Parliament, again, it would not have mattered. The debate would not have had to be held because, one day after this Bill had gone through the Parliament, should the Premier have wished to have a ministerial reshuffle and to change every department in the Public Service and every administrative unit, various other Acts of Parliament would have come into play and permitted that without any debate in Parliament. So that is the answer to the Leader's question. It is as simple as that.

I am very proud, while I am on my feet, to thank members in the Legislative Council—members of the Liberal Party—who saw this issue as one that warranted about 30 seconds of their time. All it required was a little commonsense, and I pay credit to the Deputy Leader. The Deputy Leader also showed some commonsense and agreed that this was the way it ought to be.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, we are here to question the Government. The Minister's remarks have no relevance to the question that was asked; he is filibustering.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The Treasurer.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The question was quite clear: why are we here? I have outlined one reason—for a technicality. That is the principal reason. The other reason is that, although—

Mr D.S. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, the answer to the question has no relevance to the question asked, and I would ask you to rule on it.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not accept that as a point of order. We are now dealing with a return to the Estimates, which is a quite different set of Standing Orders. The honourable Treasurer.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was asked by the Leader why are we here, and I am going through it. It was a direct question; I think it was the first one I have heard today that is in order, and I am very happy to respond. So, because of a technicality, an accident of timing, we have to do it in this way. That is all. The Deputy Leader sat on the front bench opposite; and members in another place all agreed it was a technicality—30 seconds and no fuss. Of course, the Deputy Leader had some problems in conveying his own commonsense to certain members opposite, although not all members opposite. I know that the debate was somewhat heated in the Party room. What it described to me is that the maddies opposite had the numbers on the day, and that is why we are here. I think that is a very full explanation.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Premier would understand that officers have been seconded to the Office of Public Sector Reform from his department. How many officers are attached to the Office of Public Sector Reform and from which agencies have they been drawn? What is the

budget allocation for officers' salaries for the remainder of this year?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is an Estimates Committee type of question and it is not a question related to the schedule before us.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not allow members to shout down another member. A question has been asked; it will be answered and, if any member wishes to ask another question, the member can stand in his or her place and be recognised. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We are dealing with the transfer of money, to use the Leader's own term—the shuffling of moneys—and nothing more than that. As to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: As to what people may or may not have transferred, although not appropriate to this debate but to help the Committee, I will bring back information for the honourable member on that.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I would like to ask the question again, because moneys have been taken from the Premier's allocation and transferred to the Attorney-General's allocation. We would like to know what those funds represent in terms of manpower and how much has been spent. That is a reasonable question. It is a simple question and a question that the Premier of this State should be able to answer because it is his own portfolio that has been affected. It is absolutely essential that we know how funds are being moved. If the Chairman is going to accept that Ministers do not have to talk about the funding and the items contained in the changes—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mitcham will resume his seat. If the honourable member has a problem with the Chair's ruling, it is in his hands to do something about it. He now has the opportunity to do so and, if he wishes to take that opportunity, he should proceed. I will not allow indirect references to the Chair in the debate.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I ask—

The CHAIRMAN: Are you going to take the opportunity that I am giving you?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Not at the moment, but I may later, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is—

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have a question that I wish to ask the Premier. May I ask the question, Sir?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Premier please tell the Committee of the composition of funds that have been transferred from his budget line to the Attorney-General's budget line?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This question was asked before and I answered it before. In his own explanation the honourable member provided some of the answers himself. I am following your ruling, Mr Chairman, about what is relevant to the debate. Notwithstanding that, I have still indicated my willingness to bring back information at a later time because it is not relevant to this debate.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Premier tell the Committee why, in the moneys being transferred from the line

'Premier and State Development, Miscellaneous' to 'Premier and Minister of Economic Development, Miscellaneous', the funding allocation for the MFP of \$37 642 000 has to date only been expended by the amount of \$1 009 000 and can the Premier please explain the status of that expenditure?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Mitcham clearly does know what has been happening because he can read the schedules well. His mathematics are correct in terms of actual expenditures, but the issue we come back to again is that it is not relevant to the debate at the moment. There is a place and a time when those matters can be raised, and I shall certainly answer those matters in the right place and time. In the Leader's own words, at this stage we are dealing with the shuffling of the funds to take account of the changes in the portfolios. Therefore, because I am following your ruling on the debate, Mr Chairman, with which I agree, as it indicates how far the debate extends, that is, just to the schedule—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There is a place and a time and there is Question Time next week—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If we want to get into what is responsible and what is not responsible, I can canvass why we are here today. We are here today—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Premier to sit down and I ask the Committee to come to order. I want the Committee to be conducted in a proper way, in a way that the people of South Australia would like to see it being conducted, and at the moment that is not being done.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would expect that to be done in the way that Standing Orders provide. A question has been asked and I would like to wait until the answer has been given and then, as every member has a right to ask a question, they should take that opportunity. The honourable Premier.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Coming back to why we are here, it is because a technical matter is being rearranged, and that technical matter could have been rearranged much more easily than is turning out to be the case. We are here today because of the intransigence, irresponsibility and silly antics of the Opposition.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Standing Order 119 makes it clear that no member may reflect on a vote of the House. The Premier well knows that we are here as a result of a vote of the House. As he is clearly in breach of the Standing Order, I ask you to rule on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not accept that what the Premier has said is a reflection on a vote of the House. I ask the Premier to come back to the proposition before us. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will certainly do that, Mr Chairman. The point is that at all times in my career in Cabinet I have been more than willing to be forthcoming with information. I remember the number of speeches made by members opposite in the Estimates

Committees before which I have appeared as Minister where they have said how much information we gave them and how willing my colleagues and I have been to give information. They have given credit because credit was due to be given in those situations. That is the way that I operate in terms of ordinary questions in Question Time in the House. Again, I am fulsome with the information that I provide.

Frankly, in this situation today we have a series of matters that have taken place at the Opposition's instigation on this matter and we have a very technical matter to attend to. I will keep my answers to the technical matter before the Committee, following your ruling Mr Chairman, that is, the schedule and the movement of funds according to the schedule.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Chairman, I seek clarification. About five minutes ago you said that the Committee was going to be conducted in the same way as an Estimates Committee, if I heard you correctly. That was the way I understood it and that is the way we would wish it to be, because we are considering the schedule and a new set of expenditures.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is a new schedule; we are considering a new schedule.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to sit down. The purpose of the expenditure contained in all the programs summarised in the original schedule has been fully examined in the Estimates Committees. The changes that have led to the suggested amended schedule relate not to the purpose of the expenditure but to the new ministerial and departmental arrangements as to the responsibility for the expenditure. Questions related to those changes in responsibilities are, therefore, in order, but questions related to the purpose of the expenditure are not in order and, just as I ruled before the luncheon adjournment, I again rule that way.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Premier explain the different responsibilities between his department and the Office of Public Sector Reform?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is not the purpose of this debate. The purpose of this debate is why—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This is not to go into the philosophy of the changes or the political programs that have been outlined; it is simply whether or not the appropriate funds have been allocated according to the schedule. This schedule does that as a result of the reshuffle and what the reshuffle has brought about. The questions are therefore about that schedule and that is what is before the Committee.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Adelaide will come to order. The member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will ask the question again. I took a lead from the directions of the Chairman of this Committee. The Chairman said that it was quite competent to talk about the changes in responsibility, and that is the direction from the Chair. Does the Premier accept that it his responsibility to answer that question?

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is 'That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments be agreed to'.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Premier provide information as to why of the various grants under his line only \$7 000 has been expended?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Again, the member for Mitcham shows that he can read the figures, and so far so good. The sum of \$7 000 is listed on the schedule as having been expended, because that is what has been expended and that is why it appears on the schedule. I agree that there would be a point if there was an actual expenditure of \$9 000 or \$5 000 and this schedule showed \$7 000, but it shows \$7 000 because that is actually what has been expended.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Premier inform the Committee whether the whole of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology was transferred to the Minister of Business and Regional Development, and, if not, has he retained any officers from that department?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In the way that the budget papers were arrayed certain portfolios were named. There was an Estimates Committee for the Premier and there was another Estimates Committee for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. In fact, I attended two Estimates Committees for that reason. That is where the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology lay. There has now been a change of ministerial responsibilities and titles, and that is dealt with further on in the schedule, to which I refer the honourable member, those figures are clearly laid out there.

Mr OLSEN: I address my first question to the Minister of Business and Regional Development. With the establishment of the Information Utility under the schedule and the splitting of that between the Premier's Department and the Department of Business and Regional Development and the recruitment of the Chief Executive Officer, what salary will be paid to the new Chief Executive Officer?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The new Office of Business and Regional Development basically covers a range of areas which include the Small Business Corporation, the Centre for Manufacturing, the Deregulation Unit and, of course, the Information Utility. Some officers are currently working with Bill Cossey in that area to work up that program, and negotiations are proceeding in relation to other things, including the Chief Executive Officer's salary.

Mr OLSEN: I ask the Premier: in relation to the establishment of the new super seven Ministries and the employment of new Chief Executive Officers for those ministries, what salary base will be negotiated with those Chief Executive Officers?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is a very good question, but again it is not relevant to this debate. This debate is purely about the technical consequences of the reshuffle and the shuffling of funds which has had to take place to reflect that and about which I am happy to provide answers. However, that question is not relevant to this matter.

Mr OLSEN: I address a further question to the Premier. In relation to the Information Utility and the dissection of that department, part of which will be retained by the Premier and part of which will go to the Minister of Business and Regional Development, what proportion of staff will remain in the Premier's office

under what was formerly DITT, and how many staff will be transferred to the Minister of Business and Regional Development? This has a direct relevance to the schedule, because it concerns the allocation of funds under either one of those portfolio areas.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I do not believe that the member for Kavel has got that right. I suggest that if the Opposition's advisers are listening they might do a little more homework on what has actually taken place with respect to the Information Utility and the Information Technology Unit.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Mitcham to contain himself. The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The point I was making is that the member for Kavel would do well to look at the various aspects of information technology in Government and realise what is included in the Information Utility and the Information Technology Unit and then, when he has a proper understanding of that, I suggest that he look at the schedule and ask appropriate questions.

Mr OLSEN: It is information for this Parliament that is important. The annual report of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology has been tabled and the annual report of the Premier's Department was tabled today. Given the changes that have taken place in recent weeks, the thrust of those annual reports is out of date. Therefore, it is legitimate, appropriate and proper for the Opposition to ask the Government about its new structure related to the allocation of taxpayers' money for the expenditure and operation of Government over the remainder of this financial year.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: In response to the interjection by the Minister for what I cannot remember under the new arrangements—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would ask the honourable member not to respond to interjections and to address the Chair. If he ignores the interjections we will all get on much better.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Chairman, I look forward to your protection from the Government's ranks interjecting—

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will always have my protection.

Mr OLSEN: I look forward to it—

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member is suggesting that he is not getting the protection, it is in his own hands to do something about it. The member for Kavel.

Mr OLSEN: I am simply looking forward to it. Perhaps the Premier would like to advise the Committee about the allocation to specific departments and to whom they will be responsible under this new schedule. For example, the South-East Horticultural Development Committee has a responsibility associated with DTTT. To whom does it report now?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: First, picking up a comment made by the member for Kavel, he said that the annual reports are now out of date. They are not out of date. The annual reports do what they purport to do: report on a particular year. The report that I tabled today for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet 1991-92 did just that: it reported on the activities of that

department in the financial year 1991-92. No matter what happens post-1 July in terms of reshuffles and reallocations, it still reports on 1991-92 and accurately reflects what happened in 1991-92. The South-East Horticultural Development Committee has over the years been supported by two departments and it continues to be supported by two departments in its activities. However, I cannot see where it appears on the schedule.

Mr OLSEN: Two departments, but I still do not know which departments have a responsibility or to whom it reports. If that is too difficult for the Premier to answer today, perhaps he can in due course provide an answer to the question. Saying 'two departments' has little relevance, I suggest, to the question that was asked. I should have thought it was a deliberately evasive answer. To whom will the immigration promotion unit now report?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Again, I do not see the relevance of that to this technical schedule. As I said, it is certainly something that I am well and truly able to answer but it is not relevant to the debate before the Committee at this stage. In trying to be helpful—I do not want to transgress what is relevant to this debate—I will get some information.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Hayward may make those sorts of noises—it was hardly even an interjection in the sense of words that could be put down in *Hansard*. Again, I remind members how willing I am to come forward with detailed information in Estimates Committees and in Question Time. I continue to be willing to do that in the right place and at the right time but not subject to the sort of game plays that have been forced upon this Parliament. In that circumstance, we have a technical matter to resolve. I will help provide information on that technical matter to resolve it but other questions can wait until another place and another time.

Mr OLSEN: I refer to the annual report of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr OLSEN:—which states:

The department was completely restructured last year, and during 1991-92 operated under four main divisions: manufacturing, advanced industry, business develop and corporate operations.

Given that the restructuring of DITT has just been completed in the past financial year and we have a schedule before us that once again brings about a completely new structure, will the Premier nominate to whom those four old divisions will now report?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Again that is not relevant to the technical matter before us and, therefore, it is beyond the purview of this debate.

Mr OSWALD: I address my question to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. The *Government Gazette* of 8 October contains a reference to the transferring of all positions in the Department of Environment and Planning, other than the Aboriginal Heritage Unit within the department, to the Department of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. Does this mean that the Botanic Gardens, conservation policy, costal management, the

State Herbarium and all the other programs that were part of the Department of Environment and Planning are now under the control of the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The new ministry that I have assumed has funding responsibility for all programs, with the exception of the program to which the honourable member referred, that is, the Aboriginal heritage conservation program. I have assumed the funding responsibility from the former Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr OSWALD: The *Government Gazette* of 1 October lists the Acts which have been assigned to the Minister of Environment and Land Management: will the Minister explain how he will administer all those environmental programs, when all the Acts that pertain to those programs are under the portfolio of the Minister of Environment and Land Management?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Not only is that not relevant but also it is a gross misunderstanding of the way in which Government works.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the following motion to be debated—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot accept that proposition in the middle of Committee debate.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I think you can, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept that proposition in the middle of Committee.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I move:

That progress be reported.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown (teller), J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Noes (23)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins (teller), G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, M.J. Evans, R.J. Gregory, T.R. Groom, K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, N.T. Peterson, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

The CHAIRMAN: There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I wish to move the following amendment to the motion before the Committee:

That the line 'Premier and Cabinet' be reduced by \$1 000.

The Hon. T.R. Groom: Where are you going to put it?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We are taking it off the Premier's salary.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask all members to come to order. To clarify the situation, the Leader is moving to leave out certain words in the schedule and include others. I ask the Leader to proceed.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As we know from Standing Orders, this is effectively a vote of no confidence in the Government of the day. We are moving this vote of no confidence for a number of reasons that have been highlighted this afternoon. First, we have had a refusal by both the Premier and the Treasurer to reveal to this Chamber what salary increase is being paid to each of the new super permanent heads of the Public Service. The Government is not prepared to reveal to the taxpayers of South Australia this afternoon what is the additional cost—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Leader to sit down. This is indeed a very serious debate, and I will be treating it very seriously. So, if members contravene the Standing Orders, they will not be taking part in the vote, and that goes for both sides. I would ask all members to treat this matter with the respect that it deserves, and I ask the Leader to proceed.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman, and I proceed with my amendment on several grounds. First, this Government is not prepared to reveal to the taxpayers of South Australia what salary structure it has settled upon and agreed to for the permanent heads of the new so-called seven super ministries. I think that is a disgrace. It is asking us, the taxpayers of this State, to pay for the cost of the restructuring of the Public Service.

Already this afternoon we have revealed that, despite all the restructuring, not one dollar has been saved for the whole of the Government at the bottom of the schedule, yet the Premier himself has argued consistently over the past two months, since talking about his new ministries and the new direction of his Government, that it has been brought about with the objective of increased efficiency and a leaner, more efficient Public Service. Where is the evidence of that? Despite all the questions asked this afternoon, it is unable to produce one iota of evidence to substantiate that claim. It has consistently refused to answer question after question as to what are the details—and the very embarrassing details as we all now know—behind this restructuring.

Mr Chairman, this Government is in chaos. This Government could not organise a children's birthday party, let alone give any purpose, direction or economic development for South Australia. For two months it has had the chance to get its Public Service and its budget schedule in order, and even today we find it has failed to do so. The very embarrassing evidence today is the fact that, in case after case, it has allocated by proclamation a particular Act to one Minister and is now attempting to allocate funds to a different Minister. How can this State be administered, and how can there be accountability in South Australia with a Government that cannot even match up the allocation of funds with the allocation of ministerial responsibilities by proclamation? That is the second reason for my moving this amendment this afternoon.

The third reason is the arrogance and refusal of this Government to answer even the most basic questions this afternoon about the restructuring and about this schedule. I highlight to the Committee that it was the Government that introduced a new schedule, not an amended schedule. This Parliament has the right to debate the whole of that schedule, and now consistently, with your support, Mr

Chairman, which I am amazed you should be giving when sitting in an impartial position—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to sit down because I have no intention of sitting in the Chair and accepting his abuse. If the Leader wanted to move against my ruling, I gave him every opportunity—I repeat: every opportunity—and he never took that opportunity. I am not going to allow the Leader to reflect on the Chair, and that is what he is doing. I ask him to come back to the proposition that is in front of us.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I point out that, because it has a majority, the Government was able to refuse to allow progress to be reported so I could move that Standing Orders be suspended. The motion I was going to move is as follows:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended to enable the following motion to be debated:

That this House no longer has confidence in the South Australian Government due to its inability to provide vital information on the new budget schedule and, in particular, the refusal of the Government to reveal the salary increases being paid to the new seven super Public Service heads, and its administrative incompetence in failing to reconcile ministerial duties and funding allocations.

In all the time I have been in this Parliament I have never seen a Government shirk from a motion of no confidence in it. I recall that Premier Dunstan was always willing to debate a motion of no confidence in his Government, but this afternoon this Government is so unsure of its numbers on the floor of this Chamber that it decided to shirk that very tradition of this Parliament. It is not prepared to test whether or not it has the confidence of the Lower House, and no wonder, because only two or three weeks ago, on four separate occasions in the one week, it lost vital votes on the floor of this Parliament. On two very vital aspects with respect to WorkCover, the Government could not muster its own numbers to make sure that the vote got through the Lower House. Members would know of two other issues, one with respect to a private member's motion and the other with respect to the suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr S.J. Baker: Four times they were knocked off.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Four times in the one week, when members opposite are supposed to be in a Government with a majority in the Lower House. Ask the public; read the headlines. The whole of the State knows that this Government is in absolute chaos. It cannot even match up the allocation of funds with the responsibility of the ministry. Despite all the anomalies that I have highlighted this afternoon in my preliminary speech on the budget, the Premier and the Treasurer have not been able to give even one satisfactory explanation as to why it has occurred. The Government has a Minister of Environment and Land Management who has no responsibility but has the money. All he has is the zoo, Monarto and one or two other minor things in the north of the State.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask members to settle down.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yet, we have a Premier who has asked this State to have confidence in his Government because he is giving a new forward thrust to

economic development. Let us look at some of the other areas. We have the farce of his reorganisation of his own former Department of Industry, Trade and Technology. We were told six weeks ago that he would have before this House in a few weeks the details of the new economic development board; here we are, six weeks later, and we still do not have the detail of who is to sit on the board, what the structure of the board will be, or how the board is to act.

Back in June this Government allocated \$40 million to essential economic development in South Australia. It has spent none of that \$40 million since June of this year, some five months ago. That is the lack of priority it places on economic development and the creation of jobs in South Australia. This Government could not organise a thing. I cannot keep stressing that point too strongly. The people have lost confidence and the public servants have lost confidence in you, Premier. They joke about your Government. They talk about your super ministry as the 'seven dwarfs'. They talk about you as 'Snow White'. Even amongst their own ministerial ranks, with their personally selected ministerial staff, they cannot get their act together. We heard in Question Time today that the Premier's press secretary sent a fax to each Minister's press secretary asking them to return details of the achievements of this Labor Government for the last 10 years. He did not get a response—because for week after week they could not think of any achievements. I saw what was written on one of the responses; it simply said, 'You have destroyed the economy of South Australia.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have the fax that was sent out to all press secretaries by Wallaby. One press secretary sent back the following statement. This is how much confidence the Ministers' press secretaries have in this Government. The response stated:

Wallaby—

and Wallaby was underlined, because that is where it was directed to—

I can assist you in compiling the achievements.

1. Completely stuffed up the economy of South Australia.

Love from ...

That is the handwritten note at the bottom of this fax that was sent back. This is the Government's own staff putting down as the one and only achievement of this Labor Government for the last 10 years, 'You've stuffed up the economy.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This has particular significance, because the person who wrote this knows exactly what is going on behind the closed doors of the ministry. This person—this Don—is in a very privileged position. He understands the chaos that the Government is in. He understands the fact that day after day, as they try to carry out their ministerial Acts, they find they do not have the ministerial authority to do so. He knows, for instance, that, when a real estate contract was about to be finalised, after the restructuring of the Government was announced what did they find? They found that they could not complete that transaction because of the mistakes made in the proclamations and powers given to the different Ministers.

When the person rang me, he was distressed but, 24 hours later, he said, 'Don't worry; they have fixed it but they have asked me not to reveal the fact that they have fixed it, because they have obviously backdated the authority that was given.' In other words, it was obviously done illegally, to cover up the debacle that existed over the restructuring. That is the sort of Government that we have here in South Australia at present.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: What can we do about it? The people of South Australia want a lot done. First, they want an election. For you, Minister, who interjects across the Chamber—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the Leader take his seat; there is a point of order.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, the Leader is again referring to members opposite as 'you' instead of 'members opposite'.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the member for Hayward: it is the third time. I ask the Leader to address members by their correct title.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out that the people of South Australia want an election. They want a new Government. They want a future for their children in this State, and they are certainly not getting it under this tired, weary Labor Government which has been in office for 10 years and which cannot even highlight its own achievements.

Let us come back to the crux of this motion. We are moving for a reduction in ministerial lines, because this is the only way now, based on the majority vote of this House, that we can express our no-confidence in this Government. We are doing so for the three reasons I have explained. There are far more fundamental reasons that come to the very core of where South Australia sits today. In the last two years under this Labor Government we have lost 38 000 full-time jobs, 21 000 of those in the manufacturing sector—the equivalent of five Mitsubishi plants closing down in the last two years—and all under this one Minister as Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology who now purports to be our Premier.

On top of that, this same tired ministry has lost, through the State Bank, \$3 150 000 million through its financial mismanagement and its lack of accountability that is the subject of a royal commission report that will be handed to this Government next week—at least, the first stage of it only. I can imagine the embarrassment for the member for Ross Smith, for the now Deputy Premier who was Minister of Finance for so long during the period when questions about the State Bank were being asked, and for the now Premier who, as Minister responsible for industrial development, was actually questioned by senior directors of the State Bank and told that there were serious problems there. All 13 Ministers in that ministry sat on their hands and sat on their principles.

As a result, this State, having lost \$3 150 000 million through the State Bank, now has a State debt of about \$8 000 million and is paying for it dearly with an annual payment of \$978 million equivalent interest payments per year. That is the cost—about \$3 million a day—that we

are paying for the financial mismanagement and lack of accountability of this Government.

It came into office 10 years ago with a State debt based on the last budget under the former Government of \$2 600 million. It has the dubious record or achievement of having taken it from \$2 600 million to over \$8 000 million. It purports to be a Government that this State should have to give it future direction. Our children will pay for 10 years, at least, that is, if they stay in this State, because so many of our children are leaving South Australia to find a job either interstate or overseas. That is the real problem of this Labor Government: it is tearing apart the very fabric of the families of South Australia as people go out and search for some sort of job and some sort of future. It is time this Government resigned. It is time this Government went to the people. I have great pleasure in moving this motion that reflects no confidence in the Government.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Clearly, we do not accept this absolutely childish exercise that the Leader is putting before this Parliament this afternoon. The Leader said that we would not be able to organise a children's birthday party. I might say we did not ever attempt to do so; it is not in this schedule that we should have children's birthday parties. What we will be happy to do is organise the political wake of the Leader of the Opposition which is surely coming. The Leader knows that he is on thin ground, given the way he has been performing. He knows he has people breathing down the back of his neck. He knows he faces a divided Party and that is why—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Premier to sit down. I will make the same appeal to the Committee which I made when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking and which was complied with. I ask members to remain silent while the Premier is speaking. I would expect the same courtesy to be extended to the Premier as was extended to the Leader of the Opposition. This is an important debate. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is why the Leader is so hungry to try any attempt to grab power in this State, because he knows his window of opportunity—to use that phrase—and his chances are limited. He knows that if he does not happen to make some political score soon, he is finished. So, we see a hunger about him, we see a mean hunger about him, where he is prepared to tear up any agreements that his side might have made or might have been prepared to enter into just in this process alone.

This process that causes us to be here today is part of the self-same mean hunger that is part of the Leader's desperate attempt to try to hang on. If we want to use the images of children and a children's birthday party, we recall that the former member for Kavel, when he was the Leader of the Opposition, would have a sign up on the second floor that said 'so many days to the next election'. However, the Leader has taken that to a new childish level and his view is that it is 700 sleeps to the next election, or whatever the figure might be, and he crosses one off, going down to 699 sleeps to the next election and so on, going down. He is so eager to get the chance to be the next Premier of this State.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. All day you have ruled on relevance. Clearly, we are debating an amendment which has been moved by the Leader, and I ask you to rule on relevance in respect of the Premier's comments.

The CHAIRMAN: It is important that members understand why we are. We have now moved into a different debate. We are talking about an amendment which is virtually a vote of no confidence. I allowed wide-ranging debate so far as the Leader of the Opposition was concerned, and I intend to do the same for the Premier. I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr Chairman. What we have here is a Leader who has been rejected more times—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Heysen.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —than he cares to remember, and he ought to be reminded about that. The very fact is that, just prior to the 1979 State election, he had high hopes; he wanted to be the Leader of the Opposition, but he did not get the chance, because suddenly there was a State election forced and, wouldn't you know it, he did not get a chance because the Opposition fell into Government. So, he did not get the chance to be Leader of the Party.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Not only could he not manage to get into the leadership of the Party at that stage, he could not even hold his own seat. The honourable member sitting behind him must sometimes think, with a wry smile, that he has in front of him someone who could not win his own seat in the 1985 election. Later on—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: I call the member for Adelaide to order. If that happens again, I shall wain him and he knows what happens thereafter. The member for Fisher.

Mr SUCH: Mr Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The Premier is not addressing the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order. I am afraid I have been distracted. I have been listening to the debate. It is appropriate for every member to address the Chair. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: My apologies, Mr Chairman. I certainly should have been directing my remarks through the Chair. Not only could the Leader not hold his own seat but he could not even get the vice presidency of his own Party: he lost in that situation.

The Leader referred to some minor matters that we did not win on the floor of the House last week, but he seems to have forgotten that he was a member of the Cabinet, of the Liberal Government, which, when the first two votes were taken in the Parliament—and they were not minor matters (and there are some people who remember)—lost both of them, one in this House and one in another place. They made a nomination for Speaker and they could not even do it. They had just had a massive election result but they could not get their own nomination up in this House, and they could not get their

own nomination for President in another House. That was day one—and it was downhill from there.

The facts are that we have a simple, mean and hungry attempt to try to make any sort of capital out of the situations that have taken place. This Government is more than happy to debate appropriate no-confidence motions at any time when due process is followed. We have indicated that, and we have allowed those motions to be received. There are proper times for that to happen.

One would almost think that the House was not going to be sitting after today, that there were no further sitting days when the Leader could move such motions. There are quite a few sitting days when this could happen, and I have no doubt that the Leader might choose to move motions on those occasions, and we will debate them vigorously. The Leader attempts to read things all sorts of ways. On the one hand, in his own words, he acknowledges that this debate is simply about how funds are shuffled as a result of the ministerial reshuffle but then, on the other hand, he says that this should have really involved a mini budget in respect of the schedule, because he made the comment that not one dollar had been saved at the bottom of the schedule.

That is not the point of the schedule. The schedule is to reflect what happens to the deployment of funds as a result of the reshuffle that took place, and that is precisely what happened. It was not in itself meant to be a mini budget at any point in time and, for the Leader to start lamenting the fact that somehow that is not involved, shows how fundamentally he misses the point, yet it is a point that he himself acknowledged earlier this afternoon by his own words that this was simply about shuffling the funds.

In the right place, in the right circumstances, we are more than happy to provide as much information as possible to the Leader and members opposite, as our record shows, and I suggest that you go back to the Estimates Committee process and read your own speeches about the estimates process to see what sort of comments you made about the willingness of—

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. The Premier is not referring to members by name or title but addressing us as 'you'.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order and ask the Premier to refer to members by their correct title. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The facts are that, when it came to the Estimates Committee process, we took questions from members and answered a great many on that day and then took a lot more on notice. I can recall that, on a number of occasions in my Estimates Committees, conscious of the fact that we might run out of time and not leave the Opposition with enough time to ask questions, I said, as we got towards the end of a session, I simply said, 'Just ask all the questions you want.'

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the member for Morphett to order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I said, 'Just ask the questions one after the other and we will take them on notice and get the answers for members.' That is the process I followed, and I know that many of my colleagues do exactly the same to allow as much time as

possible to be given to the Opposition to have their questions asked and to have answers provided to those questions. The practice regarding how many questions are asked by Government backbenchers compared with Opposition members in Estimates Committees shows how much favour is given to the Opposition to allow members to use that important forum for asking questions.

We then have the matter of Question Time. At the moment, we are being accused of not providing information in this process on what is a purely technical matter involving a limited arena of debate, where the schedule is what is at question—and the figures of that schedule are all that are at question. We are being accused of not answering questions that go well beyond that ambit. What did we have in Question Time this morning? We had the opportunity for many of these questions to be asked. Some of the questions the Leader raised in his speech and some of the questions asked in the debate this afternoon would have been good question material for Question Time this morning. Such questions would have scored a good mark, had they been asked in Question Time this morning.

Indeed, they would have been worthy of the forum, they would have been worthy of Question Time and they would have been worthy of the Parliament, and the Opposition would have obtained answers to those questions. As members opposite well know, the information being sought in those answers is known, but there is an appropriate time and place for those questions to be asked and for answers to be provided.

If, for some reason or other—and I cannot think why—members opposite do not want to bring up those sorts of questions in Question Time (and perhaps they will feel a bit embarrassed, because they will not like the answers they get and will be embarrassed by those answers they get)—if they want to go one step back, I would introduce them to the methodology of questions on notice. They can ask questions on notice and get answers in due course.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Hanson seems to be taking some exception to that point. Again, I simply refer him to the statistics on all the questions on notice that have been answered over the many years of this Government and he will have to acknowledge that his interjection was not only out of order but quite wrong.

This Government is not refusing to provide information. We are more than happy to provide information in the appropriate place and at the appropriate time, but not simply because the Leader of the Opposition decides to play his own mean, hungry games to change the way things take place and to break agreements that have been made and then suddenly expect us to say, 'Okay, you've broken the agreement, but that doesn't matter; we'll still allow you to play the process fully.' You cannot expect it to be that way. If you are not prepared to play the system in a fair and reasonable way, you can hardly expect—

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, the Premier continues to address members without using their titles, and I draw your attention to that fact.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order and ask the Premier to make sure that everybody is addressed by their correct title. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I do not want to recanvass all that happened in the process that brought us to today's special sitting, but I want to make the point that other alternatives were considered before today. My colleagues and I were discussing this matter and we were more than willing to go through an extensive process of having the various lines questioned in great detail. Other methods were being looked at of handling this than the present one that we are dealing with, which we tried to get into this place by various other means, but we were not allowed to do so through the suspension of Standing Orders. In that situation we were looking forward to having an extensive question and answer period on each of the lines that came before the Committee.

I know for a fact that some hours were mentioned as being required for that. I understand that something like four hours was being required for going through that detailed consideration on one day. That is how willing we were to help, but when agreement after agreement was broken, at some point you have a right to get fed up; you have some right to get annoyed about that, and say that members cannot keep on expecting to have a reasonable response from the Government when they themselves do not play any reasonable game. We know that their Upper House colleagues are looking with amazement at how the Opposition is going on in this place. We know that they do not believe that this is the proper way that things should be happening.

Various other points could be made. We could go into a lengthy debate about the economy, if that is what members want in this no-confidence motion. But I suggest they should have put it on in the proper place. I am quite happy to come out with all the facts and figures and with the many achievements of this Government. I am conscious that we have a guillotine in this place at 6 o'clock tonight, which clearly the Opposition does not seem to care too much about.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: They are terrified.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: They are probably terrified that things will go as long as 6 o'clock tonight. We have a lot that we could say about how much has been achieved under this Government, and we are proud to stand on that record.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It comes down to what the issue before the Committee is, and that is the technical matter, the schedule, that has to be dealt with. The real cynicism of the Leader and his members was revealed by the fact that the Opposition has been offered for two weeks briefings from officers of the Government to walk them through what is going on, to walk them through which funds have gone where, to give them that pre-briefing, so that they could come in here and ask questions. The member for Kavel might be worried and concerned to hear that, because he probably does not know that that was taking place. The reality is that the Opposition was offered that chance to be pre-briefed to ask all the questions they wanted so that they could come into this place better armed, better briefed and really ask incisive questions of the Government. That was

something that we were quite happy to see happen, but they were not prepared to undertake such a briefing process.

Why would you let the facts get in the way of a good story? Why would you want to have anything to do with some real information, so that you could come into this place and use it? That is their decision. This is a democracy. They have a right to make that kind of decision. They have a right to turn down those briefings; that is fine. But they cannot have it both ways. When they come into this place so basically abusing the whole process, somehow expecting us to be generous in response with information when they have not used other reasonable ways of getting that information in this place, it is a bit rich to expect us to provide that information so willingly.

I have already indicated that the limits of this debate have been very tight, because it is a technical matter, but I have already indicated in some of my answers to the questions that I was asked that I shall be quite happy later to provide that information in the proper place. That is the issue at stake here. The Opposition cannot have it both ways. The simple matter is that we either have a proper way of running this system and Parliament and the Opposition agrees to work by that system or, if they are going to refuse to use the system in the proper way, they cannot really expect it from us.

I ask members to reject this motion. Unlike the member for Hayward's comment, this is essentially a no-confidence motion that is before us on this occasion and therefore it canvasses the wider debate. This is a very important vote, I accept, but I ask members to reject the motion. What is being asked of this Parliament is for the Opposition to be able to say, 'Let us play whatever games we want; let us not pay any regard to the appropriate ways of doing things; let us break any sort of agreement we might have had with you; let us do all of those sorts of things and, somehow or other, lay the blame for that on the Government.' That is what would happen in terms of passing a no-confidence motion. There could be no more cynical approach to politics. The very sort of thing that brings politicians into disrepute is fuelled by activities such as that. Therefore, I clearly believe that this Committee should reject the motion of the Leader.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call the Deputy Leader, I want to make clear the proposition that we have before us. It is suggested that amendment No. 3 be amended by reducing the vote of Premier and Cabinet of \$10 880 000 by \$1 000. It is an amendment to the amendment. The honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr INGERSON: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, it is No. 5—Premier and Cabinet—to reduce the line—

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that. You will see there are three amendments. You are moving an amendment to No. 3.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am talking about line 5.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I know you are talking about line 5, but you are moving an amendment to No. 3. The honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr INGERSON: I have listened on many occasions in this place to the former Minister of Industry, Trade and

Technology and I have listened today to what I think has been the most disappointing of presentations by a Premier that I have heard for a long time. It is not often that we expect a Premier to stand up and spend most of his time with personal abuse or having a go at individuals—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Committee will come to order. The Deputy Leader.

Mr INGERSON:—instead of defending the case that has been put against the Government on a very important no-confidence motion. The Premier said many times that there was a breaking of an agreement. The one thing that the Premier knows absolutely nothing about is a discussion that occurred between two people at the back of this Chamber in which no agreement was made. The Premier would have no idea what occurred. What occurred has already been put down on the record of this House, and that has not been refuted. It has been on the record for some 10 or 15 days. There is no question that the Opposition had the right, once it ascertained the extent of the amendments involved with this schedule, to question them.

The information is clearly set out in the documentation given to us by way of explanation of the new schedule involving three particular areas: first, that some appropriations are unchanged (and everybody in this place accepts that); secondly, that some appropriations have been reduced (and it is important to note an admission that appropriations have been reduced with no explanation of that matter); and, thirdly—and this is really the most important issue—that some of the proposed appropriations are new.

It is this Parliament's and this Opposition's right to question the Premier and Ministers about these new appropriations, and that is what it is all about. It is about getting information for the community, about making sure that the Government of the day, when it introduces a budget, is truthful and to the point, and about the right of an Opposition to question whether the information before this House is accurate. It is the beginning of the end when a Government becomes so arrogant that its Leader can say that he thinks it is a bit rich that the community should know what the arguments are all about, yet that is what you said, Mr Premier. Look at *Hansard* and you will find that is the truth.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Unlike the House of Representatives, we have a long tradition to which we firmly adhere that members direct their remarks through the Chair and do not call out 'you' to members opposite. They should use the first and the third persons, but not the second.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order and ask the Deputy Leader to address the Chair and to refer to members by their correct title.

Mr INGERSON: I will make a deliberate attempt to adhere to your ruling, Mr Chairman. This debate is all about this Government's record and the fact that it is not prepared to stand up and have its record questioned in the short period of this budget session. If you change the whole financial scheduling of a Government, you ought

to be prepared to stand up in this Parliament and answer for it. The record of this Government has been one of failure in the State Bank, massive problems in terms of accountability, problems with our State Government Insurance Commission, problems with Scrimber, and problems in an area in which I have been particularly involved, namely, the total mismanagement of workers compensation and industrial relations in this State. That is why we believe we have a right to be here today to question the Government and to get information from it in terms of the community benefit.

A document was forwarded to every member of Parliament by the Treasurer, and it is entitled 'Appropriation changes'. On the first page of that document there is change in every single listed department. The Premier said earlier that we had no right to ask questions about such appropriation changes, but they are not just small changes: they extend from \$1 million in respect of the multifunction polis through to \$159 million in Treasury—not small items but huge sums of money which have been changed, and that is not my opinion but the information contained in the documentation sent out by the Treasurer. That is the sort of information we are attempting today to have clarified.

The Premier said that it was all about a technical matter. How can the transfer of over a third of a budget of \$1 billion be simply a technical matter? It is a total reshuffle of all the departments and of the money allocated to them. In the past two days I have been at Wilpena Pound, where I had a discussion with a gentleman from the National Parks and Wildlife Service. One of his comments to me was, 'We didn't know what our new department was going to be called, but what we have been told to do is keep all the signs, the logos, on our sleeves, because they'll be memorabilia for the future.' They do not know what their future is—they have no idea—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr INGERSON:—and that is at least three weeks after there has been a decision to change the structure of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. That is just one example that has been highlighted to me in the past few days by an innocent gentleman who just happened to want to talk about his problems at Wilpena, in particular. In an area for which I, as a member of the Opposition, am responsible, occupational health and safety, there is a change of some \$600 000, and no explanation for this has been forthcoming today. On the tenth anniversary of this weary Government, we believe it is time that all these issues were properly answered before this House, and I support the motion.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I oppose the motion, and it would be no surprise to anyone in the Committee. I regret that I have to go through a bit of the history as to why we arrived at this position. It is regrettable that we have come to the stage—and I hope it goes no further—where, in conducting the business of the House, arrangements that are made are not adhered to by members opposite. I am a charitable person, and I am willing to give the benefit of the doubt that on occasions some of the Leader of the Opposition's troops are not always controllable. Therefore, arrangements break down,

and I allow for that. But, even so, what has happened preceding this debate today?

When it was established that changes would have to be made to the schedule to the Appropriation Bill, the Attorney-General spoke to members' counterparts in the other place and within minutes secured an agreement on a commonsense way of handling this matter. I approached the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in this place and put exactly the same proposition. The Deputy Leader agreed with me that that was the sensible way to handle it. Subsequently, when he went back to the Party room—or the leadership group, whoever they may be—he got rolled.

The Deputy Leader with the assistance of the leadership group then worked out that by refusing a suspension of Standing Orders or by not cooperating the Opposition could actually stymie the process of carrying out what the Deputy Leader had agreed with me and what the leadership in the upper House had agreed with the Attorney-General as being the sensible way to proceed. I think the Deputy Leader will agree that that is precisely what happened.

I have been rolled from time to time—we all win some and lose some in this game—but what I do not do is give my word and subsequently not deliver. This is not the first time. I regret that earlier in this Appropriation Bill when it was going through the House and when the Estimates Committees were on I had an agreement with members opposite, with the Deputy Leader. I allowed the Deputy Leader to write the program for the day, to say at what time he wanted officers present, what specific time he wanted to be allocated for specific portfolio areas and so on. I did not want any say in it whatsoever; I was very happy for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to write anything members opposite wanted. All I asked was that they adhered to it.

During that Estimates Committee debate the Leader of the Opposition tore up that agreement and ran right over the top of the Deputy Leader saying, 'Never mind about any agreement; we'll do what we like.' That was my first experience in 17 years in this place of the unreliability of people who give their word. About a fortnight ago, we had an agreement to a suspension to extend beyond midnight, but again that agreement was not carried out because the member for Murray-Mallee had a different view—to which he is entitled—and, rather than have the Deputy Leader carry out the agreement and see that it was adhered to, members opposite backed the member for Murray-Mallee. So, it appears that what I as Leader of the House have to do is get the agreement of the member for Murray-Mallee rather than the agreement of the Leader or the Deputy Leader, because the word of the Leader and the Deputy Leader to date has been unreliable for whatever reason.

I have been in Parliament for a long time and motions of no confidence in the Government have been very few. It is a very serious issue to put before the Parliament. Normally, it is not put on the spur of the moment, and it is certainly not put when there are no members of the press around because, if anyone is serious about such a motion, it is put when it will have the maximum effect and when it will take on the most serious intent of the Opposition. The reason for this motion is that we would not, during this debate, tell the Opposition what Michael

Lennon's salary is. For that reason, according to the Opposition, the Government ought to resign. It devalues the parliamentary process; it devalues completely motions of no confidence in a Government—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the member for Heysen to order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Opposition seeks to bring on a motion of no confidence because in this debate we would not tell members opposite Michael Lennon's salary. It is no wonder that the press believes that the Opposition's tactics in dealing with these changes to the schedule to the Appropriation Bill are silly. I am not talking about journalists who are favourable to the Labor Party—in fact, I do not know any—but those who have worked for and are favourable to members opposite. Read what they say about the way in which members opposite have behaved over the past two weeks.

Members opposite have not had the slightest interest in getting information on this suggested amendment, because it is self-explanatory and there is not a lot to say about it. Nevertheless, for the slower members of the Opposition I have given the member for Mitcham, who assumes responsibility for the Opposition in these matters, the amended schedule as I received it. I have given the member for Mitcham an explanatory table and probably a dozen pages of notes, which further enlarge upon it if any enlargement is required, and none really is. Nevertheless, I made that available two weeks ago. Also, on at least two or probably more occasions, I personally offered the member for Mitcham—not through officers; I telephoned him personally—Treasury Officers in case he was having difficulty in sorting out the amendment. He said that he was not, that he knew what the amendment meant. I have also offered the member for Mitcham—and through him any other member opposite—the departmental officers who are dealing with the altered appropriations; for example, officers of the Department of Primary Industries where there has been a considerable shift of funds.

Over the past two weeks, I have made those offers, but none of those offers has been taken up for two reasons: first, members opposite got themselves into this hole through a knee jerk reaction and by refusing to cooperate in a suspension—they were in a hole and they did not know how to get out of it; and, secondly, they did not want the facts to spoil what they saw as a good story. Never mind members on this side, there is not one political commentator in this State who does not know and has not said that the maddies in the Liberal Party who took them down this path are just that—stupid. They have made themselves look silly. I congratulate those members opposite—and they know who they are—who attempted to persuade the Leader not to go through this childish exercise with no purpose.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Coles was not one of them. The member for Coles is firmly in the camp of the maddies. So, I am happy to name the member for Coles, who encouraged this particular path down which the Opposition went—and I believe that the Opposition ought to be a lot better than that.

While I am dealing with the member for Coles, we know that she is disturbed at the moment. The member for

Coles likes to come in here full of sanctimonious self-righteousness about everything, yet what did she do? The member for Coles told the member for Kavel she would vote for him. The member for Coles kissed him—I read it in the paper, so it must be true—and the member for Coles stabbed him in the back.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. I protest at the way in which the Deputy Premier and Treasurer is impugning my integrity, and I ask that he retract because what he has said is not true.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot accept that as a point of order, but I ask the Treasurer to come back to the proposition in front of us.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Sir. I was provoked by the member for Coles. Everyone in the Parliament and who observes the Parliament knows about the integrity of the member for Coles: if she ever had any it has gone.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I would be very happy to do that.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I do not know about the member for Adelaide. I would have thought that the member for Adelaide and the member for Bright stayed out of that particular debate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Treasurer to come back to the point.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was a member of the Legislative Council for 10 years, and I was known to say some fairly harsh things about the Legislative Council and about the behaviour from time to time of some Legislative Councillors in the way they took over Government business, and I did not like some of the other things that they did. However, I can honestly say that, in a place where the Government of the day did not have the numbers—and I was in the Legislative Council during a Liberal Government and a Labor Government—I never saw the Opposition Party behave in this way.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister should not refer to the Legislative Council.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I should say the other place. I have never seen either Party behave in this way. I point out again that it took the counterparts of members opposite a very short time—and I refer to people with legal training—to work through the issues and agree to a process for fixing up this technical difficulty. It took them a very short time to do that, and they adhered to their word. They kept their word, said that this was appropriate and carried it out, unlike members here. Certainly, when occasions like this arise, it makes me ashamed to be a member of the House of Assembly, because I believe that the Opposition is bringing every member of the House of Assembly into disrepute. What they are doing rubs off on all of us. We all get the blame in the community when there are farces such as this, and I do not appreciate being associated with it and having my character—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —as a member of Parliament blackened because of the action of a few navvies opposite. I do not appreciate it, and neither do people outside.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, you could rely on those, there is no question about that. There are still some people here on whom I would rely just some. The difficulty that the Opposition has got itself into is that the debate on the suggested amendment from the Legislative Council is very narrow. If you understand the schedule—and overwhelmingly members opposite do—it is a very simple transfer of funds from one column to another. There is nothing difficult at all, and members opposite appreciate that. Given that it is so simple, there is not a lot to say about the schedule. There are not many questions that can be asked that are in order. I appreciate that, and that is why the debate on the suggested amendment probably should have gone for no longer than one hour or, with the assistance of departmental officers, probably no longer than half an hour. So, I appreciate the difficulty. What members opposite have to do is fill up the time until 6 o'clock. They cannot fill up the time until 6 o'clock—

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —with questions that are in order on the suggested amendment.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That was always going to be the case. So, what did they do? They debase the parliamentary currency and debase the no confidence motion mechanism by bringing it on at this time over the question of whether or not we will tell them Michael Lennon's salary because they have nothing else to put to the Committee. I believe I have never heard such a frivolous motion of no confidence. I will be honest. I would have thought that, over the past couple of years or so, this Government was fairly vulnerable to motions of no confidence.

I concede that. I would have thought that there were many opportunities on many serious issues that warranted a motion of no confidence. It would not have warranted passing, but it would have warranted a motion. That has not been done. What a bunch of mugs to bring on the most powerful motion that an Opposition can move in Parliament on a trivial issue such as this on a Friday afternoon when nobody in the whole of South Australia is the slightest bit interested. It shows that, if this was a deliberate tactic, the Opposition ought to go back to its tacticians and tell them they had better do better in the future. I urge the Committee to reject the proposition.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Rarely have we heard so much drivel from the Deputy Premier of this State. I ask the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the tacticians opposite: what happened in the past 16 hours? Yesterday, this amended schedule was debated on its merits in the Upper House. For 4 1/2 hours, members of the Opposition asked questions of the Government. Those questions were answered, or they were taken on notice and replies were promised. That is exactly what happened yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must not refer to debates in the other place.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What has happened between this place and the other place in the preceding few hours? Yesterday in another place the Government agreed to provide information and now, less than 24 hours later, it refuses to answer any questions from the Opposition. The reason for this relates to the vulnerability of the Government, which was just reflected upon by the Deputy Premier. If the Government were subject to intense scrutiny, it would pale by comparison, fall apart, and the press would see it for what it is: people who cannot understand changes that have taken place within their own ministries. That is what this farce is all about. That is why the Government is now refusing to provide answers. Let us be quite sure that this Chamber is the master of its own destiny. The Parliament is the master of its own destiny. If fundamental changes have taken place, it is right and proper for this place to reconsider them.

It was incumbent on the Government to get it right. It was incumbent on the Government to ensure that the changes it was making with the ministries did not coincide with the budget process. It was incumbent on the Government to manage its affairs properly. That is why we are here: not because we as the Opposition forced us here, but because the Government got it wrong. The Government wanted to trample all over the parliamentary processes and the people of South Australia because it made mistakes, and it has been picking up ever since.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: They say it is a bit rich to answer questions.

Mr S.J. BAKER: They say, 'It is a bit rich to answer questions but, if you knock on our door later, we will provide some answers.' That is most extraordinary stuff. Forget about briefings, the Parliament is the master of its own destiny. The people have a right to know if there are fundamental changes to programs, ministries and all the expenditure related to the Government.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Of course they are not getting information. Why do you think the Opposition wants to know the information? Because the Government officers to whom we talk say they are in a hell of a mess out there and do not know what is going on. They would like to know. They do not know; the Ministers do not know; and the people do not know. It is appropriate that this Parliament reconsider any of the fundamental changes that have taken place. The performance we have seen today is indicative of the sickness that this Government is passing onto the people of South Australia. Let us remind the Government that it is there by default. It is there only because of the peculiarities of the electoral system. Fifty-two per cent beats 48 per cent on most occasions that I am aware of. If we look at the polls, we see that it is around about 53 per cent to 32 per cent. That is why the Government does not want to answer questions; that is why the Government wants to prevaricate on important issues.

We wanted some simple answers. We did not want to reinvent the wheel. We wanted simple answers that should have been provided, as they were in another place, answers that would have settled the concerns of people,

of public servants and possibly even of the Ministers themselves if they had to go through the homework exercise. We wanted simple answers on the disparities between the management and the funding of the Grand Prix. We wanted information on the MFP. We wanted information, as the member for Heysen has pointed out. Instead, we have had no answers: we have had brick walls. As the Deputy Premier said, this is a shameful moment in this Parliament's history, but the shame lies with the Government, not with the Opposition.

When the Premier stood up in this House full of bluster and bull, he talked about the Leader of the Opposition marking off 700 sleeps. If we used the criteria that the Premier used, I have got one, and we all have one on this side, and we are all ready to cross them off. We want it tomorrow: we do not want it next year. He knows that, on every occasion the Government is put under pressure, it is found wanting, and that is why we have had prevarication today. It is not purely technical: it is the right of the Parliament to know.

Of course, offers for a briefing have been made by the Deputy Premier but, under the circumstances, there should be no briefing. If we want further information after the Parliament has considered the matter, we will take up those offers of briefing if we have not had enough information provided by this process. We demand the information be provided on the floor of the House, not through the back door—not through briefings. We want the information, as is the right of the Parliament, on the public record, as the member for Coles says, because we are dealing with a new schedule. We have heard many untruths told in this House. We are dealing with a new schedule, which has amendments to it. It is appropriate, competent and important that the Parliament considers it on its merits.

Whilst part of that schedule might refer to existing programs—which have changed anyway and are unrepresentative of the future direction of the Government—the point still remains that we have a new schedule, and we should have the right to examine every line, but we were to examine only those that had changed. The Opposition sought a great deal of information today so that it could be placed on the public record, and that revolves around all the changes that have taken place in the ministry and in the departments. At this stage, we do not even have a list of departments associated with the new ministry, and neither do members opposite.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Their own backbenchers do not have a clue what their Ministers are responsible for. That is a fair indication of the state of disarray of the Government today. It is a disgrace to this Parliament that the Government refuses to answer the questions. It is an absolute disgrace that we are being treated in this fashion, and it is an absolute disgrace that the Parliament has not been provided with the answers which it so richly deserves.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This is obviously a \$1 000 version of Trivial Pursuit, and no-one is here, by the way, because no-one actually cares about the Leader of the Opposition's tactics: people in the community and people in the media are saying that the Opposition is simply playing games. If members do not believe me,

they should let me read from this week's column by the press secretary to the former Liberal Leader of the Opposition, now the member for Kavel. It states:

Taking the Opposition's tactics first, last week's stop the budget changes game showed just how far the Opposition was from being a responsible alternative Government. It was grandstanding where acting like adults instead of politicians would have seen the impasse resolved.

Talking about members opposite, the article states:

They're not now at all impressed by this week's extra sittings. It's fine to attempt to make the Government look silly but not making yourself look juvenile in the process. It all had the atmosphere of stick-out tongue and 'I'm not going to play—so there!' Alternative Governments can do better than that. Of course maybe all the local action and hype was designed to deflect attention from Jeff Kennett's action across the border.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You do not have the guts to listen. It stated:

[Dean Brown] will no longer be allowed the luxury of a 10 second grab slagging off at the Government. It's time for, 'I'll show you mine' even if perhaps I'd prefer not to.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The article continues:

Meanwhile, in Canberra it's not exactly hidden that Hewson is less than enamoured by the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Minister to sit down and I ask the House to come to order. It is ridiculous the way the House is going on, with people shouting at each other across the benches. I would expect, and I would think other people would expect, this House to be conducted with more decorum, and I hope we achieve that from here on.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The point is that, earlier today and this afternoon we saw a series of forlorn looks by the Leader of the Opposition up to the gallery, looking for media allies. Where have they gone? They have gone; it is kaput. He just hopes that the 7.30 Report will look after you tonight. The fact is that during the Estimates Committee process you blew it. The Premier is absolutely right.

The CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the House come to order. I cannot hear.

Mr BRINDAL: I believe it is customary that remarks be addressed through the Chair. The Minister is referring again to 'you'.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order, and I ask the Minister to address the Chair and to address people by their correct title.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I apologise, Mr Chairman. The simple fact is that, during the Estimates Committees, Opposition members blew it. I made extra questions available to the Opposition when hour after hour they were scrambling around, looking for questions to ask. However, this year, I must confess, they did not ask me for dorothy dixers to provide to them. The simple question is 'Why are the media not here?' Why is it that members opposite have blown the no-confidence motion that they had arranged for next week to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the Labor Government? The simple fact is that they ran out of questions. They knew that they had made a tactical blunder and they had to fill in the time.

There is a number of issues that have to be raised. There is the question of policies. We are talking about confidence. Where does the Leader of the Opposition stand? So far, we have seen him flip-flop around from issue to issue. Where did he stand on zero tariffs? Some of his front bench, including some former Leaders of the Opposition—and there are quite a few there—seem to be for zero tariffs. One day he was for, one day he was against. Will the real Leader of the Opposition please stand up?

Where did he stand on the GST? One day he was against, one day he was for. Then he supported the GST, even though it would absolutely devastate the tourism industry. And then, amazingly, he came out in support of the bed tax. After weeks of shenanigans on that side of the House, we heard him on the Keith Conlon show saying that perhaps a bed tax was appropriate. Where does he stand on Fightback? One minute he is for, one minute he is against.

It is not surprising that Alex Kennedy, the former Liberal press secretary, says that it is about time he showed us his, as horrible a thought as that might be. Where does he stand on Jeff Kennett? He was great mates a few weeks ago. He was on the phone to Jeff all the time, but where does he stand now on employment contracts? Where does he stand on leave loading? Where does he stand on industrial relations? People all around this State are asking, 'Where do you stand?' The Leader of the Opposition will not get away with being a flip-flop. He will not get away with one day being for and one day being against.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Heysen.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The fact is that people want you to actually say what you mean and mean what you say. Your mates will try to protect you, because the cameras are turned up at the wrong moment.

Mr BRINDAL: I apologise for again taking up your time, Mr Chairman, but I rise on the point of order that the Minister does not seem to understand that he must address his remarks through the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order, and I ask the Minister to address the Chair.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. People are asking the Leader of the Opposition to say what he means and to mean what he says. Unfortunately, that is not his policy or his creed. He would rather have the creed of always being sincere, even if he has to fake it, and he fakes it every day. We saw him run out today when he did not have time to organise Richard Yeeles to write a speech for him and he did not have time to ask Ian, who is off to join Jeff, to actually organise the media. The fact is that time and time again we see an Opposition that knocks and tries to undermine. We have seen them try to undermine the Grand Prix, the submarine project and the tourism industry.

We saw Legh Davis, that great mate of members on that side of the House, leak false information designed deliberately to damage the tourism industry in this State. The Opposition talks about the tenth anniversary of the Labor Government, but it is also the tenth anniversary of this Opposition. We saw that the Leader, who lost his seat, is now losing his way. We are seeing the new

Leader being spiked by his front bench and his back bench.

We saw the member for Kavel—no ifs or buts—over seven years. He led them to go backwards and then came back: two losses, then dumped, then resigned his seat, then he came back and then dumped again. We have also seen the member for Victoria, the man who said he would not quit. He said, 'I will never quit. I am never a quitter.' He said that the day before he quit.

I made a few predictions earlier this year, and on this Grand Prix weekend perhaps I can be allowed a bit of indulgence to refer to them. I am told that a senior *Advertiser* writer said at the time that none of these predictions had any substance or credibility. We know for whom he used to work. First, I said that the member for Victoria would be dumped. Apparently, that was denied and the story was not run. Then I predicted that the member for Bragg would become the Deputy Leader and was hunting for votes. He denied that and he was given support by his mate in the media.

We also said that the member for Mitcham would be dumped as Deputy and would lose his white car. That was vigorously denied. Then I predicted that Ted Chapman would resign his seat to allow the present Leader of the Opposition to get preselection and then become elected Leader. There was widespread laughter on that side of the House. Then I predicted that the present member for Kavel would quit the Senate and come back to the Parliament. That was treated with total derision and laughed off with the claim that it could not and would not happen.

Well, I have news for the Opposition today. I made five predictions that were denied but proven true. I have now one more prediction to make before the end of this year: that is, the member for Kavel will be back.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Chairman—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Committee will come to order.

Mr OLSEN: There is one indisputable prediction that the Minister left out, that is, that the Labor Government will lose the next State election in South Australia. It would be appropriate to debate a no-confidence motion today—6 November 1992, 10 years to the day that we had a Labor Administration in South Australia. What do we have today? We have a repeat of the hallmark of the Bannon years—a refusal to answer questions about budget lines and expenditure of taxpayers' money in South Australia under the guise that they were not relevant questions.

Time after time points of order were taken, blocking and stalling, and we have had that for 10 years. South Australia is a financial disaster, because this Administration, the Bannon/Arnold Governments, under the guise of commercial confidentiality, has refused to answer legitimate, probing, responsible questions from the Opposition. It is this Administration that has walked away from the Westminster system of government and accountability, through the Parliament, to the people of South Australia. Certainly, we saw that over the 10 year period. If there is one fundamental responsibility of a Minister of the Crown, it is in this House, in this Parliament, to answer questions about the expenditure of

funds. That is a fundamental principle. To repeat, the reason we are in trouble is—

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: That is a relevant question. Today we have been dealing with the budget schedule, which lists the allocations to portfolios. In respect of the interjection, I heard other Ministers talk about the Estimates Committees. The Minister who has just completed his comments said, 'You blew it in the Estimates Committee.' No, we did not. What really happened? Let me give examples, and I have referred to the abuse of the Estimates Committees system by Ministers of the Government. Let me give one example concerning the Minister of Small Business, and I am delighted that she happens to be in the gallery at the moment.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Mr Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Reference to people present in the gallery is completely out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order and ask the member for Kavel—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Members are wasting their own time. I uphold the point of order and ask the member for Kavel not to make references to people in the gallery.

Mr OLSEN: I will not, Mr Chairman, but I am absolutely delighted that at first hand the Minister can hear my remarks to the Chamber today. In Estimates Committees one asks the Minister a question, then we get the Dorothy Dix questions coming intermittently from the other side, and then the Minister reads out three and four page responses to the Dorothy Dixers knowing that at 10 o'clock all questions are finished, that members cannot ask any more questions on those budget lines. I add that that is quite unlike the Senate system, which is a far better system, where the Ministers—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr OLSEN: Might well you ask.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: In the Senate, the Minister sits there until all questions have been asked and answered. There is no limit to block out time. Certainly, I had the misfortune of having two Ministers before me in Estimates Committees who used that tactic of Dorothy Dix questions and three or four page answers simply to wind out time so that they did not have to answer a range of questions. That was an abdication of responsibility by the Minister. It demonstrates that either a Minister has no confidence in his or her ability to answer the questions or simply is not able to answer those questions. It is incompetence or inability, or both—we can put it whatever way we like.

That is an abuse of the parliamentary system, and we are seeing the continuing abuse of that system. When Premier Arnold was elected as Premier of this State and Government, I would have thought that there would be a new approach to accountability on the basis of his track record.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It is on the basis of his track record as a Minister and a regard for the Westminster system of government. Today we have seen the Government simply resort to type—

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: As to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, and Recreation and Sport, the first reply that he gave today in this Chamber was, in fact, a detailed and reasonable answer to a question. However, he did not get a chance to answer a second question that way, because obviously he was told, between giving the answer to the first question and being asked the second question, that it got back to, 'This question is no longer relevant, because we are sticking to the new schedule and, therefore, it is not appropriate for me to answer that.'

What did the Premier do in response to the Leader's motion today? He traced irrelevant political history and did not concentrate on the real substance of the issue before us. How can this Opposition, the media or the public of South Australia have any confidence in a Government that has behaved in that way? Look at the deal that was done on Torrens Island. It has been shown to have been a tax sham. It cost the taxpayers of South Australia tens of millions of dollars. Look at Scrimber, the State Bank, Beneficial, the Remm development, and so the list goes on.

I well remember when the questions first started on the State Bank the derision by Government members for asking questions of that nature about the State Bank. Mind you, the media did not pick it up and run with it either. As I have said in speeches before, there is an accountability on the part of the media as well in reporting this matter. The simple fact is that there is example after example of this Administration, over the course of 10 years, refusing under the fundamental principle of the Westminster system to be accountable for its actions before this Parliament and to respond to legitimate questions before the Parliament.

How can we have any confidence and faith in a Government, the pride of the 1989 State election campaign, which decided to spend \$2 million of taxpayers' funds in an attempt to get it over the line? It decided to spend \$2 million of taxpayers' funds provided it was done secretly, provided it was not put out in the public arena, and in an election campaign that was principally about interest rates it had a very telling effect.

What did we find out in recent weeks and months? Not only the \$2 million secret subsidy and deal that was to be disguised from the public and the taxpayers of South Australia but that the Government breached Cabinet procedures in doing so. Therefore, the Premier says, 'I cannot supply the answers today. Pass the Appropriation Bill, the new schedule, the new list, and in due course, in the fullness of time and at an appropriate time in the future, I will answer your questions.' No thanks. On your track record you do not deserve any tolerance whatsoever in responding to questions. You ought to be accountable in the Parliament here and now for your actions and your financial actions.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The Government—the Bannon/Arnold Administration. What we are seeing in the Arnold Administration is no different from the way in which the Bannon Administration operated in terms of the expenditure of taxpayers' funds.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Given the chaos that we have seen around the place, there is confusion among Public

Servants as to those to whom they should report, what their responsibilities are and what their charter is within those portfolio areas. It is simply not there. That is why confusion is reigning. What the Government decided to do in relation to this matter today was to say, 'There is confusion, there are problems, there are difficulties; we have made some mistakes with the schedule and the financial allocation of resources within departments, with the manpower allocation, and who is reporting to which Minister, so we will resort to saying it is not relevant unless it is related to the reallocation of funds within specific lines and we will not deviate from that. If we do not deviate from that, we will not have to answer any questions today and we will get our budget measure through before Supply runs out on 13 November.' That is what the Government decided to do. It decided to block, block, block, use the numbers, and trust that on this occasion the Independents will support the Administration and therefore they will get their budget measure through.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr OLSEN: As the former Speaker would well know, Question Time has been abused as well as the Estimates Committees. The honourable member will be well aware that the present Speaker has had to draw to the attention of Ministers that they are abusing Question Time instead of using ministerial statements. So do not interject about our having plenty of Question Time and the like. The fact is that at Question Time, Estimates Committees and here again today the Government is abusing the parliamentary system. It is about time that the principles of the Westminster system of Parliament were put back on the agenda in South Australia.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I enter this debate—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The Leader wants to hear the situation in which he has put the Opposition. The member for Kavel commenced his contribution by saying that the motion was based on the refusal of the Government to answer questions, and other Opposition members said the same thing. I have been waiting since 11 o'clock this morning to receive a question. I was prepared to take the Opposition's request for a sitting today seriously and genuinely.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: My department had sustained a severe alteration and I thought there was a reasonable basis for the Opposition to ask some questions in relation to it. However, I have been here since 11 o'clock this morning, I have had officers on standby if need be, and I cancelled a trip to New Zealand, which was particularly important for the Forestry Division. I curtailed a trip to the South-East because I was told that there would be no pair for any Government activity whatsoever, no pair to take a delegation to New Zealand on a very important task, no pair for any other purpose, and my presence in the Chamber was absolutely essential.

It is now 5 o'clock and I have not received one question from the Opposition. It got as far as the member for Kavel, because the member for Mitcham said, 'Are you ready, John?' The member for Kavel was ready. The parcel of questions got as far as the member for Kavel and immediately went back to the Leader. The shadow

Minister of Primary Industries to date has missed out. I wanted to talk about the advantages of the super ministries, because this is what we are here for.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The member for Kavel based his thrust on the refusal of Government members to answer questions, which was absurd. For the past one and a half hours the Opposition has been spinning out the time. The questions commenced at about 2 o'clock, went to 3.30, and then we had a tactical motion of no confidence. That could be moved any time. It could have been moved last Thursday or next Tuesday. Instead of asking questions, particularly in relation to the super ministries, the Opposition has chosen to bat out time with the old worn out rhetoric that takes place in this Chamber. It is no wonder that the public is cynical about this Parliament when tactics and strategies of this nature are thrust into the public arena.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The only question that I have had today—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: You ought to remember when you devise these strategies that the public does watch this Parliament and expects it to retain a certain esteem and status. This was a strategy to call the Parliament back for a special day's sitting with the object of blocking the schedule which incorporates the super ministries. I wanted to tell the Parliament about the advantages of the super ministries, and the only question that I have had today was from the Government side. That question was in relation to South Australia's being selected as the Australian State to provide and coordinate agricultural research, advice and training for the Iranian Ministry of Construction, Jihad. It was a very important gain that we got for South Australia involving many millions of dollars. We will have an avenue, because it is a giant market for South Australian products; it will open the Iranian market to South Australia. It will get businesses out of the recession mentality.

It is a very significant development. It highlights the wisdom that the Premier and Cabinet had in creating a Department of Primary Industries, with a strong thrust to promoting the economic development of South Australia. It also underpins the advantage of setting up a South Australian research and development institute. It highlights the practical skills available in South Australia, the skills that our scientists have, the technology that exists in South Australia and our ability to keep new strategies afoot which will benefit the State, because the research and development institute will become an international focus for South Australia. Amalgamating the agencies and developing interprimary industries was a particularly positive step in advancing the economic interests of South Australia.

What we have before us is a motion on the part of the Opposition to block the schedule, to block the creation of key ministries, the creation of key economic portfolios—and for what gain? Simply to use a tactic, the old worn out tactic, of a no-confidence motion, reducing the line by \$1 000, which is based on suggestions that questions were not being answered—spurious based—and members opposite know that. The honourable

member told me that my presence in this Chamber today was absolutely essential, that there would be no pairs and that I had to cancel everything that I had planned, (because this was a non-sitting week). For what purpose? To sit here and listen to a replay for the past one and a half hours. The parcel went as far as the member for Kavel, and immediately went back to the Leader for a very tired old worn out tactic of a no-confidence motion. For one and a half hours I have listened to the same speeches I have heard in this Chamber for 12 years.

I thought at one stage there was a genuine basis for today's sitting. I know the tactics that the Opposition used. I thought perhaps there was a genuine basis. I thought perhaps the Opposition would simply set up the tactic and genuinely continue to probe and ask questions. I was up till midnight expecting that; having been told my department had suffered such alterations and my presence was absolutely essential, I cancelled everything, because I genuinely believed that some questions would be directed at me, properly based, but it is now 5.5 p.m., there is only 55 minutes left and the only question I have had today is from the Government side of the Committee, and that question illustrated the benefit of the super ministries, and the benefit of the economic direction upon which the Premier has embarked. Instead, the net effect of the Opposition's tactic is to block a schedule that incorporates the super ministries.

I hope that, in view of the contribution I have made, at some stage this afternoon I will get some questions, that the Opposition will allow the parcel of questions to go down the line, to pass beyond the member for Kavel, to get to the member for Morphet and, finally, to get to member for Victoria, the shadow Minister of Primary Industries, so I can legitimately answer perhaps some properly based questions of the Opposition. The Opposition has simply fallen into the old ploy, because the strategy—and I say this objectively—is a failure. There is no-one here; no-one is taking notice of this occasion.

An honourable member: Sit down then.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I will, but I hope the Opposition simply rethinks its strategy and, at least for the remainder of the time, we can get on with what we are supposed to be here for and deal with some questions. I look forward to getting some questions.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I know it might be painful for the honourable member to listen to me, but the member for Bright must know deep down that today has been a farce, because members opposite have not got anywhere; nothing has been achieved. They had a very extensive Estimates Committee and, if all the Opposition wanted to do was move a no-confidence motion, it have could have done it last week, last Tuesday, next Wednesday or during the Estimates Committees. If that is what we are here for, it is a farce. I believed that perhaps there was some genuine basis for it. I stress that the net effect of the Opposition's tactics is that there was ample justification to discuss the schedule, particularly in relation to my department. But at the end of the day, all we actually have is an Opposition blocking a schedule to incorporate super ministries when the only question I have had today is from the Government side of the Committee, and that question just illustrates the benefit,

the wisdom, of creating a Department of Primary Industries and a research and development institute.

Mr OSWALD: What a remarkable outburst. I can see the honourable member haranguing the court. All we received from that contribution was an admission by the Minister that he would have answered questions and that he disagrees with the other Ministers around him for not answering. There is no question that a very evident tactic was used by the Government, that is, not to answer questions. It was very evident from the Deputy Premier, when he rose on his first point of order, what the Government tactic would be, and that was to stifle any opportunity this Opposition had of receiving information in this Committee.

The Opposition has tried to obtain information from this Government. We have tried by means of Estimates Committees and Question Time. When the Premiers changed over and when we had a new range of Ministers, we endeavoured to question new Ministers on their portfolios and, certainly in the portfolios I shadow, not once have I yet received a reply. Not once have I received replies to the Estimates Committees questions which I repeatedly asked. I have asked important questions on recreation and sport, including TAB, but, because they are super-sensitive questions, we have not received a reply. Five or six weeks has gone by in that area and, because the Government knows it has a problem, we have had no response to it.

The schedules we are debating this afternoon contain information regarding the new portfolios, particularly that of environment and planning, which we accepted when we considered the budget and which involved some \$53 million. That sum now has been divided up into two new portfolio areas, one of planning and urban development and one of environment and lands. We are entitled to know how that money has been allocated. What we have found from the schedules is that some \$27 million went across to the Office of Planning and Urban Development, yet only \$2.3 million has gone into the Departments of Environment and Lands.

The Opposition has a responsibility to ask the question and find out how that money has been allocated. We also would like to know why, out of the environment and planning portfolio up until October, 47 per cent of the money we allocated in the budget has already been expended. I would have thought that was a correct and proper question to put to the Minister. I was prepared to raise that with the Minister this afternoon but, because of the tactics of the Government, I am being prevented from asking the Minister how the Government has disposed of nearly half the budget allocation before we reached the month of October.

I was also prepared to ask the Minister of Environment and Land Management why \$2 million of about \$3 million allocated to the Department of Lands had already been expended by the time we reached the month of October. They are correct and proper questions. The Minister of Primary Industries said that he was prepared to answer questions. When I started my line of questioning to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, a very clear line of questioning to try to follow through the new line-up in the Department of Environment and Land Management, he immediately ducked into his suitcase

and I did not get a reply—and I was not going to get one because as far as the Ministers are concerned no-one brought any notes in here. We prepared some very in-depth questions, but the Ministers were not prepared to answer questions. They brought no notes in here, no material at all. They sat back, well briefed beforehand in their Party room, knowing that the Opposition was going to get nothing out of this afternoon's exercise.

The Deputy Premier holds up his Question Time folder, but no information was forthcoming this afternoon. I cite the example of the question I raised concerning the Department of Lands. The department originally encompassed environment, planning and lands, but that has been amalgamated and we have ended up with a Department of Environment and Land Management which, supposedly, has a whole raft of responsibilities and a budget of \$2 million. This is the appropriate place to follow through that line of questioning. If the Government is not going to tell us how it will fund that department, the flow-on question from that is: how is the EPA going to be funded? The former Minister promised during the Estimates Committees that she would allocate \$500 000 for contaminated sites. If \$500 000 is taken out of that \$2 million, only \$1.5 million is left to run the Department of Environment and Land Management.

The Government may have appropriate answers, but I put to the Premier and the Deputy Premier that this is the time and the appropriate place, not necessarily, as he claims, during the Estimates Committees, which rolls off the inevitable. This is a proper line of questioning, because three departments were shifted around and amalgamated into two. Mr Chairman, you told us that this was a proper line of questioning, that if there was a break-up or a change of portfolios we could ask these questions. However, as soon as we started asking those questions the boom was lowered. As has happened with the Bannon Government and now with the Arnold Government, whenever the Opposition wants to ask appropriate questions which could cause some embarrassment, the boom is lowered, the Standing Orders are revoked and the Opposition is not given the opportunity.

It is no wonder that this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition ended up having to move, in desperation if you like, for a reduction of \$1 000 to give cause to the concern that the Opposition is being denied the chance of asking legitimate questions on behalf of the public. We will go away from this afternoon's debate none the wiser as to how the departments have been divided up or what is the constitution of the new Department of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations and the Department of Environment and Land Management. We have no idea, and I doubt very much whether the Ministers know what is happening in some of their departments, what some of the departmental divisions are and who the officers who run those departments are.

From inquiries I have made, it is obvious that many Ministers, directors-general and CEOs do not know the final structure of their departments; yet, we are asked to approve their schedules, and that, once again, goes back to the budget debate. We were asked to approve funding, but the departments did not know where that money would be allocated. Staff and programs have been moved

from one department to another. Directors-general do not know where their staff allocations will go in their departments and what their responsibilities are. The management of Government in this State is becoming a joke, a farce. We have senior public servants laughing at the Government's poor administration. We have a moribund Government on its knees. The public is demanding an election. I urge members to carry this no-confidence motion this afternoon so that that objective can be achieved.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Opposition Leader has tried to hang this debate on the fact that on 6 November 1982 (10 years ago) a Labor Government was elected in this State. He has tried to cobble his way out of this debacle, which he has created through his own inability to understand Standing Orders, procedures and other matters of the House, and that shows that he has not remembered very much about what happens in here during the time he has been outside. As the Minister of Primary Industries said, no doubt next Tuesday was the day planned for this debate. It is significant that 10 years ago a Labor Government was elected in South Australia, but the true significance of that day—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —for this debate is that it was on that day that the electorate of South Australia rejected the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues as a Government of this State. The people had had enough; the Liberal Party had had its opportunity, its three years in office, and it had been a disgraceful failure in its carrying out of office. So, it is significant that we refer to that period of 10 years ago, because not only was the Leader of the Opposition a senior member of that Government but five of his colleagues, who are scattered at various places around the benches—most of them on the back bench—were also part of that debacle and that rejection that we should be commemorating today, and I am delighted that the Leader of the Opposition has given us the opportunity to do so.

I will give members a few facts about the Opposition. In the attack on the Government today, we have heard issues raised such as debt. At this stage, debt in this State is lower than it was when we came to office—debt which had been hyped up through former years, *per capita*, and as a proportion of gross domestic product—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Committee to come to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —was reduced year by year in the time we were in office.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is certainly true that the State Bank debacle has changed that picture—we cannot shrink from that and we must accept the reality of that responsibility—but the fact is that in terms of what we were managing, unlike our predecessors—the Liberal Government, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a key member—we reduced this State's debt year by year in our own budgetary expenditure. What about public finance? Was it not the Government of which the Leader of the Opposition was a leading member that used our capital works money to prop up its recurrent expenditure?

It had nowhere to go and nothing else to do. It is this same hypocritical group, which day after day criticises our capital works program and demands that we spend more. Look at the spending pattern of this Government.

In terms of public sector employment, have we not heard requests for more from all members opposite at different times, depending upon which particular barrow they were pushing, whether it be hospitals, the environment, parks or housing, it does not matter—more police, more this and more that? Yet, they are sitting behind a Leader of the Opposition whose single-handed greatest contribution to the public sector employment of this State was a massive dislocation and reduction by a means that cost us dearly.

This was the double bungler effect, the one that said, 'We will render these people redundant but we will keep them on the payroll while we try to work them off it. Meanwhile, we will put out contracts to the private sector to do work that they are perfectly capable of doing.' This program cost the State millions, and it was master-minded by the Leader of the Opposition. So when he is calling on us, as he and his colleagues do, to ensure that we employ more people in these strategic areas, let him look to his own record.

In terms of jobs generally and unemployment, we are castigated about the position of the State in the current environment, we are castigated by the Leader of the Opposition and five of his former ministerial colleagues and another three or four who were in that Government and supporting it. That Government for a total of 34 months had consistently the highest unemployment in this country of all the States and territories. Month after month, the Liberal Government with which the Leader of the Opposition was connected had the highest unemployment at a time of record unemployment.

Consistently it had those figures, and now the Opposition has the audacity to try to criticise this Government which created thousands of jobs and was part of a major growth in employment. In fact, during our period in office, we have had the highest number of persons ever employed in South Australia's history, and it is still only marginally less than that now. The Leader of the Opposition talks about what has happened in the recession. He should look at his own record; that consistent record of record unemployment and record employment loss in this State.

He had the audacity to mention people leaving the State. He has certainly forgotten everything about Standing Orders and the procedures of this House. He also has a great big blank about the facts of life when his Party was in office, because people were leaving South Australia then. Net interstate migration from South Australia was very high indeed. We were in a situation where we were losing people because there was nothing for them in this State. During the past decade, we have reversed that situation. At one stage it was only Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia showing any net growth in interstate migration, and those figures have persisted right through until very recently in the current recession, so fancy raising that as a reason that we should be supporting this motion. It is quite outrageous. We did not hear about inflation and various other matters because perhaps he does remember the record in those areas.

It is all very well to refer to the State Bank, and I will certainly not back away from it because I have a responsibility there and one that I believe I have demonstrated. It is interesting to hear that the Leader of the Opposition has a fairly short memory on this matter also. When he chides us about the bank board, I remember his interjection when the Premier was saying something about the board and its responsibility. He yelled from the other side, 'You chose them; they were yours.' In fact, half the members who comprised the State Bank Board were Liberal appointees, deliberately kept on the new bank board in order to preserve continuity and some sort of faith with Opposition members, with some belief that they would have confidence in their own appointees. Well, they had tremendous confidence.

They were delighted with Mr Barrett and others until things went wrong. Then they raced away from them as fast as their legs could carry them. They put the greatest distance and dust between them. They purport to have forgotten that important fact. They have forgotten that they sat here and created the State Bank Act that prevented the Government from directing, intervening and controlling that bank. They have forgotten that they, the then Leader of the Opposition, the member for Kavel and his friends, strengthened that Act both in this House and another place. They have the audacity to try to say, 'We had nothing to do with that and we wash our hands of it.' That is absolutely disgraceful.

In looking at a motion like this, one does not just look at it in terms of the indictment of the Government's record, hypocritical and shallow as that has been. Surely, one looks at the alternative, and that is the big problem and flaw that this Opposition has. Is it offering South Australia a change or a reversion to that record and that time that the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues represent? On many occasions in many forums the Leader has tried to put himself forward as the architect of change and advancement. He had his chance in Government. He was the No. 3 Minister. He was meant to be one of the power houses, part of the all powerful razor gang—he, the former member for Kavel (the Hon. Mr Goldsworthy) and the Leader of the Opposition. These were the people who were setting the agenda with the hapless Premier, David Tonkin, sitting on the side. So, he cannot take any comfort from the fact that he was not the Premier of that Government. He was quite prepared to strut around and tell everyone informally in the media, 'I am actually making the decisions; I have the policy; I have the vision' some policy; some vision!

He was rejected by the people of South Australia. Then he had another go. They are in Opposition now and that senior Minister, that architect of the policies, the driving force, said to his colleagues, 'Here I am; I will be your Leader. Elect me and we will get back into Government.' But what did they do? They rejected him. They would not have a bar of him. They chose the now member for Kavel to be their Leader, fairly overwhelmingly, against the person who sits in the Leader's chair now. So he was rejected by the electorate in that sense. He is now rejected by his colleagues.

What was the next occasion? The next occasion is out there in his constituency. One would think that at least the people would understand the great contribution and

brilliant representation that he has there, but did he succeed? No. In 1985 he lost his seat. He not only lost the leadership to the member for Kavel, but he lost his seat to the then member for Fisher, now the member for Davenport, so he vanished from the scene for a while. He went to try to perhaps make restitution for some of the problems of his public office in the private sector. So, there we are: rejected in Government, rejected in Opposition and rejected in the electorate.

Finally he said, 'Well, I will come back and be a policy maker in the Party. I will be back there guiding the policy of the Party and helping to elect it. I will offer to be Vice President.' We all know that the Vice President generally takes on the presidency thereafter, but there were a few embarrassments at that level. The incumbent had to leave the State rather hurriedly with a bit of a problem, so Mr Brown, as he then was, presented himself to his Party, but his Party rejected him on that occasion. This is the person in whom not only we in this place but the people in the State are meant to have confidence, when all those sitting with him, those in his Party and those in his electorate, have consistently rejected him I thought it was very—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the Committee to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —significant, very Freudian, when the member—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—for Kavel got a bit wound up and was being challenged in the course of his address—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! For the last time I call the Deputy Leader to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: He told us that he would make a promise, and I listened to this with great interest because I thought I knew what was coming. However, I and others were wrong. He did not make a promise that we would see this motion pass and that the Leader of the Opposition would be installed as Premier. On the contrary, he said, 'You will lose the next election.' But he could not bring himself to mouth the words, 'The Leader of the Opposition will be Premier of this State', and I bet that we will have to listen very closely indeed for him ever to say those words. He is happy to say that the Labor Party will lose the next election, but he could not say, knowing the record of his Leader, that he would ever be Premier of this State. He is wrong on the first count, but he is certainly right in not making any predictions about the Leader. We have the Leader of the Opposition rejected at all points of his career. He has had one brief and temporary victory. He is now the Leader.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Someone was prepared to embrace him. It turned out that it was the member for Coles at the last minute in extraordinary circumstances. So he is there. How strongly he is there remains to be seen. In all that time he has not been prepared to hazard himself on the floor of this House in this sort of debate. This one, cobbled up at the last minute because they ran

out of questions and did not know where to turn and could not keep it going until six, is the first occasion in the 24 days that this Parliament has sat in this session that the Leader of the Opposition has hazarded himself to direct a debate of this kind on the floor, because he cannot deliver it and is not prepared to take it. He is not prepared to have it dished out by the Premier and those on the front bench or his colleagues on the back bench. He talks about opportunities to move this motion. He has had them day after day, and every one of them has been squibbed on every occasion.

Even when he has pumped up the press to think there is going to be some big moves or developments he has backed off, and he has backed off in circumstances which are quite extraordinary. If members of the Opposition are fair dinkum about this motion why have they not moved this sort of thing before? Why have they not actually fronted up? They have had a new Government structure, a new Premier in office, and I am sure the Premier was there, waiting, ready and willing to be tested; that is part of taking on the job. We were looking forward to seeing the contest but it was no contest because it was squibbed by the Leader of the Opposition until he cobbled it up today, and we all realised, if we had to have it demonstrated, just how inadequate he was going to be.

So, there we are with that situation. The target is gone, of course. It was fine when I was sitting down there on the front bench and the Leader of the Opposition could gear himself up and get plenty of coverage in the media about his attacks. But suddenly it disappears and where does he go? What does he do? The problem is that two things have happened in this. First, the focus goes on a new Premier, a new structure and new things happening in South Australia, which I support fully and totally and which I think are providing us with tremendous impetus in recovery. The second thing that happens is that the focus goes back on the Leader of the Opposition, and people say: 'All right, Bannon's gone. Now, what are you going to do? What are your policies? What are you on about?' The answer is 'Nothing'.

On tariffs, an issue that is fundamental to South Australia's future and its employment base, he has wimped out. When the whips cracked he went to water very rapidly indeed. We recall that he began by muttering about how he did not fully agree with the zero option, but indeed we have heard very little about it since. On the GST, he has endorsed it, despite all the inequities, injustice and problems for South Australia. The tourism industry, one of our most important job creators, is crying out for some sort of support across the Chamber and not just from us. Are they getting it? Nothing, zilch! The member for Coles used to be a spokesperson on tourism: nothing, zilch is coming from her on that. In relation to State cuts, what have we heard? We hear about Dr Hewson's payroll tax cuts, and that is good news says the Leader of the Opposition. Too right, it is, but it is at the expense of major funding and major programs in this State. Do we ever hear him criticise that? Not a word has come out.

Then, we look across the border to Kennett in Victoria, the great exemplar of what the real agenda, the secret agenda, is and the Leader of the Opposition now prevaricates and twists and turns on that as well. The fact is that his cover is blown. He needs an election very

quickly indeed. He has got major problems there with his colleagues. He has a deputy who cannot deliver. It could be a Government run in that sense by the lowest common denominator—perhaps an unfair way to describe the member for Murray-Mallee, but nonetheless true. He has a former deputy who says he does not want briefings—he is not interested in having briefings on anything, he does not want to be informed, he will just sound off as he has been doing for years. He has got a former Leader, of course, who was betrayed on his re-entry to this Parliament. Goodness knows why he left the Federal scene to return here, and I am sure he has been thinking about that himself very deeply and he is waiting his chance. He will get a chance again, probably.

And finally the Leader has a disaffected and dismayed back bench. All this is about is the Leader needing an election as quickly as possible because he knows the results are going to show that this Government will consolidate itself in a way that will be seen and recognised by the electorate.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: He will disrupt. His cover is blown across the border in Victoria. The longer Kennett has to run and the more chance Hewson has of getting in, the more the chances of the Opposition in this State slip away. He knows it and we should reject totally his futile and pathetic means of trying to cover that tremendous agitation and dismay that is now beginning to sweep the Liberal ranks.

Dr ARMITAGE: What a sad performance. The architect of South Australia's disastrous situation, who at one stage was on 70 per cent, but the member for Ross Smith, as he now is, quickly went down the slippery slope to 20 per cent. In that time he snuck in with his Government at 48 per cent but the only statistic that really matters now is 52 per cent to 31 per cent, so the Liberal Party is quite happy with the way that things are going at the moment with the polls.

We feel devastated for South Australians, though. I cannot believe the breathtaking arrogance of the last member who spoke, the architect of the disaster, the person responsible for our huge \$3 million a day debt; yet the member for Ross Smith is up defending the record. It is like the captain of the Hindenburg saying, 'I am sorry, someone told me hydrogen was not flammable.' It is unbelievable and it is from the man who at one stage when he was talking about the bank and how there were not enough beds for patients in the hospitals said, 'If only the bank had not failed, things would have been better in South Australia.'

We have had a 10 year downward spiral. There has been an ever increasing debt and ever decreasing jobs. We have had ever increasing dole queues and, more importantly, ever decreasing confidence, yet we hear this from the man who said he was coming in to fix unemployment in 1982 and in 1983, one year later, unemployment was at then record levels, and it continued to go that way. What a record and what a contribution from this mirage on the backbenches. I am uncertain whether he is the organ grinder or the monkey, because only today we saw the Premier accepting messages from the member from Ross Smith during speeches. What is

the role of the architect of South Australia's disastrous situation?

This motion is about confidence or lack of it and I would ask the Government and every member of the House to think how much confidence the 9 300 people on waiting lists have in the Government. In 1982 when this Government came to power waiting lists were not even mentioned. Now cancer patients cannot get treated. If one has breast cancer, one cannot get an operation. There are nine month waiting lists for major procedures and there is a 15-hour waiting list for people unconscious on a barouche in a corridor, yet this Government has the hide to say that it is deserving of confidence of the people of South Australia.

Further, in the country health scene we have the closure of yet another hospital, despite the previous Minister of Health's firm and solid promise that no more hospitals are looking down the barrel. How many other country towns will be decimated? If we look at the situation in the city, Royal Adelaide Hospital has 320 beds closing over Christmas and the latest newsletter from the Royal Adelaide Hospital Chief Executive Officer says, 'We are lucky we are inefficient in our slow reporting because, if we were not, we would be even a million dollars worse off.' What a disgraceful thing to say, that they are pleased that they are slow in their reporting. If they were not, another million dollars would be pruned from the Royal Adelaide Hospital. At the Queen Elizabeth Hospital 50 beds have been closed permanently and one in four outpatient departments closed. The Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital has waiting lists for the first time ever. The situation at Flinders Medical Centre has been well documented and Adelaide Women's and Children's Hospital cannot even afford to provide incontinent pads for children with spina bifida. Let us ask those people if they have confidence in this Government.

The Government's solution is to try to fudge and handball the problem. The Booz, Allen and Hamilton reviews were to solve all the problems. We saw \$4 million of taxpayers' money and has the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission read the report? No! Has he a copy of the report? No! What would he do if he had a copy of the report? He would not have time to read it, yet \$4 million of taxpayers' money has been spent. Let us ask the people on waiting lists whether or not they have confidence in the Government. Clearly, they have not. Why should they have confidence? Hospitals have been let to run down dramatically. We know that there are maggots in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and that \$200 million is required. What provision has the Government made to fix Queen Elizabeth and Royal Adelaide Hospitals? None whatsoever. The member for Ross Smith says that the Opposition wants extra public spending. That is a typical solution and that is exactly why South Australia is in the appalling situation that it is in today.

There are solutions without involving more spending and I put to the Government that \$600 000 can be saved at the Children's Hospital by competitively tendering the cleaning services—and every player wants to do it. The unions want it, management want it, the hospital management want it and clearly the management of the firm want it. The sum of \$600 000 can be saved, but the

Government will not do it. This Government has a tendency to try to keep information from the people.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: It is an obsession.

Dr ARMITAGE: As the member for Coles said, it is an obsession. Unfortunately, it has done that today. However, that is not what this motion is about. This motion is about confidence, or lack of it, in the Government. I put to the Committee and to South Australians that this Government has given us a record debt which our children will not pay off. It has absolutely sapped the confidence of South Australian business so that it will not offer jobs to people. As a consequence, we have record unemployment and, as an indictment on every member of this Government, we have record youth unemployment. Clearly, this Government does not deserve the confidence of the Committee.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Let us not lose sight of why we are here today. Today's sitting has been forced on the Parliament by the Liberal Party, and no-one who is any way honest will walk away at 6 o'clock tonight and be able to say that it has not been a farce. It has been a farce from the minute—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —the Leader of the Opposition stood up and we went through this charade. We have had a series of vile personal attacks on members on this side. I have been in this Parliament for a long time and I have seen—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. One of the unfortunate things about democracy is that from time to time one has to listen to things with which one does not agree, and that applies to both sides. I would ask members to show a bit of respect and to see this debate finish in the proper way. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Mr Chairman, for your protection. As I said, I have been in this Parliament for a long time and I have got used to members of the Liberal Party, if they do not have anything substantial to say, reducing the debate to gutter level attacks on members on this side. Today they have surpassed everything that I have heard in the past. They have tried to ridicule Ministers when they themselves have not been able to understand why we are here today. It has been adequately placed on the record that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition could not deliver and was made to look a fool, so I will not go into that.

I have learnt two things today as a result of this whole sorry saga. One is that the member for Coles kissed the member for Kavel. I do not know where the member for Coles kissed him, but I look forward, when a certain book is written, to finding out exactly where. That is one thing that I have learnt today. The other is something about which I have had an idea all the time—that Opposition members cannot understand a simple schedule. They cannot understand what the schedule is all about. Because they do not understand, or because they do not want to understand (I think the Deputy Leader understands), we have to endure this whole charade. By the time 6 o'clock comes, not one legitimate question will have been based on the schedule. From what I understand, every Minister has been here willing and

waiting to answer questions in relation to the schedule. However, that did not suit the Leader of the Opposition's tactics in this regard, so we have had what eventually came about.

Reduction of a budget line is one of the most serious things that can happen in a Parliament. It is worse than a motion of no confidence. Whilst it might achieve the same end, it is worse. What did we have? The Leader of the Opposition just could not get his own way. You, Sir, were subjected to attacks; it was said that you were biased in favour of this side. Then the member for Mitcham, by way of interjection, said, 'So you should be ashamed.' But he would not say that in a speech, because he knows he would have to pay the consequences.

The Leader of the Opposition moved the suspension of Standing Orders in the Committee stage. That is totally unheard of and totally against Standing Orders. When he was told that, he grubbed and clutched around and came up with reducing a line by \$1 000. The Leader of the Opposition knows that that is a most serious charge to make against the Government, but he chose to go down that path because he was anxious to prove to the people of South Australia that today's sitting was justified.

I am sure that you, Sir, as the Deputy Speaker, could provide an analysis of how much today's sitting has cost the people of South Australia. It will run into a tidy few thousand dollars, but that does not mean a thing to the Leader of the Opposition. When we debated the reduction of the line, not once did I hear a serious argument that could be justified. Members opposite went on about the way they were treated during the Estimates Committees. Sir, I happened to be a Chairman of one of those Committees, as was my colleague the member for Albert Park, and I have never seen, in all the times I have been a Chairman of an Estimates Committee, a more abysmal performance by members opposite.

Mr Becker: Rubbish!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Hanson says 'Rubbish!' The member for Hanson has cost the taxpayer literally millions of dollars because—

Mr Becker interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —he stands in the middle of Anzac Highway looking at Government plates and asking stupid questions which he puts on the Notice Paper. The member for Hanson should keep quiet and retire very quickly.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I reject this motion. The people of South Australia will see this motion for exactly what it is—a desperate grab by a man who the Liberal Party thought would be its saviour, and he has turned out to be a miserable squib. If I were a Machiavellian person, I would even go so far as to say that the member for Kavel, in the Liberal Party room, actually prompted him to take this course of action. All the member for Kavel has to do is to sit back and watch the Leader of the Opposition make a fool of himself, and one day that rather reluctant back bench will come to the conclusion—the same conclusion we came to many weeks ago—that it backed a loser in the present Leader of the Opposition and that he will take them only into another term in Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is interesting that, when the Government cannot defend itself, it abuses individuals. That is all we have heard since about 3 o'clock this afternoon, from the leadership of the Premier, to the Deputy Premier and even ending up with the member for Ross Smith. I thought it was incredible. I thought for a moment I heard a political skeleton starting to rattle as the member for Ross Smith—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —stood and tried to defend the actions of this Government in its administration over the past 10 years. Can members imagine any person who has led a more disastrous Government than the member for Ross Smith? Yet this afternoon had the gall to stand up and try to defend this Government—a man who has led this State to a loss of \$3 150 million through his own sheer incompetence, inability, laziness and political manoeuvring. Yet he had the gall to stand here this afternoon and try to defend the Government. He said, 'Don't worry. The Arnold Government will consolidate itself.' I think they call it *rigor mortis*; it occurs about eight hours after death has settled in. I have no doubt that *rigor mortis* is about to settle upon this Government now that it is well and truly dead.

I come back to the fundamental issues we are dealing with today and have been dealing with for the past few weeks. We have a Government that for eight weeks could not get its budget papers in order as they went through this Lower House, even though it announced the restructuring of Government well before the budget was passed in this House. What did it do? It forgot the fundamentals of government, and that is to make sure you have your budget right.

Secondly, we have had a Government that has introduced a new schedule. I point out that this Parliament, this Chamber, has had the right to debate the entire new schedule and not the amendments to the old one, despite what members opposite have been saying. We have had an attempt this afternoon to patch and plaster over what have been some very fundamental weaknesses in relation to how this restructuring of Government has been put together.

Earlier this afternoon and late this morning, I cited case after case where, by proclamation, ministerial responsibilities were given to one Minister, but the funds and the schedule were given to another. Since I entered this Parliament, a time going back to 1973, I do not think that I have ever seen a Government in greater disarray than this Government has been over the reorganisation of the Public Service. That is not just my assessment but that of the business community of Adelaide and of the senior public servants who are trying to operate under it.

The Government has created seven super ministries, and I understand that the head of the Premier's Department still has not given any instructions whatsoever to those heads of the new ministries as to how they are to operate. They themselves are trying to operate in a void and a vacuum. It is because of that that this State has floundered and will continue to flounder until we get to the next State election. Here is a Government that is not even prepared to tell this Parliament what increase in salary will apply to these

new super ministries. That is the lack of accountability that this ministry is now prepared to hide behind; they are not even prepared to tell us the salaries of the new permanent heads.

We find that there is complete chaos within this Government. It is, by everyone's standard, a tired, weary Government. It is more than appropriate on its tenth anniversary and 10 years of failing to give South Australia the leadership and the economic development this State has needed that we should move this motion of no confidence to reduce a line of the budget accordingly and to ensure that, if possible, we can get a majority of this Parliament to support it. I should hope that members who are not bound by a Caucus vote will consider very carefully how they vote on this issue.

The polls clearly indicate that they want a change of Government, and I ask this Committee to support this vote of no confidence and to reject this Government, this Government of chaos, this tired and weary bunch that call themselves the Labor Government of South Australia.

The Legislative Council's suggested amendments Nos 1 and 2 agreed to.

The Committee divided on the amendment to the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 3:

Ayes (23)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown (teller), J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Noes (23)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins (teller), G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, M.J. Evans, R.J. Gregory, T.R. Groom, K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, N.T. Peterson, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

The CHAIRMAN: There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote to the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The House divided on the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 3:

Ayes (23)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins (teller), G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, M.J. Evans, R.J. Gregory, T.R. Groom, K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, N.T. Peterson, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

Noes (23)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown (teller), J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 23 Ayes and 23 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote to the Ayes.

Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 3 thus agreed to.

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

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.
Motion carried.

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC ACTUARY) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EXPIATION OF OFFENCES (DIVISIONAL FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

SUMMARY PROCEDURE (SUMMARY PROTECTION ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

STATE LOTTERIES (SOCCER POOLS AND OTHER) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr LEWIS: During the course of the debate just concluded, the Treasurer alleged that I made some breach of an arrangement with the Opposition. To the best of my knowledge, I did no such thing. At no time was I aware of any arrangement. If he was referring to the incident with respect to Standing Order 51, all I did was exercise my right to call the attention of the House to Standing Order 51, and the House determined that it would not proceed with its sittings beyond midnight. That alone is the truth of the matter. He misrepresents me on the record by claiming that I broke some agreement.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 10 November at 2 p.m.